

APPLICATION NO: 25/01296/FUL		OFFICER: Mr Ben Warren	
DATE REGISTERED: 19th August 2025		DATE OF EXPIRY : 14th October 2025	
WARD: Park		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	The Applicant		
LOCATION:	1 Prinbox Works Saddlers Lane Tivoli Walk		
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment of the site to provide 6 no. dwellings following the demolition of the existing building.		

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	22
Number of objections	22
Number of representations	0
Number of supporting	0

2 Tivoli Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UX

Comments: 10th September 2025

We would like to add our support to our neighbours objections to this development as it stands.

The observations of the civic society and others identify clearly that the development as proposed would be detrimental to the Tivoli area.

14 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TY

Comments: 15th September 2025

Letter and photographs attached.

14 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TY

Comments: 15th September 2025

Here is a video my wife took very recently highlighting how far we typically have to park from our house on lypiatt st (no14) , it's rare to get a spot on the road as it is. These plans will impact tivoli walk as well, which is going to make parking significantly harder for the

current residents. The proposal as it stands is offensive and completely disregards the needs of the existing residents of the street.

Thanks

From*****Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2025 7:32:18 pm

To.*****

Cc: dccomments@cheltenham.gov.uk

Subject: Re: 25/01296/FUL

To whom it may concern,

Further to my husband ***** email below, please see the attached video taken by myself - *****_*****wife also residing at 14 Lypiatt st, Cheltenham GL50 2TY- this video was taken at 19.50pm on Monday evening 8th September 2025 , I drove around looking for a space, but had to park at the very top of Tivoli walk - on the corner, outside the bed and breakfast apartments that lead onto Hatherley street- I walked down Hatherley street, and started filming walking through Princes street and onto Lypiatt street to show how people are even parking on double yellow lines, as there are no spaces. This is a regular occurrence. We would need to have residents parking to safeguard our spaces.

Yours sincerely

4 Llandudno Villas
Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TZ

Comments: 10th September 2025

As a long term resident of Lypiatt Street, I am concerned regarding the loss of Parking Spaces. What guarantee will we have we can park in the Street, which is not always likely at present? Will any size vehicle be able to turn in and Park into Saddlers Lane Properties?

What use was it surveying the Street 6.00-6.30 and 22.00-2030 I assume this has been done very recently, i.e. School Holiday Season and before the Uni is back!

Has any consideration been given to the speed limit, i.e.30 at present should it not be 20mph, as many people like to 'cut through between the Park & Town. They become cross when we are unloading or are trying to reverse back out into Princes Road! These various aspects subtract from our quality of life!

We have had NO STREET LIGHTS for at least 8 weeks! This in itself is becoming an issue and to add to that, my vehicle is old and someone damaged the Wing Mirror 2 weeks ago when it was parked at the kerbside, during the evening! The Children are

back at School and dark nights will soon be here, surely this should be a matter of urgency for the National Grid, I know ***** has been chasing them up!

I am sure there are many more points I could try and raise, and many will be highlighted by neighbours.

One further point I would like to make is that Prinbox, as it is now has several parking spaces but I never seem to see it half full even. I realise it could be for Directors/Managers who are out on business a great deal of the time.

4 Llandudno Villas
GL502TZ

14 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TY

Comments: 8th October 2025

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing as a local resident of 14 Lypiatt Street, Cheltenham (GL50 2TY) to object to the above planning application.

My objection relates primarily to the unacceptable impact this proposal would have on local parking availability, traffic congestion, and highway safety within the Tivoli and Lypiatt area.

1. Increased Pressure on On-Street Parking

The proposal for six new dwellings will inevitably generate additional parking demand from residents, visitors, deliveries, and tradespeople.

The streets surrounding Saddlers Lane and Tivoli Walk — including Lypiatt Street — already experience severe parking pressure, particularly during evenings and weekends.

This development does not appear to provide adequate off-street parking provision, meaning further displacement of vehicles onto surrounding residential streets. This would increase congestion, inconvenience existing residents, and in some cases obstruct access for emergency and service vehicles.

2. Highway Safety Concerns

The additional parking stress and vehicle movements will likely lead to cars parking closer to corners, junctions, and driveways, reducing visibility for both drivers and pedestrians.

Given the narrow nature of Tivoli Walk and the surrounding roads, this presents a clear highway safety risk, particularly for children and elderly residents walking in the area.

Without sufficient on-site parking or traffic management measures, the proposal fails to protect the safety and convenience of existing road users.

3. Failure to Meet Local Planning and Parking Standards

The development appears inconsistent with Cheltenham Borough Council's adopted parking standards as informed by the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets. Each dwelling is expected to generate at least one parking space, with visitor provision on top of that.

By not demonstrating sufficient off-street capacity, the proposal conflicts with the Joint Core Strategy Policies INF1 (Transport Network) and SD4 (Design Requirements), which require safe and suitable access, adequate parking provision, and avoidance of unacceptable transport impacts.

4. Lack of Sustainable Transport Mitigation

While the proposal may reference sustainable transport options, there are no clear or enforceable measures (such as secure cycle storage, electric vehicle charging points, or travel plan commitments) to realistically reduce private car dependency. Without these measures, the proposal will intensify local parking and traffic problems rather than alleviate them.

5. Suggested Mitigation if Approved

If the Council is minded to approve the application, I respectfully request that the following conditions or obligations be applied to mitigate the impact:

1. Restriction on residents' parking permits for the new dwellings within existing controlled parking zones.
2. Provision of adequate off-street parking spaces to meet local standards.
3. Requirement for secure cycle storage and EV charging facilities for all dwellings.
4. A post-occupation parking survey to monitor and address any adverse parking displacement.
5. A contribution towards local traffic management or parking control measures if parking congestion worsens.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed redevelopment of Prinbox Works would cause an unacceptable impact on parking availability, highway safety, and residential amenity in the surrounding streets.

The application fails to demonstrate compliance with local planning policy or adequate mitigation for these impacts.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Cheltenham Borough Council refuse planning application 25/01296/FUL.

Comments: 9th September 2025

We live at 14 Lypiatt Street and we are very concerned about the worsening parking situation that will happen if these apartments are built- as it will decrease even further any parking availability for local residents. We have ***** , and it is becoming increasingly difficult and unsafe to get the children in and out of the car, particularly when I'm forced to park some distance from our house as there are no free spaces on Lypiatt street- people who work in the town are already parking and leaving their cars here all day, to have more apartments will increase the issues. Our ***** and has no road awareness, which makes the situation even more challenging and potentially dangerous. On many occasions I have had to stop in the middle of the street with my hazard lights on just to get the children safely out of the car or to unload a family shop as I can not park near my house. This is happening more frequently as parking pressures grow. We strongly support the introduction of residential parking permits to safeguard spaces for the people who live here. Without this, the problem will only get worse - especially once the new apartments are built. Thank you *****

Trewsbury
Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TY

Comments: 3rd September 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the above application on the grounds of highways and parking harm, conflict with Conservation Area duties, and procedural deliverability issues.

1. Loss of Public On-Street Parking

The Transport Statement confirms that the scheme will result in the removal of 3 spaces on Lypiatt Street and 7 spaces on Tivoli Walk (Transport Statement 5.32, 7.1). This equates to the permanent loss of 10 valuable public spaces relied upon daily by existing residents and visitors.

2. Inadequate Replacement and Flawed Parking Survey

The applicant justifies this loss by claiming a theoretical 214 available spaces in the wider area, calculated by dividing kerb length by 5.75 m (TS 7.5). However:

- The survey was conducted on a single weekday (Thu 1 May 2025) at 06:00-06:30 and 22:00-22:30 only (TS 7.6-7.7). This is not representative of weekend or daytime demand.
- The methodology ignores driveways, dropped kerbs, junctions, and refuse staging areas, inflating the supposed capacity.
- The TS itself acknowledges existing footway parking on Tivoli Walk (TS 7.4), demonstrating real-world stress on kerbside space.

3. Safety Concerns - Visibility and Speed

The TS assumes a 20 mph design speed for visibility splays (2.4 m × 22 m), despite Lypiatt Street being a posted 30 mph road (TS 5.7-5.12). No speed survey evidence is provided. Reliance on "side friction" from parked cars is speculative and unsafe.

4. Conservation Area Harm (Section 72 Duty)

The site lies within the Tivoli character area of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Area (Design & Access Statement 3.0; Planning Statement p.4). Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to preserving or enhancing character.

- The creation of multiple new crossovers, extended double yellow lines, and loss of continuous street frontage will introduce visual clutter and forecourt parking, eroding the historic character of Lypiatt Street.
- These highway alterations themselves should be subject to heritage impact assessment, which has not been provided.

5. Deliverability Dependent on TRO

The TS acknowledges that the proposed highway changes (extended double yellows) require a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (TS 5.20, Appx I). TROs are not guaranteed and require statutory consultation, with the public able to object. Without a confirmed TRO, the development is not deliverable in the form assessed. A Grampian condition should be imposed at minimum.

6. Other Omissions and Risks

- Visitor/Trades Parking: No provision is made for visitors or tradespeople, despite loss of 10 public bays.
- Waste & Servicing: With reduced kerb length, refuse staging is likely to obstruct sightlines and footways.
- Construction Impact: Narrow streets and Tree Protection CEZs (Tree Survey 6.2.8-6.2.10) will constrain access; a Construction Traffic Management Plan is absent.
- Ecology: The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal confirms nesting bird potential; demolition or pruning must avoid March-August or be subject to pre-works survey (PEA 4.9-4.13).
- Trees: The retained tree is within the Conservation Area and legally protected (Tree Survey 5.2.5, TPO section).

7. Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with:

- NPPF 111 - development should be refused where there are "unacceptable impacts on highway safety" or "severe residual cumulative impacts."
- Cheltenham Local Plan policies on transport and heritage.
- Section 72 duty - no demonstration of "preserve or enhance" to the Conservation Area.

8. Requested Actions

I respectfully request that the Council refuse the application.

If the LPA is nevertheless minded to approve, I request robust conditions/obligations including:

1. Grampian condition - no commencement/occupation until the TRO is confirmed and implemented.
2. Commitment to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk, ensuring residents are prioritised in parking allocation.
3. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and ATC speed survey - to be undertaken and designs amended before approval.
4. Parking Management Plan - covering provision for visitors and trades.
5. Construction Traffic Management Plan - covering routing, contractor parking, and tree protection.
6. Waste & Servicing Plan - showing safe bin staging away from sightlines.
7. Ecology and Tree Protection - pre-commencement surveys, CEZ compliance, and lighting controls.
8. Detailed SuDS/drainage design - permeable surfacing and on-site attenuation.

Conclusion

The proposal removes vital public parking, reduces safety, harms the Conservation Area, and is not deliverable without a separate TRO. It should therefore be refused or deferred until proper evidence and parking controls (via a residents' permit scheme) are secured.

14 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 8th September 2025

Planning Application for Prinbox Tivoli Cheltenham
Redevelopment of the site to provide 6 no. dwellings following the
demolition of the existing building.

25/01296/FUL

1 Prinbox Works Saddlers Lane Tivoli Walk Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2UX

I am writing to formally object to the proposed six-bedroom housing development at The Prinbox.

I added my complaint last year along with many other neighbours when the proposed 'change of use' plans for the Prinbox were published. It was immediately apparent that trying to fit six dwellings into that space would detrimentally affect the whole area. The new plans are equally problematic.

We know Cheltenham is very attractive to investors and developers and that there is pressure for change, be it large scale new build or small incremental alterations, but we live in a conservation area here in Tivoli with particular characteristics which over time have already been diminished by poor building choices during a period in time when many, low-quality, high-density dwellings were erected which have not aged well and detract from the character of these lovely, old streets.

Issues

Parking - safety and over-crowding.

Parking in these small streets has been an issue for many years and despite numerous surveys by the council nothing has happened to ameliorate the situation for the residents. Tivoli is the last free parking in Cheltenham and everyone uses it.

At one point the press reported that a near-by flying school was advising their students to use our streets for long term parking. Shoppers and workers use these streets to park in. We have disabled parking slots which use 1.5 spaces. The two pubs have customers who take up space in the day and evenings when residents arrive home and can't find space to park. We even have a new, 'change of use' hairdressing salon and an import/export business using multiple spaces and both bringing more traffic and pressure on parking spaces. The residents themselves have friends and family to visit and many have two or three cars per household. People even turn up in camper vans and spend a few weeks at a time. The festivals bring chaos to our streets with people wanting free, easy access to the venues.

Moreover, a couple of years ago, we lost double-digit, on-street parking spaces to double yellow lines. One of the reasons cited for painting the lines was due to limited manoeuvring for emergency vehicles due to too many cars parked.

This new development will further remove double-digit, on-street parking capacity so, where are existing residents of Tivoli supposed to park our cars and where are friends, family and other visitors to the new dwellings supposed to park?

The planned development states, ""The site is bounded by roads on three sides, allowing convenient access to off -street parking for each dwelling."

This is a gross exaggeration.

In fact, the site is actually bounded by one normal road (Lypiatt street) and one very tight and narrow road (Tivoli Walk) and one tiny, private track (Saddlers lane) which runs up the back of the houses between Tivoli street and Lypiatt street. Mostly, it is grassy and bumpy with inconvenient access to the tight, narrow Tivoli Walk. It is ludicrous that this dirt track will be home to croft garages for four cars! In addition, the house on the end of Tivoli street and Tivoli walk runs some kind of import/export business so has vans stopping outside to load and unload on a regular basis. Equally, the pub on the corner of Tivoli Walk has regular beer and miscellaneous deliveries.

As this design stands, for every off-road car space planned, the street loses the same and more parking. Drawings show no cars parked on Tivoli Walk on the side of the development. We cannot lose these spaces.

The parking issue, is in itself enough to say no to this over-developed housing scheme until a parking solution for the whole area has been identified, agreed and implemented. There are disputes regularly outside with cars and vans getting stuck. How on earth are all these new proposed cars supposed to navigate the small roads?

It is the job of the Council to discourage additional traffic from using unsuitable local roads but here we are!

"POLICY BE 7 PARKING ON FORECOURTS OR FRONT GARDENS IN CONSERVATION AREAS Objective O11 Development which introduces or extends the parking of vehicles on forecourts or front gardens of buildings in conservation areas will not be permitted."

Design problems

1)

The design shows 'croft-style' parking. It rains... A LOT.. in Cheltenham. In 2007, I believe, the area flooded, basements flooded... yet this design suggests a low flood risk?! The basement at no. 12 Tivoli street was enlarged over the last decade to try to create extra head height however, the builders hit the water table and created many problems as a result. There was pumping equipment outside for days.

Some neighbours who have lived in Tivoli for decades talk about the river that runs underneath us. To create under-house parking in Saddlers Lane without undertaking necessary research to establish the water line is insane. Simply, these two proposed units on that side should be removed along with their 'croft-style' parking or they will be regularly flooded.

The residents should be able to see in advance of any approval, that a comprehensive survey of the infrastructure is carried out so that existing land drainage, sewerage will not be overwhelmed and that a chaotic build is avoided when it inevitably becomes apparent that the whole of the area requires upgrading to accommodate the new additions. We've seen many examples of the Suffolks rendered impassable to traffic over the years as newer sewers had to be installed. OR, you could just build a less demanding development that really does blend into the Tivoli environment.

"POLICY UI 3 SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS Objective O30 In new developments the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems will be required. Where this is not practicable developers will be required to demonstrate fully why the development cannot incorporate sustainable drainage systems and how the development manages surface water drainage. " - It rains a lot in Cheltenham! Digging up the roads for new infrastructure will cause mayhem.

"POLICY UI 2 DEVELOPMENT AND FLOODING Objective O30 New development will only be permitted where it would: not increase the quantity or rate of surface water run-off and not have a direct and adverse effect on a watercourse or its flood defences; and not impede access to flood defence and management facilities.

The minimum standard of attenuation required will be the difference in run-off between that for a 1 in 100 year storm prior to development and a 1 in 100 year storm post development. The restriction and reduction of surface water run-off is likely to require the use of sustainable drainage systems"

2)

"Development in conservation areas is supposed to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of an area, development is most likely to be acceptable if it harmonises with an area's special architectural and visual qualities."

The Tivoli conservation housing area is mainly comprised of two storey terraced housing with front and back gardens built in the 1880s. The scale and mass of the proposed development fails to respect the special character and quality of the area.

The roof lines and messy mix of materials is rather something that can be seen all over Cheltenham on new estates and bears no relationship with the existing style of the Tivoli streets. The design is alien to the existing street scene of simple lines, elegant railings, flowered front gardens, chimney pots and coloured walls.

The mass of the proposed design crowds the space whereas the existing street scenes open up the space- you can see the sky.

Rather it is an unsuitable mass blob which harms the conservation area and detracts from the proportions in relation to adjoining properties with its stylistically unsuitable features such as the pink cladding. We face some pink cladding at the back of our house and it has not aged well over time and leaks so it constantly requires remedial works despite only being installed a few years ago.

One tree left from the original site does not constitute a contribution to the environment. The development should be scaled back so that so these messy lines can be removed and a street scene created that is congruent with the existing.

Allegedly, there is some kind of garden on the proposed plans and a tree but only facing Lypiatt Street. Do other neighbouring properties not deserve something green to break up the mass of the other facades? Tivoli is comprised of front and back gardens, this development is devoid of both.

3)

"Some development has occurred in conservation areas which have eroded this character, and the continued, cumulative effects of even small reductions in open space can have a significant effect on Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review: Adopted July 2006 30 the character and appearance of conservation areas. For these reasons, development which will have an adverse impact upon the green and open character of the conservation areas will be resisted."

One of the important elements in all the conservation areas is their residential character. For the most part they originally consisted of individual houses. It has produced areas of great beauty and an environmental character, which it is important to retain.

A viable use for buildings is essential, but if residential uses at original densities can be retained this will help to preserve the more subtle aspects of the character of the areas, connected, for example, with intensity of use. It will, for example, reduce the pressure for car parking in gardens and may well help to produce a stable community concerned to help take responsibility for individual buildings, gardens and the neighbourhood.

It is important that, where this character remains, it is strongly protected, particularly in conservation areas. Over-development can intensify activity in an area and erode quiet residential character through the cumulative effects of many small changes, including additional pressure for parking space, both on and off the highway... and can have an adverse impact on the light, privacy and amenity space of adjoining properties.

"The hotchpotch of different additions and alterations made over the years cannot simply be eliminated, but the Council will resist the extension of this random diversity of elements." I would like to see the Council resist this hotchpotch.

I appreciate your time and consideration and welcome further discussion on these matters.

Many, many residents of Tivoli are concerned that this development is done well and in such a way as to enhance the quality of our environment and community. The current offering is lacking in this respect and must be challenged.

13 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TY

Comments: 8th September 2025

In general terms we are pro the intention to develop the site into houses and feel 6 units seems appropriate without overdeveloping the site.

We welcome the green space introduced to the corner of Lypiatt St & Tiv Walk, retaining the existing tree and improving the visibility of that junction.

However, we feel the design and materials are out of keeping for residential properties within the area, brick on such a large scope is not suitable.

The view down the street from Andover Rd will be compromised, although Prinbox is not beautiful it is set back and so your eye is drawn to the attractive Georgian terraces. None of the CGI images or elevation drawings issued show any detail of the existing streetscape and there are no photomontages to give the proposals context.

The façade design (although an improvement on what is currently there) is now on the same line as the Georgian streetscape (not set back like the current industrial units) and should be more in keeping or complement the existing streetscape in order to preserve the special character of the area which stretches across several streets in parallel.

The existing context is simply shown as blocks of a single height, so there is no way of telling whether this relates to the parapet height of the adjacent houses or the ridge height of the roofs. The difference between the two will have a significant impact on the scale of the development and how it sits within the context.

There is no study or justification for the potential impact on the rights of light to the 3 houses directly opposite, given Prinbox is well set back from the street the new development will alter the current setting of these houses.

The proposed roof terraces are not appropriate for this area and will have a significant impact on those living opposite.

The development will take away 3 parking spaces on Lypiatt St and 7 spaces on Tivoli Walk from the existing residents, parking is already an issue given the street is always used by non-residents. Although a survey was undertaken, we do not feel the results are reflective of actual demand over a sustained period of time where there is significant turnover and movement. This blocks use for families that come and go during the day, (have their space taken while doing school drop off etc) these are a large proportion of the area demographic and their need to park close to home is greater.

We are sure (and hope) an approval will be reached at some stage and so the residents interests need to be taken into account during construction, therefore could the following conditions (or similar) be considered:

- working hours need to be appropriate for a Residential area, 08:00-18:00 maximum during the week and limited hours on a Saturday only
- strict wheel wash for site vehicles to prevent mud on the road and regular road cleaning to be enforced
- dust suppression measures in place during the works to reduce damage to neighbouring gardens, properties and vehicles. While protecting people's health
- traffic management for deliveries and large site machinery to prevent any road/pavement blockages, lorries queuing to get into site etc. and ensure the safety of pedestrians. Potential time restrictions to avoid commuter times.
- Compliance with The Considerate Contractor Scheme as a requirement of the company undertaking the works.

5 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UA

Comments: 10th November 2025

As a property directly opposite this new development I am getting more and more concerned that it is over-reaching what is acceptable on a pretty terraced road in a conservation area.

1. The top floor must be removed to retain existing house height on Lypiatt Street and the properties set back further.
2. Residents of the property must use adequate on site parking - ie. at least one parking space per dwelling and not take up the already minimal parking available on street. The scant existing bays must not be removed to avoid inevitable congestion.
3. I am particularly concerned about cars turning at night and having full glare headlights and security lights in through my windows. Also, during the building works.
3. It must NOT have the balconies that will intrusively look into my bedroom directly opposite. It is a gross invasion of privacy. I bought this property because there was limited overlooking. It will impact any sale of this property.
4. I am concerned about the additional load on sewers.
5. The survey on parking should never have taken place at low impact time of day and must be re-done in commuter hours.

This development has been ill-conceived and the revisions present no regard for existing residents in a conservation area.

29 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UD

Comments: 9th September 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

I formally write to you to raise my objections to the planning application 25/01296/FUL for the Redevelopment of the site (1 Prinbox Works, Saddlers Lane, Tivoli Walk, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 2UX) to provide 6 no. dwellings following the demolition of the existing building for the reasons within my comments below:

1) Design/Build

- The current design as submitted with in the application suggest the use if 'Standing Seam' metal cladding and vertical timber cladding. This is not in keeping with the Regency style of the conservation area of Tivoli.
- The proposed roof terraces and balconies are intrusive to the existing residents on Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk.
- The view of the regency terraces from Andover Road would be compromised by the building being extended towards the footway on Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk
- The impact of the right of light to the houses directly opposite, which is currently not affected as the Prinbox is set further back from the road.
- There is no information or assessment completed in relation to the drainage infrastructure currently in place, whether this be a separate foul/storm or a combined system including potential flow rates. One would assume that the existing drainage apparatus capacity would be checked.
- A proposed Demolition plan has not been submitted with the application. I cannot see how it would be possible to grant permission for the scheme with no detailed intention for how the building will be safely demolished and outlining any affect this will have on the residents.
- The demolition of the building will require dust suppression and wheel wash, with substantial quantities of water. As this is a residential area, I cannot see how the capacity for supply and demand for the water will be met.
- In relation to the build, and the fact that the Tivoli area has exceeded its capacity for parking, there is no detailed draft Construction Phase Health and Safety Plan with simple details relating to how the Owner of the building will control the sub-contractor parking, deliveries, plant, material etc.
- For deliveries and removals of materials for a scheme of this nature, i.e. Heavy plant, low loaders, concrete vehicles, muckaway wagons, Hiab's, HGVs etc, the current road infrastructure is not suitable for these types of vehicles.

- An infiltration SuDS system would be unsuitable as a drainage system for rainwater due to the high water table. Flooding has been apparent within the area and especially noted in residential properties with basements. Again, if a SuDS system was developed to discharge into the main sewer, there is no data on the capacity for this and/or how an attenuation stored system with a Hydrobrake would work? Even if a SuDS system was to be introduced, the footprint of the scheme area is small and will require deeper excavations, potentially undermining structures and utility apparatus.

- Further concerns are raised in relation to the demolition. The houses in the area date back to the early 19th century, and although the houses are of sound construction, previous developments such as extensions have found some poor quality of footing and foundation material. The proximity of the demolition to the residential area will inevitably cause vibration, which in turn will cause costly and significantly hazardous damage to the properties.

- Although not relevant to the current planning application, the previous application which was successful has Pre-commencement planning conditions which are required to be discharged. In the event of any future application becoming successful, I request that the wording be reviewed and changed to words relating the developer from 'Should' to 'Will'. An example of this is 'The developer should be mindful of the impact of construction work on neighbouring properties'

2) Parking/Safety

- Note (as part of accompanying comments), it has become apparent that the Tivoli area is known throughout Cheltenham, and further afield, as the 'Free Parking ' zone for residents of Cheltenham and visitors to Cheltenham.

- The current proposed scheme requests incorporation of double yellow lines to parts of Lypiatt street and Tivoli Walk, with the loss of 3nr and 7nr parking spaces respectively. As the parking within these streets and locally within Tivoli is already exhausted, the loss of spaces would be significant to the residents of Tivoli.

- In conjunction with the introduction of double yellow lines, if this is not implemented and the scheme is passed with off-street parking with individual access to the proposed properties, this would provide an opportunity for the proposed properties of a 'Third' parking place by being able to park at 90 degrees to the property (in front of the proposed off-street parking). On this basis, I strongly object to the introduction of double yellow lines to Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk including individual off-street vehicle access for the proposed development.

- Lypiatt street is registered as a 30mph road. Due to the width restriction to both Tivoli street and Hatherley street, the road is used as a cut through by motorists, delivery vehicles etc. Residents have witnessed vehicles travelling at speeds exceeding the 30mph limit daily. Furthermore, if off-street parking to individual properties were to be approved, this would cause a substantial hazard to vehicles reversing from the development onto Lypiatt street, intensified by both junctions from Tivoli walk. The visual splay highlighted in the Transport statement in Appendix G for Plot 1, 2 and 3 cannot be achieved for safe access and egress.

- The Transport statement refers to a reliance to 'Side Friction' from parked vehicles on Lypiatt Street. It is clear that this cannot be relied on and is speculative as the residents have witnessed the reality of speedy vehicles accessing the street.

- The Transport statement notes that the survey of parking within the area was carried over a single day (06:00hrs - 06:30hrs and 22:00hrs - 22:30hrs) and notes that these times are considered 'High Demand'? This does not take into account peak times which affect residents who work from home, retired residents who have the right to come and go as they please without the fear of not being able to park on their street. Also, the calculated unoccupied spaces recorded over the period of 1hr is not a true reflection of the parking issues within the area.

- It is noted within the Transport statement that there were 18nr spaces unoccupied (AM) and 9nr spaces unoccupied (PM) within the controlled parking bays at the top of the A40 Andover road. Of course they were unoccupied as the cars were parked around the corner on Tivoli street and Lypiatt street without fear of penalty and with free use of the road!! This statement within the Transport statement is a non-sense.

- It is noted with in the Transport statement which schedules the proximity of local services, amenities and facilities on Page 7. This schedule should be used by the Planning department as evidence of people who also park within the Tivoli area free of charge and exhaust the parking provision further.

- It is noted in the Transport statement that there are approximately 214 on-street car parking spaces within the area. This estimate cannot be relied on and is speculative as there are no actual marked parking spaces to provide an accurate assessment over this greater period, compared to a small area assessment such as parts of Lypiatt street and Tivoli walk where 10nr spaces will be removed and can be easily calculated.

- In conjunction with the previous comment, Tivoli is used by the Skyborne residential facility which has the capacity to house 80nr persons (with provision in their car parking facilities on their property of approximately 20nr vehicles), various and numerous festivals within Cheltenham, tourists and visitors, commuters to London/Birmingham (for instance) who leave their vehicles for days and weeks within the Tivoli area and use the free parking facility. A controlled parking system within the Tivoli area would help promote the use of the expensively constructed and predominantly unused Park and Ride scheme.

- It is noted in the Transport statement that refuse collection will operate kerbside as per the arrangements on Tivoli walk, Lypiatt street and Saddlers lane. This is inaccurate as bin collection is operated on within the confines of Saddlers lane and bins are not stored on Tivoli walk and Lypiatt street. Kerbside operations will reduce the width of the footways for pedestrians, the disabled and visually impaired.

Although I object to the current scheme, I am not against the principal of the building change in use to residential (with caveats)

1) Significant design changes to the current scheme which is more in keeping in the Regency style of the surrounding conservation area and sympathetic to the immediate location.

- 2) In the event of the planning application being successful, the Planning officer will send the application to an independent planning committee for review and vote.
- 3) Strict Pre-commencement planning conditions are imposed by the Local Authority and enforced.
- 4) The application is removed/refused for the introduction of double yellow lines on parts of Lypiatt street and Tivoli walk.
- 5) The application for off-street parking accessing/egressing individual properties onto Lypiatt street and Saddlers Lane is removed/refused, with the exception of off-street parking being confined to the footprint of the scheme with a common access/egress point (single gated entrance) point onto Lypiatt street, as already existing.
- 6) GCC consultation to be sent out to the residents of Tivoli in respect to Controlled parking zoning (whatever the decision of the planning application)
- 7) A review of the existing speed limit within the Tivoli area and potential for traffic calming.

Thank you for this consideration and Regards.

42 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 10th September 2025

In principle, I support the redevelopment of the Prinbox Works commercial site, and changing its use into residential, but what has been proposed in this planning application is not in keeping with the important character of Tivoli nor does it properly consider the negative impacts, that the design submitted, will have on those in the surrounding community.

My main concerns are around the negative impacts on parking , access, and the density and style of buildings, that the developer is attempting to pack onto the Prinbox site.

I strongly object to what has been proposed.

On parking and safe access in the area:

As the local councillors will be fully aware, this is already a big issue for residents in this area. The proposals and supporting 'studies' that have been submitted in this application are flawed and misleading.

I am one of many elderly residents in the area, and it is important that we can park our cars as close to our properties as possible. Currently, it is not always possible to even park in our street, so any loss of parking spaces or increased demand for on-street parking in the area will severely impact us.

The proposals suggest more vehicles (over longer periods of the day) and a reduction in the number of spaces!

It is also important that the refuse and other services in the area are not changed or disrupted by the development. If the current rear access to our properties, via Saddlers Lane is impaired in any way, it will have a huge impact on me. I cannot lift or move rubbish bins etc around to the front of my house for collection.

As far as I can see from the plans submitted, there would be more vehicles using Saddlers Lane - and this is a concern for both safety and access.

I am also very concerned that the whole demolition and construction process, which will take many months to complete, will have a severe impact on the area in terms of creating parking chaos, restricting safe access and creating dust, noise and dirt around the surrounding streets.

On the density and style of buildings proposed.

The proposals would detract from the character of Tivoli. I feel strongly that such character should be conserved. We are meant to be in a conservation area!

The submitted designs propose too many buildings for the site. Because there will be more residents, more vehicles, more demand for local services there is sure to be negative impacts on parking, services, sewage, drainage, water run off etc.

As the buildings are to be residential, they are proposed to be much too high. They incorporate roof top social spaces that will undoubtedly create more noise and less privacy for local residents.

All existing buildings in the surrounding street are at a lower level, so the proposed designs are not commensurate to Tivoli's character.

The materials and style of buildings proposed are also totally out character too!

I am also concerned about the proposed use of heat pumps, particularly if these are visible and audible to local residents.

Comments: 10th September 2025

Comments from AS - 42, Tivoli Street GL50 2UW

In principle, I support the redevelopment of the Prinbox Works commercial site, and changing its use into residential, but what has been proposed in this planning application is not in keeping with the important character of Tivoli nor does it properly consider the negative impacts, that the design submitted, will have on those in the surrounding community.

My main concerns are around the negative impacts on parking , access, and the density and style of buildings, that the developer is attempting to pack onto the Prinbox site.

I strongly object to what has been proposed.

On parking and safe access in the area:

As the local councillors will be fully aware, this is already a big issue for residents in this area. The proposals and supporting 'studies' that have been submitted in this application are flawed and misleading.

I am one of many elderly residents in the area, and it is important that we can park our cars as close to our properties as possible. Currently, it is not always possible to even park in our street, so any loss of parking spaces or increased demand for on-street parking in the area will severely impact us.

The proposals suggest more vehicles (over longer periods of the day) and a reduction in the number of spaces!

It is also important that the refuse and other services in the area are not changed or disrupted by the development. If the current rear access to our properties, via Saddlers Lane is impaired in any way, it will have a huge impact on me. I cannot lift or move rubbish bins etc around to the front of my house for collection.

As far as I can see from the plans submitted, there would be more vehicles using Saddlers Lane - and this is a concern for both safety and access.

I am also very concerned that the whole demolition and construction process, which will take many months to complete, will have a severe impact on the area in terms of creating parking chaos, restricting safe access and creating dust, noise and dirt around the surrounding streets.

On the density and style of buildings proposed.

The proposals would detract from the character of Tivoli. I feel strongly that such character should be conserved. We are meant to be in a conservation area!

The submitted designs propose too many buildings for the site. Because there will be more residents, more vehicles, more demand for local services there is sure to be negative impacts on parking, services, sewage, drainage, water run off etc.

As the buildings are to be residential, they are proposed to be much too high. They incorporate roof top social spaces that will undoubtedly create more noise and less privacy for local residents.

All existing buildings in the surrounding street are at a lower level, so the proposed designs are not commensurate to Tivoli's character.

The materials and style of buildings proposed are also totally out character too!

I am also concerned about the proposed use of heat pumps, particularly if these are visible and audible to local residents.

2 Hatherley Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2TU

Comments: 12th September 2025

We support the principle of residential use. It will make some contribution to the town's housing needs and the site is highly accessible - very well served by public transport and within easy walking distance of local and town centre services.

However:

1 The design is entirely inappropriate and fails to fulfil the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area (Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, s72) or the requirements of Tivoli Character Area Appraisal and Management Plan

2 Off street parking is unnecessary in this very accessible location. Providing it - for two cars / dwelling - is one of the reasons the design is so unsatisfactory. This should be a one / no car development, and parking should be on street - as it is for most of the rest of us in Tivoli!

3 A consciously "modern" design could be satisfactory - but this is not it. Echoing the Tivoli vocabulary - modest scale and massing, terrace, stucco finish etc - can also provide good design, and has been used successfully in infill (eg 17 Hatherley St) or larger development like Tivoli Walk.

Of course, part of what is at issue here is the difficulty of parking in Tivoli. Many non residents park here to avoid the parking restrictions in adjacent areas. A CPZ for Tivoli is urgently needed, and is the way to resolve parking problems.

This application should be refused and a much better design produced.

44 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 9th September 2025

Dear Sirs

We wish to register our formal objection to the proposed re-development design of the Prinbox works as submitted.

We did not object to the change of use planning application, as I am supportive of the principle of improving the site.

I have read the comments from Cheltenham Civic Society and endorse 100% their views as presented.

My objections to the development can be summarised as follows:

1)The proposed design is incongruous and not sympathetic to the conservation attributes of the surrounding areas of Tivoli.

2)Concern of the impact of Undercroft parking/garages for the proposed properties accessed from Saddlers lane. The flood of 2007 had severe impact on the properties in Tivoli Street.

3)The provision of private drives/parking spaces at the expense of the existing on-road parking, severely worsens the parking issues in the Tivoli area which are well known to all. The timing of the parking survey undertaken totally misrepresents the true parking issues residents experience on a daily basis between 08.00 and 18.00 each week day.

4)Contrary to the suggestion that Saddles Lane is not regularly used, it is used on a daily basis by residents whose properties back on to the lane. In addition to it being an important service lane, vehicles are parked in some of the garages. Access the full length of the lane must be maintained at all times.

For any development of the site it will be important to ensure the following are in place:

1. Commitment to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Lypiatt Street, Tivoli Walk, and Tivoli Street ensuring residents are prioritised in parking allocation.
2. Parking Management Plan - covering provision for visitors and trades.
3. Construction Traffic Management Plan - covering routing, contractor parking, and tree protection.
4. Waste & Servicing Plan - showing safe bin staging away from sightlines
7. Ecology and Tree Protection - pre-commencement surveys, CEZ compliance, and lighting controls.
8. Detailed SuDS/drainage design - permeable surfacing and on-site attenuation, including a review of the services and on and to Saddlers Lane

In conclusion we fully endorse the comments from other residents that this proposal will remove vital public parking, reduces safety, harms the Conservation Area, and is not deliverable without a separate TRO. It should therefore be refused or deferred until proper evidence and parking controls (via a residents' permit scheme) are secured.

27 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UD

Comments: 10th September 2025

We are not opposed to the redevelopment of the site or the change of use to residential housing in principle. However, we strongly object to this application in its current form and agree with many of the more detailed objection comments already made. We would like to add the following:

1. This proposal results in a net loss of parking spaces at the expense of all existing residents. We would favour that parking is contained within the development site using their existing access.
2. The proposed design does not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. There appears to be little understanding of the historic context the development is in. The size, scale, layout, design, massing, height, frontage activity and materials are totally inappropriate. We do not think this is high quality design and do not think it will be a positive building in the context of the Tivoli conservation area.
3. Planning applications for residents in the conservation area have been heavily amended at the advice of the council in order to comply with preserving or enhancing the conservation area. We expect the same scrutiny to be applied to big developments such as this.
4. Roof terraces are not appropriate in the conservation area.
5. Any south facing windows should be obscured glass as they would be new side facing windows for the terrace, overlooking back gardens and the rear of properties in Lypiatt Street. All recent developments/planning applications in Lypiatt Street have adhered to this for North or South facing windows.

2 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UA

Comments: 9th September 2025

2 Tivoli Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2UA (Objects)

Planning Application for redevelopment of the site known as PrinBox Works to provide 6 dwellings following the demolition of the existing building.

Dear sir/ madam

I am writing to raise my objections to the planning application 25/01296/FUL for the redevelopment of the site (1 Prinbox Works, Saddlers Lane, Tivoli Walk, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 2UX) to provide 6 dwellings, following the demolition of the existing building. This is on the grounds of highways and parking harm, conflict with Conservation Area duties, and procedural deliverability issues for reasons as outlined within my comments below:

1. Loss of Public On-Street Parking

The Transport Statement confirms that the proposed development will result in the removal of 3 spaces on Lypiatt Street and 7 spaces on Tivoli Walk. This equates to the permanent loss of 10 valuable public parking spaces relied upon daily by existing residents and visitors.

2. Inadequate Replacement and Flawed Parking Survey The applicant justifies this loss by claiming a theoretical 214 available spaces in the wider area, calculated by dividing kerb length by 5.75 m.

Please Note:-

The survey was conducted on a single weekday (Thu 1 May 2025) at 06:00-06:30 and 22:00-22:30 only. This is not representative of weekend or daytime demand. - The methodology ignores driveways, dropped kerbs, junctions, and refuse staging areas, inflating the supposed capacity. - The Traffic survey itself acknowledges existing footway parking on Tivoli Walk, demonstrating the real-world stress on kerbside space availability.

3. Safety Concerns - Visibility and Speed The Traffic Survey assumes a 20 mph design speed for visibility splays (2.4 m × 22 m), despite Lypiatt Street being a posted 30 mph road. No speed survey evidence is provided. Reliance on "side friction" from parked cars is speculative and unsafe.

4. Conservation Area Harm/ Impact (Section 72 Duty) The site lies within the Tivoli character area of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Area Design and Access Planning Statement. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to preserving or enhancing character. The Proposed development is not in keeping with the character of Tivoli area. The double yellow lines proposed for Tivoli Walk and the loss of continuous street frontage will introduce visual clutter and forecourt parking, thus eroding the historic character of Lypiatt Street. This plan proposes to build a development which is 3 stories high, with Rooftop patios which will be intrusive and have an impact on to at least houses number 1,2,3,4,5, Lypiatt street. Building in front of the existing 'Building line' is not in keeping with the current 'Building line' of Lypiatt street and will reduce the drivers line of sight when traffic is exiting the junction of Tivoli Walk and Lypiatt street. (This is a Serious safety concern)

The height of the proposed new development will impede a light impact on houses number 1,2,3,4,5, Lypiatt street along with all current properties situated in Tivoli Walk. It will also cause a lack of privacy to the top floor windows in these current dwellings. Designation of the Conservation Area is not intended to prevent change, especially that which would enhance the character or appearance of the area, it only seeks to ensure that any future development of the area is appropriate to the existing character of the area. Therefore careful consideration should be given when considering inappropriate modern designs and the materials being proposed. The proposed changes both in the design, proposed materials to be used and the highway alterations themselves should be subject to heritage impact assessment, which has not been provided.

5. Deliverability Dependent on Traffic Regulation Order The Traffic Survey acknowledges that the proposed highway changes (extended double yellows) require a Traffic Regulation Order, which to date has not been approved and requires statutory consultation with the public having the option to object. Without a confirmed Traffic Regulation Order, the development is not deliverable in the form assessed. A Grampian condition should be imposed at minimum.

6. Other Omissions and Risks

Site Visitors/Trades Parking: No provision has been made for visitors or tradespeople, despite loss of 10 public bays. - Waste & Servicing. With reduced kerb length, refuse staging is likely to obstruct sight lines and footways. - Construction Impact: Narrow

streets and Tree Protection will constrain access and construction. A Construction Traffic Management Plan and hours of work plan are both absent. - Ecology: The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal confirms nesting bird potential; demolition or pruning must avoid March-August or be subject to pre-works survey. - Trees: The retained tree is within the Conservation Area and legally protected.

7. Policy Conflict; The proposal conflicts with: -development should be refused where there are "unacceptable impacts on highway safety" or "severe residual cumulative impacts." - Cheltenham Local Plan policies on transport and heritage. - Section 72 duty - no demonstration of "preserve or enhance" to the Conservation Area.

8. Requested Actions; I request that the Council refuse the application. If the Local Planning Authority is nevertheless minded to approve, I request robust conditions/obligations including: 1. Grampian condition - no commencement/occupation until the Traffic Regulation Order is confirmed and implemented. 2. Commitment to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone for Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk, ensuring residents are prioritised in parking allocation. 3. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and speed survey - to be undertaken and designs amended before approval. 4. Parking Management Plan - covering provision for visitors and trades. 5. Construction Traffic Management Plan - covering routing, contractor parking, and tree protection. 6. Waste & Servicing Plan - showing safe bin staging away from sight lines. 7. Ecology and Tree Protection - pre-commencement surveys, compliance, and lighting controls. 8. Detailed SuDS/drainage design - permeable surfacing and on-site attenuation.

9. A Utilities impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure this development will not impact the current residents. ie no drop in current water pressure. No information or impact assessment completed in relation to drainage infrastructure currently in place regarding drainage and water run off, showing potential flow rates. Flooding has been apparent within the area and especially noted in properties with basements.

Conclusion

If this proposal was given approval it would remove vital public parking, reduce public and residents safety, harm the Conservation Area, and would not be deliverable without a separate Traffic Regulation Order. It should therefore be refused or deferred until proper evidence and parking controls are secured.

Approval of this proposal could set a concerning precedent for other developers to ignore the conservation protection given to the area of Tivoli.

Any parking changes in the area should prioritise and benefit the existing community and not sacrifice residential amenity or safety. Therefore the Borough Council should reject and reconsider the proposed changes to Tivoli Walk. As this will Increase Congestion and Reduced Safety on the north side. Serious Consideration should be given to Emergency vehicle access at all times.

Whilst I am not against the future development of the Prinbox Works Tivoli Cheltenham, I feel this proposed development is purely beneficial to the developer and the development and with little or no consideration being given to the existing residents and the Conservation duties of the area.

Significant design changes to the current proposal need to be more in keeping with the Regency style of the surrounding conservation area and sympathetic to the immediate location, need to be addressed.

Comments: 9th September 2025

2 Tivoli Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 2UA (Objects)

Planning Application for redevelopment of the site known as PrinBox Works to provide 6 dwellings following the demolition of the existing building.

Dear sir/ madam

I am writing to raise my objections to the planning application 25/01296/FUL for the redevelopment of the site (1 Prinbox Works, Saddlers Lane, Tivoli Walk, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL50 2UX) to provide 6 dwellings, following the demolition of the existing building. This is on the grounds of highways and parking harm, conflict with Conservation Area duties, and procedural deliverability issues for reasons as outlined within my comments below:

1. Loss of Public On-Street Parking

The Transport Statement confirms that the proposed development will result in the removal of 3 spaces on Lypiatt Street and 7 spaces on Tivoli Walk. This equates to the permanent loss of 10 valuable public parking spaces relied upon daily by existing residents and visitors.

2. Inadequate Replacement and Flawed Parking Survey The applicant justifies this loss by claiming a theoretical 214 available spaces in the wider area, calculated by dividing kerb length by 5.75 m.

Please Note:-

The survey was conducted on a single weekday (Thu 1 May 2025) at 06:00-06:30 and 22:00-22:30 only. This is not representative of weekend or daytime demand. - The methodology ignores driveways, dropped kerbs, junctions, and refuse staging areas, inflating the supposed capacity. - The Traffic survey itself acknowledges existing footway parking on Tivoli Walk, demonstrating the real-world stress on kerbside space availability.

3. Safety Concerns - Visibility and Speed The Traffic Survey assumes a 20 mph design speed for visibility splays (2.4 m x 22 m), despite Lypiatt Street being a posted 30 mph road. No speed survey evidence is provided. Reliance on "side friction" from parked cars is speculative and unsafe.

4. Conservation Area Harm/ Impact (Section 72 Duty) The site lies within the Tivoli character area of the Cheltenham Central Conservation Area Design and Access Planning Statement. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to preserving or enhancing character. The Proposed development is not in keeping with the character of Tivoli area. The double yellow lines proposed for Tivoli Walk and the loss of continuous street frontage will introduce visual clutter and forecourt parking, thus eroding the historic character of Lypiatt Street. This plan proposes to build a development which is 3 stories high, with Rooftop patios which will be intrusive and have an impact on to at least houses number 1,2,3,4,5, Lypiatt street. Building in front of the existing 'Building line' is not in keeping with the current 'Building line' of Lypiatt street and will reduce the drivers line of site when traffic is exiting the junction of Tivoli Walk and Lypiatt street. (This is a Serious safety concern)

The height of the proposed new development will impede a light impact on houses number 1,2,3,4,5, Lypiatt street along with all current properties situated in Tivoli Walk. It will also cause a lack of privacy to the top floor windows in these current dwellings. Designation of the Conservation Area is not intended to prevent change, especially that which would enhance the character or appearance of the area, it only seeks to ensure that any future development of the area is appropriate to the existing character of the area. Therefore careful consideration should be given when considering inappropriate modern designs and the materials being proposed. The proposed changes both in the design, proposed materials to be used and the highway alterations themselves should be subject to heritage impact assessment, which has not been provided.

5. Deliverability Dependent on Traffic Regulation Order The Traffic Survey acknowledges that the proposed highway changes (extended double yellows) require a Traffic Regulation Order, which to date has not been approved and requires statutory consultation with the public having the option to object. Without a confirmed Traffic Regulation Order, the development is not deliverable in the form assessed. A Grampian condition should be imposed at minimum.

6. Other Omissions and Risks

¿ Site Visitors/Trades Parking: No provision has been made for visitors or tradespeople, despite loss of 10 public bays. - Waste & Servicing. With reduced kerb length, refuse staging is likely to obstruct sight lines and footways. - Construction Impact: Narrow streets and Tree Protection will constrain access and construction. A Construction Traffic Management Plan and hours of work plan are both absent. - Ecology: The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal confirms nesting bird potential; demolition or pruning must avoid March-August or be subject to pre-works survey. - Trees: The retained tree is within the Conservation Area and legally protected.

7. Policy Conflict The proposal conflicts with: -development should be refused where there are "unacceptable impacts on highway safety" or "severe residual cumulative impacts." - Cheltenham Local Plan policies on transport and heritage. - Section 72 duty - no demonstration of "preserve or enhance" to the Conservation Area.

8. Requested Actions I request that the Council refuse the application. If the Local Planning Authority is nevertheless minded to approve, I request robust conditions/obligations including: 1. Grampian condition - no commencement/occupation until the Traffic Regulation Order is confirmed and implemented. 2. Commitment to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone for Lypiatt Street and Tivoli Walk, ensuring residents are prioritised in parking allocation. 3. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and speed survey - to be undertaken and designs amended before approval. 4. Parking Management Plan - covering provision for visitors and trades. 5. Construction Traffic Management Plan - covering routing, contractor parking, and tree protection. 6. Waste & Servicing Plan - showing safe bin staging away from sight lines. 7. Ecology and Tree Protection - pre-commencement surveys, compliance, and lighting controls. 8. Detailed SuDS/drainage design - permeable surfacing and on-site attenuation.

9. A Utilities impact assessment should be undertaken to ensure this development will not impact the current residents. ie no drop in current water pressure. No information or impact assessment completed in relation to drainage infrastructure currently in place regarding drainage and water run off, showing potential flow rates. Flooding has been apparent within the area and especially noted in properties with basements.

Conclusion

If this proposal was given approval it would remove vital public parking, reduce public and residents safety, harm the Conservation Area, and would not be deliverable without a separate Traffic Regulation Order. It should therefore be refused or deferred until proper evidence and parking controls are secured.

Approval of this proposal could set a concerning precedent for other developers to ignore the conservation protection given to the area of Tivoli.

Any parking changes in the area should prioritise and benefit the existing community and not sacrifice residential amenity or safety. Therefore the Borough Council should reject and reconsider the proposed changes to Tivoli Walk. As this will Increased Congestion and Reduced Safety on the north side. Serious Consideration should be given to Emergency vehicle access at all times.

Whilst I am not against the future development of the Prinbox Works Tivoli Cheltenham, I feel this proposed development is purely beneficial to the developer and the development and with little or no consideration being given to the existing residents and the Conservation duties of the area.

Significant design changes to the current proposal need to be more in keeping with the Regency style of the surrounding conservation area and sympathetic to the immediate location, need to be addressed.

3 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UA

Comments: 7th November 2025

Site is being over developed which is leading to issues.

- Remove 2nd floor to retain existing housing height on Lypiatt st
- Set properties further back from tivoli walk and saddlers lane
- Car parking spaces within the properties are fine, it must be enforced that the new property owners use them rather than leave empty and park across them, to help avoid need of residents parking
- Style/material not in keeping with a conservation area

It feels like fitting this proposed development into an existing congested area, does not compliment the community.

5 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UA

Comments: 3rd September 2025

In addition to my earlier comments I have now found out that the developers have requested the permanent removal of TEN parking spaces - which I strongly object to on the basis of lack of existing spaces for residents.

Comments: 2nd September 2025

My property is directly opposite the proposed development and I am very concerned at:

1. The lack of privacy from top floor windows
2. The noise during development
3. Most importantly, the drain on existing parking in the streets. I note that there is an application to further restrict parking with yellow lines under the guise of better access for pedestrians- this is nonsense and clearly a bid to make easier access for their lorries during development and residents when it is finished. The proposed development MUST include off street parking and NOT affect the already difficult parking in the street. Furthermore - any attempt by the council to make these streets resident only - seeking yet more revenue - would be underhand and unfair to an already cash strapped neighbourhood. PLEASE TAKE THESE COMMENTS INTO SERIOUS CONSIDERATION WHEN

45 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 12th November 2025

In respect of the "Additional drawing- proposed sketch views 2":

This illustrates that the overall visual impact of the proposed development would be incredibly detrimental to the Tivoli community.

The images, shown in the additional drawing, deliberately omit the context of the surrounding houses; this is because the proposal (in terms of density, modern blocky style, modern materials and height) conflicts with all that the designation of Tivoli's conservation area attempts to preserve.

We strongly object to this wholly inappropriate proposal.

As a reminder, in July 2008, the Council commissioned the 'Tivoli Character Appraisal & Management Plan'; this continues to form part of Cheltenham's 'Local Development Framework'. The 2008 document states:

"The uniformity of the houses provides Tivoli with a unique and distinctive character". Tivoli, as a Conservation Area is, "an area that has a special character or appearance worth protecting"

The document states that:

- new developments must be well designed
- use of in-keeping, traditional, and natural materials will normally be required
- new buildings, extensions and alterations must preserve or enhance the appearance of the conservation area
- future development must be appropriate to the character of the area

We see no evidence that the developers have taken any of this into consideration when drafting their proposal. We implore the Council to uphold the intentions of Tivoli's Conservation Area designation, and to refuse permission for what has been proposed.

With regard to the slightly revised floor plans:

We welcome the removal of the 2nd floor terraces from plots 1,3 and 5. This will lessen the negative noise and privacy impacts, of the original proposals, on those in neighbouring properties.

However, these revisions do not go far enough to lessen negative impacts, nor do they address our concerns about the appropriateness of the proposed development in the context of Tivoli's conservation area designation.

With regard to the positions of the Air Source Heating Pumps (ASHPs):

- the revised drawings show a repositioning of the ASHP's in relation to plots 1 & 6. We welcome this revision as it may lessen the noise impact on those in neighbouring properties

- there is no indication (on any of the Plan drawings for ground, first or second floors) of the position of the ASHP for plot 4. This omission is a concern.

- as it is now proposed that there be no 2nd floor terrace for plot 3 ASHP there needs to be a correction to the proposed ASHP position for this respective plot - as currently the ASHP for plot 3 appears to be floating in midair on the 2nd floor Plan.

- plan drawings show an ASHP for Plot 5 on the ground and 2nd floors - so there appears to be duplication that needs to be corrected

We appreciate that our comments about ASHPs are very specific - but the devil is definitely in the detail - and drawings for the proposals need to be correct!!

Comments: 10th September 2025

Comments/observations from residents at 45 Tivoli Street:

Overall:

Whilst we are supportive of the redevelopment of the Prinbox Works site, and change of use to 'residential use', the size, density and look of the buildings proposed, in the application (and changes to the respective facilities) are unsympathetic to the conservation area of Tivoli. There are likely to be several negative impacts on existing local residents, if the plans submitted were to be approved.

We therefore strongly object to what has been proposed.

Our main concerns / objections in relation to what has been proposed are:

A) The incongruity of the proposed design when taking into account the surrounding area:

The designs proposed indicate that, rather than creating a development that sits sensitively within its surroundings and not detract from the character of Tivoli's conservation area, the submitted design crams in too many buildings and facilities onto the site, to maximise potential return on investment.

The dense nature of the proposed development (and resultant increase in the number of residents) will undoubtedly put undue pressure on existing facilities in the area (such as parking, refuse collection, sewage/drainage/water run off, and other services).

Furthermore, the proposed height of the new dwellings and use of materials is wholly incongruous to the Victorian character of the Tivoli part of the wider conservation area.

Whilst the apex of the existing pitched roofs is high - we do not feel it is necessary to match this with the replacement buildings, because the proposals are for residential not commercial.

We feel that the number of houses to be built on the site should be limited to 3 or 4, and that these should be in a more sympathetic and commensurate style for this area (and in congruous materials). The height of the new buildings should also be restricted to 2 storeys, rather than the rather ugly variable heights of those proposed.

A less dense development would provide better and more open living spaces, and facilitate safer, easily accessible on-site parking for the new residents.

This would decrease additional pressures on the local facilities and parking, and it may even enhance the area, in line with conservation guidelines.

We are also concerned that solar panels proposed, to be mounted on top of the flat roofs, will be visible to local residents (and therefore unsightly) if they are mounted on an angle and extending beyond the height of the buildings shown on the plans.

B) The negative impact on parking and access in the area:

- The proposal - see 25_01296_FUL-PROPOSED_GROUND_FLOOR_PLAN-1648359 (drawing no. 24.20.016 24.20.016 PL112 - suggests there will be 'off road' parking for up to 10 vehicles (the same as the current site), but it also shows that 3 of the existing on-street spaces would be removed.

There would therefore be a net loss of parking together with a net increase in the number of residents on site (meaning that parking demand is 24 hours, and not over office hours of the current site). The relevance of this is shown below:

- some of the garage/hard standing off road spaces proposed are particularly tight (as evidenced by existing experience of those with garages and hard standing in Saddlers Lane). It is felt that there will be undoubtedly an additional increase demand for on street parking as a result of the development, as some of the residents of the proposed dwellings will find it more convenient to park on the street, rather than the tight space on their property. This has been increasing the case where a number of 'garages' have been built on Saddlers Lane in recent years.

- The parking survey undertaken by Rappor on 1st May 2025 appears to deliberately mislead in terms of the impact of the proposals on parking in the area - The survey misrepresents the reality of the current experience, as clearly there are already parking pressures on the area! The survey was conducted between the hours of 06:00 and 06:30 and between 22:00 and 22:30. This is by the surveys own admission NOT during peak hours. The survey hours ignore commuter traffic, many St Stephens Social Club and Tivoli Inn customers and shoppers (who regular park in the area). It also ignores that vehicles are regularly parked on the yellow lines in the area, without sanction (as the monitoring by parking enforcement officers is a very rare occurrence, if it happens at all)

- Due to the angle of vehicular entry to plots 5 & 6 - This would cause a significant hazard / danger to pedestrians stepping in/out of their houses directly opposite these plots in Saddlers Lane.

- TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT-1648374 I Appendix J - Swept Path Analysis - Estate Car does not take account of pedestrians stepping out of their houses directly opposite parking bays of plots 5&6. It effectively treats the frontage of these houses as vehicular access.

- The proposals add significant vehicular traffic to a small lane onto which residents from 2 houses (directly opposite the proposed development) step, without any pathway their side.

- The proposals will give rise the possibility that the new residents will park their vehicles on Saddlers lane - or partially jutting out - so that they encroach onto the narrow lane, blocking vehicular and pedestrian access to properties further down.

- Without input from Ubico (refuse and recycling waste service providers) - there are no guarantees that current services for existing residents will not be disrupted or changed during and after the works are completed. Section 5.23 of the Transport Statement document 25_01296_FUL-TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT-1648374 indicates: "Refuse collection will operate kerbside, as per the existing arrangement on Tivoli Walk, Lypiatt Street and Saddlers Lane." - But what opportunity have Ubico had to confirm this?

- proposals have been put forward by the developer in Appendix I of the Transport Statement (25_01296_FUL-TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT-1648374) to introduce additional parking restrictions along Tivoli Walk . This suggests that a proposal has been made to Gloucestershire Highways to remove 7 on-street parking spaces along Tivoli Walk, adjacent to the north elevation of the Prinbox site.

Whilst we understand that this is a matter for Gloucestershire Highways to consider, if they do support this proposal, parking demand in the area will far exceed provision.

C) A potential negative impact on the environment and existing facilities in the area:

- We are concerned that the proposed open terraces - on first and second floors of the proposed buildings - will give rise to increased noise levels in close proximity to other residents. The position of these terraces, essentially social spaces, would negatively impact the privacy of others in the area - including views into our own garden. These roof terraces are also incongruous with the Victorian character of Tivoli.

- As there will be an increase in permanent residents on the site, we have concerns as to the increase in sewage / drainage / run off demand evidenced by the proposals (i.e. more toilets / less open ground than in the existing buildings). There is a strong potential that the existing provision for sewage and drainage facilities will be overloaded by what is proposed.

- Although the flood risk assessment appears to have been completed, summarising that "The site has a low risk of flooding (flood zone 1)" - this takes no account of the fact that in the 2007 floods, it was discovered that the water table can (and did) rise and flood basements in Tivoli Street. We have a big concern that the water displacement of the

proposed mass of buildings and requirement for much deeper foundations will increase the likelihood of flooding.

- 25_01296_FUL-ENERGY_STATEMENT__MAY_2025-1648368 indicates that ground source or air source heat pumps will be the preferred option for heating the proposed premises. We are concerned about the increased noise levels that will result from the heat pumps installed - The development needs to minimise the impact this may have on the local community. Nothing in the proposal suggests consideration of this.

- There is no reference in the proposals in respect of existing amenities in Saddlers Lane, such as the borders and frontages of the cottages along here. The nature of the lane is currently quiet, safe and aesthetically pleasing with plants/planters etc. It would be loss, if these were not preserved

- Document 25_01296_FUL-GCER_COMMENT-1650942, in relation to wildlife in the area, shows that the latest sighting of anything significant was on 08/10/2018, yet In the last 3 years alone, we have seen hedgehogs, bats, a pheasant and even a kestrel in our garden at 45 Tivoli Street or along Saddlers Lane - So this report is current nor accurate, and does not consider the current wildlife in the area

- As flat roofs are proposed, rather than the current pitched roofs, there is a likelihood of more seagulls nesting in the area, when it is already a significant problem. How will this be avoided?

D) Negative impacts of the demolition and construction process:

We understand that a Construction Management Plan will be required and that direct consultation should be sought via party wall agreements with all neighbouring properties. We consider this to be an important part of the local community engagement process.

- We hope that the Construction Management Plan will make provision as to:

o where and when will contractors and suppliers will park to ensure no communal areas, adjacent to the site, are obstructed

o maintaining 24/7 resident and vehicular access to the rear of properties via Saddlers lane throughout the works (and after construction)

o minimising dust / potentially harmful substances by appropriate risk management during the works

o a clear process to allow concerns to be raised by residents and for issues/problems to be identified and resolved

And finally - We have concerns for No.36 Lypiatt Street! Currently a whole face of this property, which we can see from the rear of our property, is tied into the existing building on Prinbox Works.

It will need to be protected from harm and that the party wall will be made good to ensure safety, weather proofing and aesthetic improvements (as the proposal means this face of the property will more exposed).

49 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 10th September 2025

Prinbox Works Lypiatt Street. Proposed redevelopment.

Comments.

Ref printbox conversion.

On design.

In a conservation area . Brick is wrong and should be rejected.

The Andover rd shops won a civic award for doing it right.

The allocated parking is limited and the tight access will only cause the new residents to park in the road . A numbered car park with one entrance would be a better design.

Parking in the area.

This development will make parking even more difficult and therefore goes hand in hand with residents parking. 2-3 hours exemption allows ss club and Tivoli time for customers to visit.

What experience of previous developments has this company Mack archived. Is there a track record?

Rooftop patios.

Intrusive and noise carries as no walls to baffle the noise.

This process is rushed and I foresee major problems.

***** 49 Tivoli st.

51 Tivoli Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UW

Comments: 23rd September 2025

As one of the closest most affected residents, we are writing to lodge our formal objection to the above planning proposal. While we appreciate the need for development, there are several major concerns that would have a significant negative impact on our entire family's mental and physical livelihood.

1. Invasion of Privacy - especially the 3rd Floor and Roof Terraces

Please note that we are used to quiet and discreet weekday daytime offices overlooking our property. Not only is the change of use from commercial to domestic, the proposal includes the addition of another floor and domestic roof terraces which would overlook directly our bedroom, our teenage daughter's bedroom, our kitchen and dining room, and our entire garden. This represents a serious intrusion into our privacy, particularly given

the elevated nature of the structures. Which madman thought that a 3rd floor and roof terraces would be in the slightest bit appropriate in this location? The enjoyment of our private indoor and outdoor spaces would be severely compromised, already causing concern and anxiety for every member of our family. We note there is no mindful thought or provision for any added privacy options or landscaping etc and even if there were, the planned windows and terrace is too high for it to provide any benefit. Would you be able to advise us who to discuss with the planting of 5 more mature red robin trees, in keeping with the one already in place, as a gesture of goodwill to provide some privacy?

2. Noise Disturbance from Construction

The scale of the proposed works suggests an extended construction period. This will inevitably bring disruptive levels of noise, dust, and vibration to the area, affecting our ability to work from home which we both do, and living in the property in peace, plus the potential impact on our children's school work and our dog. In addition to this, has anything been put in place to counteract the disorder that is going to be caused to properties? The hours proposed are long and relentless and do not seem to take into consideration that this is a quiet residential area full of permanent residents, families with children, and elderly.

3. Parking Concerns

Parking is already under significant strain in this area, it is shambolic, with residents frequently struggling to find spaces near their own homes. We approve of the proposal to remove approximately 10 parking spaces replacing with double yellow lines but this plus construction traffic would place further pressure on the limited parking available. To mitigate this, I strongly recommend that the Council give serious consideration to the introduction of a residents' permit parking scheme with priority given to the existing residents - the residents which we have discussed this with are desperate for it. Such a scheme would help manage demand fairly and protect the interests of those who live locally & drastically minimise the use of limited parking by commuter's who blight Tivoli who park terribly and sometimes leave their vehicles for days on end. Who do we contact about introducing residents permits as a matter of urgency to alleviate what is already an issue causing anxiety and unnecessary regular neighbourly disputes, and which would end constant requests to the Council?

4. Compensation for Loss of Value to our Home

Please advise who we would discuss with the loss of value to our property, should the 3rd floor and roof terraces go ahead.

In summary, the proposed development raises issues of privacy, noise, parking and traffic congestion which cannot be ignored. Unless these concerns are addressed comprehensively, I urge the Council to refuse permission for this proposal until these issues are resolved.

36 Lypiatt Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UD

Comments: 10th September 2025

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the proposed Planning Application for the Prinbox Works site. I fully support appropriate regeneration of the site; however, the plans as submitted raise serious concerns which must be addressed before any approval is granted.

1. Structural Stability and Demolition Risks

My end-terrace property was historically joined to the Prinbox building and relies on this for partial support. Its removal poses a significant risk to the safety and stability of my home, particularly given the shallow foundations typical of early 19th-century properties in the area. Demolition and excavation works must be subject to a detailed Demolition Management Plan and Method Statement, with robust safeguards to protect neighbouring structures. The developer must accept liability for any damage caused by vibration, subsidence, or collapse.

2. Excavation and Construction Impacts

The proposed undercroft parking and foundation works for six large dwellings involve deep excavation in close proximity to Victorian housing. This creates a high risk of structural damage. Heavy plant and vehicle movements on unsuitable residential roads further increase the risk of disruption and damage to local infrastructure.

3. Dust, Debris, and Noise Management

The intensity of the proposed works will generate substantial noise, dust, and debris. Without strict controls, these will cause prolonged disturbance to local residents. A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan should be required before approval.

4. Drainage and Flooding

No drainage impact assessment appears within the plans. Given the area's flooding history (notably in 2007), this omission is unacceptable. Drainage capacity and flood risk mitigation must be addressed before the application is considered further.

5. Noise from Plant Rooms

The location and specification of heat pumps require clarification. In my experience, these units are noisy and generate vibrations, creating an unacceptable nuisance for existing neighbouring residents.

6. Parking and Overdevelopment

I support and endorse the comments submitted by Cheltenham Civic Society regarding parking pressures and the scale of development. The proposals fail to provide adequate parking provision and will worsen congestion in an already constrained area (as thoroughly detailed by numerous residents in their comments)

Conclusion

For the above reasons, I strongly object to the application in its current form. Regeneration is welcome, but not at the expense of the safety, wellbeing, and amenity of existing residents.

2A Tivoli Walk
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL50 2UX

Comments: 6th November 2025

I can see the revised plans for the development itself but cant see anything in relation to revision for the double yellow lines proposed for Tivoli Walk, which is what I massivley object to as this would mean no resolution to the issue of people practically parking on my front doorstep and still restricting access to my home. Most of the objections are all relating to parking and residents have been begging for permit parking, with priority given to the existing residents. Please, if Im missing something point me in the direction of where this is being addressed?

Comments: 10th September 2025

Just in addition to my earlier comment. Ive now discovered, although should have realised, that the development will be joining the existing sewer system. 3 years ago my property was flooded on the ground floor by raw sewage from the drain directly outside my property. The 1st time it happened we had everything renewed etc only for it to happen again weeks later. Again we cleaned up, replaced all the ruined items and had drain surveys commissioned that found too many properties connected to an already very old and unsuitable sewage system that couldnt cope with demand. The flood then happened for a third time at which point we had to have the drains and manhole fitted with a sealed unit to try and stop the flooding happening, however we have been told water/sewage will always find its own level and it may possibly happen again if the system is overwhelmed. Which it will be with 6 more dwellings.

Comments: 3rd September 2025

I am writing to formally & very strongly object to the proposed parking changes affecting Tivoli Walk, Cheltenham, as recently made public by the council. You have proposed to add double yellow lines to the south side of Tivoli Walk to encourage parking to the north side, which is the same side as the residents' front doors and only access to their properties. As a local resident, I have serious concerns about the impact this proposal would have on the character, safety, and amenity of the area. Plus, the affect it will have on the stress levels of the residents who are already locked in daily battles to simple park in the road where they live or access their property. Tivoli Walk is a narrow street that already has major issues with parking, causing residents high levels of stress. Not to mention dangers caused by the current situation, I believe your proposed changes will only aspirate this and cause more problems for residents. This proposal is purely for the benefit of residents/businesses on Saddlers Lane and I don't believe residents of Tivoli Walk Have been taken into any consideration whatsoever. The survey was undertaken between the hours of 6.00am-6.30am and then at 10.00pm-10.30pm when the road is very quiet due to all the commuters etc having left!

I don't believe this gives a true representation of the challenges faced in Tivoli walk and would request (I have requested this several times to no avail) that the planning team visit Tivoli walk between 9am-6pm at any given day of the week to witness for themselves

Introducing double yellow lines to the south side of the street will undoubtedly mean those of us who have our homes/front doors on the north side of the street are going to be negatively impacted by vehicles parking even more inconsiderably than they do already.

At present we must deal with cars parking so close to our front doors that access is greatly restricted.

I have outlined concerns below.

1. Increased Congestion and Reduced Safety on north side of Tivoli Walk

The road is not designed to support additional vehicle traffic or on-street parking. More cars on the north side could present safety risks to pedestrians, particularly given the lack of adequate footpaths and the narrow road width. It's already impossible to walk on the pavement due to vehicles parking on it. Your proposal will only exacerbate this

2. Increased vehicle presence

Tivoli has a unique, almost village-like character that would be disrupted by increased vehicle presence. Residents and visitors value the peaceful nature of this street, and turning it into a parking zone would negatively alter its atmosphere.

3. Environmental Concerns

Instead of more parking you should consider landscaping. Biodiversity would really benefit Tivoli Walk and the introduction of trees along the pavement would restrict parking in a more environmentally friendly way.

4. Precedent for Future Development

Approving this proposal could set a concerning precedent for similar parking schemes in other narrow residential streets throughout Tivoli. Parking for residents is a nightmare, spaces are taken up by people who don't live in Tivoli taking advantage of the free parking, so they can then commute to town/work train station etc. Sometimes living vehicles for weeks on end.

I have suggested many times (and been completely ignored by councillors and the council) that permit parking would massively benefit Tivoli and every resident I have spoken to agreed that it's the only way forward with the problematic parking that has blighted Tivoli. This would also generate income for the council and I'm sure that's a positive for you!

I must add that I work from home. Most days the view from my window is someone's car parked so close I can barely open said window. My home is darkened even during days of sunshine, and this impacts my mental health.

I have, on occasion politely asked people to not park so close to my front door and have been met with torrents of abuse. I don't think I am being unreasonable needing to access my front door.

I've also had deliveries that have been unable to be made due to the items not being able to fit past cars parked outside my front door.

I'd hate to think what would happen if I ever needed to be removed from my property by ambulance on a stretcher as this just wouldn't be possible!

The Garage next to my home also has a No Parking sign as it's in constant use, but this is ignored and again, deliveries/bin collection etc are disrupted.

Directly outside my home is a dropped curb, which should be used for access for wheelchair/mobility scooter/pushchair users etc, but this is always parked on contrary to the highway code which states "Parking at a dropped curb is illegal and can result in a

Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) because it obstructs access for pedestrians, cyclists, or vehicles leaving a driveway, and can create hazards for vulnerable road users. You can be fined for any part of your vehicle covering the lowered kerb, and the contravention is often enforced after a report from the property owner or business affected" again this is completely ignored and not enforced.

You have already put double yellow lines on the various junctions around Tivoli, which are blatantly ignored and in the 8 years of living in Tivoli I have never once encountered a parking warden.

While we understand access is needed for refuse collection/emergency services etc what you have proposed is not the answer and has been led purely by the findings of people employed by the company wishing to develop the offices in Saddlers Lane, the whole proposal is centred around this development and zero consideration for existing residents I urge Cheltenham Borough Council to reconsider the proposed changes of Tivoli Walk. Any solution to parking challenges in the area should prioritise sustainable, community-led alternatives that do not sacrifice residential amenity or safety. The residents of Tivoli Walk should be made priority to find a solution

I have many photos as evidence that my front door is blocked etc, which I have previously sent to the parking /planning depts at the council and have never even so much as received an acknowledgement which is very disappointing. Please confirm receipt of this objection and kindly keep me informed about any future consultations or decisions regarding this matter.

Comments: 3rd September 2025

I am writing to formally & very strongly object to the proposed parking changes affecting Tivoli Walk, Cheltenham, as recently made public by the council.

You have proposed to add double yellow lines to the south side of Tivoli Walk to encourage parking to the north side, which is the same side as the residents' front doors and only access to their properties. As a local resident, I have serious concerns about the impact this proposal would have on the character, safety, and amenity of the area. Plus, the affect it will have on the stress levels of the residents who are already locked in daily battles to simply park in the road where they live or access their property.

Tivoli Walk is a narrow street that already has major issues with parking, causing residents high levels of stress. Not to mention dangers caused by the current situation, I believe your proposed changes will only aspirate this and cause more problems for residents. This proposal is purely for the benefit of residents/businesses on Saddlers Lane and I don't believe residents of Tivoli Walk have been taken into any consideration whatsoever. The survey was undertaken between the hours of 6.00am-6.30am and then at 10.00pm-10.30pm when the road is very quiet due to all the commuters etc having left! I don't believe this gives a true representation of the challenges faced in Tivoli walk and would request (I have requested this several times to no avail) that the planning team visit Tivoli walk between 9am-6pm at any given day of the week to witness for themselves

Introducing double yellow lines to the south side of the street will undoubtedly mean those of us who have our homes/front doors on the north side of the street are going to be negatively impacted by vehicles parking even more inconsiderably than they do already.

At present we must deal with cars parking so close to our front doors that access is greatly restricted.

I have outlined concerns below.

1. Increased Congestion and Reduced Safety on north side of Tivoli Walk

The road is not designed to support additional vehicle traffic or on-street parking. More cars on the north side could present safety risks to pedestrians, particularly given the lack of adequate footpaths and the narrow road width. Its already impossible to walk on the pavement due to vehicles parking on it. Your proposal will only aspirate this

2. Increased vehicle presence

Tivoli has a unique, almost village-like character that would be disrupted by increased vehicle presence. Residents and visitors value the peaceful nature of this street, and turning it into a parking zone would negatively alter its atmosphere.

3. Environmental Concerns

Instead of more parking you should consider landscaping. Biodiversity would really benefit Tivoli Walk and the introduction of trees along the pavement would restrict parking in a more environmentally friendly way.

4. Precedent for Future Development

Approving this proposal could set a concerning precedent for similar parking schemes in other narrow residential streets throughout Tivoli. Parking for residents is a nightmare, spaces are taken up by people who don't live in Tivoli taking advantage of the free parking, so they can then commute to town/work train station etc. Sometimes living vehicles for weeks on end.

I have suggested many times (and been completely ignored by councillors and the council) that permit parking would massively benefit Tivoli and every resident I have spoken to agreed that it's the only way forward with the problematic parking that has blighted Tivoli. This would also generate income for the council and I'm sure that's a positive for you!

I must add that I work from home. Most days the view from my window is someone's car parked so close I can barely open said window. My home is darkened even during days of sunshine, and this impacts my mental health.

I have, on occasion politely asked people to not park so close to my front door and have been met with torrents of abuse. I don't think I am being unreasonable needing to access my front door.

I've also had deliveries that have been unable to be made due to the items not being able to fit past cars parked outside my front door.

I'd hate to think what would happen if I ever needed to be removed from my property by ambulance on a stretcher as this just wouldn't be possible!

The Garage next to my home also has a No Parking sign as its in constant use, but this is ignored and again, deliveries/bin collection etc are disrupted.

Directly outside my home is a dropped curb, which should be used for access for wheelchair/mobility scooter/pushchair users etc, but this is always parked on contrary to the highway code which states "Parking at a dropped curb is illegal and can result in a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) because it obstructs access for pedestrians, cyclists, or vehicles leaving a driveway, and can create hazards for vulnerable road users. You can be fined for any part of your vehicle covering the lowered kerb, and the contravention is often enforced after a report from the property owner or business affected" again this is completely ignored and not enforced.

You have already put double yellow lines on the various junctions around Tivoli, which are blatantly ignored and in the 8 years of living in Tivoli I have never once encountered a parking warden.

While we understand access is needed for refuse collection/emergency services etc what you have proposed is not the answer and has been led purely by the findings of people employed by the company wishing to develop the offices in Saddlers Lane, the whole proposal is centred around this development and zero consideration for existing residents

I urge Cheltenham Borough Council to reconsider the proposed changes of Tivoli Walk. Any solution to parking challenges in the area should prioritise sustainable, community-led alternatives that do not sacrifice residential amenity or safety. The residents of Tivoli Walk should be made priority to find a solution

I have many photos as evidence that my front door is blocked etc, which I have previously sent to the parking /planning depts at the council and have never even so much as received and acknowledgement which is very disappointing. Please confirm receipt of this objection and kindly keep me informed about any future consultations or decisions regarding this matter.

Dear Planning Authority,

I am writing with regard to the planning application on Lypiatt Street, which includes a proposal to reduce the number of available parking spaces on the road. I would like to raise my concerns about this plan and urge you to reconsider.

Attached to this email, you will find photos taken today (Sunday evening), which clearly demonstrate that there are no available parking spaces on Lypiatt Street or the adjoining Princes Street. As a resident, I can attest that this situation is a regular occurrence and the existing parking capacity is already insufficient to meet the needs of the residents.

Reducing the number of available parking spaces will only exacerbate the current problem, making it even more difficult for residents to find parking. This will undoubtedly lead to increased frustration and inconvenience for the community.

I strongly urge you to refuse the current plans and consider alternative solutions that do not involve reducing the number of parking spaces. It is essential to address the parking needs of the residents to maintain the quality of life in our area.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.





