

<b>APPLICATION NO:</b> 25/00837/FUL	<b>OFFICER:</b> Ms Michelle Payne
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 28th May 2025	<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 27th August 2025
<b>WARD:</b> St Marks	<b>PARISH:</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Cheltenham Borough Council
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land Off Shelley Road Cheltenham
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Development of 70 dwellings, public open space, drainage, access and all other ancillary works.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>8</b>
Number of objections	<b>7</b>
Number of representations	<b>0</b>
Number of supporting	<b>1</b>

2 Othello Close  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7HN

### Comments: 17th June 2025

While accepting that dwellings are needed, my main objection to this development is that the number of vehicular and other traffic movements which will inevitably be imposed upon an already congested and busy area.

Shelley Road is a twisting road much used for local car parking.

Shakespeare Road is of the same width as Shelley Road but is a 'bus route.

Again, it is much used for car parking by local establishments, educational and other.

These roads are therefore in practical terms, single lane roads.

Also apparently used to by-pass at certain times, the congestion and delays caused by the sudden reduction of the width of the A40 approaching Cheltenham to accommodate a 'bus lane from the Princess Elizabeth Way/A40 junction.

In essence, therefore I am opposed to the development as it stands owing to the anticipated large increase in traffic which will be the result.

30 Shelley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7DR

### Comments: 1st June 2025

I wish to register my objections to the very high number of proposed housing units, but not the need for housing on the site.

1. Traffic. Assuming the average no. of vehicles per unit is one (a very low estimate, probably closer to 1.5), and the narrowness of both Shelley & Shakespeare Roads with

existing on road car parking, each morning would see prolonged traffic gridlock periods especially on working days during morning and evening rush hour.

2. Amenity. Assuming 2 persons per household giving a minimum estimate of 140 in total, this population density combined with that of the nearby flats will significantly negatively impact all amenity in the area, including public access, overcrowding, etc.

3. Noise pollution from est. 140 people will significantly impact the quality of life for all local residents in the vicinity of the proposed development. Also excessive noise from the initial construction activities, followed by ongoing noise levels from the increased traffic, the operation of the completed project, etc.

4. Environments. The proposed 70 units will include the destruction of wildlife habitats, the loss of green spaces, & the disruption to local wildlife.

5. Preserving the character and appearance of the Poets estate is an important consideration for objecting to this planning application. What steps have been taken to the proposed development to reduce any impacts on the visual aesthetics of the estate, preserving the architectural style, historical significance, and overall character?

6. What steps have been agreed by CBC planning regarding the impact on neighbouring properties and privacy, which is a significant concern for local residents? Will the proposed development overshadow or overlook existing properties, or infringe upon the privacy of existing residents. Additionally, will the project result in a loss of natural light for neighbouring properties.

7. What are the the potential impacts of the proposed development on local amenities and services? The number of proposed housing units will lead to increased strain on local infrastructure, e.g. schools, healthcare facilities, and public services. How could the development affect the availability of essential amenities, such as shops, parks, and recreational spaces.?

Finally, once these issues should have been assessed and mitigations agreed with CBC, and the local residents must be provided with all relevant information on how any negative outcomes will be reduced before any agreement should be finalised.

Personally I could accept a much lower number of houses, perhaps 20 as maximum, similar top the typical density of the Poets estate.

I look forward to a full and frank response, whether by public statement or other methods.

\*\*\*\*\*

52 Shakespeare Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7HH

**Comments:** 14th June 2025

I feel this development would create more anti social behaviour in the area and the current surrounding infrastructure is not adequate to accommodate this project hence I also feel this will devalue a lot of the current property in this area

19 Shelley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7DN

**Comments:** 18th June 2025

The demand for housing and therefore the space needed for them is clear but this needs to be done in a manor that suits the facilities around it.

The number of properties will lead to a huge amount of extra cars coming in and out on what are effectively single lane roads due to the amount of street parking by residents and those working at GCHQ. This is cause disruption, potentially lead to accidents and we have disabled residents and prams using the pavements on a daily basis that will only be put at more risk as cars park on the pavements.

The height of the flats will cause a lot of privacy issues to the existing properties. Whilst that is a concern of my own, I feel the impact on the residents in the care home will be even more pronounced and this should be seriously considered. Impacting their quality of life should not happen.

Furthermore, residents of the area need to conform to various regulations due to this being a conversation area. Therefore why do we have plans being submitted that will impact the visuals of the area due to the building style but also decimate what has become natural habitats for many creatures and plants due to the amount of time this land has sat unused. Different plans for less houses and keeping more natural green space would be a much more acceptable use of the land in this area.

17 Shelley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7DN

**Comments:** 15th June 2025

I'd like to object to these proposals. Whilst in principle I support the use of this site for housing, the number of them seems significantly too many for the location. I am concerned about the estimates for the car ownership per house, in reality it will likely be at least 2 cars per household and not enough provision has been made for this.

The surrounding roads of Shakespeare and Shelley are already significantly narrow and parked along particularly during weekdays when people park for gchq.

Having no provision for this additional burden does not seem to have been considered.

From Shelley road there is an existing access to the area. Why have the plans not used this, but want to get rid of more mature trees to incorporate this?

The plans for 3-storey housing are not in keeping with the surrounding area, and particularly as they're on the edge of the development will overlook the gardens of existing properties.

I'd like to note that the previous consultation questionnaire was also slyly worded to 'encourage' participants to be 'supportive'.

I think with amendments there could be a suitable proposal for this land, but i regret that this is not it.

C/o Oxford Bus Company  
Cowley House  
Garsington Road  
COWLEY  
OX4 6GA

**Comments:** 7th July 2025

Letter attached.

17 Shelley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7DN

**Comments:** 17th June 2025

I object most strongly to this development. There are several concerns that I have which I will list below.

My first concern is that there are inadequate parking spaces. There are currently not enough parking spaces allocated. It has been assumed that there will be 1 car per household - where will additional cars for residents or visitors go? I can only assume they will clog up the already congested roads of the Poets Conservation area.

Secondly, this site borders the Poets Conservation Area. What measures have been taken to ensure this is in keeping with the current style of the area and it's surroundings? As far as I can tell, this has not been taken into consideration at all. If residents of the conservation area are subjected to stringent planning rules, then these should be taken into consideration for this development.

In addition to this, I am concerned about the high density of population that will be squashed into this small plot of land. Surely a park or public space would be of greater public interest for this area? It has sat unused for over 5 years - what a shame.

I would finally like to draw your attention to the planning application for 60 dwellings, from 2019. There are no comments of support for this, and that was for 10 fewer homes. I am

shocked and appalled that this current application has even been considered given the negative reception that one received.

Monkscroft Care Home  
Shelley Road  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 7DP

**Comments:** 6th June 2025

To whom it may concern',  
're 'Shelley Road, Monkscroft, planning application 70 dwellings

I am a resident in Monkscroft Care Centre.

I witness daily residents in their rooms and in our communal spaces.  
I urge to imagine that the distress ( in some, non verbal) to people living with dementia, caused by the disappearance of a familiar green space and wildlife area may count as a valid comment.

Maybe the the argument goes that we shall 'get used to it', the same argument for 'progress' at the cost of nature but please consider the visual impact of houses and flats near our boundary and, in places apparently, with no large tree planting as a screen - on enquiry at the public consultation, only whips.

Which takes me to my next point - invasion of privacy. Some of the residents are bed-bound . To ensure they have the best quality of life in the circumstances , beds are positioned with a 'view' to the outside - now in question. These residents receive personal care in beds; some need assistance at meal times. The first floor rooms especially will be visible to occupants of the proposed housing.

I understand that the open spaces will be for public access.

At the consultation meeting , I requested that, if planning is granted, there is a direct path between the Care Centre and the gardens / wildflower meadow/ communal allotment.  
Could you check that the request is still in place, please?

What provision has been made for the maintenance of these spaces and safeguarding for respect ?

Please be mindful that the care home needs easy access for doctors and emergency vehicles.

Are there adequate parking spaces allotted per household ? Many families have two cars, where will the overflow park?

Thank you for reading my comments. I trust they may be duly noted.

Yours sincerely,

\*\*\*\*\*





c/o Oxford Bus Company  
Cowley House  
Garsington Road  
COWLEY  
OX4 6GA

7<sup>th</sup> July 2025

By e-mail: [michelle.payne@cheltenham.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.payne@cheltenham.gov.uk)

Ms. Michelle Payne  
Senior Development Management Officer  
Cheltenham Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
The Promenade  
Cheltenham  
GLOUCESTERSHIRE  
GL50 9SA

Dear Ms. Payne

**25/00837/FUL Former Monkscroft Primary School, Land off Shelley Road Cheltenham**

**Pulhams Coaches' Representations**

Pulhams and Sons (Coaches) Ltd. ("Pulhams" ; "Pulhams Coaches") is pleased to write in strong support the proposals referenced above, currently before you for consideration. We also highlight a number of key matters related to accessibility to suitable public transport, and we offer our support for the application.

Pulhams notes that the applicant's conclusion that, quite apart from being a site on which the principle of residential development has been established in policy under Policy HD2 of The Cheltenham Borough Plan, this submission is to be determined under the so-called "tilted balance" set out at Paragraph 11d of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"). This engages a presumption in favour of proposals that do not affect protected areas or assets as defined in footnote 7 of NPPF, and that otherwise offer benefits that demonstrably exceed any other identifiable harms. We conclude likewise.

Moreover, as a major local employer and service provider, now operating from a local depot at Golden Valley, we also urge the Council to consider that the delivery of housing to meet pressing local needs, including a significant number of "truly affordable" tenures, should carry very substantial positive weight in the planning balance. The lack of housing supply in the Borough, especially for affordable tenures, has compounded over many years. The result is not only that housing is now out of financial reach for many, but that the availability of any suitable properties, at any tenure or price point, is starting to directly affect the ability of employers to recruit and retain staff. This is a particular issue for service providers.

We also highlight that, in addition to the case the applicants present in their Planning Statement, this site is one that also demonstrably conforms to the expectations set out in NPPF

Chapter 9 regarding locational sustainability, and in particular the language at paragraphs 109-110 and 115. It has been the case since the publication of the original version of the Framework in 2012, that patterns of development should be actively managed to maximise the opportunities to use sustainable travel modes: active travel and public transport.

We consider that it is evident that this site is one that does so exceptionally well. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application presents a great deal of evidence to support this conclusion. At a time when the Council is faced with an immediate need to very rapidly boost the stock of deliverable planning permissions in the short term to address housing needs, and the requirement given by the revised Standard Methodology in place since December 2024, it is even more important that appropriate proposals in these most sustainable locations are indeed approved without delay.

The site is within immediate reach of the district centre on Princes Elizabeth Way. This is a public transport node, quite apart from the very heavy concentration of facilities and services within immediate proximity, and thus within easy walking distance. This includes Gloucestershire College, which is of sub-regional importance.

Stagecoach service A operates on a commercial basis from Coronation Square and Princess Elizabeth Way stops, frequently, with a full evening and Sunday service. This provides links to Cheltenham town centre.

Pulhams operates, in addition, service R, that runs directly past the site along Shakespeare Road. This relatively new service replaced a former local route, but additionally provides entirely new links to Kingsditch, one of the main employment centres in the Borough, and beyond to Bishops Cleeve, again, passing key employers. The combination of this connectivity with service A offers a very wide range of potential bus destinations reachable from the site.

In short, in view of the pressing housing needs of the District, this site is demonstrably a highly sustainable choice that aligns with the existing spatial strategy in the adopted Local Plan, as well as with national policy. Importantly it is one where sustainable travel opportunities clearly exist, for walking, cycling and public transport use. In view of the high proportion of social rented dwellings, this is crucial to support residents being able to participate to the greatest extent in the community and wider society without having to use a personal car, or be exposed to the high costs of other solutions such as taxis.

We therefore are happy to commend the application to the Council. We trust that the proposals are worthy of a positive recommendation and that they will be consented without delay.

Yours faithfully,



Head of Built Environment and Infrastructure

## **PETITION against the proposed new housing in Shelley Road .**

We the undersigned residents, relations and staff of Monkscroft Care Centre, strongly object to the proposed housing on the field adjacent to our home for the following reasons:

1. Many residents are living with dementia. The field and trees are their daily view of nature and a source of calm.
2. The distress to residents if it disappears will be considerable and lasting.
3. The daylight hours of noise will be unsettling, confusing and disruptive.
3. The ill-considered flats that are planned, overlook bedrooms are an intrusive and insensitive proposal.
4. The loss of a 'green lung' and a wildlife haven have been disregarded.

PRINT NAME	SIGN
	

PRINT NAME

SIGN

