

<b>APPLICATION NO: 26/00001/REM</b>		<b>OFFICER: Ms Michelle Payne</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 2nd January 2026		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 3rd April 2026
<b>WARD:</b> Benhall/The Reddings/Fiddlers Green		<b>PARISH:</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	HBD Golden Valley Limited	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land At West Cheltenham Southern Parcel Fiddlers Green Lane Cheltenham	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Application for the approval of Reserved Matters (layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access) for Phase 1 of development pursuant to Outline Planning Permission 23/01875/OUT for an Innovation Centre with ancillary cafe and event spaces (Class E), a Mobility Hub (Sui Generis) with flexible retail (Class E) and community uses (Class F) on the ground and first floor, and all associated infrastructure and open spaces.	

## REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	<b>3</b>
Number of objections	<b>2</b>
Number of representations	<b>1</b>
Number of supporting	<b>0</b>

12 Niven Courtyard  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0GG

**Comments:** 4th February 2026

Regarding 23/01875/OUT 26/00001/REM Phase 1 Development of Innovation Centre and Mobility Hub

The plans show the Mobility Hub to be a 24-hour facility. Has due consideration been given to sound and light pollution and the associated impact on local residential areas? This includes Operational noise and lighting, Engine noise and acoustic vehicle alert systems (e.g. beeping when reversing) and also any additional impact if the top floor is open air.

Changes are proposed to Caine Square / Galileo Gardens junctions to Telstar Way. Since traffic flow is expected to increase substantially on Telstar Way, are additional changes required to these junctions to enable free flowing entrance to and exit from the existing residential estates leading off Caine Square and Galilee Gardens?

**Comments:** 27th January 2026

Planning comments from 12 Niven Courtyard

Regarding 23/01875/OUT 26/00001/REM Phase 1 Development of Innovation Centre and Mobility Hub

The plans show the Mobility Hub to be a 24-hour facility. Has due consideration been given to sound and light pollution and the associated impact on local residential areas? This includes Operational noise and lighting, Engine noise and acoustic vehicle alert systems (e.g. beeping when reversing) and also any additional impact if the top floor is open air.

Changes are proposed to Caine Square / Galileo Gardens junctions to Telstar Way. Since traffic flow is expected to increase substantially on Telstar Way, have additional changes been considered to enable free flowing entrance to and exit from the existing residential estates?

38 Falkland Place  
Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL51 0RP

**Comments:** 13th April 2026

Further to my email sent yesterday, I'd like to add another reason for my objection. Please see below.

Contradiction with the Council's own 2018 Cheltenham West Vision Masterplan

I attach two pages from the official Cheltenham West Vision document (Nash, 2018), which was funded by a government grant of over £300,000 and was intended to guide regeneration in West Cheltenham, including Hesters Way.

The document explicitly promised:

"Improve connections to existing areas of open and green space" and "Create new public spaces and improve the landscaping and play facilities in existing ones"

"Increased biodiversity and wildlife opportunities" through wildlife-friendly planting, improved surface treatments, shared SUDS, and colour and interest in land form

Enhancing the "wildlife network" and public open space benefits for health and wellbeing, particularly in areas of deprivation.

These commitments were made specifically for the communities directly affected by development in West Cheltenham. Yet the current BNG for application 26/00001/REM proposes to deliver the entire 10% BNG requirement several miles away at Hill Farm in

Leckhampton, ignoring the very local green-space and biodiversity improvements that the Council's own 2018 masterplan identified as priorities.

This is not only contrary to the spirit of the National Planning Policy Framework but also represents a clear failure to deliver on the Council's previous public commitments to West Cheltenham residents.

Letter attached.

**Comments:** 13th April 2026

Objection to Planning Application 26/00001/REM

Land at West Cheltenham Southern Parcel, Fiddlers Green Lane  
Phase 1 Reserved Matters (Innovation Centre, Mobility Hub etc.)

I wish to register a strong objection to the approval of reserved matters application 26/00001/REM on the grounds that the proposed Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) strategy is wholly inadequate and fails to deliver meaningful benefits for the communities most directly affected.

1. The core flaw: Biodiversity gain is being exported miles away

The submitted Phase 1 Biodiversity Gain Plan and the Council's own Ecology Response are explicit:

Phase 1 will cause a net loss of -6.93 habitat units (29.63% loss).

The entire Golden Valley outline scheme will still show an overall net loss of -4.17 habitat units.

To achieve the developer's voluntary 10% BNG target, all required off-site units will be delivered at Hill Farm, Leckhampton, several miles away in south-east Cheltenham. Hill Farm is also being used for SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) and is CBC owned land.

This means the open countryside and wildlife corridors right on the boundary of Hesters Way are being permanently lost, while the promised "net gain" for nature is provided somewhere else that Hesters Way residents will rarely, if ever, visit.

2. This directly harms a deprived community

Hesters Way is one of Cheltenham's most deprived wards, with high levels of multiple deprivation including environmental deprivation. Local people already have limited access to quality green space. The Fiddlers Green Lane site is one of the few remaining areas of open countryside accessible on foot or by bike for thousands of residents. Removing it and exporting the BNG gain to Leckhampton is not mitigation, it is environmental injustice.

The National Planning Policy Framework and BNG statutory guidance are clear that gains should be delivered as close as possible to the site of impact, following the mitigation hierarchy. Shipping biodiversity units to the other side of Cheltenham does not comply with the spirit (or the practical intent) of these policies.

### 3. Lib Dem-controlled Council hypocrisy

As both landowner and local planning authority, Cheltenham Borough Council (currently Lib Dem controlled) has repeatedly passed motions and made public commitments to biodiversity and to tackling inequalities in West Cheltenham. Yet they are now proposing to approve a scheme on their own land that takes green space from a deprived area while delivering the environmental compensation elsewhere. This is textbook greenwash.

### 4. How 10% BNG could, and should, be delivered locally in West Cheltenham

There is no technical or policy reason why the required biodiversity units cannot be created within West Cheltenham itself. Practical, deliverable options include:

Enhancing existing parks and green spaces in Hesters Way and Springbank (e.g. creating species-rich neutral grassland, new scrub, wetlands and wildflower meadows). Biodiverse grass verges and street greening along key routes such as Fiddlers Green Lane, Hesters Way Road, and the A40 corridor.

SUDS and blue-green infrastructure integrated into the Golden Valley development itself and on adjacent CBC-owned land, designed to create genuine habitat rather than just amenity grass.

Under-used or low-value Council land in the west of the borough (including smaller parcels near the development site) for targeted habitat creation - exactly the same habitats (neutral grassland, hedgerows, scrub) that the Hill Farm proposal claims to deliver.

Community-led schemes on verges, roundabouts, school grounds and social housing green space, secured through a revised Section 106 agreement with long-term management by local groups.

All of these options would keep the biodiversity benefits where the harm is occurring and give Hesters Way residents actual, tangible improvements to their local environment.

I therefore ask the Council to refuse the current reserved matters application (or defer it) unless and until the applicant demonstrates a revised BNG strategy that delivers the full 10% net gain on-site or within West Cheltenham. The off-site Hill Farm solution is unacceptable for a deprived community that is already losing its local countryside.

The voluntary nature of the BNG commitment in this pre-mandatory application gives the Council even more flexibility to insist on a better, locally focused solution. As landowner, CBC has full control to require this.

I would be happy to meet with officers or the Committee to discuss practical ways of delivering genuine local BNG in West Cheltenham.

If officers are minded to recommend approval, I formally request that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for determination. This would allow elected Members the opportunity to scrutinise the clear environmental justice implications for Hesters Way residents.

Thank you,

Regards,

\*\*\*\*\*

38 Falkland Place  
Cheltenham  
GL510RP

Garlands  
34 Cudnall Street  
Charlton Kings Cheltenham  
Gloucestershire  
GL53 8HG

**Comments:** 13th April 2026

Loss of biodiversity in an area of Cheltenham that is already has a lack.

This area is one of the most deprived in Cheltenham, particularly in terms of access to nature.

The loss not being compensated in the area itself, but on the other side of town, which is already well provided.

So the people in the area to be developed will lose their access to nature and have no meaningful compensation.

Additionally, no amount of biodiversity loss should be tolerated.

# The Vision

## Landscape Vision

<sup>10.7</sup> There are a number of strengths to the existing landscape around the site, including the avenue of Acer trees along Princess Elizabeth Way which provide a strong sense of place, and wonderful autumn colour. However, the landscape is very one-dimensional and provides limited offering for education, play, reflection, or foraging and habitat opportunities for wildlife.

<sup>10.8</sup> There are a number of areas which can be improved upon, and some unintended uses of the landscape which create a sometimes messy and cluttered appearance, including rutted grass verges which are often parked on. The current approach to landscape across the sites, which often includes large areas of lawn, require high maintenance to be kept in good condition, and it is therefore quite obvious if maintenance standards aren't followed.

<sup>10.9</sup> An inconsistent use of boundary treatments and large shared lawn areas in front of apartments also make for uncomfortable gardens, which are rarely used due to a lack of privacy and defined edge.

<sup>10.10</sup> This project provides an opportunity to bring more interest and biodiversity into the landscape, using wildlife friendly and colourful and interesting landscape planning. A more colourful and interesting landscape approach will be applied to encourage users of the spaces to interact with it, and allow the residents to take pride in the landscapes around them. The images below provide a sense of what could be achievable here in terms of improvements to the public realm.

- 1** Increased biodiversity and wildlife opportunities
- 2** Improved surface treatments for pedestrians and cyclists
- 3** Shared surface treatment to key junctions
- 4** Opportunity to incorporate SUDS at strategic locations
- 5** Add colour and interest to land form



<sup>10.11</sup> T

## Analysis of Existing Open Space

6.1

There is generally a good provision of green space around the site, although there is a lack of biodiversity in many of the public open spaces which often consist of areas of amenity grassland and ornamental tree planting. There is an opportunity to improve the green connections between many of these spaces, whilst enhancing the wildlife network, and also health and well-being benefits for people using the spaces.