

APPLICATION NO: 23/01874/OUT	OFFICER: Mr Chris Gomm
DATE REGISTERED: 7th November 2023	DATE OF EXPIRY : 6th February 2024
WARD: Springbank	PARISH:
APPLICANT:	HBD Golden Valley Limited
LOCATION:	Land At West Cheltenham Northern Parcel South Old Gloucester Road Cheltenham
PROPOSAL:	Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for a severable and phased development to provide new homes (Use Class C3) and non-residential floorspace comprising flexible commercial and community uses (Use Class E), as well as land for potential primary education (Use Class F1) and other associated infrastructure.

REPRESENTATIONS

Number of contributors	4
Number of objections	2
Number of representations	2
Number of supporting	0

Westhaven
Hope Orchard
Springbank Road Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 0LT

Comments: 25th February 2026

Revised Planning Objection Statement

I write to formally object to the revised Illustrative Masterplan and the Landscape & Built Form Design Code (Revision D) insofar as they materially and unacceptably worsen the privacy, security and residential amenity of mine, and two properties on Hope Orchard, directly adjacent to the Northern parcel.

Grounds of objection

1. New footpath immediately adjacent to private garden - loss of privacy and security

The Illustrative Masterplan now shows a formal pedestrian/cycle route and recreational loop running directly alongside (Westhaven) garden and the privately maintained road (Illustrative Masterplan, pp. 8-9). This is a material change from earlier iterations and will significantly increase the risk of trespass, dog incursions, noise, and overlooking.

I note in section: 5.8.2 Dark corridors and mitigation for wildlife may include limited lux, directional lighting, time or sensor controlled smart lighting. This will draw attention to my property and is a safety concern, as the 'thin' existing hedge will not block out lighting, and if it is continuously going on and off die to sensors this will directly impact me.

The SUDS imagery (HBD101_4007B_January2026) presents a permanent water feature; whilst I appreciate this is an illustration, in practice the corridor will be dry for much of the year and therefore likely to attract informal use adjacent to private curtilage.

The Design Code stresses the need for safe, well defined boundaries, yet no secure fencing or defensible space is proposed against existing boundaries. This exposes residents to:

- Trespass and criminal activity
- Dogs or children entering private gardens
- Loss of privacy and increased overlooking
- Noise and disturbance
- Reduced sense of safety
- Light pollution directly impacting neighbouring properties

This conflicts with the Code's own principles on boundary treatments (p. 5, "boundary treatments and edge treatments") and with JCS SD4, SD14, and Cheltenham Plan Policy D1.

2. Intensification of Activity at the Site Edge

The Movement and Green Infrastructure strategies formalise a trim trail and recreational loop that will concentrate footfall along the northern boundary (Illustrative Masterplan, pp. 8-9; Landscape Framework, pp. 50-52). As mentioned in my above statement, the hedge is 'thin' and moreover, easy to gain access to my property. The proposed green corridor and SUDS are not sized or specified to absorb the level of use now shown; the result will be increased noise, potential for accessing existing properties (Westhaven), late evening use and reduced amenity for existing homes. This is contrary to JCS SD14 (health and environmental quality) and INF3 (green infrastructure).

The Design Code stresses the need for safe, well defined boundaries, yet no secure fencing or defensible space is proposed for existing boundaries. This exposes residents to:

- Trespass and criminal activity
- Dogs or children entering private gardens
- Loss of privacy and increased overlooking
- Noise and disturbance - Reduced sense of safety

3. Failure to provide effective, secure boundary

The revised plan places a high use route pressed against my existing private boundary with only a thin hedge shown as separation and omits any secure fencing. This is inadequate to prevent trespass I therefore request that the application be refused or that the council impose conditions requiring robust, permanent boundary treatments and a maintenance regime.

The site also slopes upward away from existing homes. pp. 6-7 and pp. 14-15 show 2-3 storey dwellings positioned on higher ground overlooking existing properties.

Combined with minimal (instant) screening proposed (and removal of Tree H24 see below), this creates:

- Direct overlooking into gardens and habitable rooms
 - Loss of privacy
 - Long delays before new planting provides screening
- This is contrary to JCS SD4, SD14 and the Code's own tree/hedgerow retention commitments (Landscape Strategy, pp. 50-56).

4. Loss of Existing Screening - Tree H24 Partial Removal/Removal

The Design Code states that existing hedges and trees should be retained "where possible" (p. 8, key showing existing hedges/trees). However, the revised plan shows

partial removal of Tree H24 that currently provide essential screening and exposing this area will increase the risk of potential crime threat and trespassers as the removal of this tree is to allow to widen a current access to the field into a public footpath. I am not seeing any fencing or boundary plans, and the removal of the tree directly exposes the property.

This increases overlooking and reduces visual amenity, contrary to JCS INF3 and the Code's own landscape principles (pp. 50-52).

5. Insufficient Green Space Capacity

The Landscape Framework (pp. 50-52) and Key Spaces (pp. 72-85) show the SUDS corridor and central green spaces functioning as recreational destinations.

However, the revised masterplan now:

- Draws in residents from neighbouring developments via new connections (pp. 8-9)
- Concentrates activity along the northern boundary (adjacent to existing residents and infrastructure)
- The green space is not scaled to absorb this combined use without harming neighbouring amenity.

6. Unclear Boundary Treatment Along the Private Road

The Illustrative Masterplan (pp. 8-9) inaccurately shows hedge boundaries where barbed wire fencing currently exists along a privately maintained road. No detail is provided on:

- Future boundary treatment
- Ownership
- Maintenance responsibilities

This creates uncertainty and potential conflict.

7. Remedies sought (minimum requirements):

- Re route the footpath so it is not immediately adjacent to existing private boundaries and provide a minimum 8-10m planted defensible buffer with semi mature trees and a secure 1.8-2.0m boundary fence/gate (details and specification to be approved by the LPA).
- Retain Tree H24 in full; if removal is unavoidable, require on site replacement with mature screening (min. 10-12m height equivalent) and a binding timetable for planting and maintenance plan.
- Provide a detailed boundary and ownership plan showing existing and proposed fences, hedges, gates, ownership, and maintenance responsibilities for the hedge/ garden boundary as this is not currently maintained by Cheltenham Borough Council.
- Require compliance and a crime risk assessment for the northern edge, plus a lighting strategy that balances safety, with no detrimental impact on existing residents.
- Provide a planting timeline and proactive approach to planting to support residents on Hope Orchard. Trees/screening/fencing should be implemented at the earliest opportunity, especially as tree growth take many years to establish. Plant before build commences.
- Require a realistic SUDS management and maintenance plan (not illustrative imagery) that demonstrates how the corridor will function year round and how it will be managed to avoid becoming an attractor for anti social behaviour.
- Confirm Hope Orchard private road status in the Design Code and include a clause that no public access shall be created or implied; require prominent signage and legal protection (S106) and confirm that any access control measures (gates, bollards) required as a result of the development will be funded by the applicant.

Conclusion: Without the above measures the proposal will cause unacceptable harm to residential amenity and security and fails to meet the requirements of JCS SD4, SD14, INF3 and Cheltenham Plan D1. I therefore object to the revised masterplan and request that the council either refuse the application or impose the conditions and S106 obligations set out above.

Request to provide additional technical evidence:

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Tree Protection Plan (showing RPZs and demonstrating retention of H24 or equivalent replacement).
- Boundary and Ownership Plan (legal title/plan) for the private road and adjacent land; solicitor's certificate of ownership/maintenance responsibilities.
- Crime Risk Assessment / Secured by Design statement and proposed mitigation (gates, signage, CCTV, lighting). Gloucester C...
- Noise and disturbance assessment for the new route and focal spaces (day/evening) and predicted footfall modelling for the trim trail/loop. Gloucester C...
- SUDS performance and management plan (showing seasonal water levels, planting schedules, maintenance regime and safety measures). Cheltenham B...
- Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation and planting establishment timetable (to ensure screening is delivered at a mature scale).

19 Leinster Close
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 0ND

Comments: 29th January 2026

Will any provision been made to the deer families that live in the fields / trees / hedges on the field adjacent to Leinster Close ?

Could the allotment area on the other side of the hedge to Leinster Close be increased instead of the buildings placed next to the proposed allotment or ideally a wooded area instead for the local wildlife that would be forced out otherwise. Have plenty of pics of the deer that come to the hedges on other side of Leinster Close as proof that they are in the field daily. A few more wildlife corridors should be considered

Westhaven
Hope Orchard
Springbank Road
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL51 0LT

Comments: 6th June 2025

Dear Head of Planning

Thank you for your letter dated 8 May 2025 regarding the additional information related to the above proposal reference. Following my call today, I would like to formally provide the comments below for your review:

I have previously emailed Ms. Nicole Golland with questions about the proposal; however, at this stage, the design was under review. I am attaching the relevant information for your reference only. I live at Westhaven on Hope Orchard, directly facing the 'Phase 2' land parcel shown in the documents. I have a few queries and comments that I would appreciate being reviewed. Below, I outline my property's location in relation to the proposed design:

1. ****Security, Dust Exposure, and Privacy Concerns:**** I have significant concerns regarding security, dust exposure to my property, and my privacy. I see that there are plans to plant deciduous trees, and I strongly prefer that these trees be as mature as planting allows to help shield my property from exposure. This is particularly important as my property uniquely includes the boundary hedge to the adjacent field.
2. ****Planting Adjacent to My Boundary Hedge:**** Regarding the indicative species palette proposed against my boundary hedge, I would like to emphasise the importance of ensuring that enough 'mature' trees are planted adjacent to my boundary hedge to maintain my security and privacy. Trees that take many years to mature are insufficient. They need to be well established.
3. ****Timing of Planting:**** The field adjacent to my property boundary falls within Phase 2 of the proposal. However, I would greatly appreciate it if the planting could begin at the start of the Phase 1 development. Since I understand that development will span a 5-10-year period, implementing planting early will help mitigate excessive dust and pollution once Phase 2 begins. The current boundary hedge is not substantial in height, and as my property is situated lower than the fields, once housing is built—including three-story buildings, standard homes, apartments, and mixed-use buildings—there will be a clear line of sight into my property, particularly into my bedroom and living room, unless measures are taken to protect my privacy and security. I ********* am concerned that my property will become exposed to potential crime threats, which currently is not an issue due to its private setting.
4. ****Formal Boundary Measures:**** I own 50% of the private road on Hope Orchard that leads to my property. Currently, there is a low open fence with barbed wire separating the road from the field. Please ensure that measures are put in place to create a formal boundary.

5. ****Managing Access to Private Road:**** As of now, there are no issues with pedestrians or cars accessing the private road because of the isolation of houses and lack of infrastructure. However, due to the development, more people will likely be walking, cycling, and attempting to drive into the access point at Hope Orchard, thereby increasing the volume of traffic on the private road. We need to ensure that the risk of unauthorised access remains at its current level and implement measures to clarify that this is not a public road.

6. ****Request for Tarmacking Hope Orchard Private Road:**** Hope Orchard main entrance road (which currently leads to the farm) is adopted by the council, and I can see from the plans that it will be resurfaced. Hope Orchard extends to the private road mentioned above. Would it be possible to consider tarmacking the private road (Hope Orchard) at the same time as the resurfacing of the adopted road? I understand that this would incur costs for the owners, but as a joint owner, I would appreciate the opportunity to have this road resurfaced to align with the surrounding road/landscaping improvements.

7. ****Day Work Timings:**** I would like to know the start and finish times for the work and whether it includes weekends. As a resident directly affected by the development, I understand that there will be significant disruption over a long period. I hope there is a plan in place to minimise disruption where possible, especially on weekends.

Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to your response.

Regards

20 Mildenhall Way
Kingsway, Quedgeley
Gloucester
GL2 2DH

Comments: 27th November 2024

I make the observation that this outline application makes no allowance or reference to Self and Custom Build Housing.

Section 2.4 of the submitted Design and Access statement make reference to parts of the National Planning Policy Framework but doesn't mention Paragraph 62 of the NPPF which states:

"Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies ... including but not limited to... people wishing to commission or build their own homes-28"

Footnote 28 states:

... local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of the Act to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand. Self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.

Further in section 2.5 the submitted Design and Access statement discusses the Joint Core Strategy, specifically SD7 but makes no mention of SD11, policy SD11 states:

"Policy SD11 establishes that development should provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types, and tenures; meet appropriate minimum space standards; and provide specialist accommodation where appropriate."

ii. Self-build housing and other innovative housing delivery models will be encouraged as part of an appropriate mix;

Finally the Design and Access statement discusses the Golden Valley SPD but again no mention of objective B3 which states "To support the concept of a small self-build community local self-build groups will be invited to support the developing planning and delivery strategy" Or section 7.2.4 which specifically mentions self-build opportunities.

Self and custom housing plots are an appropriate part of the mix of housing within this scheme and there is significant demand identified on both parts of all JCS Councils Self and Custom Build registers.

Therefore the scheme as currently proposed does not align to the NPPF, JCS or SPD as detailed above.