

Statement 18 (4) (b): Main issues raised and the Council's response to them

Representations on the five Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Documents for Prestbury, St. Mary's (Charlton Kings), Cudnall Street (Charlton Kings), Bafford (Charlton Kings) and The Poets are attached.

The five Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) have generally been welcomed by those making representations on them. They have been seen as a useful addition to the Council's planning policy guidance.

Many of the comments made relate to minor alterations – factual errors or the provision of more detail to be incorporated into the character appraisals.

The large majority of comments made relate to traffic management and parking issues within the Conservation Areas. Although traffic issues were raised in all five conservation areas, there was a particularly heavy response on Cudnall Street, where the same comments were raised by 29 individual residents (24 of which were made outside the consultation period). Officers have invited Gloucestershire County Council to consider how they would implement projects which address the highways issues raised in the Management Plans' action points.

Despite the large number of comments received on the appraisals and management plans, there were no alterations of major significance. There were 20 respondents in total and a breakdown of comments is set out below.

No comments were submitted regarding the proposed boundary amendment to the Lower High Street Character Area, part of the Central Conservation Area.

| | GENERAL COMMENTS | SUPPORTING COMMENTS | OBJECTIONS | TOTAL RESPONSES |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| PRESTBURY | 29 | 7 | 5 | 41 |
| ST. MARY'S (CK) | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| CUDNALL ST | 12 | 3 | 0 | 15 |
| BAFFORD | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| THE POETS | 16 | 3 | 0 | 19 |
| LOWER HIGH STREET BOUNDARY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| AMENDMENT | | | | |
| TOTAL | 70 | 17 | 5 | 92 |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | Whole document | 1731 / 44 / / | Supporting statement: In general Hannick Homes support the appraisal of the Prestbury Conservation Area and management proposals however, would like to highlight that new development should not be avoided or prevented as it can be implemented in a sensitive and appropriate manner which would preserve and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area. | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. Paragraph 5.11 in the character appraisal recognises that "Modern residential development tends to fit well into the historic context of the village..." Management proposal 1 (Control of Development) within the management plan addresses new development in conservation areas and sets out factors to be considered. It states that "...provided the new buildings are carefully designed it should be possible for them to have a harmonious and positive presence." The accompanying action point states that the character appraisal acts as a basis for establishing the important aspects of context. | None. |
| 2 | Whole document | 1734 / 44 / / | Supporting statement: The assessment refers to modern residential development that has taken place on green spaces within the grounds of some large buildings such as The Hayes. The view is supported that modern development can compliment | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | a historic setting including that of listed buildings. | | | |
| 3 | Whole document | 1738 / 44 / / | <p>Objection: The essential purpose of a Conservation Area Character Appraisal is to assess the elements that contribute to an area's special interest. It should not go beyond that and suggest potential constraints on development that may rise therefrom. Whether or not a development is acceptable within the Conservation Area cannot and should not be undertaken as part of a Conservation Area Character Appraisal. Even more unacceptable is where inferences are made regarding the suitability of land for development outside the designated area.</p> | <p>A Conservation Area is not a designation of development constraint and any assessment of, and allusion to such, has no place in an assessment of the character of the designation and should be removed therefrom. Any such references to the unsuitability of land for development outside the designated area should be removed from the Character Appraisal, which should focus on land within the designation and not beyond.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged. English Heritage provides additional guidance which says that local authorities should consider the setting of Conservation Areas and their wider context, which is what the character appraisal does. Any judgments regarding the development of these areas would need to be assessed on their merits in light of all material considerations. Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) para 4.14 states that "The desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should also, in the Secretary of State's view, be a material consideration in the planning authority's handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into and out of the area." English Heritage guidance on producing conservation area appraisals states that "The definition of special interest should provide a vivid, succinct picture of the overall</p> | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | | <p>conservation area... For example, the definition might assess the importance of the wider context (the relationship of the conservation area to its setting and the effect of that setting on the area); ...It should seek particularly to define local distinctiveness and the sense of place... The topography of the area, the setting of the conservation area and its relationship with the wider landscape (if relevant) should be described, with reference to any existing historic landscape characterisation... The landscape setting is often an important part of the character of an area, particularly in small rural settlements. Ever-present views of surrounding hills, or glimpses of landscape from urban streets, can contribute significantly to the atmosphere of a place."</p> | |
| 4 | Whole document | 1739 / 44 / / | General comment: Prestbury is unequivocally part of the Cheltenham urban area. This is accepted in the appraisal | The character analysis is correct in identifying Prestbury as having become a 'residential | Comment acknowledged. Para 2.1 makes it clear there is a physical link with Cheltenham. The appraisal | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | | (at para. 5.1)following character analysis. However, there are inconsistencies between this and the several prior references before character analysis to Prestbury being an outlying village (e.g. in para. 2.1). | suburb' of Cheltenham and having 'merged into the town'. This should be reflected throughout the appraisal. The character appraisal is inconsistent in referring to the rural character of this part of the village within the Green Belt. These inconsistencies should be eliminated. | does acknowledge that Prestbury now forms a residential suburb of Cheltenham, which has developed around Prestbury's historic core. However, the appraisal also notes that the historic village remains very much in evidence and that Prestbury has managed to retain its village character. The open, undeveloped area of the Green Belt comprises fields which provide an important element in its rural setting. The Council does not agree that there is inconsistency between this and the Green Belt review's assessment of their Green Belt function. | |
| 5 | Whole document | 1688 / 861 / / | General comment: Activities adjacent to the Conservation Area such as tree removal and development are allowed without any thought as to their impact on the Conservation Area itself. The character of an area can be drastically diminished by changes which occur on its fringes. For example with reference to the dry stone wall, if that on the side of Deep Street not within the Conservation Area was to be | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. It is agreed that development adjacent to conservation area boundaries can impact upon the setting of the conservation area, either in a positive or negative way. Planning applications which can potentially affect the setting of a conservation area are given additional scrutiny by conservation officers to ensure that the setting of the conservation area is either preserved or enhanced by | Other areas of historic walling within and adjacent to the Conservation Area (including the walling on the east side of Deep Street) will be researched and added into the character appraisal in the 'Contribution of key unlisted buildings' paragraph as appropriate. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | removed it would have a detrimental impact on the visual value of the wall on the other side, which is within the conservation area. | | such proposals. | |
| 6 | Whole document | 1694 / 1394 / / | General comment: Bank House and the HSBC building on the High Street have some of the worse looking modern windows in the High Street but escape comment. Improvement to these frontages would have as much visual impact as improvement to the Kings Arms car park. | None requested. | Comment acknowledged. The Townscape Analysis Map in the Character Appraisal identifies these two buildings as being 'positive'. Buildings are identified as being positive due to their historic and/or architectural interest and their positive impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The windows are an unfortunate modern alteration to these buildings. However, the buildings themselves are historic and have a positive presence within the Conservation Area. Improvement to the frontages of these buildings could only potentially be negotiated through any future planning applications. Within the Management Plan, management proposal 2 'Loss of traditional architectural features on some historic buildings' attempts to find ways of addressing this | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | issue. | |
| 7 | Whole document | 1722 / 1395 / / | Supporting statement: Can I complement those that have prepared this document. It is in fact so comprehensive that there is only from our perspective little that can be added. | | Comment welcomed. | None. |
| 8 | Plan Townscape Analysis Map of Prestbury Conservation Area | 1663 / 187 / / | General comment: A better map showing the setting of the Conservation Area would be helpful. The Townscape Analysis Map (Figure 1) reproduces very poorly on line. | Amend the Townscape Analysis map so the OS base is more clear. | Agree with comment. | The Townscape Analysis Map will be amended so the OS base is more clear. |
| 9 | Plan Townscape Analysis Map of Prestbury Conservation Area | 1693 / 1394 / / | Objection: In our view, the Library and Capel Court are innocuous (neutral) buildings, which have been part of the landscape for some years. The latter is low and not very visible. The library has been made more visible by the removal of an old hedge which should be made subject to planning controls. If the Library is such an awful building, why is there no recommendation for improvement? The Burgage stores opposite have no architectural or historic value which has not been commented on; this store is a valuable amenity. | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. Capel Court has been identified as a 'significant neutral building' and Prestbury Library as a 'significant negative building' on the Townscape Analysis Map within the Character Appraisal. Capel Court has been assessed as failing to fit successfully into its historic surroundings in terms of its size, scale, footprint, materials and architectural detailing. However, the appraisal does accept that this development is "low-lying and does contain some interesting architectural detailing. It is | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Similarly the "unattractive" car port in the Hayes ground gets attention but is barely visible from the public highway. | | set in spacious, landscaped grounds which softens its impact." With regards to the assessment of the Library, it has been made clear in the character appraisal how the library fails to sit well within the historic context of the Conservation Area and how it has a strong physical presence. Management proposal 'Enhancement of existing buildings and land' within the Management Plan attempts to find ways of improving the visual appearance of such developments through the Council's various powers. The Burgage Stores have been identified as being 'positive' on the Townscape Analysis Map as they sit well within the historic context of The Burgage and overall area. It is acknowledged that these Stores are a valuable amenity within the local area. | |
| 10 | Chapter 1.9 Conservation Area Boundaries | 1723 / 1395 / / | General comment: It is a pity that the areas of Bowbridge Lane, Park Lane, Spring Lane and Shaw Green Lane are not included in the Conservation Area. In this area you have a mixture of | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. The character appraisal and management plan cannot introduce boundary revisions to the Conservation Area. A separate legislative procedure is required for the | Notes will be added to the section on 'Conservation Area boundaries' within the character appraisal to reflect these comments. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | properties many of which have excellent views of the racecourse and Cleeve Hill. | | amendment of Conservation Area boundaries. Conservation Areas are designated as areas of special architectural or historic interest. Bowbridge Lane, Park Lane, Spring Lane and Shaw Green Lane contain a mixture of historic and more modern houses. Some of the historic houses maybe seen as worthy of Conservation Area designation. These areas will be re-assessed when the Conservation Area boundary is reviewed in the future and included within a re-designation of the boundary as appropriate. | |
| 11 | Chapter 2.1 Location and Context | 1664 / 187 / / | General comment: The Cotswold AONB is a vast area to the east and south of Prestbury; however, the reader would not know that the AONB boundary adjoins the Conservation Area boundary at the north east corner of the Conservation Area, and what the significance of AONB designation means. Development in views both to and from the AONB could be harmful as the Conservation Area forms part of the setting | A few more lines of explanation would help with regard to these comments. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. | Wording will be inserted into para. 2.1 to explain what AONB designation means and that the AONB boundary almost adjoins the Conservation Area boundary at the north east corner of the Conservation Area. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | of the AONB. | | | |
| 12 | Chapter 2.6 Wider landscape setting | 1732 / 44 / / | General comment: It is considered that the layout and form of the existing development and its relationship with the neighbouring greenbelt is somewhat ill-defined and illogical. New development in this part of the village would create a clearer distinction between the existing urban settlement and adjacent undeveloped countryside to the north. This would continue to protect the rural setting of Prestbury, preserve separation from other settlements through achieving more formal enclosure and contribute towards an enhanced setting for the Conservation Area. | None requested. | Comment acknowledged. The land referred to is located outside the Conservation Area. Any development in this area would impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. It is not considered that the layout and form of the existing development and its relationship with the neighbouring greenbelt is ill-defined and illogical. Mill Street and Shaw Green Lane form country lanes which have organic development along them. This is a common form of development along village lanes. | None. |
| 13 | Chapter 2.7 Wider landscape setting | 1724 / 1395 / / | General comment: You list a number of historic buildings, I think the Royal Oak should be included. | Add the Royal Oak to this paragraph. | Comment acknowledged. The paragraph lists a selection of historic buildings within the Conservation Area which are landmark; it is not intended to be an exhaustive list of every historic landmark building in the Conservation Area. However, it is considered appropriate that the Royal Oak public house can be added to this paragraph. | Add Royal Oak public house to wording in paragraph. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Chapter 4.2 The character and interrelationship of spaces within the area and key views/vistas | 1733 / 44 / / | General comment: The assessment concludes that substantial areas of private space within the Conservation Area are key features in contributing to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst it is accepted that in some instances this is the case, it is not considered appropriate to in any way prevent or prohibit development of or within these or adjacent green spaces. New development has the potential to contribute to and enhance the character of a Conservation Area and can also contribute towards achieving a distinctive 'sense of place' in settlements such as Prestbury. | None requested. | Comment acknowledged. Private (as well as public) green space is seen to form a key characteristic of the Prestbury Conservation Area. The character appraisal notes that the undeveloped green spaces create attractive settings for buildings and that the fields act as a physical reminder of Prestbury's agricultural past. The development of any such spaces would be examined on their own merits in light of planning policy. The most important factor to be considered is the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting. | None. |
| 15 | Chapter 5.3 Commercial | 1725 / 1395 / / | General comment: In this paragraph are listed commercial and public services. It should be pointed out that the hotel (Prestbury House) is now a bed and breakfast establishment. | Amend wording accordingly. | Comment acknowledged and agreed. | The word 'hotel' will be replaced with the words 'bed and breakfast'. |
| 16 | Chapter 5.4 Road Use | 1726 / 1395 / / | General comment: It should be noted that the Burgage, Bowbridge Lane and Shaw Green Lane is a cut through | Note these issues within the paragraph. | Comments acknowledged. | Wording will be added to the paragraph and 5.43 Negative factors to reflect that The Burgage, |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | for traffic during rush hour times and Mill Street is also used as a cut through. There is a no entry sign at both points on the Southam Road but these are totally ignored as there is no police presence. | | | Bowbridge Lane, Shaw Green Lane and Mill Street are used as cut throughs to avoid traffic on the High Street and Southam Road. |
| 17 | Chapter 5.10 Architectural detailing | 1727 / 1395 / / | Supporting statement: I agree that negative factors are evident as can be seen with properties in The Burgage where plastic windows and doors have been used instead of wood. | | Comment noted. | None. |
| 18 | Chapter 5.11 20th – 21st century development | 1735 / 44 / / | Supporting statement: The view is supported that the incorporation of modern buildings within the Prestbury Conservation Area creates variety and an interesting and diverse built environment. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 19 | Section 5.15 Contribution of key unlisted buildings | 1687 / 861 / / | General comment: At the recent meeting in Prestbury I mentioned the dry stone walls which abound the Conservation Area. The document specifically mentions the wall along the Burgage, Tatchley Lane and into Deep Street. There are however many more stretches of historical wall throughout the area which | Add detail on other stretches of historic walling into the character appraisal. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. | Other areas of historic walling within and adjacent to the Conservation Area (including the wall on the east side of Deep Street) will be researched and added into the character appraisal as appropriate under the 'Contribution of key unlisted buildings' |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>should be given some form of recognition, i.e. the wall running along the east side of Deep Street which continues into Blacksmith Lane.</p> | | | <p>paragraph.</p> |
| 20 | Chapter 5.33 Contribution of trees and green spaces | 1736 / 44 / / | <p>General comment: Whilst it is accepted that some of the trees located adjacent to the northern boundary of the Conservation Area do contribute to the character and setting of the Conservation Area, the view that the fields immediately beyond the Conservation Area boundary also contribute to establishing the rural character of the settlement is not supported. The land immediately north of the Conservation Area boundary and surrounded by the development on Bowbridge Lane and Shaw Green Lane can be viewed as part of the settlement rather than part of the open countryside beyond. Future development on this parcel of land would not impact on the setting of the Conservation Area or have a detrimental impact on views into and out of the Conservation Area. Development on this parcel</p> | None requested. | <p>Comments acknowledged. The definition of the Green Belt boundary is not an issue for the Conservation Area appraisal to address. The type of development along Mill Street and Shaw Green Lane is ribbon development which is typical of village character. The partial enclosure of fields by development on Mill Street and Shaw Green Lane does not diminish their ability to provide a rural setting for the Conservation Area and their low landscape quality does not diminish this function.</p> | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | of land would allow a more logical and defensible boundary to the settlement to be created thus allowing views of the truly open countryside beyond to be maintained and enhanced. The Green Belt Review prepared by Cheltenham Borough council identifies this parcel of land as having a low intrinsic landscape value. | | | |
| 21 | Chapter 5.43 Negative factors | 1677 / 370 / / | General comment: We are now seeing more wheelie bins on public view seven days a week, which I consider to be detrimental to the overall street environment, which the Council is trying to protect. In such areas, the Authority needs to constantly remind residents this is not acceptable in a Conservation Area. | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. It is acknowledged that the presence of wheelie bins is a negative feature in street scenes. Where wheelie bins are left in the street throughout the week, the Council's cleansing enforcement team may negotiate with owners a suitable location to store the bin or offer to provide a smaller bin if appropriate. Fixed penalty notices may be issued to owners as a last resort. | None. |
| 22 | Chapter 5.43 Negative factors | 1678 / 370 / / | General comment: On the grass verge adjacent to the Women's Institute on the western side of Bouncer's Lane, there are wooden oak posts with interlinking metal chains, which are designed | None to content of paragraph. | Comments acknowledged. These posts were erected on private land by Cheltenham Borough Council as an environmental improvement. The onus is on the property owner to | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | to prevent cars parking on the grass and stop motorbikes and cyclists cutting off the corners. Unfortunately, five or six of the posts have rotted and left lying on the ground for several weeks. Such negligence is not a good advertisement when approaching the area. Prestbury Parish Council needs to be more vigilant in this respect. | | maintain these posts. | |
| 23 | Chapter 5.43 Negative factors | 1728 / 1395 / / | General comment: The Bank and Mill Street are listed as having significant amounts of on-street parking. The Burgage should also be included as the road is often totally solid with parked cars on both sides from residents parking and visitors to the Royal Oak. This creates a traffic hazard as well as negating any possible street cleaning. It means that residents of the older houses who have garage facilities are unable to park. | Note that The Burgage also has high levels of on-street parking. | Comment acknowledged. | It is agreed that The Burgage also experiences high levels of on-street parking and the wording of the paragraph will be amended accordingly. |
| 24 | Chapter 5.43 Negative factors | 1729 / 1395 / / | General comment: The mini roundabout where the five roads meet is not only unwelcoming, it is also a hazard as there are two mini roundabouts and traffic is | Acknowledge this in the wording of the paragraph. | Comment acknowledged. The paragraph already acknowledges the difficulty both pedestrians and vehicles have in navigating their way over the junction. It | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | unsure of the right of way. | | reads - "This hard, blank space offers a poor and unwelcoming approach to the village centre, which is hard to negotiate for both vehicles and pedestrians." | |
| 25 | Chapter 5.51 General condition of area | 1730 / 1395 / / | Objection: It is totally inaccurate to say that there is little problem with vandalism and litter. Theft, burglary and vandalism is also on the increase. | Acknowledge these issues within the wording of the paragraph. | Comment acknowledged. Theft and burglary are not issues for this document. However, the issues of vandalism and litter will be re-assessed and the wording of the paragraph will be amended if seen to be appropriate. | It has been found that some litter is apparent in the grass verges of the Conservation Area (particularly along Tatchley Lane). The wording of the paragraph will be amended to reflect this. |
| 26 | Chapter 5.55 Problems, pressures and capacity for change | 1737 / 44 / / | Objection: The conclusion that all green spaces must remain undeveloped and protected from infill development is opposed. The Regional Spatial Strategy has identified a need for Cheltenham to accommodate an increased level of housing development to meet the identified housing shortage. Therefore, it is necessary to balance this key policy consideration with the desire to protect the Conservation Area. New development will not necessarily have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area and could prove | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. The Management Plan acknowledges that new development can take place where it preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | | beneficial particularly in relation to the vitality and viability of the wider settlement and the Conservation Area. | | | |
| 27 | Section Development control proposals - 1 Control of Development | 1696 / 1394 / / | Objection: Action PB1 refers to the use of the assessment of character as a basis...this assessment runs to nearly 16 pages and there is no conclusion or summary, nor any real definition of the "character". This will make it difficult to prepare and assess planning proposals, which will then be dealt with on a basis of subjective opinions. | None requested. | Comments acknowledged. Although the character appraisal does go into detail about the various components which make up the character of the Conservation Area, there is also a summary section of 'Key characteristics' and 'Key issues' near the front of the document. This is designed to act as a quick reference for people who want to find out about the character and issues affecting the Conservation Area. Adopted supplementary planning documents for other Conservation Areas in Cheltenham following the same format and have been successfully used in the determination of planning applications and as supporting evidence in planning appeals. | None. |
| 28 | Section Development control proposals - 2 Loss of traditional | 1699 / 1394 / / | General comment: In common with many buildings, our house has been built over several | None requested but suggests the respondent may like to see comments reflected in | Comments acknowledged. The energy efficiency of any building depends on a variety of | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| | architectural features on some historic buildings | | centuries and probably has little original in it. Buildings naturally evolve and materials change. The overriding requirement should be that the area's overall "character" should be preserved and this may mean some sensible compromises especially where the use of old materials conflicts with house owner's attempts to reduce their carbon footprint. | the wording. | factors. When proposals are made to change a building to make it more energy efficient, all the relevant factors shall be considered, including the historic character and appearance of the building, and the contribution it makes to the Conservation Area. | |
| 29 | Section Development control proposals - 2 Loss of traditional architectural features on some historic buildings | 1700 / 1394 / / | General comment: We would like to see the document referred to in PB2 but the link does not work and we cannot find it on the council website. | None. | Comment acknowledged. The link has been checked and found to work. The respondent has been emailed the link. | None. |
| 30 | Section Development control proposals - 6 Boundary enclosures | 1697 / 1394 / / | General comment: Do the powers for control of boundary treatments extend to inappropriate tree planting such as the use of fast-growing conifers on the roadside boundary? | None requested to content of document. | The planting of inappropriate trees cannot be controlled. High (evergreen or semi evergreen) hedges can be controlled by the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2005 and the Highway authority has the power to enter onto land where there is a danger of trees falling onto the road (Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1976). The Neighbouring Land Act 1992 can give the court powers to enable individuals to enter onto a | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | neighbour's property to fell dangerous trees/hedges etc. | |
| 31 | Section Development control proposals - 8 Enhancement of existing buildings and land | 1698 / 1394 / / | General comment: We would expect to see Action PB8 extended to Bank House and the HSBC. | Include Bank House and the HSBC building in this action. | Comments acknowledged. Action PB8 looks at enhancing buildings within the Conservation Area which detract from its character. The action cannot control alterations to buildings which have either had planning permission granted on them or for works which have been classed as permitted development (i.e. a planning application or other consent was not required for the work). It may be possible through future planning applications to negotiate a more sympathetic solution for poor alterations done on the building in the past. | None. |
| 32 | Section Project proposals - 10 Approach to Deep Street | 1679 / 370 / / | General comment: Comments refer to the background of the installation of the two mini-roundabouts at the 'approach to Deep Street' junction. Comments state that the before the establishment of the two mini-roundabouts, traffic travelling along the High Street/Deep Street/Prestbury Road (B4632) had priority over the other roads which | None. | Comments acknowledged. Management proposal 10 ('Approach to Deep Street') attempts to address the poor aesthetics of this junction and the difficulty vehicles and pedestrians have in navigating their way over the junction. It is acknowledged that there have been few accidents at this junction but its current state, with poor hard surfacing, traffic paraphernalia etc. creates a | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>caused considerable tailbacks along Bouncer's Lane and Tatchley Lane, especially during peak periods of the day. The possibility of installing a single roundabout at this junction was considered but it was discovered to be impracticable for certain types of vehicles to negotiate. In the autumn of 1989 the two mini roundabouts became permanent. This junction cannot be considered dangerous in traffic terms but one could say that it is a complicated junction, especially for pedestrians and cyclists to negotiate.</p> | | <p>visually poor space within a key part of the Prestbury Conservation Area.</p> | |
| 33 | Section Project proposals - 10 Approach to Deep Street | 1745 / 510 / 153 / | <p>General comment: The Prestbury Conservation Area SPD has detailed goals to improve the traffic in its area. The NICE Guidance refers to improving environments that encourage active travel for example walking and cycling. If improvements can be made we would seek for these approaches to enhance the opportunities for physical activity through walking and cycling infrastructure by creating</p> | <p>We would seek that the supplementary planning document incorporates the above comments and the recommendations of the NICE Guidance.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged. Any proposals to redesign this junction would take account of the needs of people with disabilities, pedestrians and cyclists, and be designed as far as possible around these needs.</p> | <p>The wording of this management proposal will be amended to reflect the need to incorporate the requirements of those with disabilities, pedestrians and cyclists in the layout and design of this junction.</p> |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | | new through routes and not just links to the existing facility. This approach would also need to ensure that the specific needs of those with limited mobility and those with disabilities such as visual impairments are included in any alterations made. | | | |
| 34 | Section Project proposals - 10 Approach to Deep Street | 1695 / 1394 / / | General comment: Traffic has a very significant negative affect on the Conservation Area, especially around the double mini-roundabouts. Tinkering with the double mini-roundabouts may improve the visual impact of signage etc., but must be carefully considered. Routes through Prestbury are used by vehicles that are too large for the roads and traffic problems are caused by inconsiderate and illegal parking with virtually no enforcement. The only real solutions would involve new roads such as the Starvehall Farm proposals and a bypass. The biggest problem with traffic control (weight limits and parking) is lack of enforcement. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Management proposal 'Approach to Deep Street' addresses the poor space comprising the double mini-roundabouts junction. The action reads "The Council will lobby and work with Gloucestershire County Council to negotiate a better road layout at the Prestbury Road/Bouncer's Lane/Deep Street/Blacksmith's Lane/Tatchley Lane junction to improve this important approach into the Conservation Area and Prestbury village centre. A new layout will also improve pedestrian movement and provide a more attractive setting for near-by buildings." Stephen Burden, Skakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways ha | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | | <p>s stated that "There are currently no plans to change these roundabouts and given the complex range of movements it is difficult to see any easy alternative. These roundabouts are likely to remain until such time as the Tatchley Lane link road (or alternative route through housing development) is completed. This would then ease demand on the junction and provide an alternative for large vehicles." Gloucestershire Highways are responsible for implementation of weight limits and the Police are responsible for enforcement. Cheltenham Borough Council is aware of the parking issues in Prestbury. The Council has set up a mobile unit to respond to complaints about parking contraventions in surrounding areas and are about to increase staff numbers and patrol beats. However, the Council can only enforce restrictions that are on the ground. If there are no restrictions and cars are parked dangerously or causing obstruction then it is still a Police</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | | matter. Cheltenham Borough Council will continue to work in close partnership with the Police, the Parish council and the County Council to ensure that the enforcement service is as effective as possible. | |
| 35 | Section Project proposals - 11 Traffic in Deep Street and High Street | 1680 / 370 / / | General comment: The present traffic flow through the village (High Street) is, in my view, not unreasonable in traffic terms. Any future proposals must take into consideration the additional traffic that will be generated when GCHQ Oakley moves to Benhall and the land developed into residential use. Likewise, when Starvehall Farm is sold for housing development, plus the new roads linking New Barn Lane with Prestbury Road, this will generate additional traffic pressures on the existing multi-junction at Tatchley Lane/Deep Street/High Street/Blacksmiths Lane/Prestbury Road. With any redesigning of this junction, traffic management and road safety must take priority. | None. | Comments acknowledged. It is acknowledged that there will be a likely increase in traffic levels through the area generated from the development of Starvehall Farm in particular. Any improvements to this junction will be implemented as and when appropriate, considering such issues. With regard to the two mini-roundabouts, Stephen Burden, Skakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has stated that "There are currently no plans to change these roundabouts and given the complex range of movements it is difficult to see any easy alternative. These roundabouts are likely to remain until such time as the Tatchley Lane link road (or alternative route through housing development) is completed. This would then | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | | | | ease demand on the junction and provide an alternative for large vehicles." | |
| 36 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1704 / 371 / 69 / | Supporting statement: We welcome the Sustainability reports and are also pleased that you have incorporated some of our comments and proposals. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 37 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1709 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not provide information on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |
| 38 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1714 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In your response to some of our previous comments, you have highlighted that some recommended indicators would be added to future scoping reports. We understand you have submitted the final version of the SEA/SA reports and we would therefore welcome further explanation of which future reports you refer to. | Clarify which future scoping reports you refer to in Table 13. | These issues are beyond the scope of this SPD, however, the data will be added to future Scoping Reports on the appraisal of documents that can influence this issue such as that for the Joint Core Strategy. | None. |
| 39 | Report Sustainability | 1719 / 371 / 69 | General comment: In Table | Remove 'Car ownership' | Comments acknowledged | The sustainability issue |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| | Appraisal Report | / | 10 (Derivation of Sustainability Objectives) the sustainability issue 'Car ownership' might have been added in the "Water" theme by mistake. | from the "Water" theme. | and agreed. The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' has been placed under the "Water" theme in error. | 'Car ownership' will be placed under the "Transport" theme which will be added in to rectify this. |
| 40 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1742 / 510 / 153 / | Supporting statement: All of the SPDs (Sustainability Appraisal reports) stress the importance of green spaces, stating that 'It is hoped that they may retain, create and enhance open spaces for recreation and sport to improve wellbeing.' Health is another priority, as they 'Hope to improve mental and physical health and wellbeing and reduce inequalities.' We welcome this approach as potentially contributing to reducing health inequalities and reducing obesity. | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |
| 41 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1701 / 1394 / / | General comment: We feel we ought to comment on the Sustainability report but it is very difficult to find anything of substance specific to the Prestbury Conservation Area in a 66 page document that is mainly concerned with overall policy in Cheltenham as a whole. Table 15 does appear to be specific but as it is effectively incorporated | None. | Comments acknowledged. The Sustainability report for the Prestbury Conservation Area SPD (and the other draft Conservation Area SPDs) has been based on the Core Strategy produced for Cheltenham, which is of a similar length. It is a statutory requirement in the production of SPDs to ensure that the SPD is | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>in the main document our comments are as above where relevant. We do think that producing a document as wordy and obscure as the Sustainability report is most unlikely to encourage individuals to read it let alone pass comment.</p> | | <p>sustainable. Sustainability Appraisal is required for all new plans under the new system of planning introduced by the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. Sustainability Appraisal is a process to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of major new plans and programmes.</p> | |
| | | | | | | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Whole document | 1665 / 202 / / | General comment: The essential character of the three Charlton Kings Conservation Areas must be maintained, which includes carrying out repair work to maintain the character. | None requested. | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 2 | Whole document | 1710 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not provide information on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |
| 3 | Whole document | 1685 / 1392 / / | General comment: We are considering improving our garden to a fully red-brick wall with wrought iron gates and a parterre garden. This would improve the aspect of the house and the street. To encourage this sort of development within the conservation area is the council offering any grants or incentives? | None. | Comments acknowledged. The respondent has been informed that the council has no grants for residential alterations. | None. |
| 4 | Whole document | 1686 / 1392 / / | General comment: Since the installation of speed ramps in Horsefair Street, traffic has increased in Lyefield Road | None requested but suggests the respondent would like to see this issue acknowledged | Comments acknowledged. It is particularly useful for us to get local residents' perceptions' of rat-runs in the | The issue of rat-running along Lyefield Road West and Copt Elm Road will be added into |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>West as people want to avoid them. What is the council proposing to do to address the issue of Lyefield Road West and Copt Elm Road being used as a rat run? The level of through traffic on this route from the A40 to the Cirencester Road appears to be considerably higher than that in Horsefair Street.</p> | <p>within the document.</p> | <p>conservation area as they experience these problems on a daily basis. This issue of rat-running along Lyefield Road West and Copt Elm Road has been noted and will be reported to Gloucestershire County Council which is the highways authority. Cheltenham Borough Council will discuss with them possible solutions to address and alleviate this problem. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has stated that "It is very difficult to protect large residential areas from extraneous traffic without restricting access for residents. This request has been noted for future consideration, a more widespread 20 mph limit may be more appropriate."</p> | <p>the 'Negative factors' section of the character appraisal.</p> |
| 5 | Chapter 5.15 Contribution of key unlisted buildings | 1682 / 234 / / | <p>General comment: As a resident in what in the plan is identified as a 'Key unlisted building' I wonder what the criteria for listing are? Are you sure that they are sufficiently protected?</p> | <p>None.</p> | <p>'Key unlisted buildings' have been highlighted in the character appraisal as buildings of historic and architectural interest. It is likely that a number of their original features have also survived. Most of the</p> | <p>None.</p> |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | 'key unlisted buildings' identified on the Townscape Analysis map are on the Council's Index of Buildings of Local Interest. Designation on this index does not affect any planning rights on the property, but planning applications would be given added scrutiny to ensure that the special historic and/or architectural qualities of the property would be preserved. | |
| 6 | Section 2 Article 4 directions | 1681 / 234 / / | General comment: I am reasonably happy with the character appraisal and development plan. I am however disappointed that you are unwilling or unable to take an Article 4(2) Direction to cover it. A number of original windows have been replaced with unsuitable alternatives, a number of front gardens have been paved over and there have been obtrusive and unsuitable additions such as satellite dishes. I appreciate that you have problems concerning staff numbers available to do this work and have no objection to your passing on this email or parts of it to councillors if you feel that this may help. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. The Council is interested in exploring Article 4(2) Directions to control changes in selected areas. However there are insufficient staff resources to undertake the considerable work involved. The Management Plan section of the documents does provide detail on Article 4 Directions and what they could control, which will provide a useful background for when these Directions can be applied. In the meantime, the character appraisals and management plans, other published guidance and planning legislation etc. will provide guidelines and laws for local residents with regards to | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | | | | altering their properties. | |
| 7 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1705 / 371 / 69 / | Supporting statement: We welcome the Sustainability reports and are also pleased that you have incorporated some of our comments and proposals. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 8 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1715 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In your response to some of our previous comments, you have highlighted that some recommended indicators would be added to future scoping reports. We understand you have submitted the final version of the SEA/SA reports and we would therefore welcome further explanation of which future reports you refer to. | Clarify which future scoping reports you refer to in Table 13. | These issues are beyond the scope of this SPD, however, the data will be added to future Scoping Reports on the appraisal of documents that can influence this issue such as that for the Joint Core Strategy. | None. |
| 9 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1720 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In Table 10 (Derivation of Sustainability Objectives) the sustainability issue 'Car ownership' might have been added in the "Water" theme by mistake. | Remove 'Car ownership' from the "Water" theme. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' has been placed under the "Water" theme in error. | The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' will be placed under the "Transport" theme which will be added in to rectify this. |
| 10 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1750 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | does not provide information on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | | | |
| 11 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1743 / 510 / 153 / | Supporting statement: All of the SPDs (Sustainability Appraisal reports) stress the importance of green spaces, stating that 'It is hoped that they may retain, create and enhance open spaces for recreation and sport to improve wellbeing.' Health is another priority, as they 'Hope to improve mental and physical health and wellbeing and reduce inequalities.' We welcome this approach as potentially contributing to reducing health inequalities and reducing obesity. | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | Whole document | 1666 / 202 / / | General comment: The essential character of the three Charlton Kings Conservation Areas must be maintained, which includes carrying out repair work to maintain the character. | None. | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 2 | Whole document | 1760 / 1073 / / | General comment: By far the most serious cause of concern to residents identified by the management plan is that of rat-running between Cirencester Road and London Road via Cudnall Street and Oakland Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Street. This is worst during the morning and evening but remains a problem at all times. Traffic will often mount and drive along the pavement to pass other oncoming traffic where parked vehicles narrow the road. Additionally, vehicles turning into or out of Oakland Street from or to Cudnall Street have very poor sight lines at this junction which has resulted in some collisions. There is also direct detrimental effect and damage to the Staffordshire blue engineering brick kerb stones. Rat-running occurs | None requested to wording of document, but the respondent requests that the Conservation department lobbies colleagues within the Highways department to consider these proposals. | Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| | | | <p>because vehicles cannot turn right from Cirencester Road into London Road at Holy Apostles junction. A viable solution would be to allow traffic to make this right turn. Another consideration could be to make the western end of Cudnall Street between Cirencester Road and Brookway one-way in an easterly direction, i.e. no entry to Cudnall Street off Cirencester Road.</p> | | <p>and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads."</p> | |
| 3 | Whole document | 1668 / 1389 / / | <p>General comment: Comments largely relate to traffic management issues within the area: 1). It would ease traffic if cars could turn right from Cirencester Road at the traffic lights (onto London Road); 2). A scheme allowing only locals to park (on Cudnall Street) would be beneficial. Many people who work on</p> | No requested changes to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. These comments largely relate to traffic management issues which have been raised in the character appraisal and management plan for the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. In response to points 1 to 4, Cheltenham Borough Council will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to address these | None to content of document. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>London Road park here throughout the day; 3). Some people park right at the end of Cudnall Street which is dangerous. Would double yellow lines help here? 4). Sixways does indeed look cluttered with signage and it could be improved; 5). If you have no powers of enforcement or manpower to pursue things, then other improvements like planting, getting windows restored and improving the cut-off end of Cudnall Street would enhance the area but will simply not happen. I will lobby (Cheltenham Borough Council/Gloucestershire County Council) as you suggest.</p> | | <p>traffic/parking related concerns within and near to the Conservation Area. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads." In response to the comments on the Six-Ways junction, he has responded that "There are no plans to reduce signing or highway furniture. If there is any unnecessary street furniture then that will be removed as part of routine maintenance work." In response to point 5, the management proposals within the Part 2 Management Plan attempt to address these issues through legislation, guidance and project proposals. However, there are currently insufficient staff and financial resources to undertake the work. | |
| 4 | Whole document | 1748 / 1389 / / | Supporting statement: In general the Conservation and Heritage Department is to be congratulated on a clear and well-researched document that clearly addresses the majority of issues of this conservation area. | | Comment acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |
| 5 | Whole document | 1749 / 1389 / / | General comment: By far the most serious cause of concern to residents identified by the management plan is that of | None requested to wording of document, but the respondent requests that the Conservation department lobbies | Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>rat-running between Cirencester Road and London Road via Cudnall Street and Oakland Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Street. This is worst during the morning and evening but remains a problem at all times. Traffic will often mount and drive along the pavement to pass other oncoming traffic where parked vehicles narrow the road. Additionally, vehicles turning into or out of Oakland Street from or to Cudnall Street have very poor sight lines at this junction which has resulted in some collisions. There is also direct detrimental effect and damage to the Staffordshire blue engineering brick kerb stones. Rat-running occurs because vehicles cannot turn right from Cirencester Road into London Road at Holy Apostles junction. A viable solution would be to allow traffic to make this right turn. Another consideration could be to make the western end of Cudnall Street between Cirencester Road and Brookway one-way in an easterly direction, i.e. no</p> | <p>colleagues within the Highways department to consider these proposals.</p> | <p>Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | entry to Cudnall Street off Cirencester Road. | | being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads." | |
| 6 | Whole document | 1746 / 1396 / / | General comment: The volume of traffic along Cudnall Street has risen to such a level that combined with the increased number of parked cars, it has become a much more dangerous place to walk and cycle, let alone drive along. It is outside our house between 8 and 9am that as many as seven vehicles can be queued up waiting to take their turn to run the gauntlet along to the 'six-ways' end. As they cannot see their exit is clear they often then have to reverse back down, creating even more havoc or squeeze past oncoming cars by mounting the pavement. Drivers drive a lot faster along the western entrance to Cudnall Street. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | <p>has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads."</p> | |
| 7 | Whole document | 1754 / 1396 / / | <p>General comment: By far the most serious cause of concern to residents identified by the management plan is that of rat-running between Cirencester Road and London Road via Cudnall</p> | <p>None requested to wording of document, but the respondent requests that the Conservation department lobbies colleagues within the Highways department to consider these proposals.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic</p> | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>Street and Oakland Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Street. This is worst during the morning and evening but remains a problem at all times. Traffic will often mount and drive along the pavement to pass other oncoming traffic where parked vehicles narrow the road. Additionally, vehicles turning into or out of Oakland Street from or to Cudnall Street have very poor sight lines at this junction which has resulted in some collisions. There is also direct detrimental effect and damage to the Staffordshire blue engineering brick kerb stones. Rat-running occurs because vehicles cannot turn right from Cirencester Road into London Road at Holy Apostles junction. A viable solution would be to allow traffic to make this right turn. Another consideration could be to make the western end of Cudnall Street between Cirencester Road and Brookway one-way in an easterly direction, i.e. no entry to Cudnall Street off Cirencester Road.</p> | | <p>management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | | Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads." | |
| 8 | Whole document | 1747 / 1397 / / | General comment: The seeming use of Cudnall Street together with Oaklands Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Road to facilitate freelance and at times overwhelming vehicular movement between London Road and Cirencester Road, is dangerous and environmentally destructive. Narrowness, nature of junctions and on-street parking present unacceptable congestion and frequent access and exit delay to residents. Unavoidable vehicular mounting of narrow pedestrian pavements, where they exist, is destructive of amenities. The whole area ought to be a 20mph zone with some sort of restricted access. That 30mph can be considered safe for such as area is quite preposterous. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | | | | <p>currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads."</p> | |
| 9 | Whole document | 1755 / 1404 / / | <p>General comment: By far the most serious cause of concern to residents identified by the management plan is that of rat-running between Cirencester Road and London Road via Cudnall Street and Oakland Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Street. This is</p> | <p>None requested to wording of document, but the respondent requests that the Conservation department lobbies colleagues within the Highways department to consider these proposals.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of</p> | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>worst during the morning and evening but remains a problem at all times. Traffic will often mount and drive along the pavement to pass other oncoming traffic where parked vehicles narrow the road. Additionally, vehicles turning into or out of Oakland Street from or to Cudnall Street have very poor sight lines at this junction which has resulted in some collisions. There is also direct detrimental effect and damage to the Staffordshire blue engineering brick kerb stones. Rat-running occurs because vehicles cannot turn right from Cirencester Road into London Road at Holy Apostles junction. A viable solution would be to allow traffic to make this right turn. Another consideration could be to make the western end of Cudnall Street between Cirencester Road and Brookway one-way in an easterly direction, i.e. no entry to Cudnall Street off Cirencester Road.</p> | | <p>these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads." | |
| 10 | Whole document | 1759 / 1408 / / | General comment: By far the most serious cause of concern to residents identified by the management plan is that of rat-running between Cirencester Road and London Road via Cudnall Street and Oakland Street, Hamilton Street and Overbury Street. This is worst during the morning and evening but remains a problem at all times. Traffic will often mount and drive along the pavement to pass other oncoming traffic where parked vehicles narrow the road. Additionally, vehicles turning into or out of Oakland Street from or to Cudnall Street have very poor sight lines at this junction which has resulted in some collisions. There is also direct detrimental effect and damage to the Staffordshire blue engineering brick kerb stones. Rat-running occurs because vehicles cannot turn right from Cirencester Road | None requested to wording of document, but the respondent requests that the Conservation department lobbies colleagues within the Highways department to consider these proposals. | Comments acknowledged. These comments relate to traffic management issues within the Cudnall Street Conservation Area. Gloucestershire County Council is responsible for all highways and traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Officers have made a note of these concerns and will discuss with and lobby Gloucestershire County Council to look at possible solutions for managing these issues. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways has commented that, with regard to the possibility of having residents-only parking along Cudnall Street "This has been added to the request list for future consideration. The County is currently preparing a new policy for residents parking and new schemes will be implemented in accordance | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| | | | into London Road at Holy Apostles junction. A viable solution would be to allow traffic to make this right turn. Another consideration could be to make the western end of Cudnall Street between Cirencester Road and Brookway one-way in an easterly direction, i.e. no entry to Cudnall Street off Cirencester Road. | | with the policies and priorities that are decided by this review." With regard to the issue about rat-running, he states that "This scheme has been added to the request list for future consideration." With regard to the issue about vehicles being restricted from turning right from Cirencester Road onto London Road at the traffic lights at Holy Apostles, he states that "This would need to be reviewed as part of any proposals to control extraneous traffic in Cudnall Street. Such a proposal may well work against vehicular capacity on main roads." | |
| 11 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1703 / 371 / 69 / | Supporting statement: We welcome the Sustainability reports and are also pleased that you have incorporated some of our comments and proposals. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 12 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1708 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not provide information | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | | | |
| 13 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1713 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In your response to some of our previous comments, you have highlighted that some recommended indicators would be added to future scoping reports. We understand you have submitted the final version of the SEA/SA reports and we would therefore welcome further explanation of which future reports you refer to. | Clarify which future scoping reports you refer to in Table 13. | These issues are beyond the scope of this SPD, however, the data will be added to future Scoping Reports on the appraisal of documents that can influence this issue such as that for the Joint Core Strategy. | None. |
| 14 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1718 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In Table 10 (Derivation of Sustainability Objectives) the sustainability issue 'Car ownership' might have been added in the "Water" theme by mistake. | Remove 'Car ownership' from the "Water" theme. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' has been placed under the "Water" theme in error. | The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' will be placed under the "Transport" theme which will be added in to rectify this. |
| 15 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1741 / 510 / 153 / | Supporting statement: All of the SPDs (Sustainability Appraisal reports) stress the importance of green spaces, stating that 'It is hoped that they may retain, create and enhance open spaces for recreation and sport to improve wellbeing.' Health is another priority, as they 'Hope to improve mental and physical health and | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | | | wellbeing and reduce inequalities.' We welcome this approach as potentially contributing to reducing health inequalities and reducing obesity. | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | Whole document | 1667 / 202 / / | General comment: The essential character of the three Charlton Kings Conservation Areas must be maintained, which includes carrying out repair work to maintain the character. | None. | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 2 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1702 / 371 / 69 / | Supporting statement: We welcome the Sustainability reports and are also pleased that you have incorporated some of our comments and proposals. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 3 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1707 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not provide information on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |
| 4 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1712 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In your response to some of our previous comments, you have highlighted that some recommended indicators would be added to future scoping reports. We understand you have submitted the final version of the SEA/SA reports and we | Clarify which future scoping reports you refer to in Table 13. | These issues are beyond the scope of this SPD, however, the data will be added to future Scoping Reports on the appraisal of documents that can influence this issue such as that for the Joint Core Strategy. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | would therefore welcome further explanation of which future reports you refer to. | | | |
| 5 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1717 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In Table 10 (Derivation of Sustainability Objectives) the sustainability issue 'Car ownership' might have been added in the "Water" theme by mistake. | Remove 'Car ownership' from the "Water" theme. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' has been placed under the "Water" theme in error. | The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' will be placed under the "Transport" theme which will be added in to rectify this. |
| 6 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1740 / 510 / 153 / | Supporting statement: All of the SPDs (Sustainability Appraisal reports) stress the importance of green spaces, stating that 'It is hoped that they may retain, create and enhance open spaces for recreation and sport to improve wellbeing.' Health is another priority, as they 'Hope to improve mental and physical health and wellbeing and reduce inequalities.' We welcome this approach as potentially contributing to reducing health inequalities and reducing obesity. | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | Whole document | 1674 / 1390 / / | General comment: It's important that building extensions are restricted in the form they take. It would be useful if planning permission advised and limited such improvements to fit in with the design of the property – as many additions are eyesores. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Government legislation (PPG15) states that alterations which require planning permission within conservation areas must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is taken into account in the determination of planning applications. Cheltenham Borough Council has produced some guidance on the suitable design of additions to buildings, in the form of the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD and a leaflet entitled 'Looking After Your Old Buildings'. Additionally, management proposal 'Control of Development' in The Poets Conservation Area Management Plan addresses important factors to consider in new developments, including extensions. | None. |
| 2 | Whole document | 1675 / 1390 / / | General comment: Number of anti-social behaviour issues in the area. I have requested "No Ball Games" signs to be added to one street lamp in Spenser Avenue but was told by Gloucestershire County | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Not an issue for this SPD. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | Council that they don't work and are no longer installed. I also requested the community police add Spenser Road to their route. | | | |
| 3 | Whole document | 1676 / 1390 / / | General comment: The parking around the Tennyson Road shops is appalling and a hazard to road users and pedestrians. There is aggressive parking on pavements and street corners. I suggest yellow lines and enforcement. The shops should be for pedestrians and non car users. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Cheltenham Borough Council will raise the issue with Gloucestershire County Council which is responsible for traffic management issues within this area. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways, has commented that the possibility of creating incuts in Tennyson Road to alleviate this problem "...cannot be funded by Highway funding. Cheltenham Borough Homes is now investigating these (incuts) with Gloucestershire Highways on their sites (contact is Cheltenham Borough Homes' Diane Hamilton." | None. |
| 4 | Whole document | 1683 / 1391 / / | General comment: I believe the most serious issue in the area is parking and traffic. People frequently drive at high speed down Milton Road which is very dangerous given the number of parked cars. I would | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. These comments will be raised with Gloucestershire County Council which deals with all traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | suggest the area be designated a 20 mph zone with traffic calming measures. | | Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways, has commented that "The possibility of a zonal 20mph limit for the streets around and including Milton Road has been added to the request list for future consideration. Schemes on this list are priority assessed and chosen for the approved Capital programme based on merit and to the extent to which they meet County approved objectives." | |
| 5 | Whole document | 1689 / 1393 / / | Supporting statement: I am delighted to see that effort is being made to improve the area. | | Comment acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |
| 6 | Whole document | 1690 / 1393 / / | General comment: The blossom trees are stunning at this time of the year. Lets do all we can to keep trees in St. Mark's. | None. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. The section on 'Contribution of trees and green spaces' includes detail on the importance of the street trees in St. Mark's. Additionally, the management proposal 'Tree Management' within the Management Plan states the importance of street trees and how we are managing and maintaining them. | None. |
| 7 | Whole document | 1692 / 1393 / / | General comment: There is one house in the area that has become rundown and is | None. | Comments acknowledged. The respondent was passed the details of the Council's | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | | an eye sore. There is a problem of littering in the garden. | | environmental enforcement officer and the planning investigation officer has been informed of the condition of this property. | |
| 8 | Chapter 5.38 Street furniture | 1673 / 1390 / / | General comment: Why the ugly new street lights? Keep the George V pillar boxes and where necessary ask BT to install the K2 phone boxes back. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Cheltenham Borough Council has expressed its concern to Gloucestershire County Council over the removal of the swan-neck lamp posts. The County has advised that these lamp posts are in a poor structural condition and that the replacement lamp posts have low maintenance costs, better equipment longevity and more efficient luminaries than the swan-neck lamp posts. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager at Gloucestershire Highways, has commented that "Standard good quality highway street lighting (has been) used" for the replacement lights. The George V pillar box remains on Tennyson Road and has been highlighted as an important local detail within the character appraisal. It is highly unlikely that BT would reinstall the K2 phone boxes | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | | | | | back. | |
| 9 | Report Development control proposals - 2 Loss of traditional architectural features on some historic buildings | 1672 / 1390 / / | General comment: Double glazing, like hard-standings are an inevitability. Advice or permission needs to be given on materials and design for double glazing. If it in place over a period of 10-15 years all replacement windows would conform. | None requested to content of document. | Comments acknowledged. Under the current planning legislation, residential dwellings (i.e. not flats or in non-residential use) can alter their windows in conservation areas without requiring planning permission. The management plan and management proposal 'Loss of traditional architectural features on some historic buildings' address the need to implement Article 4 Directions which would mean that the Council could control replacement of windows and other traditional features through a planning application. The implementation of Article 4 Directions is subject to resourcing which the Council cannot provide at this moment in time. The Council has produced some separate guidance on the repair and alteration of timber windows which can be found on the Council's website at http://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/The_Conservation_and_Renewal_of_Timber_Windows_1_.pdf | None. |
| 10 | Section | 1669 / 1390 / / | General comment: The | None to content of | Comment acknowledged. It | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| | Development control proposals - 4 Drives and loss of front gardens | | development and houses were not built and laid out to accommodate parked vehicles. It is inevitable the car has to be parked somewhere; either on the pavement, on the road or in the front garden. I believe the front garden is the best option, although not aesthetically ideal. There are Arts and Crafts solutions: keep the privet hedge where possible and replace pedestrian entrance with 6'6" width with wooden period gate piers. | document. | is acknowledged that cars at times park in the front garden space of properties due to lack of alternative parking solutions in The Poets. Driveways can be designed sympathetically and management proposal 'Drives and loss of front gardens' in the Management Plan attempts to address this issue. It states that "The Council will seek to limit the adverse impact of on-plot front area parking by using its powers under planning and other legislation to secure the use of appropriate, traditional and complementary boundary and surface treatments which will in turn greatly reduce levels of surface water run-off." | |
| 11 | Section Development control proposals - 4 Drives and loss of front gardens | 1684 / 1391 / / | General comment: I am disappointed to see that the report talks about the conversion of front gardens into driveways in such negative terms. The vast majority of front garden conversions which have been completed in the area have been carried out in a sympathetic and attractive manner, with planting and | No specific changes requested to content of document but comments suggest the respondent is requesting that the wording re. conversion of front gardens into driveways is altered so it is worded less negatively. | Comments acknowledged. It is acknowledged within the character appraisal that the overall conversion of front gardens into parking, the associated removal of traditional boundary treatments and on-street parking are all negative factors which have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | <p>parts of the original hedge remaining, and attractive gates and surfacing. To my understanding there are already some guidelines in place ensuring new driveways are laid with permeable surfaces reducing the problem of water runoff. It is a reality that the majority of the households in the area own 1, 2 or 3 vehicles. In my opinion the sight of cars parked on the street detracts more than cars parked on driveways. Cars parking on pavements damage the kerbs, pavements and grass verges. Pavement slabs have become cracked which further detracts from the street's attractiveness. Unless parking restrictions are imposed, the refusal to allow front garden driveway conversions will only exacerbate this problem. Perhaps the council should consider issuing planning permissions for driveways which follow certain guidelines around maintaining the maximum possible amount of hedgerow boundary, and using sympathetic materials, using</p> | | <p>Conservation Area. However, it is recognised that households frequently have more than one car and the estate was not designed to accommodate cars on such a high level. However, the management proposal 'Drives and loss of front gardens' within the Management Plan attempts to provide a practical solution to this issue. It states that "Where it is considered acceptable the use of brick or gravel instead of tarmac, with the retention of some garden space and the use of appropriate boundary treatments would reduce runoff, offer a more attractive setting for buildings and give a more sustainable approach than some current practice." The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2008 also addresses this issue, requiring planning permission to be sought for hard surfacing on front gardens where impermeable drainage methods are used. In response to the comments about on-street parking,</p> | |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | | | some of the good examples of this on the estate as best practice models. The problem of on-street parking in the area is unacceptable and it is disappointing that the report deals with this problem in a very cursory way compared to other more superficial issues and does not arrive at any plan of action other than consulting with the county council. | | Gloucestershire County Council deals with all traffic management issues within Cheltenham Borough. Cheltenham Borough Council recognises that this important issue needs addressing and will discuss it with the County Council to come up with practical solutions to manage this issue. Stephen Burden, Stakeholder Manager for Cheltenham at Gloucestershire Highways, has commented that with regard to the problems with parking on wide pavements and damage to kerbs, the "Police can enforce obstruction problems. Bitumen Macadam (is) a better material to withstand footway overriding." | |
| 12 | Section Development control proposals - 4 Drives and loss of front gardens | 1691 / 1393 / / | General comment: I think that turning front gardens into driveways is a practical solution to road parking providing it's done with care to maintain some greenery. Some people have done a good job on this with a gravel driveway and the retention of some garden space. | None. | Comments acknowledged. Management proposal 'Drives and loss of front gardens' attempts to address this problem by finding practical solutions to accommodate both green space and appropriately designed parking areas in front gardens. | None. |
| 13 | Section | 1671 / 1390 / / | General comment: Is the | None requested. | Comments noted and agreed | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| | Development control proposals - 6 Boundary enclosures | | loss of boundary enclosures the generic privet hedges? I believe the integrity of the buildings is ruined by the road boundaries - a variety of unsympathetic fencing, brick walls, no boundaries at all which can give the impression that there is no arts and crafts housing estate here at all. A more uniform boundary line would give you that impression immediately. | | with. The loss of traditional boundary enclosures does refer mainly to the privet hedging which was the original form of boundary treatment within the Estate. The management proposal 'Boundary enclosures' attempts to address the issue of poor, inappropriate boundary enclosures or no boundary treatment being in place and the consequent breakdown in the strong line of the plot boundary along the street. | |
| 14 | Section Project proposals - 9 Rat-running through the Conservation Area | 1670 / 1390 / / | General comment: I am more aware of people speeding rather than Spenser Road being used as a rat run, which I suppose Shakespeare Road must be. | None. | Comment acknowledged. The document does not state that Spenser Road is used as a rat run. Shakespeare Road is, however, used as a short-cut through the Conservation Area. | None. |
| 15 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1706 / 371 / 69 / | Supporting statement: We welcome the Sustainability reports and are also pleased that you have incorporated some of our comments and proposals. | | Comment acknowledged. | None. |
| 16 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1711 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: Although some of our comments relate to the indicators for water quality (Table 7A & Appendix 2) other comments relate to surface water | We would therefore recommend that you review your comments in boxes 4 and 5 on page 38 of the report. | This issue is beyond the scope of this SPD. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | run-off. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not provide information on water quality as mentioned in your comments in box 5. | | | |
| 17 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1716 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In your response to some of our previous comments, you have highlighted that some recommended indicators would be added to future scoping reports. We understand you have submitted the final version of the SEA/SA reports and we would therefore welcome further explanation of which future reports you refer to. | Clarify which future scoping reports you refer to in Table 13. | These issues are beyond the scope of this SPD, however, the data will be added to future Scoping Reports on the appraisal of documents that can influence this issue such as that for the Joint Core Strategy. | None. |
| 18 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1721 / 371 / 69 / | General comment: In Table 10 (Derivation of Sustainability Objectives) the sustainability issue 'Car ownership' might have been added in the "Water" theme by mistake. | Remove 'Car ownership' from the "Water" theme. | Comments acknowledged and agreed. The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' has been placed under the "Water" theme in error. | The sustainability issue 'Car ownership' will be placed under the "Transport" theme which will be added in to rectify this. |
| 19 | Report Sustainability Appraisal Report | 1744 / 510 / 153 / | Supporting statement: All of the SPDs (Sustainability Appraisal reports) stress the importance of green spaces, stating that 'It is hoped that they may retain, create and enhance open spaces for recreation and sport to improve wellbeing.' Health is | | Comments acknowledged and support welcomed. | None. |

| Rec. number | Document section | Representation number | Respondent comment | Respondent requested changes | CBC comment | Proposed modification |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | | | another priority, as they 'Hope to improve mental and physical health and wellbeing and reduce inequalities.' We welcome this approach as potentially contributing to reducing health inequalities and reducing obesity. | | | |
| | | | | | | |