

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
			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.	within the document.	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."	the 'Negative factors' section of the character appraisal.
5	Chapter 5.15 Contribution of key unlisted buildings	1682 / 234 / /	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?	None.	'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	None.

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.