Local Green Space Topic Paper The Cheltenham Plan 2011 - 2031

Cheltenham Borough Council January 2018

Contents

| 1. Introduction | Error! Bookmark not defined |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Appendix A - Local Green Space criteria and Gui | dance4 |
| Educational Sites | 4 |
| Highway Land / Roadside verges | 4 |
| Parish Council Land | 4 |
| Sites suitable for housing | 4 |
| Appendix B – Individual Site Assessments | 8 |

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This topic paper provides additional context and background to the Local Green Space section of the Cheltenham Plan Pre-Submission document.
- 1.2. The NPPF (para 76-78) makes provision for local communities to identify green areas of particular importance to those communities, where development will not be permitted except in very special circumstances. These Local Green Spaces (LGS) can be designated through a local plan or through neighbourhood plans. The LGS designation will be an addition to the current protections for green spaces set out in the 2006 Local Plan and Development on Garden Land & Infill Sites Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Existing policies which protect public and private green spaces will remain in place and will continue to be taken very seriously.
- 1.3. In response to the introduction of the new Local Green Space designation outlined in the NPPF, Cheltenham Borough Council commissioned Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) to work with parishes and community groups within the Borough on a Local Green Spaces Study. The aim of the work was to support communities to identify and analyse potential Local Green Spaces to be considered for designation through the emerging Cheltenham Plan and help those communities capture the reasons why areas were intrinsically special in line with NPPF criteria.
- 1.4. GRCC visited Parish Councils and Neighbourhood and Community groups to get their feedback on green areas in their locality that are of particular importance to local communities. To facilitate this, the Council provided a toolkit that supported communities to evaluate the merits of proposing green areas for Local Green Space, and gave them a guide to relevant evidence they could submit.
- 1.5. Over 110 open spaces/sites were considered by the communities at the initial assessment stage and 29 of these were taken forward to full toolkit application. Communities considered factors such as threat of development, current level of protection, usage and whether, in the time available, it would be possible to demonstrate that a site was special to the local community.
- 1.6. The 29 sites were included in the 2015 Issues and Options consultation and feedback from that consultation has been taken into account. Following the consultation, the evidence provided by communities has been assessed further by officers and reviewed by the Planning Liaison Member Working Group. This included also assessing at the current development status of the sites (for example if the site was already allocated for development or had been included in the Strategic Assessment of Land Availability (SALA)) and their accordance with the criteria laid out in the NPPF.
- 1.7. Evidence provided by the community was assessed by a panel of officers. This included investigating the current development status of the sites and their accordance with the criteria laid out in the NPPF (see appendix A). The result of this was that 14 sites were set out in the Preferred Options consultation in 2017. It was considered that these sites were

demonstrably very special to the local community and suitable for Local Green Space designation.

- 1.8. As part of the Preferred Options consultation several new sites were suggested for LGS designation. These sites were also assessed against the NPPF criteria set out in appendix A. The full list of all sites that have been analysed can be found in appendix B. The table contains information on when and how a site was submitted as well as a reason that it was selected or not selected.
- 1.9. The 2006 Local Plan contained a policy which safeguarded from development a number of public green spaces around the Borough which the Council owns. Paragraph 6.20 of the plan said:

"The Council itself owns a substantial amount of Cheltenham's green space, including some of the most prominent and significant. The visual, environmental and recreational value of this space is enhanced by its public accessibility. The Council, in recognising its own role of stewardship of this green space, will safeguard it from loss or erosion as a result of development. It is important that proposed public green space is protected as well as appropriately funded and maintained, if it is to fulfil the function the Council intends."

- 1.10. The protection and enhancement of green spaces remains a key priority for the Council as well as for residents and visitors. Indeed, none of these sites have been developed since the policy was implemented and the policy remains popular and highly needed.
- 1.11. The public green space policy was very much a forerunner of the LGS policy of the NPPF in that it gave locally valued open spaces strong protection against development. This protection should be maintained in the Cheltenham Plan but having one policy for these sites and another for new LGS sites would be confusing and inefficient. Therefore the former public green space sites are now also included in the LGS designation alongside the new sites discussed above.
- 1.12. The following pages outline the criteria that have been used to determine whether sites are appropriate to be categorised as Local Green Space (Appendix A). The individual site assessments are provided by way of the table at Appendix B.

Local Green Space criteria and Guidance

The following guidance reflects the local interpretation of national guidance and national planning policy.

Educational Sites

National guidance states that the space must be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. In order to address future needs for school places there may be a need to reconfigure the arrangement of school buildings and playing fields. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools. Therefore, educational sites (grounds and playing fields) would not normally be suitable for designation.

Highway Land/Roadside Verges

National guidance states that the space must be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Land adjoining an existing highway is the subject of 'Permitted Development' rights, which could be used to bring forward development that may be contrary to a Local Green Space designation, but would not require planning permission to be granted. Highway land may also be utilised in bringing forward future highway/transport schemes. Therefore, highway land/roadside verges would not normally be suitable for designation.

Additional local issues also include the following:

Parish Council land

As representatives of local communities Parish Councils will protect the open spaces within their ownership from development. Therefore designating such sites as Local Green Space will not provide any additional benefit. It is also important that Parish Council land remains adaptable so that it can best meet the changing requirements of the community that it serves.

Sites suitable for housing

The NPPG states that "plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making." Therefore sites identified as suitable options for housing development in the Issues and Options consultation (2015) would not normally be suitable for designation as LGS.

Every proposed space must meet all the criteria 1-5.

| Crite | eria | Explanation of criteria / evidence prompts |
|-------|--|--|
| 1. | It will rarely be appropriate to designate spaces that are the subject of a planning permission for development. | Is the space the subject of a planning permission for development? Information on planning permissions is available from: https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/42/planning/740/planningbuilding_control_applications |
| | | Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate where the land has planning permission for development. |

Appendix A

| | | Exceptions could be where the development would be |
|----|---|---|
| | | compatible with the planning permission or where planning |
| | | permission is no longer capable of being implemented. |
| 2. | It will not be appropriate to | Is the space allocated or does it have potential to be |
| | designate spaces that are allocated or proposed for | allocated in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan? |
| | development in the Local or | Further information on the Cheltenham Plan is available |
| | Neighbourhood Plan, unless it | from: |
| | can be shown that the Local | https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/46/planning_policy/10 |
| | Green Space could be | 34/the_cheltenham_plan |
| | incorporated within the site as | The designation of Level Cross Coases should be consistent |
| | part of the allocated development. | The designation of Local Green Spaces should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and |
| | development. | complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other |
| | | essential services. |
| | | |
| | | The NPPG states that: Designating any Local Green Space will |
| | | need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify |
| | | sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified |
| | | development needs and the Local Green Space designation |
| | | should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan |
| | | making. |
| | | The space should be capable of enduring beyond the plan |
| | | period. |
| 3. | The space must not be an | Designated spaces would normally be fairly contained with |
| | extensive tract of land and | clearly defined edges. |
| | must be local in character. | |
| | | Why does the space or combination of adjoining spaces |
| | | "feel" local in character and scale, in respect of the local community that the space serves? |
| | | community that the space serves: |
| | | Is the proposed space larger than other areas of land in the |
| | | vicinity? Is it contained with clearly defined edges? |
| | | How does the space connect physically, visually and socially |
| | | to the local area? |
| | | Blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to |
| | | settlements is not appropriate. |
| 4. | The space must be within | The space would normally be within easy walking distance of |
| | close proximity to the | the community it serves. |
| | community it serves. | |
| | | How close is the space to the community it serves? |
| 5. | The space must be | Blanket designation of all/most green areas or open space |
| | demonstrably special to the | within an area is not appropriate. The space must be |
| | local community. | demonstrably special by meeting at least one of criterion 6- |
| | | 11. |
| | | Other relevant evidence: |
| | 1 | |

Appendix A

| Does the space have a friends group? |
|---|
| Is the proposal to designate supported by any of the following: A friends group Local community groups A parish plan etc. The Town/Parish Council |
| The Ward member(s) The MP |

All spaces must meet at least one of the following criteria:

| Crite | ria | Explanation of criteria / evidence prompts |
|-------|--|--|
| 6. | The proposed space is of particular local significance because of its beauty. | This relates to the visual attractiveness of the space, and its contribution to townscape, landscape, character and/or setting of the settlement, which would normally be expected to be significant. How is the proposed space of particular local significance, in respect of its beauty? |
| | | Is the space covered by other landscape or townscape designations? (e.g. Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Conservation Area) |
| | | Does the space have a literature or art connection? |
| 7. | The proposed space is of particular local significance because of its historic | How is the proposed space of particular local significance, in respect of its historic significance? |
| | significance. | Does the proposed space or elements of the space have local historical significance? |
| | | Are there any historic buildings or structures in the space? (e.g. listed building or scheduled monument) |
| | | Are there any important historic landscape features on the space? (e.g. veteran trees or old hedgerows) |
| | | Does the space have a historic literature or art connection? |
| 8. | The proposed space is of particular local significance because of its recreational | How is the proposed space of particular local significance, in respect of its recreational value? |
| | value. | What variety of recreational activities does the space support? (e.g. the space is used for playing sport and for informal recreation) |
| | | National guidance states that there is no need to designate linear corridors as Local Green Space simply to protect rights of way, which are already protected under other legislation. |

Appendix A

| 9. | The proposed space is of particular local significance | How is the proposed space of particular local significance, in respect of its tranquillity? |
|-----|--|---|
| | because of its tranquillity. | Green spaces may provide value to the local community in terms of providing an oasis of calm, perhaps in a busy town, or a space for quiet reflection. Why is the space considered to be tranquil? |
| 10. | The proposed space is of particular local significance because of its richness of | How is the proposed space of particular local significance, in respect of its richness of wildlife? |
| | wildlife. | Is the proposed space formally designated for its wildlife value? (e.g. is it a SSSI, SNCI or Local Nature Reserve). |
| | | Are any important habitats or species found in the space? |
| | | Does the proposed space support species of fauna or flora protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 or Habitat Regulations 2010; or species and habitats listed by the Government as being of Principle Importance for Biological Diversity in Britain under Section 41 of the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006 (Priority Species and Habitats)? |
| | | Does the proposed space support irreplaceable habitats such as ancient semi-natural woodland and veteran trees? |
| | | Does the proposed space function as part of a wildlife corridor or green infrastructure enabling the dispersal and favourable status of species of flora and fauna? |
| 11. | The proposed space is of particular local significance because of another reason not covered by criteria 6-10. | Are there any other reasons why the proposed space has a particular local significance for the local community? |

| Site | Period | Submitted by | Completed | Area | Proposal | Rationale | Designation |
|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| | submitted | | toolkit | (ha) | | | no. |
| Leckhampton Fields | Part of 2015 LGS | Leckhampton with | Yes | 39.31 | Designate | The JCS Inspector | 1 |
| | study | Warden Hill Parish | | | | discussed LGS at | |
| | | Council | | | | Leckhampton in her | |
| | | | | | | Preliminary Findings: "In | |
| | | | | | | my judgement, the | |
| | | | | | | evidence suggests that | |
| | | | | | | the NPPF criteria are | |
| | | | | | | met and LGS designation | |
| | | | | | | is justified." | |
| Fairview Green | Part of 2015 LGS | Fairview | Yes | 0.16 | Designate | Highly valued site | 2 |
| | study | Community | | | | owned and managed by | |
| | · | Association | | | | CBC. It is similar to | |
| | | | | | | several other Public | |
| | | | | | | Green Space sites but | |
| | | | | | | not designated. | |
| | | | | | | Currently has strong | |
| | | | | | | protection due to use | |
| | | | | | | and ownership but is | |
| | | | | | | also very special. | |
| George Readings | Part of 2015 LGS | Hesters Way | Yes | 1.75 | Already designated via | The boundaries of the | - |
| Park | study | Partnership | | | PGS list | PGS site did not reflect | |
| | , | · | | | | the full extent of the | |
| | | | | | | valued space. The LGS | |
| | | | | | | application has been | |
| | | | | | | used to refine the | |
| | | | | | | boundaries of the site to | |
| | | | | | | make more sense. | |

| St Marks and Hesters Way Community Centre grounds | Part of 2015 LGS study | Hesters Way Partnership | Yes | 0.51 | Designate | This site has a clear value to the local community for its recreational use. No objections to its designation were received in the Preferred Options consultation. | 4 |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|------|-----------|---|-----|
| Lynworth Green | Part of 2015 LGS study | Oakley Regeneration Partnership | Yes | 0.42 | Designate | This site has a clear value to the local community for its recreational use and as a centre point for the area. No objections to its designation were received in the Preferred Options consultation. | 0.0 |
| Albemarle Orchard gardens | Part of 2015 LGS study | Albemarle Orchard Garden Group | Yes | 0.10 | Designate | This site has a clear value to the local community for its recreational use and as a community space. No objections to its designation were received in the Preferred Options consultation. | 6 |

| Colesbourne Road and Redgrove Park | Part of 2015 LGS study | Cllr Nigel Britter | Yes | 0.81 | Designate | This site has a clear value to the local community for its recreational use. No objections to its designation were received in the Preferred Options consultation. | 7 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|-------|-----------|--|---|
| North West Strategic Allocation | Part of 2015 LGS study | Swindon Parish Council | Yes | 48.47 | Designate | The JCS Inspector said, in her Final Report that, "the allocation at North West Cheltenham should ensure that a green buffer remains around Swindon village within which Local Green Space may be designated, the detailed boundaries of which are to be left to the forthcoming Cheltenham Local Plan." | 8 |
| Victoria Cricket Ground | Part of 2015 LGS study | Fairview Community Association | Yes | 2.76 | Designate | This site has a clear value to the local community for its recreational use. No objections to its designation were received in the Preferred Options consultation. | 9 |

| Ewens Farm Play | During Preferred | Individual Issues & | No | | Designate | Highly valued site | 10 |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----|------|-----------|---------------------------|----|
| Area | Options | Options responses | | | | owned and managed by | |
| | consultation, | | | | | CBC. It is similar to | |
| | 2017 | | | | | several other Public | |
| | | | | | | Green Space sites but | |
| | | | | | | not designated. | |
| | | | | | | Currently has strong | |
| | | | | | | protection due to use | |
| | | | | | | and ownership but is | |
| | | | | | | also very special. | |
| Harrington Drive | During Preferred | | Yes | | Designate | This site has a clear | 11 |
| | Options | | | | | value to the local | |
| | consultation, | | | | | community for its | |
| | 2017 | | | | | recreational use. | |
| | | | | | | Although it is a fairly | |
| | | | | | | small green space it | |
| | | | | | | benefits from significant | |
| | | | | | | local value as | |
| | | | | | | demonstrated in the | |
| | | | | | | submitted LGS toolkit. | |
| Clyde Crescent | Existing PGS site | | | 2.79 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 | 12 |
| | in 2006 Local | | | | | Local Plan | |
| | Plan | | | | | | |
| Clarence Square | Existing PGS site | | | 0.68 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 | 13 |
| | in 2006 Local | | | | | Local Plan | |
| | Plan | | | | | | |
| Whaddon Road | Existing PGS site | | | 2.23 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 | 14 |
| | in 2006 Local | | | | | Local Plan | |
| | Plan | | | | | | |
| Pittville Circus | Existing PGS site | | | 0.37 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 | 15 |
| | in 2006 Local | | | | | Local Plan | |
| | Plan | | | | | | |

| Fiddlers Green Lane | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.21 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 16 |
|-------------------------------|--|------|---------------------------|---|----|
| Pittville Crescent (south) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.25 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 17 |
| Pittville Crescent (north) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.25 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 18 |
| Wellington Square | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.72 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 19 |
| Pittville Park/South | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.79 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 20 |
| George Readings Way | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.79 | Designate with amendments | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 21 |
| Pittville Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 4.28 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 22 |
| St. Peters/Chelt Walk | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.13 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 23 |
| Caernarvon Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.16 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 24 |
| Pittville Park/North | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 4.75 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 25 |
| Sandford Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.17 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 26 |

| Bath Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.20 |) Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 27 |
|--------------------------|--|------|--------------|---|----|
| Montpellier Gardens | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 3.71 | . Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 28 |
| Lansdown Crescent | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.81 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 29 |
| Queen Elizabeth II | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 4.23 | B Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 30 |
| Swindon Village | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 8.89 |) Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 31 |
| Welch Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 7.51 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 32 |
| Henley Road (south east) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.22 | 2 Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 33 |
| Henley Road (north west) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.59 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 34 |
| King George V | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 11.7 | 70 Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 35 |
| Coronation Square | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.45 | 5 Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 36 |
| Hesters Way Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 4.02 | . Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 37 |

| Horsefair Street | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.07 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 38 |
|-------------------------------|--|------|-----------|---|----|
| Prior's Farm | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.30 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 39 |
| Benhall (west) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 3.57 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 40 |
| Benhall (east) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 6.23 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 41 |
| Reddings Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.08 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 42 |
| Hatherley Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 3.11 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 43 |
| Burrows Field | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 6.34 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 44 |
| Naunton Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.02 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 45 |
| Sandford Mill Cox's Meadow | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.46 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 46 |
| King William Drive | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.34 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 47 |
| Charlton Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.94 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 48 |

| Cirencester Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.33 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 49 |
|------------------|--|------|-----------|---|----|
| Sandy Lane | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.91 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 50 |
| The Beeches | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 5.75 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 51 |
| Sandford Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 2.87 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 52 |
| Arle Court | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.73 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 53 |
| Weavers Field | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 3.29 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 54 |
| Imperial Gardens | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.16 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 55 |
| Fernleigh Green | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.27 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 56 |
| Glenlea Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.78 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 57 |
| Cheriton Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.21 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 58 |
| Manor Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.56 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 59 |

| Up Hatherley Green | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.18 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 60 |
|--|--|------|---------------------------|---|----|
| Hatherley Court | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.01 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 61 |
| Holmer Park/Greatfield Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.95 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 62 |
| Chelt Walk (Jessops Avenue) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.02 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 63 |
| Pilgrove Way (west) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.82 | Designate with amendments | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 64 |
| Pilgrove Way (east) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.29 | Designate with amendments | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 65 |
| Oxford and Priory Garden (south-east) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.06 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 66 |
| Oxford and Priory Garden (north west) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.09 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 67 |
| Honeybourne Line (central) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.81 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 68 |
| Honeybourne Line (south) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 2.47 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 69 |
| Honeybourne Line (north) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 4.18 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 70 |

| Winston Churchill Gardens | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.20 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 71 |
|----------------------------------|--|------|---------------------------|---|----|
| The Lanes (north) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.60 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 72 |
| The Lanes (south) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.20 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 73 |
| Sandford Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.93 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 74 |
| Pilley Bridge (southeast) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 1.44 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 75 |
| Pilley Bridge (northwest) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.85 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 76 |
| Chelt Walk (St. Georges Road) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.17 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 77 |
| Chelt Walk (Honeybourne Way) | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.51 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 78 |
| Long Mynd Avenue | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.32 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 79 |
| Land off Springbank Road | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.37 | Designate with amendments | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 80 |
| Summerfield Close | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 0.03 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 81 |

| Pittville Park | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | | 19.51 | Designate | Existing PGS site in 2006 Local Plan | 82 |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------|-----------|--|----|
| Jasmin Way/Justica Way Open Space | Following the Preferred Options consultation | | 0.35 | Designate | The site is owned and managed by CBC. It is very similar to several other Public Green Space sites but was not designated in the 2006 Local Plan. It is included here for consistency. | 83 |
| Campion Park Open Space | Following the Preferred Options consultation | | 0.94 | Designate | The site is owned and managed by CBC. It is very similar to several other Public Green Space sites but was not designated in the 2006 Local Plan. It is included here for consistency. | 84 |
| Berkeley Garden | Following the Preferred Options consultation | | 0.11 | Designate | The site is owned and managed by CBC. It is very similar to several other Public Green Space sites but was not designated in the 2006 Local Plan. It is included here for consistency. | 85 |

| West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation | The site emerged from the JCS | | | 18.25 | Designate | Policy A7 of the JCS requires the West Cheltenham Strategic Allocation site to include Local Green Space as part of a network of green infrastructure. | 86 |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|-------|------------------------------------|--|----|
| Newcourt Green | Part of 2015 LGS study | Charlton Kings Parish Council | Yes | 1.39 | Already designated via PGS list | See entry for 'Cirencester Road' | - |
| Pilgrove Way | Part of 2015 LGS study | Hesters Way Partnership | Yes | 1.33 | Already designated via PGS list | See entry for 'Pilgrove Way (east)' and 'Pilgrove Way (west)' | |

| Henley Road and Triscombe Way | Part of 2015 LGS study | Hesters Way Partnership | Yes | 1.28 | Already designated via PGS list | - |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----|------|------------------------------------|---|
| Chargrove Open Space | Part of 2015 LGS study | Up Hatherley Parish Council | Yes | 1.93 | Already designated via PGS list | - |
| Redthorne Way | Part of 2015 LGS study | Up Hatherley Parish Council | Yes | 1.42 | Already designated via PGS list | - |
| Honeybourne Line | During Issues & Options consultation, 2015 | Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council Issues and Options consultation response | No | 4.20 | Already designated via PGS list | - |
| Caernarvon Park | During Issues & Options consultation, 2015 | Up Hatherley Parish Council | No | 1.20 | Already designated via PGS list | - |

| Westdown Gardens | Part of 2015 LGS | Fairview | Yes | 0.06 | Do not designate | The site has value as a | - |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----|------|------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | study | Community | | | | green space and open | |
| | | Association | | | | area but does not meet | |
| | | | | | | the test of being | |
| | | | | | | demonstrably special to | |
| | | | | | | the community. | |
| Witcombe Place | Part of 2015 LGS | Fairview | Yes | 0.08 | Do not designate | The site has value as a | - |
| | study | Community | | | | green space and open | |
| | | Association | | | | area but does not meet | |
| | | | | | | the test of being | |
| | | | | | | demonstrably special to | |
| | | | | | | the community. | |
| Hardwick Campus | Part of 2015 LGS | Elmsfield & Town | Yes | 0.78 | Do not designate | The site is locally valued | - |
| | study | Centre | | | | but should not be Local | |
| | | Neighbourhood | | | | Green Space because it | |
| | | Coordination Group | | | | is part of an educational | |
| | | | | | | site. | |
| Christ College | Part of 2015 LGS | Hesters Way | Yes | 2.23 | Do not designate | The site does not meet | - |
| | study | Partnership | | | | the test of being | |
| | | | | | | demonstrably special to | |
| | | | | | | the community. It was | |
| | | | | | | also identified in the | |
| | | | | | | Issues and Options | |
| | | | | | | consultation as being a | |
| | | | | | | suitable for housing | |
| | | | | | | development. | |

| Monkscroft School Field | Part of 2015 LGS study | Hesters Way Partnership | Yes | 1.39 | Do not designate | The site does not meet the test of being demonstrably special to the community. It was also identified in the Issues and Options consultation as being a suitable for housing development. | - |
|---|---------------------------|--|-----|------|------------------|---|---|
| Prior's Fields | Part of 2015 LGS study | Oakley | Yes | 7.44 | Do not designate | The site was identified in the Issues and Options consultation as being a suitable for housing development. The reasons provided for the specialness of the site will be taken into account in any future masterplan. | - |
| Circa Green Link | Part of 2015 LGS study | St Paul's Neighbourhood Coordination Group | Yes | 0.74 | Do not designate | Legal agreement connected to the adjacent development provides adequate protection. | - |
| St Paul's Walk | Part of 2015 LGS study | St Paul's Neighbourhood Coordination Group | Yes | 0.05 | Do not designate | Site was provided as part of the recent development. Planning constraints provide adequate protection. | - |
| Prestbury Parish Council Playing Fields | Part of 2015 LGS study | Prestbury Parish Council | Yes | 2.88 | Do not designate | The site is owned by a Parish Council. | - |

| Blacksmith's Lane Allotment Gardens | Part of 2015 LGS study | Prestbury Parish Council | Yes | 3.87 | Do not designate | The site is owned by a Parish Council. | - |
|--|---------------------------|--|-----|------|------------------|---|---|
| Robson Memorial Field | Part of 2015 LGS study | Prestbury Parish Council | Yes | 0.58 | Do not designate | The site is owned by a Parish Council. | - |
| A40 corridor | Part of 2015 LGS study | Benhall Residents Association / Cllr Nigel Britter | Yes | 1.25 | Do not designate | There are no current plans for this land to be used as part of any highway works. However, this could change in the future and the A40 is a vital part of the transport network. Improvements to this route should not be fettered. | - |
| All Saints Allotments and Church | Part of 2015 LGS study | Fairview Community Association | Yes | 0.13 | Do not designate | The site has some value as a green space and open area but does not meet the test of being demonstrably special to the community. | - |
| Holy Apostles Primary School Fields | Part of 2015 LGS study | Fairview Community Association | Yes | 2.50 | Do not designate | The site should not be Local Green Space because it is part of an educational site. | - |
| Holy Trinity School Fields | Part of 2015 LGS study | Fairview Community Association | Yes | 0.19 | Do not designate | The site should not be Local Green Space because it is part of an educational site. | - |

| Ashley Close adjacent to number 16 | During Issues & Options consultation, 2015 | Individual Issues & Options responses | No | 0.05 | Do not designate | The site does not meet the test of being demonstrably special to the community. Insufficient evidence has been provided to show why the site should be designated. | - |
|---|--|---|-----|------|------------------|---|---|
| Glenfall Way School site | During Issues & Options consultation, 2015 | Individual Issues & Options responses | No | 0.80 | Do not designate | The site should not be Local Green Space because it is part of an educational site. | - |
| Reeves Field | During Issues & Options consultation, 2015 | Charlton Park Residents Association | Yes | 4.50 | Do not designate | The site should not be Local Green Space because it is part of an educational site. | - |
| St Edwards Field/land off Oakhurst Rise | During Preferred Options consultation, 2017 | Individual Preferred Options responses | No | 4.00 | Do not designate | The site was identified in the Issues and Options consultation as being a suitable for housing development. The reasons provided for the specialness of the site will be taken into account in any future masterplan. | - |

| The Reddings (SO45 - | During Preferred | Reddings Residents | No | Various | Do not designate | The land suggested falls | - |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|----|---------|------------------|--------------------------|---|
| SO58) | Options | Association | | | | within the Green Belt. | |
| | consultation, | | | | | There is no compelling | |
| | 2017 | | | | | evidence that LGS | |
| | | | | | | designation would | |
| | | | | | | provide any additional | |
| | | | | | | local benefit. | |