The Hesters Way Forum is generally in support of the SPD and is particularly keen on the proposals which involve biodiversity, passive house designs as exemplified by the RIBA winners in Norwich and by the cycle, walking and public transport aspirations

The forum has held several meetings to discuss the SPD. The feedback responses given below have emerged from those discussions and reflect the views of the whole group.

**Buffer zone.** All agreed that the buffer zone of at least 80 metres between houses backing onto Fiddlers Green Lane, Beverley and Juniper Courts and the Cyber Hub buildings is key to the success of the project as far as local residents are concerned. This should be a landscaped area with screening trees and shrubs and include good access to the development for walking and cycling. The closest buildings on the cyber site should not be visible from the residences which back onto Fiddlers Green Road and should definitely not loom over them. The references to a buffer zone in the document should include Fiddlers Green Lane as well as Henley Road and Old Gloucester Road. There is a good description of the views of the group in the HW masterplan on p24. Any careful planning of the boundary buffer zone should include close collaboration with the HWF.

**Fiddlers Green Lane (FGL).** The traffic on FGL should be reduced to a minimum and if possible be limited to a walking and cycling route.If vehicles do access the road that should be limited by either bollards to restrict width located at the brook near to Meadow Close on FGL (as at Caernarvon Road in Hatherley) or using weight restrictions. If traffic is permitted to use the road then chicane parking as shown in the masterplan on p22 should be used. Further narrowing could be installed at the junction of Niven Courtyard with FGL allowing safer walking and cycle crossing and access to the development through the hedgerow.

**Building heights.** Building heights should be restricted in the vicinity of the housing on FGL and Beverley and Juniper Courts and should definitely not loom over properties on these roads as may be the case with the proposed “mid density mixed use” buildings. The proposed entry to the site at the FGL / Telstar Way roundabout should abide by the proposals regarding the buffer zone presented above.Buildings on the site should gradually increase in height with distance away from FGL. Some views from FGL to the west to be retained.

An explanation of the need for greater densities would be useful as would the number of taller buildings above 3 stories.

**Community facilities.** The role, management and objectives of the Innovation Centre should be clarified. The community facilities described in the plan are minimal; will there be a community centre building? What services will it supply and how and by whom will it be managed? The local school could be relocated to the centre of the residential area so encouraging walking and cycling rather than car use especially at the busy peak commute times.

Sports and recreational facilities seem to have been omitted from the plan and yet are included in the HW strategy drawings. What will be provided and where will it be located?

**Public art** The public art section should reference the CBC Public Art strategy;

<https://democracy.cheltenham.gov.uk/documents/s24385/2017_12_05_CAB_Public%20Art%20Strategy_Appendix.pdf>

**Transport access (bus and car)** Access to the development should encourage bus and cycle usage. Bus access should be agreed in the document and not simply described as “potential”. Some access to the development should be via the current residential areas. E.g. Henley Road and Springbank Road. M5 Junction 10 developments should be completed prior to the site development. If this isn’t possible construction traffic should have no access to FGL. Park and ride facilities should be proposed and implemented prior to the site opening.

All possible opportunities should be taken to ensure that the main road through the development is not used as a direct through route between the Tewkesbury Road/M5 junction 10/Old Gloucester Road and Telstar Way/FGL

The document describes a modal shift in transport; clear evidence of how this will occur should be included.

**Multi story car park.** Whilst its accepted that decked parking needs to be provided the location of the multi-story car park adjacent to housing and assessed from a bend on FGL is not suitable or safe. This car park would better serve the area nearer the centre of the cyber provision.

**Parking proposals** Further underground parking at offices and apartments will be required to ensure overspill to nearby residential streets is minimised. A better explanation should be given for the “flexible and innovative approaches to the provision of residential parking” and ‘flexible approach to the application of parking standards to ensure development promotes modal shift’ – what do these phrases mean in practice?

Considering the current parking issues would a decked car park at the current GCHQ alleviate some of the current pressure and address future concerns.

**Other issues.** Concerns were raised regarding plans to build on the wildflower meadow in the fields next to FGL – what mitigation is proposed?

The hedgerow at the top of FGL has been removed; this may be necessary in order to create the new road and the open spaces around the entrances to the site. Where possible hedgerows should be retained, and new habitats created for the species affected.

The SPD describes potential development at Coronation Square; what will this depend upon?

Further clarification of the proposed allotments is necessary, particularly their location in relation to housing.