

Comment ID: 10633

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: I D Smith

Comment: The new National Planning Policy is flawed.

- House prices are not an indication of need
- That 84% of CDC area is National Landscape should be taken into consideration. The onus to build on the remaining 16% is not realistically viable

Comment ID: 10666

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: I D Smith

Comment: No. I can only speak for area 19 proposals, New development at Driffield; and the Strategic Development of Ampney Crucis, as I live in the area and have local knowledge. Comments are -

The existing roads are completely unsuitable: Waterton Lane and Tank Lane are already 'cut-throughs' and are heavily pot-holed and rutted. They are single track in many areas. Any major development would need these roads to be completely rebuilt, including the bridge over the A419.

Tank Lane and the road from Harnhill to Driffield Regularly flood and are impassable. Sometimes the road becomes, literally, a river. When the A419 was duelled in the 1990s, this was the reason why the long lane, exiting Driffield to the South, was built. It was feared that Driffield might otherwise be isolated by floodwater for long periods. Extensive work would be needed to mitigate the flooding problem should this development go ahead. The Site Assessment Document does not mention any of this.

Utilities: I am told that the sewerage system serving area 19, located in Charlham lane, is completely inadequate for the proposed developments. Again, major investment is needed, which will take several years to complete, even with best scenario.

The site assessment sheet does not mention the well preserved area of medieval 'Ridge and Furrow' pattern landscape to the south of Tank Lane. It should do so as this would be lost if the Driffield development went ahead.

Comment ID: 10637

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: I D Smith

Comment: Yes, CDC should consider sites within the National Landscape

Comment ID: 10665

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: I D Smith

Comment: No. I can only speak for area 19 proposals, New development at Driffield; and the Strategic Development of Ampney Crucis, as I live in the area and have local knowledge. Comments are -

The existing roads are completely unsuitable: Waterton Lane and Tank Lane are already 'cut-throughs' and are heavily pot-holed and rutted. They are single track in many areas. Any major development would need these roads to be completely rebuilt, including the bridge over the A419.

Tank Lane and the road from Harnhill to Driffield Regularly flood and are impassable. Sometimes the road becomes, literally, a river. When the A419 was duelled in the 1990s, this was the reason why the long lane, exiting Driffield to the South, was built. It was feared that Driffield might otherwise be isolated by floodwater for long periods. Extensive work would be needed to mitigate the flooding problem should this development go ahead. The Site Assessment Document does not mention any of this.

Utilities: I am told that the sewerage system serving area 19, located in Charlham lane, is completely inadequate for the proposed developments. Again, major investment is needed, which will take several years to complete, even with best scenario.

The site assessment sheet does not mention the well preserved area of medieval 'Ridge and Furrow' pattern landscape to the south of Tank Lane. It should do so as this would be lost if the Driffield development went ahead.

Comment ID: 10698

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: I D Smith

Comment: Objective b. 'Conserve and enhance the natural, built and historic environment'.

It is difficult to square this with the effect the proposed developments would have on Harnhill, Driffield and Ampney Crucis.

Harnhill is a small, ancient, hamlet with an active farm and Christian Healing Centre. Most residents are involved in one of these.

A development of 800, possibly 2000, houses around this site could not possibly be said to be consistent with this objective!

Comment ID: 10636

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: I D Smith

Comment: Developing 'Strategic Extensions' and 'New Settlements' will require a multimillion pound investment in infrastructure to support them: Roads, utilities, flooding measures, schools.

Existing villages, some are mentioned in the Domesday book, and communities would be devastated. It would be an act of vandalism

Comment ID: 10172

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: No doubt, based on the way the Council appears to have developed the plan, "call for sites" inside the AONB was given little weight or desire to be proactively considered. This bias is still the case under the renewed call for sites (section 6).

Comment ID: 10173

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: As only 20% of Cotswold Council land is outside the AONB, and most of Gloucestershire is outside the AONB, The Council should be taking a more conservative line and drawing up a plan which looks to allow for more of Gloucestershire Council land to be used in the long term. As mentioned by the need to ask neighbouring authorities whether they could accommodate some of the unmet need (3.14). This would reduce the likelihood of disproportionate allocation "e.g. settlements outside the Cotswolds National Landscape will normally be expected to receive more development than those inside the Cotswolds National Landscape." (3.11)

Comment ID: 10174

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: The A417 runs through Fairford and becomes single direction traffic in the middle and along many of the incoming roads due to on road parking. It already has significant traffic disruption. It is disappointing that only the Thames water issue is highlighted at this stage, as significant (Government?) investment (by pass) will be required to alleviate and deal with all the extra volume of transport requirements to meet the needs of the new housing occupants.

Comment ID: 10177

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: Excellent maps that really show how the 20% of land outside of the AONB will be disproportionately targetted, destroying the Cotswold character of Cotswold villages just outside the AONB. The new over population will then contribute to destroying the immediate AONB as people use it for transport and recreational use,

Comment ID: 10171

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: Scenario 6. The A417 / A419 dual carriageway is having a major upgrade inside the AONB (A417 missing link). Just proves building and progression can happen inside the AONB. This dual carriageway road should be helping to create the backbone of development without destroying other villages just outside the AONB, but in conservation areas. This option would have the opportunity to spread out this extra housing across the Cotswolds. The fact National Planning does not promote building in AONB, does not take into account the Governments edict on additional housing numbers where Councils are hampered by having 80% of their land in the AONB. The AONB is a line on a map, villages just outside are just as characterful (hence their conservation zones) and also need preserving without excessive over development.

Comment ID: 10176

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: Fairford would need a bypass (A417 become single direction at 1 point and due to parking most of the way along the incoming roads) , more shops, more doctors, a new sewerage works, new or more school expansions, businesses to employ all the extra residents.

Comment ID: 10179

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: To have integrated settlements, you need land allocated for businesses to be based to employ the extra inhabitants, as well as allocations for shops.

Comment ID: 10169

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: With the government ordering a 100% increase in housing in the plan, the Council has worded this option to basically eliminate it (easy option for Council), and therefore the Council is forcing everybody to THINK down the route of placing just about all the housing in 20% of the land area of the Council (assuming 80% is inside the AONB). The extra housing is very much in the public interest, and this option should have been given more consideration by the Council. However, preserving the AONB without considering new 'in character' Cotswold developments in the AONB, is then going to lead to the destroying of other Cotswold Areas of Conservation that are just outside the AONB,

Comment ID: 10170

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: Council has been dismissive in consultation by not providing all figures for scenario 6. Already ruled it out.

Comment ID: 10175

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Ian Bruce-Gardner

Comment: Fairford - Yes, some extra housing is welcome, as is already planned. However, the it should not come at the expense of destroying the conservation area and the infrastructure into the surrounding villages and towns.

Comment ID: 9003

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ian Castle

Comment: Scenario 5. It is the best mix of approaches and seems least destructive to the character of the Cotswolds

Comment ID: 9005

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Ian Castle

Comment: No. Unsustainable housing simply shifts the burden to future administrations and generations

Comment ID: 9006

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Ian Castle

Comment: Housing should provide a decent quality of life. Increasing density reduces personal space and increases ambient noise and social tension. Tall buildings destroy views of natural surroundings

Comment ID: 8682

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: Personally, the council needs to better consider the need for a new town in the Cotswolds region rather than spoiling existing towns and villages. Although this would mean a large area, it would have very little impact on the Cotswolds AONB as a whole, whilst retaining the character of the existing towns and villages which is what the area is famous for and why people love to visit. ruining many towns and villages will have a far more significant impact for the area than one new town.

Comment ID: 8681

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: This would fail to fulfil your promise to not change the character of towns in the Cotswolds. The Cotswolds is about space, countryside, gardens, not built up, densely populated towns.

Comment ID: 8680

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: All those items listed as needing review under the infrastructure plan are important and must not be brushed under the carpet. Focusing on Moreton, you state that it is a strategic transport hub. However, there is one train an hour, already insufficient capacity. Bus service is laughable. Not possible to get to Cirencester (your employment hub) without a car, also impossible to get to Warwick, Cheltenham etc. Hence the notion of Moreton being a strategic hub because of it's transport links is a joke.

You also need to keep away from the thinking that Cycle routes will solve all your problems, Just look at Warwick & Cheltenham where new developments have included cycle routes, Drive through any time of day, you get more congestion due to reduced capacity for cars and miles of empty cycle routes. The UK population do not commute on bikes!

Comment ID: 8672

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: 5, but with greater emphasis on a new town. The proposals for a new town limit the housing to below 1000? Why? Surely if you commit to a new town then it needs to be Moreton in Marsh size to benefit from suitable infrastructure i.e. create a proper town with shops, employment & leisure - not just a new location for mass housing

Comment ID: 8675

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: No as one of your other commitments is: "ensuring the character and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds and the wider district is retained" cramped housing, no gardens and high rise is not "Cotswold" like!

Comment ID: 8679

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: No! The whole infrastructure of the Cotswolds is unsuitable for large scale housing and population growth. Transportation is poor, roads unsuitable and not able to support an increase in traffic, there is a lack of employment outside retail and hospitality, and building on fields impacts flooding but reduces natural habitation for wildlife. Hence overall, the council should be doing more to push back on plans.

Comment ID: 8678

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Ian Miller

Comment: Increasing the size of Moreton in Marsh by 180% fails to deliver on your promise to keep the character of the Cotswolds and its towns. Moreton is a small market town, but nearly doubling its size that character will disappear and it will become just another large town, reducing tourism that is the life blood of the town.

There is also no employment in Moreton outside of hospitality and retail. You promise to maintain Cirencester's role as a key employment and service centre but with Moreton growing to such an extent, what are the plans to bring businesses and services to Moreton to provide local employment, allowing people to live and work locally, reducing need for people to travel and hence meeting the Green agenda.

Comment ID: 10916

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Ian Savage

Comment: I want it known that I object to the proposals of the HUGE increase of the housing to be built in Siddington. I have lived in Siddington Parish since April 1994, and the Parish has increased in size in a fairly normal and acceptable level.

The only exception to that is Spire View, which I along with many others objected too on ground of possible flooding and other reasons, and won, it was then taken to a different Court and the development was allowed. Now we suffer flooding and sewerage on the road, in our gardens and flowing into the rain water drain system.

So the infrastructure is in no way able to cope with the huge increase in houses that are planned.

Comment ID: 9094

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: These proposals inevitably mean that Siddington will lose its separate identity and become part of “Greater Cirencester”. Maintaining the separation from Cirencester is important to myself and my community -it is why I live here - but it is clearly threatened by these proposals.

These proposals would result in a vast expansion of the size of the village such that the existing village would become only a small part of a much larger urban development. The character of Siddington as a rural village, which is very important to me, will be utterly lost.

Siddington community would be totally swamped by this massive building programme - the current village community would effectively cease to exist.

The number and sheer scale of planned developments in Siddington, as well as surrounding areas, will obviously put even greater strain on the already fragile services and infrastructure: for transport (both road capacity and construction traffic), inadequate water supply, inadequate sewer capacity, school places, even poorer access to GP and hospital appointments and further increase the risk of flooding.

Comment ID: 9097

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: These proposals inevitably mean that Siddington will lose its separate identity and become part of “Greater Cirencester”. Maintaining the separation from Cirencester is important to myself and my community -it is why I live here - but it is clearly threatened by these proposals.

These proposals would result in a vast expansion of the size of the village such that the existing village would become only a small part of a much larger urban development. The character of Siddington as a rural village, which is very important to me, will be utterly lost.

Siddington community would be totally swamped by this massive building programme - the current village community would effectively cease to exist.

The number and sheer scale of planned developments in Siddington, as well as surrounding areas, will obviously put even greater strain on the already fragile services and infrastructure: for transport (both road capacity and construction traffic), inadequate water supply, inadequate sewer capacity, school places, even poorer access to GP and hospital appointments and further increase the risk of flooding.

Comment ID: 9098

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: These proposals inevitably mean that Siddington will lose its separate identity and become part of “Greater Cirencester”. Maintaining the separation from Cirencester is important to myself and my community -it is why I live here - but it is clearly threatened by these proposals.

These proposals would result in a vast expansion of the size of the village such that the existing village would become only a small part of a much larger urban development. The character of Siddington as a rural village, which is very important to me, will be utterly lost.

Siddington community would be totally swamped by this massive building programme - the current village community would effectively cease to exist.

The number and sheer scale of planned developments in Siddington, as well as surrounding areas, will obviously put even greater strain on the already fragile services and infrastructure: for transport (both road capacity and construction traffic), inadequate water supply, inadequate sewer capacity, school places, even poorer access to GP and hospital appointments and further increase the risk of flooding.

Comment ID: 9096

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: These proposals inevitably mean that Siddington will lose its separate identity and become part of "Greater Cirencester". Maintaining the separation from Cirencester is important to myself and my community -it is why I live here - but it is clearly threatened by these proposals.

These proposals would result in a vast expansion of the size of the village such that the existing village would become only a small part of a much larger urban development. The character of Siddington as a rural village, which is very important to me, will be utterly lost.

Siddington community would be totally swamped by this massive building programme - the current village community would effectively cease to exist.

The number and sheer scale of planned developments in Siddington, as well as surrounding areas, will obviously put even greater strain on the already fragile services and infrastructure: for transport (both road capacity and construction traffic), inadequate water supply, inadequate sewer capacity, school places, even poorer access to GP and hospital appointments and further increase the risk of flooding.

Comment ID: 10139

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: The CDC plan makes the premise that 'Designated Natural Landscape', 85% of the CDC area, is considered low priority for housing development. I believe this is wrong -

1. Natural landscape CAN, and should be considered in the plan
2. The housing development burden on the remaining 15% of CDC area is both unrealistic and destructive, bordering on an act of vandalism, to the communities in those areas.

CDC should make very clear that the imposed Government Plan is not achievable considering the local situation in the CDC area. Representations should be made to the relevant government department on this, and a legal challenge should be considered, possibly in conjunction with other national areas similarly affected.

Comment ID: 9708

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: I do not support any scenario that treats Siddington as a Principal Settlement. This classification is simply wrong and masks the fact that the village has neither the services nor the infrastructure to support major growth. Scenario 5 is especially unacceptable: it would overwhelm small rural villages, erase their identity, and in Siddington's case effectively turn it into a suburb of Cirencester. Allocating 1,100 homes to a village of just 339 dwellings is indefensible and completely out of line with sustainable development. Scenario 3 – the Main Service Centre focus – is the only credible and responsible option. Growth must go where infrastructure already exists, not where it clearly does not. CDC should also explore smaller non-strategic developments, revisiting holiday home designations in the Cotswold Lakes, and allowing limited expansion of The Steadings. The current targeting of Siddington contradicts the Council's own Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations.

Comment ID: 9709

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: No. Siddington is being targeted purely because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. Its incorrect Principal Settlement label hides the reality that the village lacks transport, services, and infrastructure. Choosing unsustainable locations directly contradicts the NPPF and abandons the planning principles CDC has always claimed to uphold. If CDC insists on placing development in unsuitable locations, it should be honest and admit it is abandoning good planning practice.

Comment ID: 9710

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: Increasing housing density in rural villages like Siddington is entirely inappropriate. It would destroy rural character and place even more pressure on already overstretched infrastructure. Scenario 3 remains the only sensible approach, directing growth to Main Service Centres where higher density can be absorbed without damaging village identity.

Comment ID: 9712

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: No. A huge fold expansion of Siddington would remove the separation from Cirencester, overwhelm rural infrastructure, heighten flood risk, and destroy the village's identity. Siddington already relies heavily on Cirencester for services, and that will not change. The Principal Settlement classification is wrong and cannot justify this level of growth.

Comment ID: 9713

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: Yes. The Plan must take into account of: the incorrect Principal Settlement classification; the need to protect village identity and cohesion; flood resilience and drainage constraints; rural infrastructure limits; and the essential green buffer separating Siddington from Cirencester

Comment ID: 9715

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: I agree with the vision, but the proposals for Siddington completely fail to deliver it. Instead of creating a sustainable community, they would dismantle the one we already have. They do not prioritise environmental stewardship, social equity, or economic vitality. They ignore Siddington's landscape, heritage, and rural character. They provide no new employment or essential facilities. They offer no realistic improvements to infrastructure or sustainable transport. They impose disproportionate growth and reduce green space. In short, the proposals contradict the very vision the Plan claims to champion.

Comment ID: 10768

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Imogen Charles-Jones

Comment: Proposed housing developments in zones 18 and 19 and 16:

All these proposals would drastically change the character and nature of these small rural villages.

The surrounding land and homes within and nearby have been severely impacted by flooding in recent times. Any development, coupled with climate change would exponentially increase the risk to existing homes through flooding and surface water runoff. We have recorded evidence from recent times of major flooding to surrounding roads. Vehicles became trapped in floodwater which is an obvious safety concern.

Our area is factually constrained in terms of existing sewerage capacity. Necessary upgrades to the sewerage network to facilitate the development would take too long and compromise the deliverability of the site.

Additionally, the water quality of sensitive rivers forming tributaries to the River Thames could be negatively impacted by surface water runoff. As stated in the Council's planning consultation paper, Thames Water is in a dire financial state so unlikely to be able to fund the necessary infrastructure.

There are no sustainable transport options, no infrastructure, and services such as healthcare are unavailable. The development would exponentially increase vehicle movements to facilitate travel to surrounding areas of employment, services and facilities. This would have numerous detrimental impacts.

Comment ID: 10305

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: India West

Comment: Whilst all still presenting certain limitations, scenarios 1, 3 and 4 present the least negatively impactful development options proposed. However, prior to selecting a preferred scenario, I would still request reasonable evidence regarding any discussions that have been held with neighbouring counties and their relative authorities regarding the requirements from the government to meet the full housing quota by 2043. In particular, I request to see conclusive evidence that such discussions have been held and that subsequently, in relation to the quota in question specifically, absolutely no other neighbouring authorities would be reasonably able to accommodate at least some or part of the quota allocated to the Cotswold District, which (as quoted on the CDC website directly) is home to 144 conservation areas - the most conservation areas of any district local authority across England. Does this not have an impact on the development quota allocated to the District, rendering the possible candidate locations within the District completely disproportionate to the rest of the country? Particularly in reference to existing policy that only supports development in areas where there is no substantial negative impact on the natural and historic landscape.

Furthermore, under no circumstance do I believe that the proposed scenario 5 (the CDC's preferred strategy) is in any way reasonable or sustainable. In addition to the significantly damaging impact such development would have on the natural beauty and largely protected area of landscape, the additional limitations presented to substantially developing the area referred to as BZ19 are numerous, covered across policy areas affecting highways and access, flood risk and drainage, sustainable development measures and Ecology and North Meadow SAC.

Comment ID: 10308

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: India West

Comment: No, I do not believe there to be any reasonable justification as to why the council should consider locating development in locations deemed unsustainable. Forcing development upon areas which are completely unsuitable to support such proposed quotas of development presents substantially harmful short, mid and long term challenges for the existing community, dramatically and negatively impacting quality of life, not to mention presenting vast environmental impact to an area which currently provides and supports a rich biodiversity and extensive, productive farmland for the local communities and further afield.

In order to achieve the significant housing objectives set by the government, the council's focus should be on identifying those candidate areas whereby the existing infrastructure already in place could support pockets of development, but the overall development quota must be reconsidered for the Cotswold District given that nigh on 70% pertains to protected conservation area.

Comment ID: 10310

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: India West

Comment: I believe some reasonable residential development is of course essential for an expanding community, but the focus for how this can be achieved must be on the impact it has on the local community and how much strain would be placed on existing services and infrastructure by the development in question. Much of the reason people choose to move to less-densely populated rural areas such as the infamous, picturesque villages within the Cotswolds are for exactly that reason - an escape from the heavily populated areas of larger towns and cities across the country. Infrastructure and local services can and should only support communities of a modest, proportionate size within the District and overdevelopment and expansion would cause irreparable damage on local communities, the natural landscape and environment and historic importance of the areas mentioned.

Comment ID: 10317

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: India West

Comment: No. The proposed level of development up to 2043 is neither reasonable nor remotely sustainable and in no way acknowledges the vastly disproportionately 'suitable' land available within the Cotswold District, with the highest density of protected, conservations area across the whole of England.

The level and extent of entirely new infrastructure (for example roads, schools, health services) required to support such vast development (particularly in relation to scenario 5) would come at cost so substantial, that it is undeniable that this investment would not be better allocated to enhancing and expanding on areas where a well-established infrastructure already exists.

Comment ID: 10325

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: India West

Comment: My view here relates largely to the response to question 4 above and the issues and concerns outlined here, along with the proposal that funding and investment into bolstering housing development should be better allocated to areas which can already offer an established infrastructure, unlikely the area to the west of Drifffield specifically whereby entirely new services would be required to be created and introduced.

Comment ID: 10330

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: India West

Comment: The almost certain impact the proposed development would have would contradict many of the objectives set out by the CDC, particularly the focus of being "Green to the Core". For example, whilst the intention for the housing developments themselves might be "zero-carbon" and "climate-resilient" - what of the environmental impact that introducing the additional road networks and services for these entirely new communities would have? In reference to scenario 5 in particular, the addition of an initial 840 houses to the west of Drifffield, if one assumes the average household in the UK has 1.2 cars, how would the additional circa 1,000 vehicles on the road support objective (a) set out by the CDC, which would only be expected to dramatically increase should the intended growth plans by 2043 be achieved?

Comment ID: 9478

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Ioan Jones

Comment: Our Non Principal Settlement had a population of 336 in 2021. The population has grown by 236 souls since the year 1000 AD.

Typically, an increase of about 1 person every 5 years.

What information have the authors used to show that future growth will be in the region of 758 souls per year from 2025

Comment ID: 9477

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Ioan Jones

Comment: What method and supporting data was used to calculate that the district needed to deliver 493 additional homes a year

Comment ID: 9476

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Ioan Jones

Comment: How have the authors determined that the standard government method for housing demand is applicable in this 'local area'

Comment ID: 9479

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ioan Jones

Comment: I do not think the proposed level of development up to 2043 and beyond 2043 is sustainable?

Additional infrastructure, schools, hospitals and quality employment would need to be built. Not a few warehouses and coffee shops - a strategic direction with government backing based on the history of the region - e.g.: agriculture, sheep farming and stone quarries,

Comment ID: 9880

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Ione Francis

Comment: Referring to Broad Zone 17 - Down Ampney.1. Down Ampney is a small rural settlement with limited services and limited capacity for growth. See: CDLP Policy DS1/ CDC 2022 Settlement Capacity for Growth. An increase 2.5 times current number of residences is inconsistent with a small rural settlement.

2. Village roads are narrow. There is limited pedestrian infrastructure. See: CDC 2022 Area 17 assessment identifies highway constraints and poor accessibility as significant limitation to growth. A potential 4,000+ additional traffic movements per day on these narrow lanes will be problematic both from a sustainability and traffic management point of view.

3. Down Ampney has high water level issues which have resulted in CDC 2021 Settlement Analysis identifying flood risk and drainage capacity as constraints for Area 17. CDC 2021 Evidence Base indicates infrastructure capacity concerns as a material consideration for Down Ampney, dependent on confirmed and fully funded upgrades by Thames Water.

4. NPPF Para. 130 Developments must be sympathetic to local character and history. CDC 2021 Identifies Down Ampney as a village with a strong rural identity and limited tolerance for expansion. Large scale development would cause irreversible harm to settlement character and conflict directly with both design and landscape policies.

5. CDC2021 SA for Area17 records negative effects on landscape and environmental objectives at higher growth rates. The development outlined would result in the urbanisation of a rural settlement totally incompatible with the rural landscape. CDC 2021 Settlement Analysis identifies limited service provision in Down Ampney as a key constraint .

6. Large scale development in Down Ampney would therefore be inconsistent with the Local Plan - Spacial Strategy Policy DS1; contrary to multiple NPPF Objectives; u supported by CDCs own 2021 evidence base and unsustainable when assessed against SA findings.

Comment ID: 737

Email/Letter Representation

Name: I and R Jones

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 123

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian and Ann Partridge

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 117

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian and Elizabeth Richardson

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 859

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian Richardson

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 259

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian Smith

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 402

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 406

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian Waters

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 440

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ian Wright

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 811

Email/Letter Representation

Name: IM Bye

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)

Comment ID: 665

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Isabelle Erskine

Comment: [Click here to view full comment](#)