

Comment ID: 10360

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: mafremantle

Comment: Based on the "Preferred Options Consultation" document provided, the Cotswold District Council faces a significant challenge: a mandatory government housing target that has more than doubled (from 493 to 1,036 homes per year). The document admits that even the preferred "Scenario 5" may fail to meet this target without "urban" densities that are out of character for the area.

To better protect existing residents and infrastructure while attempting to meet these requirements, the following improvements and policy shifts could be integrated into the final Local Plan:

1. Implement a Strict "Infrastructure First" Phasing Policy

The document highlights a critical risk: reliance on large strategic sites (like the one in Cirencester) which are often delayed , and a dependence on Thames Water, which is facing financial difficulties and capacity issues.

The Improvement: Instead of simply "seeking comments" on infrastructure, the Plan should include binding "Grampian" conditions for all strategic allocations. A Grampian commitment changes "hopes" into "rules".

How it helps residents: This ensures that no new housing can be occupied until the necessary sewage upgrades, water supply, and road improvements are physically completed. This prevents the "buy now, pay later" scenario where new residents overload existing systems before upgrades arrive.

Specific Focus: Given the admitted sewage/water constraints, the plan should mandate on-site water treatment and greywater recycling for all strategic sites (500+ homes) to achieve "water neutrality," removing the burden from the existing, struggling public network.

2. Aggressively Pursue the "Duty to Cooperate" Now

The document admits that Scenario 5 only meets 79% of the target and that meeting the full target would require London-style density (106 dwellings per hectare), which is "not seen as realistic".

The Improvement: Rather than waiting, the Council should immediately formalize requests to neighbouring authorities to take the "unmet need".

How it helps residents: The current plan leaves a "gap" between the 14,660 homes in Scenario 5 and the 18,650 target. If this gap isn't officially offloaded to neighbours, developers may use it to justify speculative "predatory" planning applications on unallocated green fields, arguing the Council is failing its target. Closing this gap legally is the best protection against unplanned sprawl.

3. Codify "Green Buffers" to Prevent Coalescence

The document mentions that "further investigation" is needed on maintaining green buffers between towns and villages.

The Improvement: Move from "investigation" to designation. The Local Plan should explicitly map and legally protect "Strategic Gaps" between settlements (e.g., between Cirencester and Siddington, or Moreton-in-Marsh and its neighbours).

How it helps residents: This guarantees that the proposed "strategic extensions" do not result in villages merging into towns, preserving the distinct identity and rural character of existing communities.

4. Diversify the Site Portfolio to Prevent "Stalling"

The preferred Scenario 5 relies heavily on massive strategic sites (8 sites of 500+ homes). The document admits these are "difficult to deliver" and "often delayed".

The Improvement: Include a "Reserve Sites" policy. Identify smaller, non-strategic sites that are "shovel-ready" but held in reserve.

How it helps residents: If a massive strategic site stalls (causing a 5-year land supply failure), developers often attack vulnerable unallocated land. A Reserve Policy allows the Council to release specific, pre-vetted reserve sites instead, keeping control of where development happens rather than losing control to speculative appeals.

5. Enforce Design Codes

The plan suggests increasing density is a way to bridge the housing gap but notes it can conflict with "historic character".

The Improvement: Introduce Area-Specific Design Codes alongside the density targets. If density must rise in town centres or transport hubs, it should be governed by strict codes regarding height, materials, and overlooking.

How it helps residents: This mitigates the visual impact of new developments. It ensures that higher density translates to "mews style" or "terrace" developments (typical of the Cotswolds) rather than the "apartment blocks" and "high-rise living" the document fears.

Comment ID: 10368

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: mafremantle

Comment: Based on the consultation document and planning best practices, here are specific recommendations to strengthen the Local Plan in the areas of Design, Employment, and AONB protection.

1. Ensuring Design Conforms to Local Codes

The document currently mentions "high quality design" but admits that high density targets could conflict with the area's historic character. To ensure developers don't sacrifice local aesthetics for profit, can you recommend:

Mandatory (Not Advisory) Design Codes: can the Plan explicitly link to Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) for design. Policies should state that development must comply with the "Cotswold Design Code" regarding materials (e.g., natural limestone, slate), roof pitches, and boundary treatments, rather than just "having regard to" them.

"Character Area" Assessments: we should ask for a policy requiring a Character Impact Statement for every major application. This forces developers to prove—in writing—how their specific design references the immediate surroundings (e.g., "This street layout mimics the historic burgage plots of [Town Name]").

Strict Density Caps in Sensitive Areas: The document notes that a density of 106 dwellings per hectare is "out of character". You should propose explicit density caps (e.g., maximum 30 dph) for edge-of-settlement sites to legally prevent "urban" apartment blocks in rural village settings.

2. Ensuring Jobs for Future Residents

The document admits that currently, planning decisions are happening "without a joined-up approach", which risks creating dormitory towns where people sleep but don't work. To fix this, can you recommend:

"Employment-Led" Phasing: similar to the infrastructure checks, request a policy that links housing delivery to employment land. For example: "Occupation of the 200th home on a strategic site is not permitted until the associated employment land has been serviced and marketed." This prevents developers from building the profitable houses and leaving the employment land empty.

Mixed-Use Allocations: Request that strategic sites (like those in Cirencester or Moreton-in-Marsh) must include flexible workspace hubs or "live-work" units as a condition of approval. This caters to the modern rural economy and remote workers, reducing out-commuting.

Digital Infrastructure Guarantee: To support local jobs, demand a policy requiring Gigabit-capable broadband connections (Fibre to the Premises) be installed and active before the first resident moves in.

3. Protecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) / National Landscape

The Council acknowledges a "presumption against major development" within the National Landscape, but the pressure to meet housing targets is high. To strengthen protections:

Protect the "Setting" of the AONB: The AONB boundary is a line on a map, but views cross it. we should ask for a policy that explicitly protects the "Setting of the National Landscape." This ensures that a large development built just outside the boundary (e.g., near a town edge) can still be refused if it ruins the view looking out from or into the AONB.

Dark Skies Policy: Light pollution is a major threat to rural character. Request a specific Dark Skies Policy that restricts street lighting temperatures (e.g., max 3000K) and requires strict cut-off fixtures for all new developments to prevent "sky glow."

Landscape-Led Masterplanning: we should demand that for any site near the AONB, the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) must be done first, determining the

buildable area. Currently, developers often design the housing layout first and try to screen it with trees later (which takes decades to work).

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) "Plus": While 10% is the national standard, we should ask the Council to target 20% Biodiversity Net Gain for sites affecting the National Landscape, funding the restoration of classic Cotswold features like dry stone walls and wildflower meadows.

Comment ID: 8735

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Malcolm

Comment: I support this option, with a number of caveats: Brownfield First. Density is essential for regenerating brownfield land in urban areas. High-density development makes the cleanup and redevelopment of previously used land financially viable.

Protecting Green Space: By building more homes on less land, density helps protect the countryside, Green Belt, and valuable green spaces from urban sprawl. This is a core principle of sustainable development.

It is more cost-effective to provide public transport, utilities, and services (like broadband, waste collection) to a concentrated population. Low-density sprawl creates massive long-term infrastructure costs for councils.

Higher density supports local shops, pubs, and services by ensuring a sufficient customer base within walking distance, maintaining the vitality of town centres.

Housing mix density allows for a greater variety of housing types—flats for young people and singles, smaller houses for downsizers, and family apartments. This creates more balanced and inclusive communities.

Lastly, two further points, a) affordability while not a silver bullet, building at higher density can reduce the land cost per home, potentially improving affordability. It is also the primary model for delivering affordable rental flats in urban areas. And, b) climate change and health means walkable neighbourhoods with good public transport drastically reduce reliance on private cars, cutting transport emissions.

Comment ID: 8736

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Malcolm

Comment: Any plan to 2043 cannot be rigid. It must be able to adapt, there being too many unknown, unknowns. IF 2043 is key, building in formal checkpoints to review and adjust the strategy is a must. Maybe an early formal review clause to formally review the plan 3/5 years after adoption (e.g., 2029/30) to assess progress on housing delivery and infrastructure.

In terms of unknown event triggering a review, i.e., if key infrastructure is delayed, or housing delivery falls significantly behind target, an automatic review is triggered.

The new 'super council' should build a "buffer" of reserve brought forward only if a specific trigger is invoked, or the primary strategy fails.

Comment ID: 8734

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Malcolm

Comment: I'm unsure, given the looming 'super council' I can support this option. In a future 'super council' this is unproven to represent a logical, hierarchical, and evidence-based spatial strategy. Distributing growth according to the sustainability and capacity of all of Gloucestershire's settlements?

I am also most concerned in a proposed new 'super council' any plan changed simply because one group 'shouts the loudest' is inherently unfair, undeliverable, and unlikely to pass the test of soundness at examination. How will impartiality be maintained?

Comment ID: 8732

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Malcolm

Comment: Uncertainty of Jurisdiction: I am concerned any response I may give is being submitted to a council that, in the near future, may not exist in its current form. The new "super-council" will be the ultimate authority. How will fairness and proportionality be applied across a region full of regional differences, including:

Shifting Strategic Priorities: This local plan is based on the needs and character of our existing area. The proposed new 'super council' will need to create a single, unified Local Plan for the entire new area. This means:

Competing Priorities: This area's needs might compete with the priorities of another area in the merger (e.g., a need for new housing).

Strategic vs. Parochial: The proposed new 'super council' will take a broader, more strategic view. Arguments that are purely about "our patch" may carry less weight than those that align with the strategic goals of the new, larger area.

Changes in Evidence Base: Local plans are built on evidence (e.g., housing need assessments, employment land reviews, environmental surveys). The evidence for this current area will be merged with that of others, potentially changing the overall picture and the conclusions drawn from it.

Political Dynamics: The political makeup of any new 'super council' will be different. The councillors making the final decisions on the new Local Plan may have different allegiances and priorities than your current representatives

Comment ID: 8733

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Malcolm

Comment: These options cover the needs for our area, but I am again unsure of where these sit with any new 'super councils' remit. For example, the strength of any option in delivering, i.e., housing is noted, but any strengths or weaknesses in concentrating growth in one area is surely exacerbated by any future 'super council. Perhaps an acceptable strategy would concern distributing growth proportionally across the new, 'super council's' authority's key transport corridors, would be more sustainable."

In addition, a key weakness , for me, in this analysis is the failure to properly assess strategic transport infrastructure, Towns receive the majority of funding for transport, villages don't - inequality at best. Given small Cotswold villages make up approximately 30-40% of the total number of towns and villages in Gloucestershire, revenues for transport is distinctly skewed! The new 'super council' finally take accountability for an integrated, area-wide infrastructure view.

My comment on environmental constraints is this plan must be re-evaluated with the new 'super council' spatial geography in mind.

Comment ID: 9991

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Mandy

Comment: see representation made by Gloucestershire Constabulary

Comment ID: 9994

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Mandy

Comment:

Infrastructure section of Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation November 2025

Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire (PCC) consultation response – December 2025

Statutory context:

Part 1 of the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 states that a Police and Crime Commissioner must secure the maintenance of the police force for their area, whilst ensuring that it is efficient and effective under the direction and control of the Chief Constable.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended by the Police and Justice Act 2006) requires local authorities to do all that they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment in the exercise of their various functions.

Planning context:

In line with NPPF (December 2024) guidance, emergency services are a crucial part of service delivery to sustainable communities. Paragraph 102 requires that “Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements...”

NPPF paragraph 135 f) states that:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments.....create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”

With regard to promoting healthy communities, paragraph 96 of the NPPF guides that “planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which..... are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.”

NPPF paragraph 101 specifically flags the need to need for collaboration in relation to delivery of public service infrastructure stating that: “To ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure such as health, blue light, library, adult education, university and criminal justice facilities, local planning authorities should also work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. Significant weight should be placed on the importance of new, expanded or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development.”

The NPPF references at Paragraph 58 the three tests for planning obligations as set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). Recent planning appeal case law nationally has confirmed that developer contributions towards policing infrastructure accord with the NPPF guidance.

Developer contributions to policing infrastructure have been scrutinised by the High Court, Secretary of State and the Planning Inspectorate and found to be wholly in accordance with the statutory tests including the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) on a large number of occasions. The case law in favour of such contributions is substantial. Please see the attached example appeal and other documents for further details.

PCC response to the Preferred Options Consultation

The PCC notes from paragraph 4.8 of the Preferred Options Consultation in infrastructure needs that Cotswold District Council has instructed an external specialist consultant to undertake an update to its Infrastructure Delivery Plan which

will set out infrastructure needs and requirements of all development proposed in the Local Plan update.

The PCC welcomes the inclusion of “Emergency Services” in the list of infrastructure items at paragraph 4.9 of the Preferred Options consultation that are to be considered by the Council determining the infrastructure requirements and needs for each allocation in the updated Local Plan.

Paragraph 4.10 makes it clear that the infrastructure requirements/needs are dependent on the recommended site allocations, which have not yet been determined at the time of this consultation, so the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is therefore still in its early stages, which is understood by the PCC.

Emergency Services infrastructure has previously been included in Cotswold District Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plans following consultations with the Constabulary.

The PCC is in the process of preparing an updated Asset Strategy which will be shared with Cotswold District Council when completed. This is expected to be in Q1 2026.

In engaging on all Local Plan consultations throughout the County, including the current consultation on the Cotswold Local Plan, the PCC and Gloucestershire Constabulary have the objectives of achieving the following:

1. Full recognition of community safety within Local Plans.
2. Support within Local Plans for pre-planning decision consultation with Crime Prevention Design Advisors, the principles of designing out crime and the role that Emergency Services infrastructure plays in promoting public safety.
3. Identification of the Emergency Services as key public service providers within definition of “infrastructure”.

4. Local Planning Authority commitment to engage with the Police and other Emergency Services in all relevant planning decisions.
5. Policy support for the payment of developer contributions (section 106 and / or CIL) towards essential Emergency Services infrastructure made necessary by growth and is in line with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122(2) tests.
6. Good public access to the Emergency Services at key community facilities.

The PCC and Gloucestershire Constabulary will be pleased to assist in the update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Any queries or follow up required on the above should be sent to Mandy Gibbs of Gloucestershire Constabulary (Mandy.Gibbs@Gloucestershire.pnn.police.uk).

M. Gibbs

Mandy Gibbs

Environmental Manager MILM

Executive Support

Gloucestershire Constabulary

Police Headquarters, 1 Waterwells Drive, Quedgeley GL2 2AN

01452 752258 Force Control Room 101

Comment ID: 9999

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Mandy

Comment: EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

1

Appeal Ref and Procedure: APP/P1614/W/24/3348402 – Public Inquiry

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 02 January 2025

Planning Inspector: D M Young JP BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

Appellants: Robert Hitchens Limited

Land at Gloucester Street, Newent, Gloucestershire, GL18 1HA

The development proposed is a mixed-use development comprising the following individual,

severable and self-contained elements:

i. Up to 375 residential dwellings.

ii. 1 form entry primary school including nursery.

iii. Employment area (up to 7,800sq.m gross internal floor area within Use Classes E(g), B2 and

B8)

iv. Local centre (up to 865sq.m gross internal floor area within Use Classes E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d),

E(e) and hot food takeaway (Sui Generis)

Associated works; ancillary facilities and infrastructure; open space; recreation facilities and

landscaping. Vehicular accesses from Gloucester Street and Oak Tree Way.

Force and Method of Appeal Representation: Gloucestershire Constabulary – Written Representations

Application: P0584/23/OUT – Forest of Dean District Council

49. CIL compliance statements have been submitted by the Council and GCC.
Additional

information was also submitted by the Council after the close of the Inquiry in relation
to the

police and health contributions. The information provided sets out the detailed
background and

justification for each of the obligations. I am satisfied from the evidence before me that
the

obligations are necessary, directly related to the proposal and fair and reasonable in
scale and

kind to the appeal scheme. As a result, I have taken the obligations into account as part
of my

overall conclusion that the appeal should be allowed.

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

2

Appeal Ref and Procedure: APP/Y3615/W/23/3320175 – Public Inquiry

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 24 May 2024

Planning Inspector: Christina Downes DipTP MRTPI

Appellants: Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

Land at the former Wisley Airfield, Hatch Lane, Ockham, Surrey

The development proposed includes a full planning application comprising:

i) a realigned section of the proposed Wisley Lane Diversion, to include a roundabout
with a stub road as the primary access to serve the new settlement from Ockham
Interchange;

ii) a road junction access into the proposed employment area from the proposed Wisley
Lane Diversion;

iii) a new road junction as a secondary access to serve the new settlement from Old Lane;

iv) SANG and associated infrastructure, including SANG car parks;

v) Restricted access from Ockham Lane.

The development proposed includes an outline planning application (with all matters reserved) for

the phased development of part of a residential-led new settlement comprising:

Up to 1,730 dwellings (Class C3 use), 8 gypsy and travellers pitches, up to 100 units of housing

for older people (Class C2 use)), a mixed-use commercial local centre with public square,

community hub and employment area alongside other commercial mixed-use

neighbourhood centres located throughout and an employment area, (Classes E, F2(b),

B2/B8, and sui-generis uses subject to specific planning permissions), a secondary school, a

primary school, (Class F1(a)), up to 2 nurseries,(Class E (f)), also incorporating green

infrastructure (including parks, neighbourhood greens and sports pitches (Class F2(c) and

associated pavilion (Classes E(b) and (d), F2(b)), SANG other infrastructure, (Class E(b)), part

of Wisley Lane Diversion between Ockham Interchange roundabout and realigned section of

Wisley Lane Diversion, a vehicular / cycle / pedestrian sustainable transport corridor (linking

the proposed Wisley Lane Diversion roundabout to Old Lane) and associated infrastructure

and earthworks at land at the former Wisley Airfield (with construction access from Ockham

Interchange and Elm Corner)

Force and Method of Appeal Representation: Surrey Police – Written Representations

Application: 22/P/01175 – Guildford Borough Council

473. There is a financial contribution of £339,798 for staffing equipment and other infrastructure relating to policing. There would also be an on-site office space of at least 24m²

plus dedicated WC facilities within the community building along with associated parking for

the use of Surrey Police. This would comply with the Infrastructure Schedule and policy ID1 in

the LPSS. An extremely detailed letter was submitted to the inquiry on behalf of the Police and

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

3

Crime Commissioner for Surrey. This made clear the demands that a new development of this

size would make on police resources and that these demands could not all be met by public

funding. The contribution would be paid in four tranches with 50% before the commencement

of the first residential unit. The final 10% would be paid prior to the occupation of the 1,600th

residential unit. Whilst this would be quite late in the development there would remain sufficient value in the site to ensure that this final payment would be made.

474. There was a query about the size of the contribution in that the justification in the aforementioned letter appeared to be £10,000 higher than an earlier calculation. However, it

is clear that the earlier calculation was incorrect and that there was an internal inconsistency

with regards to staffing costs. I am satisfied that the contribution as it stands in the Deed is

correct and has been properly justified. The obligation requiring staged payments is reasonable

in recognition that policing responsibilities would increase in step with the size of the new

population. The on-site facilities would be provided prior to the occupation of 750 residential

units by which time 70% of the contribution would also have been paid.

479. The community building is defined in the Deed as a flexible multi-use facility in the Local Centre.

It would include a meeting space, community hall, police office, office for the Stewardship Body

and welfare facilities. The obligations require details of its location, specification including

parking, uses and equipment, and arrangements for its future management and maintenance.

The community building is to be constructed by the occupation of the 750th residential unit. If

an on-site healthcare facility is to be provided in the community building that element would

not need to be completed until later as explained above. However, the decision as to whether

on-site healthcare facilities are to be provided would be known well in advance. In order that

the Borough Council is satisfied that the community building is fit for purpose there are inspection provisions, which also require any remedial action to be addressed.

Comment ID: 9409

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Maralyn

Comment: Not only is this planning 'crisis' caused by an arbitrary figure set by government, not based on any proper planning assessment, there are also problems in basing the very sensitive decisions on where to locate this new housing on a paper statistical exercise, rather than on a proper understanding of what life is really like in the small villages and towns under review.

In the case of MICKLETON:

Six main roads feed in to Mickleton – 3 from the north from Stratford, Long Marston and Illmington; one in the centre of the village from Broad Marston; 3 from the south from Hidcote, Chipping Campden and Broadway.

Congestion in the village is being made far worse by the huge housing developments being built just 2 miles up the road at Meon Vale and Fernleigh, the former Long Marston Airfield. These have not only increased the number of cars on the road but also delivery vans.

The village undertook 3 traffic counts in October and November 2025 on 2 weekdays and one Saturday. An average of 500 cars were passing through Mickleton every hour and this was not at peak summer tourist time.

Pavements in the village are not consistent and pedestrians have to cross the busy road at several points in order to continue on a path. In the middle of the village there is a dangerous 3 way junction. As the Cotswold District Plan admits, in this area we are dependent on cars and the building of hundreds of houses here will make the local roads impassable.

Local bus services are irregular and not timetabled for the convenience of travellers! The first bus to Stratford, for example, stops at Mickleton at 6.30 a.m. The next bus is not until 9.00a.m – useless for going to school, college, work. The last bus to Mickleton from Stratford leaves Stratford Rail Station at 6.30 p.m. - again no use for a night out, shift work, parents evening, late train. The situation is the same in the opposite direction – the last bus to Mickleton from Moreton in Marsh train station leaves Moreton at 6.30p.m. There is no public transport to our nearest train station at Honeybourne. To cycle there you need to be fit and quite brave on our roads.

The report states that we are 15 minutes from a hospital. Even by car that would take some doing on our roads. You can get a bus to Chipping Campden to see a G.P. but the buses run often two hourly in either direction so most of a day taken for a 5 minute appointment. The surgery in Chipping Campden is already under pressure and plans are being drawn up to refurbish and extend it but nothing is happening as yet.

Our Primary School is nearly full and the Secondary school in Chipping Campden is full.

Our local fire service is the volunteer service in Chipping Campden. Police have already expressed concerns about their ability to police the current planning applications to build over 150 houses in Mickleton.

Water companies cannot agree that they will be able to provide the required water and sewage services.

There is very little employment locally. The report states that 48% of working people in Mickleton work from home. That figure is incorrect. The action group Mickleton Against Inappropriate Development (M.A.I.D.) surveyed every house in the village. 50% of adults are working. Of these 38% are hybrid working, commuting at least part of the week; only 22% work completely from home. 40% commute. Of the 78% who commute only 16% commute a distance less than 3 miles. 31% commute more than 20 miles. I am afraid I cannot make sense of the assertion in the report that the building of more houses would lead to less commuting – working from home exclusively is starting to wane.

The M.A.I.D. survey also asked whether residents or their family were looking for housing in the village. Only 5% of respondents said that they were. All but 3 of those said they were looking for a home at market value with full ownership. I don't think there is an argument that we are in great need of housing in Mickleton.

So - we really do not have the necessary infrastructure for yet more housing. We have increasing traffic problems. Our public transport is inconvenient to put it mildly. We have few employment opportunities. Mickleton should definitely not be classed as a 'Principal Settlement'. It has seen so much housing development over the last few years it cannot be made to take a further influx.

Comment ID: 8891

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: The housing figure for Sididington is ludicrous. There is no where near enough demand for housing in the area to warrant this scale of development. There is not enough employment opportunity locally - by which I mean walking distance. Public transport is very limited meaning that employment is restricted to those who have cars. The road infrastructure is struggling with the recent growth in the village and nearby.

Comment ID: 8900

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: Much of the land around Siddington proposed for development is currently farm land. I ma told this is not of the highest quality but can still be used to produce food. This country is already struggling to produce the basic food stuffs that we need to feed our population (and the animals that in turn feed the population). Putting houses in farmland will only make this situation worse.

Comment ID: 8898

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: I am concerned that it appear the council are basing their figures in hypothetically - sites have been offered for development with no due diligence as to whether this is practical or achievable - that seems to come after this consultation (with proposed housing numbers) has already been published. I like to think that the landowner around Siddington would not allow all his land in the area to be built on - but CDC seem to be working on this assumption

Comment ID: 8901

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: Many of our youngsters move away from the area because there are not the employment opportunities. House prices are only part of the problem, even if this plan does bring down housing prices (which I highly doubt) unless there are good job opportunities locally the younger generation will still have no choice but to move away.

Comment ID: 8902

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: Getting a doctors appointment in Cirencester is virtually impossible. NHS dentists are not taking on new patients and private ones are at capacity. The Hospital keeps getting downgraded. The roads are increasing gridlocked at peak times. It only takes sustained rain for a few hours for the roads to flood - primarily caused by rain water run off not draining away due to blocked drains. Our Police, NHS and Fire Service are all in special measures, the Highways agency does not respond to local needs (there are small items such as replacing broken or faded road signs that Siddington have been waiting over 10 years to get repaired, the only answer we get is its on a list) any amount of money from large scale development will not change the issues we currently have. Thames water is at best a disaster area. I have no confidence that developers will be held to their promises re infrastructure. You can be sure that any traffic survey they undertake in off peak times will show that traffic is not an issue - or even worse the monitoring device will not be connected as recently happened in Nursery View - None other than local residents seem to think it strange that not a single vehicle had sued the road in 3 days.

Comment ID: 8896

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: 3 or 4 as it builds on existing infrastructure and is where there are employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 8897

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: I think this can be done in town and city centres. There are a number of vacant properties that could be converted to housing with minimal impact to the local area an community

Comment ID: 8899

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: From what I understand the government has decided that as a country we need x number of additional houses - but I can see no rationale behind this figure. Having come up with the figure they have arbitrarily split this housing around the country giving the lions share to areas where there are high house prices. I think a better way of doing it would be bottom up - assess the demand locally and map this to employment opportunities - put the housing where it is needed rather than where an algorithm says it should be. I would also like to see evidence of the requirement. I would be very surprised if there is demand of in excess of 1000 in Siddington.

Comment ID: 8892

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: I would like to know why Siddington is classed as a Principal Development. It has one bus service per hour that goes between Swindon and Cheltenham, a small shop / post office, a pub and a village school. Whilst I accept this is more than many small villages have I disagree that it makes the village a principal settlement

Comment ID: 8893

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: I feel that scenarios 3 and 4 make the most sense. This concentrates housing where there are employment opportunities and infrastructure - public transport, health care etc.

Comment ID: 8894

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: I cannot understand why this is the preferred option. It will destroy communities that are principally rural and contained by creating urban sprawl, destroying out countryside. The Siddington Neighbourhood plan consultation showed very clearly that the residents of Siddington highly value our sense of community and the fact that we are separated from Cirencester by "the gap" this proposal totally ignores the clearly indicated preferences of the local population. There is development potential in Siddington - the old Talland site which has been refused planning permission. The fields around the Greyhound - behind and opposite which will form part of the community rather than destroy it.

Comment ID: 8895

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Marcia Turner

Comment: The government must make a choice - It cannot impose this level of development on an area that is over 80% natural landscape without that natural landscape taking its share of the development.

Comment ID: 9864

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Marcie Day

Comment: A lot of rural pubs have closed - we have the Green King Seven Springs Inn at Coberley - it has been closed for almost 2 years. It sits on a large amount of land with good road access and is an eyesore - places like this could be redeveloped as affordable housing. I don't believe it's a listed building, it's not cotswold stone.

Comment ID: 10046

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: A carefully planned strategic site with appropriate infrastructure provided is preferable to piecemeal development added without considering impact

Comment ID: 10048

Location in consultation document: How did the Council select locations?

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: Factors such as flood zones, impacts on landscape, protected habitats, historic buildings etc. and capacity of infrastructure should always be considered.

Comment ID: 10036

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: I agree that option 5 is the best under the circumstances

Comment ID: 10162

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: I agree that option 5 is the best under the circumstances

Comment ID: 10039

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: The Council should not consider locating development in unsustainable locations. - it's job is to find suitable locations

Comment ID: 10164

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: The council should not consider options it considers unsustainable. Its task is to find suitable sites, and when local conditions are not appropriate for development this should always be considered and respected

Comment ID: 10043

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: I would support an increase in housing density where it is carefully planned eg a square terrace of small cottage -style properties around a central garden, where each shares a green outlook

Comment ID: 10165

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: Increasing housing density could be accepted when it is carefully planned eg a terrace of small cottages in a square round a central garden where all residents share a green outlook.

Comment ID: 10166

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: Fairford has been selected as a principal settlement because of its facilities, but the population has already outgrown the facilities. Water and energy supplies are limited; town centre is heavily congested and has no room to expand; A417 trunk road is less than 3 metres wide in places and is often gridlocked, (no possibility of a bypass because of the river in both NW and SE of the town); medical facilities are inadequate, graveyard is full, there is a lack of employment and a high level of out-commuting; and raw sewage frequently pollutes the river because the sewage produced is way beyond the capacity of the present Sewage Treatment Works. Additional infrastructure is desperately needed and the 93 houses in the current Hatherop road development should be delayed until Thames Water has actually increased sewage treating facility. Sewage flooding started in 2000 and continues. TW has been promising to increase capacity for the past 25 years (see Council minutes). It has built holding tanks and uses oversize pipes to give more capacity but all the excess goes into the river. Fairford is now one of the worst sewage polluters in the country and they make 'storm discharges' even in dry periods. It is highly unlikely that the present STW will be extended because it was built in the 1940's for the new wartime Fairford Air Base, close to the Base on Horcott Hill. Post-war development of the system in the 1950's just joined new sewage pipes to the existing STW which means that after draining to the SE corner of Fairford it is pumped from Moor farm pumping station under the river and up the hill to the STW. This is uneconomical and unsustainable, but this problem has to be solved before a population increase can be supported.

Comment ID: 10168

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: I largely agree with the vision and objectives, but care must be taken to retain the unique features of the Cotswolds as an unspoilt rural area which gives it its special character.

Comment ID: 10159

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: This option has some merit as public transport is so poor in many rural areas that people without cars have almost no access to facilities

Comment ID: 10160

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: I agree that this is the best option under the circumstances

Comment ID: 10167

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Margaret Bishop

Comment: The proposal for a new strategic site to the NE of Fairford is in the best area for development as it is higher ground and would not increase flood risk in the Fairford river basin, and there is some space before the Special Landscape Area. However another 1800 house could not possibly be added to the existing 1800 because of lack of facilities. It would have to be planned with its own infrastructure and road link to the A417 to the E

Comment ID: 10413

Location in consultation document: How did the Council select locations?

Name: Maria Horton

Comment: Why not look at further developments at the North of Cirencester, where the Daglingworth Quarry intersects with the A417? The land is higher and at less risk of flooding. The roads are easily accessible and can better accommodate people wishing to commute to Gloucester, Cheltenham, Swindon, and Stroud - without entering Cirencester. The Current proposal of 3x more housing to Siddington has major problems: there is already sewage flooding into old-folks homes in Southmead, Siddington, and the sewage has been flooding out into the roads at the Preston Toll Bar and the Ashton Road (south from Siddington to Ashton Keynes). The regular flooding of these roads (due to the low lying land, and already recognised flood plains) readily falls into a state of disrepair and cannot handle the increased traffic and weight of modern electric cars. There is already bottle-neck traffic from Siddington into Cirencester. The South side of Cirencester cannot accommodate the extra housing, traffic, sewage etc that this housing presents.

Comment ID: 10095

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Marilyn Phillips

Comment: I agree with all the comments regarding increasing density, which is highly challenging in a rural district like the Cotswolds. Including three storey buildings and greater density does not fit into the sensitive landscape.

It is important to explore what type of housing meets the needs of the population. How much affordable housing is required, how many starter homes or family homes? One category of the population which is often omitted is those of retirement age, who don't want to live in tiny houses, but something more appropriate to their lifestyle as they get older. If the right type of homes were built, this would free up larger homes for families.

Comment ID: 10097

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Marilyn Phillips

Comment: Whilst a number of options are proposed, it seems that the public is being pushed to prefer Scenario 5. Surely it makes more sense to use as many options as possible to reach the required number of houses. To dismiss Main Service Centres decreases the number of potential houses in areas which can provide better services.

Comment ID: 10099

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Marilyn Phillips

Comment: I do not think the Council should support increasing housing density. The appeal of the Cotswolds is its attractive rural landscape and smaller houses with smaller plots and higher buildings do not sit well within the area. If housing is to be increased it needs to be done sensitively to fit into the landscape and provide people with pleasant living conditions.

Comment ID: 10101

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Marilyn Phillips

Comment: The proposed level of development is not sustainable without huge investment to provide access to healthcare and education, as well as the infrastructure for road networks and public transport.

For example, Mickleton, where I live, is a village with limited services. It has neither a GP surgery nor a dental practice, no pharmacy, post office or bank. The absence of basic services makes the location unsuitable for major housing growth without parallel investment in local amenities. There is no secondary school, no rail access, congested and narrow main roads which carry a high volume of traffic including heavy goods vehicles and the public transport provision in the village is very limited, with infrequent and unreliable bus services. No service expansion is identified. Mickleton sits within a rural setting at the foot of the Cotswold escarpment on the edge of the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB). There are few local employment opportunities currently and most new residents would be required to commute, leading to further pressure on the road network. The proposed additional allocation is disproportionate to Mickleton's role and function and would lead to increased car dependency creating a dormitory settlement, contrary to the Plan's own vision and objectives.

The Plan does not appear to prove that more suitable locations for growth within Gloucestershire such as settlements with rail services, larger towns outside the Cotswolds National Landscape AONB, or locations with existing infrastructure capacity have been fully tested as reasonable alternatives. As a result, the Mickleton allocation seems to be a solution of convenience, rather than the outcome of a robust comparative assessment.

Comment ID: 10091

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Marilyn Phillips

Comment: Whilst a number of options are proposed, it seems that the public is being pushed to prefer Scenario 5. Surely it makes more sense to use as many options as possible to reach the required number of houses. To dismiss Main Service Centres decreases the number of potential houses in areas which can provide better services.

The proposal of 590 new houses in CDC's revised plan for Mickleton represents a growth of approximately 60%, a huge overdevelopment of our village with no new amenities offered. This is one of the largest proportional increases anywhere in the district and exceeds increases in many larger and better served settlements. It is disproportionate, unsustainable, and inappropriate for our village's size and rural setting, which lacks the infrastructure to support the additional housing. No robust evidence is provided to show that Mickleton's infrastructure capacity, service provision, transport connectivity, employment base, or environmental capacity can sustainably accommodate growth of this magnitude.

This increase in population will place substantially higher demands on already stretched services. The primary school in Mickleton is already at capacity and there is no space for expansion. GCC's letter confirms no space in local school, nearest two miles away, leading to increased costs and traffic movements. The Plan has not identified secondary education capacity or Alternative Provision capacity. When the proposed development is considered cumulatively within the Chipping Campden School secondary catchment, the Plan would deliver approximately 1,560 new dwellings in Chipping Campden, Moreton-in-Marsh, Blockley, Willersey, and Bourton-on-the-Hill. The Plan does not demonstrate how additional pupils have been incorporated into education capacity modelling. Nor does it consider alternative provision which could require lengthy and unsustainable travel.

The proposal of 590 new houses in CDC's revised plan for Mickleton represents a growth of approximately 60%, a huge overdevelopment of our village with no new amenities offered. This is one of the largest proportional increases anywhere in the district and exceeds increases in many larger and better served settlements. It is disproportionate, unsustainable, and inappropriate for our village's size and rural setting, which lacks the infrastructure to support the additional housing. No robust evidence is provided to show that Mickleton's infrastructure capacity, service provision, transport connectivity, employment base, or environmental capacity can sustainably accommodate growth of this magnitude.

This increase in population will place substantially higher demands on already stretched services. The primary school in Mickleton is already at capacity and there is no space for expansion. GCC's letter confirms no space in local school, nearest two miles away, leading to increased costs and traffic movements. The Plan has not identified secondary education capacity or Alternative Provision capacity. When the proposed development is considered cumulatively within the Chipping Campden School secondary catchment, the Plan would deliver approximately 1,560 new dwellings in Chipping Campden, Moreton-in-Marsh, Blockley, Willersey, and Bourton-on-the-Hill. The Plan does not demonstrate how additional pupils have been incorporated into education capacity modelling. Nor does it consider alternative provision which could require lengthy and unsustainable travel.

Comment ID: 9237

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Mark

Comment: Increasing density is fine provided that provision is made for parking, some areas where limited parking is provided are horrible to get around and live as a result of this. Also adequate green areas and water management to avoid flooding. Water pressure in the siddington area has been poor for years and got worse with the spire view development only being addressed in the last year or so despite regular complaints, the water main system needs radical improvement to support additional housing. I will repeat this comment it is vital that services like GP and our local hospital are expanded rather than cut.

Comment ID: 9238

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Mark

Comment: Low cost housing is a real need in Cirencester, we are building too many expensive houses and we have a mixed community, that said mixing like on spire view can lead to asthetically pleasing and higher density. Ideally if we are expanding the Siddington area it would be good to have a local GP and improved urgent care and provide basic services like ambulatory care at the main Cirencester hospital. As i mentioned in the previous comment the water pressure has been problematic in the past with significant outages and loss of water pressure. These need to be addressed to avoid serious problems ideally the watermains need pulling up and replacing before any developent in that area progresses too far.

Comment ID: 9239

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Mark

Comment: Healthcare is key, we are generally fortunate with our health system but it is being hacked away we should work hard to ensure that healthcare is built into the development directly, even better a small health centre at the centre of the development (I am talking about Siddington) or a larger centre there providing better but merged facilities to an existing health group.

Transport needs work. some sort of half hourly circular bus or something to make it easier to get between the larger areas. Also a better bus service to Kemble or a more specialised (cheaper) taxi offering. Kemble is a gift to Cirencester as going north or south/south east is excellent but you can watch the bus leave sometimes as a train arrives!

Comment ID: 9240

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mark

Comment: My main concern is a lack of low cost housing including social housing. Often the development have limited social housing included which puts pressure on existing stock. Having parking is important, some parts of Cirencester are blighted by lots of cars parking on grass verges creating a lot of damage. Today two or more cars per household is common irrespective of socio economic group so parking including visitor parking needs to be part of any the development. Also making sure Solar is available on new housing can really keep bills down and is much cheaper to install at build time.

Comment ID: 9241

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Mark

Comment: Planning density and layout of future developments will have an impact on crime and ASB.

As Government changes density targets for housing to keep up with population growth, it's important to understand the current issues facing the Cotswolds. Crime and ASB have an impact on every community, whether that's an individual victim or the surrounding community affected by the fear of that crime.

Legislation and Planning Guidance have been in place for some time with the aim of reducing crime and ASB by ensuring the Planning Authority make every effort to ensure the design of developments includes crime prevention techniques and each home or business has security built in.

Understanding the current level of crime and ASB should be used to recognise the issues affecting every resident or business, whether that's an established community or a new development.

Whether the dwelling is large or small, low or high density, security should be provided to ensure safety and security for every resident. If larger scale apartment blocks are considered to address increased density, then they need to ensure the design meets the needs of the future occupants and that security in every part of the building is included. The guidance provided by Secured by Design offers numerous considerations when designing, building and managing these developments.

Creating places which are designed with security and personal safety enable the community to use these spaces with confidence. The scale of development proposed over the coming years will increase the urban areas and increase the population density, but the Constabulary only has a finite number of Officers and PCSOs. Therefore, it is important to ensure every planning application offers designed solutions which reduce ASB, crime or the perceived fear of crime.

Reported incident statistics can only be provided where the community have contacted Gloucestershire Constabulary, it's therefore important to remember that a large majority of incidents and crimes aren't reported, so the following statistics provide an indication, not a true account of the problems affecting Cotswold District.

Between 1 January 2020 and 15 December 2025 there were 25,992 reported incidents of a criminal nature within the Cotswold District Council area.

In 2020 the Constabulary received 3613 reports compared to the 5092 reports received in 2025, and increase of 140.9%

During this time frame business have reported 3447 incidents ranging from violence affecting staff, burglary, criminal damage and shoplifting. Business related crimes have gone from 914 incidents in 2020 to 1268 incidents in 2025, an increase of 138.7%.

Looking at crime and incidents affecting the homes through the Cotswold, it was important to look at a Domestic Burglary has gone from 256 incidents in 2023 to 286 incidents in 2025, and increase of 111.7%

Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) reached an all time high during the Covid 19 Pandemic, each lockdown forced everyone to stay at home which led to more calls reporting problem neighbours, children playing in the parks and Lock-down breaches. By 2022 the lockdowns had finished and the levels of ASB returned to pre-covid levels.

In 2023 there were 953 reports of ASB in the Cotswold District area, increasing to 1109 in 2024, and 1422 incidents in 2025. In the past 3 years there has been a 149.2% increase in anti-social activities.

The volume of crime and ASB have all increased in the last 3 years, which requires a shift in priorities, so crime prevention becomes an important part of every planning application.

Comment ID: 9244

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mark

Comment: As a public sector organisation, Cotswold District Council has a duty under Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to exercise their functions with due regard to their likely effect on crime and disorder, and to do all they reasonably can to prevent crime (including terrorism) and disorder.

As the current Cotswold District Local Plan 2011 – 2031 does not offer any guidance or supporting information for crime prevention, it is important that future versions of the Local Plan provide a local context regarding design considerations when preventing crime and anti-social behaviour.

The requirements of Section 17 have influenced national planning policy for decades, the following demonstrates some of the current documentations which requires security and safety within any development.

Chief Planning Officer's letter in July 2017 opens with the following paragraph "This letter is to remind local planning authorities of the important role the planning system plays in ensuring appropriate measures are in place in relation to counter-terrorist and crime prevention security."

Paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) asks that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:

(b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of well-designed, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas;

Paragraph 135 of the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

(f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where

crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience

Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Paragraph 10 of the on-line version of the Healthy and Safe Communities section of the Practical Planning Guidance (PPG) explains Good design that considers security as an intrinsic part of a masterplan or individual development can help achieve places that are safe as well as attractive, which function well, and which do not need subsequent work to achieve or improve resilience. However good security is not only about physical measures and design; it requires risks and mitigation to be considered in a holistic way.

While Paragraph 12 of the Healthy and Safe Communities section of the Practical Planning Guidance (PPG) goes on to answer the question ‘Where can local authorities and others go to for further advice on measures which provide appropriate security and resilience?’

As well as the above referenced guidance, local police Counter Terrorism Security Advisors (CTSAs) and Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) have training and experience of advising on security, are independent in their advice and have further access to more specialist resources where required, including the National Counter Terrorism Security Office (NaCTSO) and the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI). Local planning authorities should consider referring appropriate planning applications for public access buildings and spaces to the police who will determine the appropriate specialist input.

The National Planning Guidance, section P2 asks for public spaces are well designed for safety

104

Well-designed public and shared amenity spaces feel safe for people who occupy the buildings around them, and also for visitors and passers-by. They help to overcome crime and the fear of crime.

Careful planning and design create the right conditions for people to feel safe and secure, without the need for additional security measures.

Planning provides an important opportunity to consider the security of the built environment, those that live and work in it and the services it provides.

Comment ID: 9243

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mark

Comment: Vision

The Vision needs to acknowledge ASB, crime and terrorism are an unavoidable reality and create the need for secure buildings and safe environments for residents, visitors, business.

The Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025 was enacted in April 2025 to enhance public safety at venues and event spaces; it requires owners or organisers to implement anti-terrorism measures according to venue capacity. Working towards risk assessments and security plans that provide proportionate measures specific to the location.

Objectives

Historical environment

In order to enjoy and access out historic environments, we first have to look after them. The District Council and other partners all working as custodians so the future generations can also enjoy these important features.

Heritage crime is an under reported problem, often mistake for theft when church roofs are stripped of lead, or a home reporting the removal of the Cotswold stone roof, or earthworks eroded by repeated motorcycle activity, or the listed building vandalised with graffiti only to have it unsympathetically cleaned.

It is important the protection of these spaces goes beyond the creation of policy, there also needs to be measures in place which work to safeguard these important assets.

Affordable Homes

Need to include security products to safeguard the residents and their property. Up to 2015, the Code for Sustainable Homes encouraged every Housing Association to apply for SBD. In doing so they agreed to install the latest standards of security products.

After 2015, the focus went to Building Regulations Approved Document Q to define the level of security. This document detailed a list of security ratings for doors, windows and locks which were appropriate at that time.

Since then, Secured by Design have been working with the manufacturing industries to ensure more stringent security requirements are developed to address the changing patterns of crime affecting the home. Each of these security product details can be found in the Secured by Design guidance documents.

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

Crime and ASB affecting an area can significantly harm health through direct physical injury and long-term mental health issues like PTSD, depression, and anxiety, affecting victims and entire communities.

The fear of crime can affect someone's decision making process which leads to women only exercising outside during the summer months due to poor lighting, to name one example.

While areas with a higher crime rate or persistent ASB creates an area of urban decay which leads to poorer overall health and lower life expectancy in those neighbourhoods.

Relationship between neighbourhood crime and health | The Health Foundation

It would be appreciated if more work could be conducted in to demonstrate how the District Council will recognise and address the effects of crime and ASB. Whether that's linked to people, homes, businesses or heritage sites.

Comment ID: 9245

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mark

Comment: The design, management and maintenance of businesses should be designed with crime prevention as a central theme. Having businesses where crime prevention has been incorporated will not only offer resilience to the business's future but also safeguard staff and protect the buildings.

Since 2020 there have been a total of 6373 incidents affecting businesses, these range from violence affecting staff, burglary, criminal damage and shoplifting; it also includes the theft of farm machinery and livestock. Business related crimes have gone from 914 incidents in 2020 to 1268 incidents in 2025, an increase of 138.7%.

Comment ID: 9246

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark

Comment: Vision

The Vision needs to acknowledge ASB, crime and terrorism are an unavoidable reality and create the need for secure buildings and safe environments for residents, visitors, business.

The Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025 was enacted in April 2025 to enhance public safety at venues and event spaces; it requires owners or organisers to implement anti-terrorism measures according to venue capacity. Working towards risk assessments and security plans that provide proportionate measures specific to the location.

Objectives

Historical environment

In order to enjoy and access out historic environments, we first have to look after them. The District Council and other partners all working as custodians so the future generations can also enjoy these important features.

Heritage crime is an under reported problem, often mistake for theft when church roofs are stripped of lead, or a home reporting the removal of the Cotswold stone roof, or earthworks eroded by repeated motorcycle activity, or the listed building vandalised with graffiti only to have it unsympathetically cleaned.

It is important the protection of these spaces goes beyond the creation of policy, there also needs to be measures in place which work to safeguard these important assets.

Affordable Homes

Need to include security products to safeguard the residents and their property. Up to 2015, the Code for Sustainable Homes encouraged every Housing Association to apply for SBD. In doing so they agreed to install the latest standards of security products.

After 2015, the focus went to Building Regulations Approved Document Q to define the level of security. This document detailed a list of security ratings for doors, windows and locks which were appropriate at that time.

Since then, Secured by Design have been working with the manufacturing industries to ensure more stringent security requirements are developed to address the changing patterns of crime affecting the home. Each of these security product details can be found in the Secured by Design guidance documents.

Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

Crime and ASB affecting an area can significantly harm health through direct physical injury and long-term mental health issues like PTSD, depression, and anxiety, affecting victims and entire communities.

The fear of crime can affect someone's decision making process which leads to women only exercising outside during the summer months due to poor lighting, to name one example.

While areas with a higher crime rate or persistent ASB creates an area of urban decay which leads to poorer overall health and lower life expectancy in those neighbourhoods.

Relationship between neighbourhood crime and health | The Health Foundation

It would be appreciated if more work could be conducted in to demonstrate how the District Council will recognise and address the effects of crime and ASB. Whether that's linked to people, homes, businesses or heritage sites.

Comment ID: 9242

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark

Comment: Yes in principle, but would like to see (i may have missed it though!) clear commitment to low cost and social housing in areas that are walkable to key areas of work.

Comment ID: 10531

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark & Louise Duckworth

Comment: We object to the proposed housing allocation for Poulton.

Poulton is a non-sustainable rural village and does not have the essential facilities or infrastructure required to support further housing growth.

For Poulton to be considered sustainable, the following facilities would need to be in place or legally guaranteed before any development:

- Village-wide flood mitigation (not site-by-site)
- Adequate sewage and wastewater treatment capacity
- Full-fibre broadband (FTTP) to every dwelling
- Reliable indoor and outdoor mobile phone coverage
- Viable public transport (including evenings and weekends)
- Access to primary education capacity
- Access to GP, Dentist and healthcare services
- Safe highway capacity and traffic management

These facilities do not exist in Poulton and are not secured by the Local Plan.

Flooding and sewage problems are long-standing and unresolved, particularly around Ranbury, Bell Lane, Stoney Pool and the A417 bridge. Past development has already worsened flooding elsewhere.

Poulton also suffers from poor broadband speeds and unreliable mobile signal, resulting in digital exclusion. This restricts home working, access to NHS digital services, emergency communications, education and day-to-day public services. Digital infrastructure is now essential infrastructure, equivalent to water or electricity.

Allocating housing in Poulton fails the Local Plan soundness tests: • Not positively prepared (known infrastructure deficits unresolved)

- Not justified (reasonable alternatives exist in sustainable locations)
- Not effective (no guaranteed delivery of infrastructure before occupation)
- Not consistent with national planning policy

Failing even one test makes a plan unsound. Poulton fails all four.

Conclusion

Poulton is not an appropriate location for further housing growth. Unless flood mitigation, sewage upgrades and full digital infrastructure are delivered and operational before occupation, the proposed allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

Mark Duckworth

Louise Duckworth

Comment ID: 9781

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Mark Bridgeman

Comment: Why has "Broad Zone 01" been chosen as a priority area (North-East of Willersey near Weston-sub-edge) ? It is a very rural area adjacent to Cotswold National Landscape land with no existing infrastructure other than an already busy and twisty B4632 road.

Comment ID: 9762

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Mark Bridgeman

Comment: The CDC should continue to argue that the Cotswold National Landscape is a highly valued national treasure and that fact that it covers 80% of the CDC area should mean that some relief from achieving the target is agreed. It should NOT mean that unsuitable and unsustainable developments are allowed to happen to achieve the target.

Comment ID: 9775

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mark Bridgeman

Comment: This comment relates to Willersey. The proposal is to increase the number of dwellings by 37% (from 495 to 679). Today we have no Shop, a School with just two classrooms, a totally inadequate sewage system that is regularly failing plus a road infrastructure that is totally unfit to cater for today's level of traffic let alone one that needs to support a near 40% increase in local population. My main objection is that there is currently ZERO commitment to improve Willersey's infrastructure to be able to cope with the population increase. Specifically the mini-roundabout at the junction of Main Street, Badsey Lane, Collin Lane and Leamington Road needs to be enlarged, prior to any additional housing being added, to reduce the number of accidents and near misses that regularly occur there. Plus if the Auto-Sleepers extension (planning permission granted) and the Terrafy housing development (planning permission under review) along the Leamington Road are to go ahead then the Developers should be contributing to any highways schemes to avoid adding further accident blackspots,

Comment ID: 9780

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark Bridgeman

Comment: Yes I totally agree with the CDC vision. Please do NOT change it and make every effort possible to adhere to it.

Comment ID: 9751

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Mark Bridgeman

Comment: Based on the 7 scenarios presented by CDC I would agree with the proposal that scenario 5 offers the best compromise in achieving Government targets albeit with the condition that key new infrastructures are agreed and implemented prior to the creation of the additional housing.

Comment ID: 8869

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: Mickleton should not be a principal settlement as there is no real infrastructure in the village. The colour coded tables further in document that state mickleton is within 15 minutes of FE college and 15 minutes of hospital are blatantly untrue - tested at 10am on Tuesday by road and via google maps.

Comment ID: 8871

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: This should be the chosen scenario as development is more widely spread. It is untrue that development is not allowed in national landscape. Just look at planning regs in Lake District (far more important than Cotswolds as an example)

Comment ID: 8872

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: Scenario 6 is the way forward as development should be spread through out Cotswolds

Comment ID: 8874

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: Scenario 6

Comment ID: 8875

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: Yes - Development is allowed in wider Cotswolds area and will stop overdevelopment of areas

Comment ID: 8877

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: Increasing the size of Mickleton by 62% with no supporting infrastructure or employment opportunities is under madness.

The data used to decide mickleton as a principal settlement is untrue. You cannot get to FE college or Hospital in less than 15 minutes.

The doctors and dentist services at Quinton are over subscribed and appointments impossible to get.

Comment ID: 8878

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mark Byrne

Comment: You should add ensure infrastructure is in place at same time as the building takes place otherwise it will never happen

Comment ID: 9134

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark Cox

Comment: Subject: Objection to Proposed Development of 1,400 New Homes in Fairford

Dear Planning Committee Members,

Cotswold District Council,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 1,400 new homes in Fairford.

While I recognise the need to provide new housing within the district, I believe this proposal is unsustainable due to existing infrastructure constraints, environmental sensitivity, flood risk, and the adverse impact it would have on the character of Fairford.

Fairford's transport infrastructure is already under pressure. Key routes such as the A417, London Road, and High Street regularly experience congestion, particularly at peak times. The local road network is not designed to accommodate the significant increase in traffic that would result from a development of this scale. In addition, many roads in and around Fairford are already in poor condition, and further traffic would accelerate deterioration and increase maintenance demands.

Local services are also operating close to capacity. Fairford Primary School and Farmor's School have limited scope to absorb a substantial increase in pupil numbers without major expansion. Similarly, the local doctors' surgery is already under strain, with residents experiencing difficulty accessing appointments. The proposal does not provide sufficient clarity or reassurance that education and healthcare infrastructure would be expanded in a timely and effective manner.

Environmental concerns are also significant. Fairford is surrounded by open countryside that contributes to its rural setting and historic character. The loss of green fields and agricultural land would negatively impact local wildlife, biodiversity, and

views into and out of the town. A development of 1,400 homes would fundamentally alter Fairford's scale and identity, changing it from a historic market town into a much larger settlement that is out of keeping with its surroundings.

Flooding and drainage are particular concerns in Fairford. The town lies close to the River Coln, and parts of the surrounding area are within or adjacent to the river's floodplain. In addition, surface water flooding has been an issue in various parts of the town during periods of heavy rainfall, especially where drainage capacity is limited. The creation of large areas of hardstanding associated with new housing, roads, and parking risks increasing surface water runoff and exacerbating flood risk unless exceptional and fully proven mitigation measures are put in place. At present, there is insufficient confidence that such measures would be adequate or delivered before homes are occupied.

Finally, there appears to be a lack of firm, binding commitments to ensure that supporting infrastructure—including roads, schools, healthcare provision, and drainage improvements—would be delivered in advance of or alongside the development. Without such guarantees, existing residents would be left to bear the negative impacts.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge Cotswold District Council to refuse or reconsider this proposal in its current form, and to ensure that any future development in Fairford is genuinely sustainable and proportionate to the town's infrastructure and character.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Cox

Retort House

Comment ID: 9132

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Mark Cox

Comment: Subject: Objection to Proposed Development of 1,400 New Homes in Fairford

Dear Planning Committee Members,

Cotswold District Council,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 1,400 new homes in Fairford.

While I recognise the need to provide new housing within the district, I believe this proposal is unsustainable due to existing infrastructure constraints, environmental sensitivity, flood risk, and the adverse impact it would have on the character of Fairford.

Fairford's transport infrastructure is already under pressure. Key routes such as the A417, London Road, and High Street regularly experience congestion, particularly at peak times. The local road network is not designed to accommodate the significant increase in traffic that would result from a development of this scale. In addition, many roads in and around Fairford are already in poor condition, and further traffic would accelerate deterioration and increase maintenance demands.

Local services are also operating close to capacity. Fairford Primary School and Farmor's School have limited scope to absorb a substantial increase in pupil numbers without major expansion. Similarly, the local doctors' surgery is already under strain, with residents experiencing difficulty accessing appointments. The proposal does not provide sufficient clarity or reassurance that education and healthcare infrastructure would be expanded in a timely and effective manner.

Environmental concerns are also significant. Fairford is surrounded by open countryside that contributes to its rural setting and historic character. The loss of green fields and agricultural land would negatively impact local wildlife, biodiversity, and

views into and out of the town. A development of 1,400 homes would fundamentally alter Fairford's scale and identity, changing it from a historic market town into a much larger settlement that is out of keeping with its surroundings.

Flooding and drainage are particular concerns in Fairford. The town lies close to the River Coln, and parts of the surrounding area are within or adjacent to the river's floodplain. In addition, surface water flooding has been an issue in various parts of the town during periods of heavy rainfall, especially where drainage capacity is limited. The creation of large areas of hardstanding associated with new housing, roads, and parking risks increasing surface water runoff and exacerbating flood risk unless exceptional and fully proven mitigation measures are put in place. At present, there is insufficient confidence that such measures would be adequate or delivered before homes are occupied.

Finally, there appears to be a lack of firm, binding commitments to ensure that supporting infrastructure—including roads, schools, healthcare provision, and drainage improvements—would be delivered in advance of or alongside the development. Without such guarantees, existing residents would be left to bear the negative impacts.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge Cotswold District Council to refuse or reconsider this proposal in its current form, and to ensure that any future development in Fairford is genuinely sustainable and proportionate to the town's infrastructure and character.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Cox

Retort House

Comment ID: 10907

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Mark Perry

Comment: it is impossible to comment effectively on this without knowing the results of the commissioned report in 3.16

Comment ID: 10911

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Mark Perry

Comment: It seems option 5 is the most likely to be agreed and I generally agree with the reasons provided, although I have concerns about the suitability of some of the proposed areas to the east and south east of Moreton-in-Marsh, especially the possibility of 'Forever Chemicals' on the Fire College estate.

Comment ID: 10905

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mark Perry

Comment: Question 4 relating to Moreton-in-Marsh:

If such a large percentage of proposed housing development is focused on the east and south-east of the town this will ,mean the high st is located a great distance from the main body of housing. This will mean more cars, adding to the already overloaded high st. Therefore, massive improvements to local public transport/infrastructure will be required, as well as REALISTIC cycle lanes.

Comment ID: 10914

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Mark Perry

Comment: What are these 'employment opportunities'? Does this simply mean using the rail links for jobs in other towns?

Comment ID: 10242

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: What document/evidence is the Governments housing target based on?

Comment ID: 10264

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: What document/evidence is this target based on? Was the evidence sponsored by business?

Comment ID: 10253

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: High density housing detracts from the rural/village environment and green spaces/views, by it's very nature rural areas have low density homes. Developers will lobby for rural settings because higher profits can be made from green field sites.

Comment ID: 10258

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Can developers made to upgrade utilities and infrastructure before they complete building sites? There is an example in my village where part of the planning agreement was to provide a footpath into the village from a group of the new homes, the homes have been sold and the developer is now going back to the council to appeal building the pavement due to the unexpected high cost.

Comment ID: 10261

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Does this report reference the base evidence the Government used to mandate the increase in housing?

Comment ID: 10262

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: No. Please refer to my other comments and questions for explanation, i.e. developers should ensure utilities and infrastructure is in place before new homes are built, developing in rural areas is counter to providing a greener environment, high density housing does not fit-in with the rural environment, brown field sites and unused business units should be prioritised for homes.

Comment ID: 10263

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Room sizes in homes should not be smaller, there should be a minimum size mandated storage and all types of rooms, bedrooms, kitchens, living rooms, and bathrooms. Smaller gardens are preferable (and likely desired by those with busy lives), but they do have to the flood risks, and a higher density increase the load on utilities.

Comment ID: 10266

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Please refer to my previous comments, they apply to all rural settlements

Comment ID: 10267

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Regarding employment opportunities and affordable housing. With low paid jobs it is better to live near the place of work to reduce transport and housing costs. There are few low paid jobs in the rural areas.

Comment ID: 10246

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Have all brown field sites and empty office/business buildings that could be converted to housing, been assessed? I think developers prefer green field sites because they have fewer risks to the build, can use of brown field sites as a priority be mandated?

Comment ID: 10251

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Putting more homes into the rural village clusters significantly increases the number of road journeys on largely unsuitable roads, there are noticeable increases to the Fairford/Cirencester and surrounding areas in the past 10 years with little road (and utility) improvement. Even when public transport is provided the public would generally choose a car journey as their preference. In village/rural areas the housing is generally more expensive (I think developers make more profit on large low density homes) and there are very few highly paid local jobs (especially as we need more lower paid service industry jobs). Fundamentally more homes in rural areas does not provide green housing.

Comment ID: 10260

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Mark Williams

Comment: Putting more homes into the rural village clusters significantly increases the number of road journeys on largely unsuitable roads. Even when public transport is provided the public would generally choose a car journey as their preference. In village/rural areas the housing is generally more expensive (I think developers make more profit on large low density homes) and there are very few highly paid local jobs (especially as nationally , and with AI, we move towards more, lower paid, service industry jobs). Fundamentally more homes in rural areas does not provide green housing.

Comment ID: 10955

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Mark Young

Comment: None of the scenarios supports the aim of the Local Plan to be sustainable and “green to the core”. They all undermine the ethos of the Cotswolds, the preservation of which has been central to previous CDC Local Plans. The scenarios take little account of the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5 destroys the rural and community attributes of a number of small villages and, in some cases transforms them into suburbs of larger towns thereby destroying their identity.

I do not support any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being treated as a Principal Settlement, because this designation does not reflect its true level of services or capacity.

Scenario 5 is only workable if strategic sites are placed where genuine infrastructure exists—not in Siddington. Allocating 1,100 homes to a village of 339 dwellings is wholly disproportionate and inconsistent with sustainable development.

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape.

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

Allowing a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan.

The selection of Siddington for strategic development is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations.

Comment ID: 10956

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Mark Young

Comment: Adopting a plan that provides for development locations that are not considered sustainable is inconsistent with the NPPF and goes against everything that has been promoted in previous CDC Local Plans.

If CDC decides to locate developments in unsustainable sites it should admit publicly that it is abandoning good planning practice.

No. Siddington is being targeted because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10957

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Mark Young

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations (such as Siddington) is inappropriate and would threaten their rural character.

Comment ID: 10954

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mark Young

Comment: There is no prospect of the proposed level of development in Siddington being sustainable. Siddington is currently reliant on Cirencester and we expect that would continue.

No. A three- to four-fold expansion would merge Siddington with Cirencester, overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk, and destroy the village's identity. The village's misclassification as a Principal Settlement further undermines the justification for this level of growth.

Comment ID: 10952

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mark Young

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

- The incorrect Principal Settlement classification
- The protection of village identity and cohesion
- Flood resilience
- Rural infrastructure limits
- The importance of the green buffer with Cirencester

Comment ID: 10953

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mark Young

Comment: I agree with the vision but the proposals in the Consultation document will not deliver that vision. From the perspective of Siddington, the proposals:

- Do not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing community.
- Will involve development that does not prioritise environmental stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.
- Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.
- Will not result in Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community.
- Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington.
- Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington.
- Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks.
- Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately
- Will reduce the green space available to the Siddington community.

Comment ID: 10135

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Martin

Comment: We are concerned about the surface water that would be generated by a development west of Driffield as we already have significant flooding on the Harnhill road when we have moderate rain fall. When there is heavy rain fall the road becomes impassable and the inhabitants of Driffield have to go out towards the Spin road as that is the only exit.

Comment ID: 10601

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Martin

Comment: We do not need all these house so I can not agree with the vision. Tax second homes more and regulate air bnb more so more of existing housing stock is freed up for local people to live in. Current prices of new homes suggest that new builds will not benefit existing young families in the area and will only increase second homes

Comment ID: 10603

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Martin

Comment: No vision for job creation or infrastructure- purely driven by a false political narrative

Comment ID: 10605

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Martin

Comment: Yes - invest in education above everything else so that we develop our youth to create a future

Comment ID: 10611

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Martin

Comment: No - houses not required and jobs and infrastructure must come first

Comment ID: 10624

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Martin

Comment: Smaller houses will benefit local people more - but whole assumption of central government must be questioned- in my opinion houses are not needed and this is just an attempt to fuel economic growth which is misplaced as we need to start with developing skills and deciding what it is that we want to sell as a country to the rest of the world

Comment ID: 9651

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: These comments address the proposed strategic extension of the village of Ampney Crucis.

Policy N4 of the new NPPF addresses Protected Landscapes and at point 4 makes the following point "development proposals within the setting of protected landscapes should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designed asset." As your land use consultants noted in their report: The zone (to the north of Ampney Crucis) is "elevated and open in character and therefore likely to have high landscape impacts in relation to the NL".

Policy S5 says of development outside settlements that it must "be well related to an existing settlement (unless the nature of the development would make this inappropriate) and be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure"

Your consultants note that the land to the north of Ampney Crucis is restricted as follows: (1) Flood Zone 3 lying to the south; (2) The Cotswold National Landscape lying to the North; (3) The zone is elevated and open in character and therefore likely to have high landscape impacts in relation to the N; (4) Large parts of the zone are covered by a Mineral Safeguarding Area; (5) Constrained sewage treatment works capacity.

They do not mention (6) the impact on the setting of the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area but this should be taken into account. There is also (7) archaeological potential in the zone (see HER records).

Additionally,

(a) The roads to it are narrow single lane roads that are clearly not used that frequently at the moment, given the grass growing in the middle of them.

(b) The development area is not in the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area but is adjacent to it. Large scale development could have a detrimental impact on the setting of the CA.

(c) It also borders the Cotswold National Landscape and large-scale development is likely have a detrimental impact on its setting, particularly given the topography.

(d) The site is in the outer zone of influence for the North Meadow SAC – it is possible that in order to build 600 houses the developer would have to contribute over £190,000 in mitigation costs on top of any other payments towards infrastructure, biodiversity measures and of course the building costs.

(e) There is an acknowledged issue with the foul drainage capacity in the area.

(f) There are also various items on the Historic Environment Record that would indicate the need archaeological input prior to the commencement of development (and potentially) during the build phase. Obviously, this is something that CDC is well versed in. However, it does potentially affect the viability of the scheme for the developer

(g) Ampney Crucis is a traditional rural village set within open countryside. It is arranged in a dispersed linear manner at odds with a large high-density development. The Appeal Inspector who considered the application for two houses in the land below Dudley Farm, was taken by the village's rural agrarian character and noted that it was largely defined by traditional vernacular architecture. It is difficult to envisage how this wouldn't be changed beyond recognition should the proposals go ahead.

Design

There would be difficulties in ensuring that the design of the proposed dwellings meets the demands of the Cotswold Design Code, particular given the high cost of some of the materials required. It is likely that the higher density of housing proposed would be at odds with the design code. This would be inconsistent with the demands of the NPPF which requires that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

This also suggests that the cost of the development result in the price of any open market housing (as opposed to affordable housing) becoming so high that they become difficult to sell. In this situation, the design of the housings and the materials used would likely become "downgraded" to make them easier to sell, and contravene the essence of the design code.

School places

Ampney Crucis Primary School at September 2025 had 90 pupils on the roll with a capacity for 105. It is unclear if there is room or finance for the school to expand, and difficulties in managing the traffic implications. Kingshill Secondary School at October 2025 had 806 on roll with a capacity for 980. There are also large expansions of Preston, Driffield and Siddington (960, 840 and 880 dwellings respectively) in the proposed development strategy. Deer Park appears to have been allocated the bulk of places

required by the Chesterton town expansion. The plan does not specify the location of new schools or clarify where the finance would come from.

Travel

It is highly unclear where residents would work. Whilst homeworking remains popular it is not guaranteed. There are only so many jobs in Cirencester. Residents will likely travel to Cheltenham, Gloucester, Swindon or further afield. Few will be cycling to work.

It is unlikely that the majority of householders would find employment locally. The preferred development zone does not have easy access to local employment centres such as Swindon, Gloucester or Bristol by public transport. The increase in traffic in the area would be striking. The crossroads with the Stow Road (A429) is managed by traffic lights and already sees heavy amounts of traffic at peak times. Those travelling east may be inclined to reach the A417 by driving through the village.

Mineral Safeguarding

As your consultants note, most of the areas around Ampney Crucis is a mineral safeguarding area. A Mineral Safeguarding area is an area designated by the minerals planning authorities which covers known deposits of minerals which are desired to be kept safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development.

These sandstone and limestone deposits may well be required in future for building at the scale the Government intends. This should be assessed and taken into account prior to allowing any non-mineral development to go ahead at a scale.

Equally, the cost of building in stone is greater than the cost of building in brick, the local design code is clear that stone is the most appropriate material for much of the region. If large village extensions or new settlements are built from a different material, the character of the region would be enormously changed to the detriment of the existing historic settlements and their settings.

Economic

Construction costs are high, particularly the cost of materials. Labour costs have also increased over the last year since the increases to the minimum wage and Employer NI contributions have come into effect.

The availability of skilled, and indeed non-skilled, labour required to build at this pace and level is in doubt. As mentioned earlier, all the surrounding authorities are also required to build at much higher numbers than under the previous system. The same

can be said for much of the country. This area is expensive to live in. It is highly uncertain that sufficient skilled labour would be available.

Market demand and consumer confidence. Housing numbers are worked out using the "standard methodology". In very simple terms this is a formula based on local house prices and earnings. Developers will need to ensure that sufficient numbers of affordable houses are delivered whilst also needing the development to be profitable.

The significant other costs to the developer: CIL, SAC impact payments, archaeological work, roads, schools, and so on could easily result in the market housing being unaffordable to locals or outright unaffordable to the developer.

Developers will have to pay: (1) Mitigation payments; (2) CIL payments; (3) Archaeological investigation costs; (4) Costs of biodiversity net gain (BNG); (5) Contributions toward Infrastructure costs – roads, foul drainage, utilities. Road and utilities are often required upfront; (6) Other developer contributions deemed necessary; (7) For materials required to ensure that the development complies with the requirements of the Cotswold Design Code – this is important to get right due to the landscape and heritage impacts of getting it wrong; (8) For the development site itself.

Summary

The proposal to strategically extend Ampney Crucis contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly policies N4 and S5. Policy N4 requires development to be "sensitively located" around national landscapes, but the topography of the proposed site means that it would be highly visible and detrimental to the national landscape. Policy S5 requires development to be "well related to an existing settlement", but the proposed extension would not be compliant due to its scale and density compared to the existing village of Ampney Crucis.

Overall, the proposal for Ampney Crucis is not sustainable because it would irrevocably cause significant harm to the existing landscape and the nature and design of the existing settlement. It is not viable because of the inadequate existing infrastructure, such as schools and transport, and the poor economic case. It is also unlikely to be deliverable since the costs of compliance with various regulations, such as the Cotswold Design Code, make high-density development a financially risky and unattractive proposition, which would encourage developers to cut significant corners.

The Ampney Crucis extension should be removed from the list of proposed sites.

Comment ID: 9641

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: Scenarios 3 and 4 seem to have the most merit and a combination of those may be the best option. By concentrating development in existing centres and near transport hubs, the rural character of the rest of the district is preserved, and services and transport will be available for residents in the new developments. This is also more consistent with the new draft National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2025) which targets development around rail stations.

Comment ID: 9643

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: Scenarios 3 and 4 seem to have the most merit and a combination of those may be the best option. By concentrating development in existing centres and near transport hubs, the rural character of the rest of the district is preserved, and services and transport will be available for residents in the new developments. This is also more consistent with the new draft National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2025) which targets development around rail stations.

Comment ID: 9644

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: The proposed changes to the NPPF also include a new category of development site size: "medium" which are sites that are up to 2.5 hectares and propose 10-49 dwellings. CDC could decide that this definition can be applied to suitable sites within the NL. This would potentially open up more sites within the NL to smaller developments beyond a binary choice between small scale and major development.

Comment ID: 9645

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: While higher housing densities make sense in existing town and city environments, they are alien and out-of-character in rural villages and smaller settlements. Inner-city style housing densities in rural areas, which many see as unattractive, would likely be at odds with the Cotswold Design code. High densities in rural areas would also conflict with the NPPF which requires that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Comment ID: 9646

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: The overall target from central government may not be sustainable or achievable. But the proposed scenario 5 is both unsustainable and unrealistic. Due to the omission of major sites inside the national landscape, the bulk of the development is squeezed into small portions of land within the CDC boundaries but outside the NL. This creates an almost ridiculous planning framework where much high-density development is planned in the rural strip between Kemble and Fairford. The distribution is highly uneven across the district, which makes little sense from either a planning or practical perspective.

Comment ID: 9647

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: No particular comments.

Comment ID: 9648

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Martin Baxter

Comment: Suggested rewording. Remove section (a) entirely and move the sub-clause "Locate development away from flood-prone areas" into section (b). In section (c) remove the phrase "with a focus on socially rented homes". In section (d), remove the phrase "Support the transition to a low-carbon economy and". In section (e) remove the first bullet point.

Comment ID: 10613

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Martin Cooper

Comment: Too much emphasis on Moreton- it is a small country town and can not double in size and retain its current charm

Comment ID: 10618

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Martin Cooper

Comment: I don't think any of the scenarios are appropriate- use brown field sites in towns if necessary and leave the countryside alone wherever it is in the uk

Comment ID: 10621

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Martin Cooper

Comment: No - council should reject government demands

Comment ID: 10608

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Martin Cooper

Comment: Create jobs before houses

Comment ID: 10473

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Martin Theophilus

Comment: Q4 - The proposed expansion in Kemble stretches into a known flood area. The EA have updated the pluvial flood maps to show the area south of the existing Top Farm development causes significant flooding to Kemble Wick and the road leading towards Oaksey. There are no rivers or water courses to take surface water runoff away from this area. There are no obvious routes for the water to be directed. No Suds solution would cope with the volume of water from new housing developments and road.

CDC flood team are already involved with mitigation for water flowing from green fields.

Comment ID: 9192

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Martyn Beasley

Comment: Due to the National Landscape dominating over 80% of the district, surely the government housing target should be drastically reduced to be in proportion to the remaining 20%.

Comment ID: 9193

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Martyn Beasley

Comment: Building such large numbers of houses in small areas such as Preston, will not only destroy the important rural aspect of the village, but will also need vast improvements to the required infrastructure, including traffic, utilities, education and healthcare.

Comment ID: 9194

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Martyn Beasley

Comment: Building large numbers of houses in small areas such as Preston, will not only destroy the important rural aspect of the village, but will also need vast improvements to the required infrastructure, including utilities, traffic, education and healthcare.

Comment ID: 9195

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Martyn Beasley

Comment: Increasing the density of development would be totally unsuitable for the historic and rural aspect of Preston.

Comment ID: 9203

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Martyn Beasley

Comment: If the government does not reduce the proposed number of houses to reflect proportionality, the Council should consider scenario 6, (subject to easing of planning policy), in order to spread the housing target sparingly, and evenly across the whole of the district.

Comment ID: 8720

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mathew Garner

Comment: How on earth can Fairford take such an enlarged volume of housing when the centre of the town narrows to one lane of traffic in three locations. It becomes gridlocked and stressful at busy times as it is. how can you double the size of the town with such infrastructure limitations? The doctors are always full already , the town cannot double in size with the existing infrastructure. The sewage system is broken and cannot cope with the existing volume, houses have to be pumped weekly. We literally cannot take such considerable volume.

Comment ID: 10138

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Matthew

Comment: Scenario 5 seems the best one. We can't accommodate new homes with the AONB and should look to develop outside of it. The new local plan should incorporate the new local nature recovery strategy. If any development is allocated in Tetbury it should be to the North near the Sir William Romney School or the new doctors surgery, as this would be sustainable.

Comment ID: 11101

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Matthew

Comment: Scenario 5 seems the best one to do. New developments should be outside the AONB to be sustainable. Any development in Tetbury should be to near to the Sir William Romney School or the new doctors surgery.

Comment ID: 10992

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Maxi

Comment: I have some questions about the designation of some of the villages scheduled for expansion in the plan through data provided in the Settlement Role Function Study.

* Willersey is a proposed non-principal settlement but it's a village of a similar size to nearby Mickleton. How can they be different designations - they share the same sustainability issues?

* If the settlement hierarchy is aimed at 'promoting a sustainable pattern of development as required by the NPPF it isn't taking account of real infrastructure issues. It seems to be purely desk work with no input from the parishes or villages subject to this system. It is widely known that the schools, shops, financial services, recreational facilities, sewage and water supplies as well as electrical services are already failing to meet the needs of the current populations

Adding more houses without making the necessary improvements to the infrastructure will be disastrous.

* The scores for other each settlements may not be correct. I know that the sustainability score for Temple Guiting is wrong. Temple Guiting is said to have easy access to a post office and primary school. Yes to the primary school, but the post office? 2 afternoons a week in Guiting Power?

So there might well be other errors that local residents could identify. Perhaps ask the local PCs across the district to make sure that the approach is based on real facts to provide the right basis for such crucial decision making.

The study also says that a total of 184 new homes are proposed for Willersey between 2025 and 2043. That is 40% higher than currently (458) but the village has also had an extra 50% since 2011 according to the PC and, as they say, there has been virtually no change to infrastructure or amenities. (That makes the village more than double its 2011 size by 2043 i.e. 642 compared with 305).

There is a comment on the website saying that the estate should be more dense. But CDC argues against this in rural districts as 'they would likely conflict with the area's character and the practical limits of infrastructure and services.'

FYI -current density in the old Local Plan was 21 dwellings per hectare. This site is proposing xxx. The preferred option (no 5) for the new Local Plan would average out at 106 houses per hectare.

Section 3.11 of the new local plan says that 'all deliverable and developable sites in sustainable locations for growth will likely need to be allocated for development in the Local Plan'. I.e. Places they have listed will be developed. That includes Willersey and Mickleton. So the only viable thing to do is to object because of the lack of facilities etc and try to get getting the infrastructure in place before building a condition.

Comment ID: 9053

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Maximilian Barker

Comment: I am writing to object to the apparent concentration of proposed new housing development in Moreton-in-Marsh, which, under the preferred options, appears to shoulder a disproportionately large share of the district's overall housing requirement.

While I recognise the need to plan for future housing and acknowledge the pressures imposed by national targets, the scale of development proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh is excessive and risks fundamentally altering the character, function, and sustainability of the town.

Moreton-in-Marsh is a small market town with limited infrastructure capacity. Its road network is already constrained, the town centre frequently experiences congestion, and local services—particularly healthcare, education, and utilities—are under growing pressure. The proposed level of growth risks overwhelming these systems rather than supporting balanced, organic development.

Furthermore, Moreton-in-Marsh occupies a sensitive location within the Cotswolds, acting as a gateway town with a distinctive historic character and close relationship to its surrounding countryside. Large-scale development on this scale threatens to erode the very qualities that make the town successful and valued, both by residents and by the wider district.

I am particularly concerned that the plan does not demonstrate clearly why such a significant proportion of new housing should be directed to Moreton-in-Marsh rather than being more evenly distributed across the district, including:

- Greater use of brownfield land
- Smaller, proportionate growth across a wider range of settlements
- Clearer justification for site selection based on infrastructure capacity rather than perceived convenience

Without a compelling and transparent rationale, the current approach appears unbalanced and places an unfair burden on one community.

I therefore urge the Council to reconsider the scale of development proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh, to reassess infrastructure constraints honestly, and to pursue a more genuinely plan-led and equitable distribution of housing growth across the Cotswold District.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this consultation.

Comment ID: 9810

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: May Ritzen

Comment: am writing to oppose the Cotswold District Council's (CDC) considered new settlement of 840, rising to 2,100 new houses in Driffield and Harhill.

This unspoilt, protected landscape setting is mentioned in the Domesday book and is a designated Conservation Area.

The villages contain narrow lanes used extensively by large farm vehicles. The monstrous scale of this new settlement would inevitably increase local vehicle movements to a case scale, and negatively compromise the safety of residents. My husband and I have 2 small children and our house is on the small lane that runs through Driffield. With the increased volume of traffic, I would be most concerned for their safety, and other children in this small village.

My children attend the local Primary school in Ampney Crucis where I've been an active member of the PTA for 7 years. This brilliant, small rural school with a capacity of 95 children could not possibly accommodate the families of these homes.

The traffic on our daily route to school is always extremely heavy crossing the London Road. I can't imagine how appalling the flow would be with an extra 2.100 homes each possibly owning at least one car.

There is no infrastructure locally. No doctors surgery, no shops, no cinemas, no car parks. Cirencester, our beautiful Roman town could not begin to accommodate these extra cars/people.

Land and homes within Harnhill and Driffield, have been severely impacted by flooding in recent times. Any development, would hugely increase the risk to existing homes through flooding and surface water runoff. We are unable to use the road on several occasions because of flood water. Vehicles have been trapped and abandoned due to the flooding.

Millions of tourists visit the Cotswolds every year. These vast settlements will obliterate our beautiful small villages, tourists will no longer visit and this will have a negative financial impact on our local small towns.

Driffild is in a conservation area and we all have a duty to protect our beautiful countryside for the next generations.

We strongly oppose this proposed settlement.

Yours faithfully

May Ritzen

Comment ID: 11012

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: The Cirencester area (including Siddington) has a new sewer connecting the Steadings to the Shorncote treatment works. This will serve the Steadings and some of the western properties in Cirencester. However, the eastern sewer main which serves large parts of Cirencester and Siddington has insufficient capacity to deal with the current level of housing, let alone the addition of several thousand (Siddington, Preston, Kings Hill, and Siddington Park (Phase 3)). A new sewer would be required and it is not clear how this would be funded and in what timescale. Siddington is already suffering from serious annual sewer spills during periods of heavy rain. The Shorncote treatment works is being upgraded by Thames Water but the outcome of the upgrade has yet to be assessed. So far this winter there have been constant discharges from the Shorncote storm overflow and it continues to have one of the worst records in the Gloucestershire area. Water supply for the Swindon and Oxfordshire area (which includes Cirencester and its surrounds) is suffering from water shortages and hose pipe bans in 2025 lasted for 5 months. No new reservoir capacity will be delivered before 2040 and even that project is far from assured given Thames Water's financial difficulties and the staggering costs of a new reservoir.

There are a number of other concerns with existing infrastructure and services and these have been outlined in my emailed comments to the CDC planning department.

Comment ID: 10993

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: None of the scenarios supports the aim of the Local Plan to be sustainable and "green to the core". They all undermine the ethos of the Cotswolds, the preservation of which has been central to previous CDC Local Plans. The scenarios take little account of the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5 destroys the rural, historic and community attributes of a number of small villages and, in some cases, transforms them into suburbs of larger towns thereby destroying their identity. This would be the case for Siddington and Preston and by the end of the Plan period, Cirencester would virtually double in size.

Scenario 5 is only workable if strategic sites are placed where genuine infrastructure exists - not in Siddington. Allocating 1,100 homes to a village of 339 dwellings is wholly disproportionate and inconsistent with sustainable development.

I do not support any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being classified a Principal Settlement, because this is an incorrect designation and does not reflect its true level of services or capacity to accept large-scale development.

Comment ID: 10995

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: The selection of Siddington for strategic development is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Locations.

Comment ID: 10998

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: Some proposals that are recommended for consideration when developing alternative scenarios:

Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape.

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold lakes.

Allowing a further, larger extension of the Steadings to the south and west of the existing plan. This would create a new self-sustaining community with most of the necessary infrastructure (better road access, new sewage main, shops, school, health centre) and would allow Siddington to be maintained as a small rural village. It would enable CDC to work with a single developer for a very large development.

Comment ID: 11001

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: No it would not.

Adopting a plan that provides for development locations that are not considered sustainable is inconsistent with the NPPF and goes against everything that has been promoted in previous CDC Local Plans.

If CDC decides to locate development in unsustainable sites it should admit publicly that it is abandoning good planning practice simply to meet an unsupportable and illogical government target.

Alternatively CDC should only submit a sustainable Plan for Reg 19 consideration and explain fully why it cannot meet the government target for very sound reasons.

Siddington is being targeted simply because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet artificial housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10937

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: Increasing housing density in rural locations (such as Siddington) is inappropriate and would threaten their rural character.

Comment ID: 11007

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: No. A threefold expansion of the village would merge Siddington with Cirencester and make it an urban suburb. It would not have the necessary services within the village for the new housing and so all of the new residents would be reliant on Cirencester and have to access the town by car. The large-scale expansion would also overwhelm rural infrastructure (narrow, choked roads, insufficient sewer main and treatment capacity etc) , increase flood risk, destroy habitat and green spaces and destroy the village's identity and close-knit community. This is neither "green to the core" or sustainable development.

Comment ID: 11022

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

The incorrect Principal classification for Siddington.

The protection of village identity and cohesion.

Take account of the recommendations in the Study of Land Surrounding Key Settlements in the Cotswold District (Additional Sites Report) prepared by White Consultants for Cotswold District Council in October 2014 and their additional sites report in 2015. Their recommendations on landscape sensitivity made it clear that there are several sites in Siddington where development would be inappropriate and yet these seem to have been forgotten, or overridden, when it came to allocating strategic development sites in Siddington.

Flood resilience (including surface water).

The importance of the green buffer between Siddington and Cirencester.

Comment ID: 11034

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Michael Barge

Comment: I agree with the vision but the proposals in the Consultation document will not deliver that vision. From the perspective of Siddington, the proposals:

Do not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing community. The close-knit community spirit will be lost with a threefold expansion of the village in a very short timeframe.

Will involve development that does not prioritise environments stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.

Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.

Will not result in Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community.

Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington.

Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington.

Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks.

Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately.

Will reduce the green spaces available to the Siddington community and the rural backdrop, things which the villagers hold dear as evidenced in the Neighbourhood Development Plan questionnaire results.

Comment ID: 10664

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Michael McCulloch

Comment: The vision and objectives say nothing about responding to the wishes of residents in particular villages (and towns), especially as expressed through approved Parish Plans etc. The current document focusses on how to deliver a set high level housing target ie a top down approach. It pays no regard to either the recent spread of locally generated plans (bottom up or grassroots priorities) or the potential implications of further decentralisation policies adopted at the national level.

Comment ID: 10218

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Michael Rawlinson

Comment: Question 1 and 2: Prefer scenario 1 - ie continuation of existing policy.

Question 2: dont go for an unsustaibable growth plan to meet central govt requirements

Cotswolds district council is a beautiful place that is far from traditional urban centres so attracts wealthy retirees that want to live in the countryside. Hence high prices and low incomes. This gives a false signal for housing need in the central governments housing algorithm. There is low employment growth and low birth rate. There is a need for more housing but it is for low cost housing rather than housing in general.

Not adjusting the algorithm's to reflect the ANOB makes no sense. It means nearly all the housing growth has to go in the areas that are not protected leading to some crazy community destroying outcomes such as more than doubling the size of Moreton in the Marsh in a generation.

In the case of Moreton in marsh its site as a proposed site for more than doubling is misguided. For two reasons:

It has been chosen because it has a train station. Who uses the train station? Very few people from Moreton in Marsh - it is served by mainly wealthy types and students that have study and jobs in London and Oxford. Low paid workers cannot afford commutes that expensive. Building houses for the low paid in Moreton for a train service they wont use doesnt make any sense. Housing by the empty bicycle racks and my local knowledge it is not mainly used by people in Moreton in Marsh. Has the council done a survey of where people come and what their incomes are who use the train?

Moretons infrastructure is already stretched. The roads are full, sewage systems not fit for purpose, there is a capacity constrained bridge over the foss and medical facilities at capacity. A near doubling of the size in its tiny high street would result in a permanent traffic jam.

Were extra infrastructure to be built it would just lead to more clogging of roads in the ANOB in places like Stow. Adding all the proposed housing in the N Cotswolds when the A44 and A429 are already clogged and notoriously dangerous will just lead to more road deaths unless dual carriage ways are made possible in an ANOB.

Where will all the extra people in Moreton work? Is the proposal to build business parks to create jobs. If not they will need to drive. Only wealthy types outside Moreton can afford a daily commute to employment hubs like Oxford Reading and London. So the 'environmental' credentials of Moreton just don't make sense. If the business parks are built it means more commercial vehicles in the ANOB. Better to build where are motorways, dual carriageways or in towns which have train stations that are closer to cities with jobs.

Question 3: I would be happy to see more dense housing in Moreton-in-Marsh to meet a housing target.

Comment ID: 10806

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Michael Rock

Comment: Fairford has limited employment facilities meaning that most people living in the town travel to other locations, such as Cirencester, Swindon, Gloucester etc for their employment leading to increased use of personal transport with subsequent road wear and congestion. (the roads from Fairford to Cirencester are a particular disgrace and further development will only add to this situation)

Comment ID: 10795

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Michael Rock

Comment: Fairford services need to be upgraded before any future development is consented. the existing services of sewage, water, medical facilities, roads, public transport, parking etc, need to be upgraded prior to any future demands.

Monitoring of sewage outfall showed that in 2023 untreated waste flowed into the River Coln for over 3000 hours.

Comment ID: 9737

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Michael Ross Glynn

Comment: Scenario 5 is I suggest the easy option, but has significant consequences. Landscape conservation areas seem to be ruling out large areas of the district. This means that new development is concentrated largely on Cirencester south and east - the Bathurst estate ruling out west and north of the town. This conurbation sprawl would eventually become a commuter belt for Swindon which would alter this part of the district to the detriment of the County as a whole.

If the Cotswold district is about to disappear, why are we not exploring the long term development for the whole county?

Comment ID: 9741

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Michael Ross Glynn

Comment: The suggested option seems to concentrate on SE Ciren plus a limited development around Moreton. Despite landscape issues further consideration should be given to the Northleach area. The A40/A429 provides good links in all 4 directions and development to the east would enable a close link to facilities in Burford. Some additional facilities in the Central area are clearly needed.

Comment ID: 9295

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Perhaps the District Council, Local Planning Authority should, from the beginning challenge the need to stick to the Government's outline target of new dwellings, as the Cotswolds has a long-accepted record of flooding problems, covering several areas of their "patch" including in the centre of Cirencester itself.? The importance of this factor should be stressed by CDC to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) in the strongest possible terms.

Comment ID: 9299

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: This option should be discounted on the grounds of long lead times and weak transportation services.

Comment ID: 9296

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Given the well-established and historical local knowledge that several parts of the Cotswolds are very susceptible to severe flooding problems, surely the CDC Local Planning Authorities should aim to secure a reduction in their overall housing target from the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), by stressing in the strongest possible terms, this key limitation to their target. Make no mistake about it, this Department of State will be totally unaware of this situation and should therefore be appraised of the fact in any Impact Statement that CDC intends to present to HMG.

Comment ID: 9302

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Non-starter!

Comment ID: 9319

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Not applicable to Poulton

Comment ID: 9321

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Scenario 5 is, in my opinion, offers neither a value for money or cost-effective solution to the problem. Indeed, HMT would not approve such a scenario on the grounds of pure cost alone! Furthermore, the long timescales involved would not be popular with all the tax-paying residents who would expect to see gradual progress in both the short and long term. Moreover, this Scenario is high risk due to the very real likelihood of either cancellation or further delay.

Comment ID: 9322

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Scenario 6 suffers from many of the drawbacks outlined in my comments in Scenario 5 but with an added disadvantage of even more risk, and should be discounted.

Comment ID: 9323

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: None starter on so many counts.

Comment ID: 9297

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: After reviewing all the stated options, Scenario 3 is clearly the cheapest, most-cost effective, quickest and most rational option to achieve DLUHCs housing targets. To expand current facilities including basic infrastructure, transport, medical, education commercial and business activities, by building on existing Main Service Centres, has proven to be the most successful approach, not just in other parts of the UK, but in other parts of Europe and the developed world.

Comment ID: 9298

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: This Scenario is the least viable of the options proposed and should be discounted on the grounds of representing something of a “scatter-gun” approach to the problem.

Comment ID: 9300

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: By CDCs own admission, Scenario 5 involves a timescale for completion beyond the current scope of this plan. As such, it is vulnerable to huge changes, not least of which is likely to be in the colour of Government. This Scenario is also vulnerable to charges of “ it will never happen” or “will never be completed”. Therefore any Local Plan, whilst considering likely changes in the situation in the future, must give tax payers in the Cotswolds some hope that they might see at least some positive progress in this matter, in the near to medium term.

Comment ID: 9301

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Sorry but Scenario 6 would be such debate, judicial reviews etc as to be a non- starter.

Comment ID: 9314

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: May I suggest that the CDC Local Planning Department challenge the housing target imposed on them by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government under para2.3, presenting a case for reducing the target number due to both the historical and current evidence leading to constraints being imposed at Poulton due to the severe flooding and sewage problems restricting building in the area. IMPACT STATEMENTS should also be submitted to support our case.

Comment ID: 9316

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Scenario 1 is not viable for Poulton due to a complete lack of a basic infrastructure, particularly Transport, Healthcare, Schools and Shops.

Comment ID: 9317

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Scenario 2 is not viable for Poulton due to the complete absence of a basic infrastructure, as detailed above. Moreover, this situation is exacerbated by extending the area to hamlets and small villages.

Comment ID: 9318

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Michael Wood

Comment: Scenario 1 is the most acceptable to Poulton out of a very poor choice of options!

Comment ID: 10332

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Mike McKeown

Comment: recognise why Scenario 5 has emerged as the Council's preferred option, particularly its attempt to balance housing delivery with the very real constraints created by the Cotswolds National Landscape. However, I have significant concerns about the overall scale of housing required by central government and the realism of delivering that scale through the preferred strategy.

Approximately 80% of the district lies within a nationally protected landscape, which fundamentally limits where large-scale development can occur without unacceptable harm. In my view, the housing target imposed on the district does not adequately reflect this constraint. That said, I fully accept that the district does need more homes, especially genuinely affordable housing, so that younger people, families, and key workers can continue to live and work in the Cotswolds.

The evidence presented suggests that Scenario 5 does not meet the full housing requirement and relies heavily on high densities and a small number of strategic locations. This raises questions about deliverability, character, and infrastructure capacity. I would therefore encourage the Council to be clearer about how any shortfall would be addressed, and how risks around density, infrastructure delivery, and cumulative impacts will be managed to ensure the strategy is robust at examination.

Comment ID: 10334

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Mike McKeown

Comment: I would support a limited and targeted increase in housing density where it is appropriate to the location, well-designed, and properly supported by infrastructure. Increasing density can play a role in meeting housing needs, but it should not be treated as a universal or primary solution to meeting the full housing target across the district.

The evidence base indicates that some scenarios imply very high average densities, in some cases exceeding 100 dwellings per hectare. In much of the Cotswold District, this would represent a highly urban form of development that is unlikely to be compatible with local character, settlement form, or community expectations. Over-reliance on density also risks undermining housing mix, space standards, and the delivery of family housing, and may reduce build-out rates rather than improve them.

Higher densities are most likely to be appropriate in locations with strong, high-capacity public transport accessibility, close to town centres, services, and employment, and where building height and form can be accommodated without harm to landscape character or heritage assets.

In more rural locations, or where infrastructure is constrained, significant density increases are unlikely to be appropriate or deliverable. It is also important that density assumptions allow sufficient space for green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, biodiversity, and urban cooling, all of which will become increasingly important over the plan period as climate impacts intensify.

In summary, density should be used as a carefully applied tool, not as a blunt mechanism to close the gap between housing targets and deliverable capacity. The Local Plan should clearly set out where higher densities are suitable, how design quality will be safeguarded, and how supporting infrastructure will be delivered alongside any increase in density.

Comment ID: 10336

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Mike McKeown

Comment: I do not believe that the proposed level of development up to 2043, and particularly the expectation of continued growth beyond 2043, can be assumed to be sustainable without significant additional provision and safeguards. Sustainability at this scale depends less on the headline number of homes, and more on whether settlements are supported by the right infrastructure, services, and long-term resilience measures from the outset.

At a district-wide level, the cumulative scale of development places growing pressure on transport networks, flood risk management, utilities, healthcare, education, and the natural environment. These pressures are likely to intensify over time due to climate change, increasing energy demand, and demographic change. Sustainability therefore requires a forward-looking approach that considers future conditions, not just current capacity.

From a Cirencester and South Cotswolds perspective, the scale of growth proposed is likely to increase car journeys even with strong modal shift measures. Cirencester already experiences parking pressure at peak times, and demand modelling will be essential to ensure the town remains accessible and economically viable. Sustainable growth here requires not only public transport and active travel improvements, but realistic planning for residual car use, alongside healthcare, education, and utilities capacity that grows in step with development.

From a Kemble-specific perspective, the proposed scale of development represents a transformational change, almost trebling the size of the village. This level of growth can only be considered sustainable if it is accompanied by substantial and early investment in infrastructure and services, including:

Transport:

Reliable, frequent, and peak-capacity public transport links between new development and Kemble Station, recognising the highly peaked nature of commuter rail use. Safe and continuous cycle routes to Kemble Station, Cirencester, and the Cotswold Lakes should be delivered early to support modal shift from first occupation.

Flood risk and climate resilience:

Existing flooding issues, including in Kemble Wick, must not be exacerbated. New development should be designed to reduce flood risk overall, taking account of future climate projections, not just current flood zones. This requires sufficient land for sustainable drainage, green infrastructure, and natural flood management.

Healthcare and education:

The scale of growth proposed is likely to exceed the capacity of existing GP provision and the local primary school, and will add pressure to secondary education and hospital services across the wider area. Sustainable development requires clear, funded plans for expanding healthcare and education capacity in parallel with housing delivery.

Energy and utilities:

New homes will increasingly rely on electricity for heating and vehicle charging. Grid capacity in the South Cotswolds is already constrained, and sustainable growth will require coordinated planning for grid reinforcement, local renewable generation, and storage.

Local services and community facilities:

To function as a sustainable community rather than a dormitory settlement, Kemble will require additional local services, facilities, and community infrastructure that reduce the need to travel for day-to-day needs.

In summary, the proposed level of development is not inherently unsustainable, but it will not be sustainable by default. Long-term sustainability depends on clear, enforceable commitments to infrastructure delivery, climate resilience, and service provision, with flexibility to adapt over time as conditions and technologies change. Without these provisions, there is a real risk that development up to and beyond 2043 will place increasing strain on settlements rather than creating genuinely sustainable places.

Comment ID: 10339

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Mike McKeown

Comment: Yes. In addition to the infrastructure categories listed, there are several further matters that should be explicitly considered within the Development Strategy and the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan if growth at the proposed scale is to be genuinely sustainable and deliverable.

1. Climate adaptation and future risk (not just mitigation)

While flood management is listed, the strategy should explicitly require infrastructure planning to take account of future climate impacts over the plan period and beyond, including increased flood risk, heat stress, and pressure on drainage systems.

Infrastructure requirements should be tested against projected future conditions, not just current baselines, particularly for large strategic allocations.

2. Electricity system resilience and grid coordination

Utilities are listed, but the electricity system warrants specific attention. New development will increasingly depend on electricity for heating, cooling, and vehicle charging, while grid capacity in parts of the South Cotswolds is already constrained. The Development Strategy should explicitly support coordinated planning for grid reinforcement, local renewable generation, and energy storage, and ensure alignment with regional grid investment planning.

3. Equity and affordability of low-carbon living

Infrastructure planning should consider not only provision, but access and affordability. For example, reliance on public EV charging rather than home charging can significantly increase household running costs and disadvantage less affluent residents. Supporting equitable access to low-carbon transport and energy should be a strategic consideration.

4. Long-term operational funding and service viability

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should consider not only capital provision, but the long-term operational sustainability of services such as public transport, healthcare, and

community facilities. Infrastructure that cannot be viably operated or staffed over time risks becoming underused or withdrawn, undermining sustainability objectives.

5. Digital resilience and demand growth

Digital infrastructure should consider future demand growth, resilience, and reliability, including the role of connectivity in supporting home working, access to services, and economic resilience. This is particularly important in rural areas where digital access can significantly reduce the need to travel.

6. Cumulative impacts and phasing across settlements

Infrastructure needs should be assessed cumulatively across settlements, not solely on a site-by-site basis. Phasing is critical: infrastructure must be delivered early enough to shape behaviour and service use, rather than lagging behind development and requiring retrospective mitigation.

7. Flexibility to adapt to change over the plan period

Finally, the Development Strategy should be flexible enough to adapt to emerging changes over the plan period, such as shifts in travel behaviour, energy systems, or service delivery models. While such changes cannot be assumed, the Plan should avoid locking in inflexible assumptions that may quickly become outdated.

In summary, beyond conventional housing, the Development Strategy should place greater emphasis on future resilience, equity, cumulative impacts, and long-term viability. Addressing these matters early through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be critical to ensuring that growth results in sustainable communities rather than increasing pressure on already constrained systems.

Comment ID: 10341

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Mike McKeown

Comment: I broadly support the revised vision and objectives. They are well framed, ambitious, and clearly aligned with the Council's corporate priorities, national policy, and the urgent need to respond to climate change. The emphasis on climate action, affordable housing, environmental stewardship, and a low-carbon economy is welcome and appropriate for the district.

That said, I believe the vision and objectives would be strengthened by greater realism and clarity in three key areas.

1. Climate adaptation as well as mitigation

While the vision and objectives rightly emphasise zero-carbon development and emissions reduction, they should place equal weight on adaptation to unavoidable climate impacts. This includes explicitly recognising increasing flood risk, heat stress, pressure on drainage systems, and the need for resilient infrastructure and settlement design that performs well under future climate conditions, not just current baselines.

2. Infrastructure delivery as a critical dependency, not an assumption

The vision refers to "integrated infrastructure" and timely delivery, but the objectives could be clearer that infrastructure capacity is a precondition for sustainable growth, not something that follows it. Given the scale of development proposed, particularly around Cirencester and in the South Cotswolds, the vision should explicitly acknowledge the risks of cumulative infrastructure strain and the need for firm, enforceable delivery mechanisms, phasing, and funding certainty.

3. Equity and rural realism

The vision appropriately promotes sustainable transport and reduced emissions, but it should better reflect the rural reality of the district. Car ownership is likely to remain high for much of the plan period, even with strong investment in public transport and active travel. Supporting equitable access to low-carbon living, including reliable home-based EV charging and affordable energy, is therefore critical to ensuring that sustainability objectives do not unintentionally disadvantage less affluent households.

4. Flexibility over the plan period

Given the pace of change in areas such as energy systems, digital connectivity, and transport technology, the vision would benefit from explicitly recognising the need for flexibility and review. While emerging technologies cannot be relied upon, the plan should be capable of adapting if circumstances change materially during the period to 2043 and beyond.

In summary, I agree with the overall direction of the vision and objectives and strongly support their intent. With a clearer emphasis on climate adaptation, infrastructure dependency, equity, and long-term flexibility, they would provide a more robust and credible framework to guide sustainable development across the district.

Comment ID: 10793

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Mike Willis

Comment: Local Plan Review (Regulation 18) – Poulton is Not a Sustainable Settlement

Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

Submission – Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review (Regulation 18)

Name: Mr Michael Wili

Address: Tincas Rest, The Butts, Poulton

Date: 02.01.2026

I object to the proposed housing allocation for Poulton.

Poulton is a non-sustainable rural village and does not have the essential facilities or infrastructure required to support further housing growth.

For Poulton to be considered sustainable, the following facilities would need to be in place or legally guaranteed before any development:

- * Village-wide flood mitigation (not site-by-site)
- * Adequate sewage and wastewater treatment capacity
- * Full-fibre broadband (FTTP) to every dwelling
- * Reliable indoor and outdoor mobile phone coverage
- * Viable public transport (including evenings and weekends)
- * Access to primary education capacity
- * Access to GP, Dentist and healthcare services
- * Safe highway capacity and traffic management

These facilities do not exist in Poulton and are not secured by the Local Plan.

Flooding and sewage problems are long-standing and unresolved, particularly around Ranbury, Bell Lane, Stoney Pool and the A417 bridge. Past development has already worsened flooding elsewhere.

Poulton also suffers from poor broadband speeds and unreliable mobile signal, resulting in digital exclusion. This restricts home working, access to NHS digital services, emergency communications, education and day-to-day public services. Digital infrastructure is now essential infrastructure, equivalent to water or electricity.

Allocating housing in Poulton fails the Local Plan soundness tests: • Not positively prepared (known infrastructure deficits unresolved)

* Not justified (reasonable alternatives exist in sustainable locations)

* Not effective (no guaranteed delivery of infrastructure before occupation)

* Not consistent with national planning policy

Failing even one test makes a plan unsound. Poulton fails all four.

Conclusion

Poulton is not an appropriate location for further housing growth. Unless flood mitigation, sewage upgrades and full digital infrastructure are delivered and operational before occupation, the proposed allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

Signed:

Mr M D Willis

Comment ID: 9926

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: I am aligned with the council in supporting Secnario 5 as the most sensible.

Comment ID: 9927

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: Absolutely not - the national landscapes in the cotswold are not only a natural and environmental asset, but they also play a large part in the tourism and industrial draw of the area, and they contribute to the housing valuations that keep our district appealing.

Comment ID: 9929

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: I support increasing housing density in developed areas, such as houses, flats, etc.

In rural and village areas - such as my own - physically smaller housing is difficult due to a lack of public open spaces, private spaces, and public transport links.

Therefore, I have strong concerns about increasing housing density in our villages due to infrastructure limits that are already pushed.

I live in Kempsford, for example. I have been here for four years now, I live in a small 2 bedroom with my family. We have not been able to secure a spot in any local dentist, for example in all this time, despite being on the waitlist for Fairford and Lechlade. With both of those towns listed for major development, this concerns us greatly - housing developments like this should come with a requirement for supporting services such as doctors surgeries, dentists and schools to secure approval, to ensure that our smaller towns don't suffer from bloat and devaluation, and so our villages don't suffer on behalf of development zones.

Additionally, we are underserved by public transport, and the roads frequently flood - which is a concern for the volumes of development proposed.

Comment ID: 9935

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: I would love to see green infrastructure be a priority within the local plan - for example requirements for solar, electric charging, and battery infratstructure tied in with housing developments, so that the housing volume is met in the most planet-friendly way. I would also love to see similar requirements for commerical developments (i.e. all new warehousing/commerical infrastructure) meeting the same green requirements (rooftop solar, charging, visula design in-keeping with the area architecture). Finally any car infrastructure (parking lots, etc) to be built with green/solar roofs - all adds to the visual value and the environmental values, too.

Comment ID: 9936

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: I agree with the council's vision and values - it aligns very well with my personal values, and I appreciate the difficulties in balancing these big picture values with smaller local realities when it comes to housing. If the work and planning committees are in lockstep with this, we're in a good place.

Comment ID: 9923

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: This seems a sensible approach - particularly with the road quality issues in rural areas, as well as frequent flooding, a plan that focussed on exsiting infrastructure and larger towns as development centres and avoid additional traffic within our smaller villages is ideal.

Comment ID: 9925

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: I do not support development in our national landscapes at all

Comment ID: 9933

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Molly Pekarik

Comment: As previously mentioned - I have serious concerns with the number of new homes proposed in Fairford, due to the lack of currently available services (doctors, dentistry), the lack of public transport to/from surrounding villages, the current road conditions and flooding, and concerns with the existing water infrastructure. I have no issues with the current permissions, but do feel like the 2043 proposed strategic/non-strategic numbers seem too high, even with scenario 5 in mind. Therefore, I would suggest that halving those numbers would be more suitable - ONLY IF there were strict requirements for developers to provide ancillary services like health care, schooling, and public transport - and shifting that strategic proposed development to areas like Kemble or Moreton on Marsh, which have public transport links, supporting development around the train stations in line with other towns.

The evidence to support my concerns with developers and support services is again based on my own home. Developed in 2015, we have only just had our cul-de-sac adopted by the council, as the developers took over 10 years post-build to meet the requirements of their planning development, with huge pressure from our hardworking Parish Council. We are close to Fairford, and that experience doesn't bode well in local memory with development volumes

Comment ID: 9225

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: Whilst no scenario has a preference, the Moreton in Marsh Town Council will comment on those Broad Zones and points that impact on the Town and its surroundings.

- Incremental development on a piecemeal basis up to 2043 will not address the significant infrastructure issues Moreton in Marsh will face particularly in terms of Electricity Supply, Water Management (Drinking water, Sewerage, Flood) and Highways. Whilst Strategic Extensions to Moreton in Marsh may seem a pragmatic approach to housing delivery up to 2043, the supporting documents to this Regulation 18 Consultation indicate a New Settlement might be better Value for Money judging the costs of bolting onto existing overburdened infrastructure versus new and the rationale needs to be more detailed in terms of impact and cost effectiveness.
- Broad Zone 5 includes land outside the current Town boundary to the North that the Moreton in Marsh Town Council has requested to be incorporated into the Town boundary via the CDC Community Governance Review (Sept 2025, outcome awaited). It is noted that Broad Zone 5 also includes other land outside the Town Boundary.

Comment ID: 9226

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: • If the sustainability requirements of the NPPF cannot be met it would not be in the interests of any Local Authority to locate development in an unsustainable location, simply to meet a government housing target.

Comment ID: 9227

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: • As the surrounding Cotswold National Landscape and Special Landscape Area is vital to making Moreton in Marsh a sustainable community in terms of economic, social and environmental impacts, higher density housing such higher buildings will be out of the character of the area.

- Higher density development in terms of increased numbers of houses and smaller gardens in Broad Zone 5 will exacerbate flood risk within and beyond the Zone by reducing the amount of land currently available that holds water and drains in increasing incidents of extreme weather owing to climate change.

Comment ID: 9228

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: The following Comments relate to Moreton in Marsh.

- Percentage growth of the settlement: The CDC Development Strategy Options Technical Report (Nov 25). It is unfortunate that the tables in each of the considered scenarios in the document do not contain similar information that would have been of use in considering sustainability of the scenarios in respect of the % growth of settlement. This information is provided in respect of scenarios 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 but not for 5 or 7. Scenario 5 is CDC's preferred scenario. The % growth of the settlement is very important in order to assess the impact of growth and to answer the consultation question in respect of sustainability.
- Studies containing key detail CDC has indicated a number of studies that have been commissioned but not yet available to read for this Regulation 18 Consultation. It is difficult to comment on sustainability without seeing the detailed studies to understand the levels and provision of services envisaged and in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- Water A Water Cycle Study has been commissioned to assess the water infrastructure requirements of planned developments, although no report date is listed on the CDC Local Plan timetable. The ability of Thames Water to deliver improvements to water and sewerage infrastructure within the current Local Plan period to 2031 remains to be realised, let alone to be assessed and deliverable to 2043. This consultation in line with para 16 of the NPPF, whilst it is prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational must also be deliverable.
- Strategic planning: Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Cotswold Local Plan Review (Nov 25). This is listed as an interim report to accompany Regulation 18 consultation on Broad Locations and Growth Strategy Options and can only be regarded as such. CDC has not indicated if specific detailed Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) will be made for land within Broad Zone 5 or if these reports will be made for individual site assessments? If individual site assessments of Sustainability and Environmental Impact rather than an holistic Masterplan approach to Broad Zone 5 are undertaken, it will be detrimental to the determination of a Local Plan period of at least 15 years.

- Economy: Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Cotswold Local Plan Review (Nov 25) Noting the assessment (B1 Key sustainability issues, Table B1 pages 60/61) point: ‘Very few locations in Cotswold district offer positive viability thresholds for new employment development.’ and points in Gloucestershire’s Economic Strategy 2024, Actions to Deliver Growth in the Economy through attracting Investment (page 46) the situation described above will need to change. Whilst the report for CDC identifies the current view, CDC’s strategic approach will need to be articulated through the Employment Needs Assessment – County Wide Housing and Economic Needs Assessment and it will need to be focussed on access to education and skills and also the potential to attract investment in Broad Zone 5, with direct fast links to other key UK locations. Economic focus needs to be more ambitious. If Broad Zone 5 is to be sustainable, attention needs to be paid to NPPF paragraph 100 and parts a) and b).

- PFOS/PFAS The Site Assessment Sheet: Broad Zone 5 contains references to Soil Quality, Water Quality, Flood Risk etc... but no mention is made in respect of PFAS/PFOS contamination as a constraint. Given the serious nature of PFAS/PFOS chemicals present in the River Evenlode and some surrounding land, the impact on land within and beyond downstream of Broad Zone 5 could be significant and cumulative. Unsustainable land should be identified and excluded from Broad Zone 5. This consultation in line with para 16 of the NPPF, whilst it is prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational must also be deliverable.

- Flood Risk It was surprising to read Table C2 Assessment of Broad findings for each Broad Zone Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Cotswold Local Plan Review (Nov 25) Broad Zone 5. Under climate change adaptation, Broad Zone 5 is rated as a Major Positive (Table C2). Para 3.51 highlights Flood Zones 3a and 3b within and surrounding the Principal Settlements including Moreton in Marsh which would ‘...ultimately deliver a higher proportion of development areas in locations which are at an increased risk of flooding’. Noting Para 3.55, the report goes on to say ‘only minor negative effects are noted at this stage but the contradiction between the paragraph 3.51 and Table C2 raise questions about the document as a whole in the context of this consultation. In the climate emergency, critical work undertaken to date to reduce flooding in Moreton in Marsh and downstream communities along the River Evenlode such as Bledington will be negated if development happens without a complete understanding of the impact of development on land that currently holds and stores water.

- Electricity supply – Broad Zones 3, 4, 5 and 6 are fed from Moreton Primary. The proposed scale of development for Broad Zone 5 alone of 3,970 plus potential further development in Broad Zones 3, 4, and 6 suggest the requirement for a significant upgrade to the existing infrastructure in terms of the delivery of 66kV substations and a number of 11kV circuit connections, possibly involving National Grid planning out to 2050. Residents need to be aware of any planned Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and this consultation in line with para 16 of the NPPF, whilst it is prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational must also be deliverable.
- Preferred Options Consultation Nov 25 para 4.8: New housing needs to be accompanied by the necessary infrastructure... and para 4.10: The infrastructure requirements/needs are dependent on the recommended site allocations, which have not yet been determined... It would have been preferable if CDC could have articulated infrastructure needs and requirements being made as part of a Broad Zone Assessment, as a 'joined up' approach. If infrastructure requirements and needs are to be determined for each allocation, the consultation at this time does not demonstrate a strategic approach to sustainability.
- Cycle/Walking infrastructure: GCC Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2020-2041 currently there is no LCWIP in place for Moreton in Marsh. Deliverability/Infrastructure Broad Zone 5 Assessment mentions NCN 48 and suggests a large or medium extension to Moreton could deliver significant improvement. To do this would require amendment to the County LTP or at least the inclusion of a Local CWIP similar to the LCWIP already in place for Kemble Broad Zone 23 (Extract from Broad Zone 23: ...is likely to deliver significant improvements in cycling routes to key destinations, i.e. through the County CWIP '29', Cirencester Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and delivery of the Kemble-Cirencester Public Transport / Cycle links.) The CDC Local Plan, whilst it is prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational must also be deliverable in line with para 16 of the NPPF and therefore included in an update of the GCC LTP.

Comment ID: 9229

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: • Battery Storage in Rural Locations. In response to CDC Regulation 18 2024 the Council commented: MTC supports a renewable energy policy framework however please note: CC2a policy point 3 in respect of Battery Storage systems. Whilst MTC supports the policy in respect of the visual impact of battery storage systems it is the safety of such installations policy needs to include. In the absence of regulation, proposals for energy storage systems linked to the National Grid should follow National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) planning guidelines. Whilst CDC may have a policy related to Net Zero and Energy, the issue of Battery Storage in rural locations may need a more strategic approach e.g. Action to Protect Rural Scotland Report 03/12/25. Whilst the Government encourages moves towards supporting the electricity network, a strategy covering Broad Zones selected for development under scenario 5 including a unified means of location recognition, size and hazard appreciation would be useful to include in respect of Battery Storage.

- NPPF para 192 Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Cotswold Local Plan Full Review High Level Screening of Development Strategy Options is limited with no reference to the Gloucestershire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Cotswold Local Plan Review (Nov 25) para 3.91 recognises the potential to link areas together and deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) at scale. In the 2024 CDC Regulation 18 Consultation the Council responded: CC7 point 3 A BNG spatial operating strategy combined or overlaid with a spatial development strategy within the District would at least enable residents to understand how their environment is being planned and managed in support of nature recovery, wellbeing and climate emergency. A strategic appraisal of potential Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery, biodiversity, wildlife, habitat conservation or recovery in line with the NPPF would be worth undertaking to meet NPPF para 192 for Broad Zones selected for Development under scenario 5.

- Masterplan If Broad Zone 5 is accepted for development nothing short of a full masterplan of the Broad Zone will be considered as meeting a Local Plan requirement in terms of the lifetime span of the plan, Nationally Significant Infrastructure requirements and delivery of the economic, social and environmental requirements to meet the NPPF sustainability criteria. CDC need to demonstrate the Local Plan is in line with para 16 of

the NPPF, whilst it is prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational must also be deliverable. The opportunity to site significant infrastructure and development will not be realised without a Masterplan of the Broad Zone demonstrating where significant infrastructure will be situated from the outset of the plan period.

Comment ID: 9230

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

Comment: • CDC 2024 Regulation 18 Consultation included the following extract
9.1.3. Cotswold District Council recognises that, whilst GFirst's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) does not consider the District to be the key focus for economic growth in the County, it is committed to promoting growth and enhancement of the Gloucestershire economy. The competitive advantage of larger surrounding towns, such as Swindon, Cheltenham and Gloucester is recognised in the relevant Strategic Economic Plans, which identify them as key locations for growth.... The Town Council responded: Whilst the Local Planning Authority accepts the situation outlined above it should be noted that the needs of both the current and future population of Moreton reside within Gloucestershire and are equally entitled to the services provided by the County Council such as education, employment, highways and transport. Development will need to be considered in the context of both District and County Council plans. Access to Employment opportunities should not be viewed simply in the context of the District and, as an approach, it is limited and unacceptable.

In terms of the CDC Vision for 2043 whilst employment opportunities are mentioned, the objectives contain no reference to improving or raising educational standards or skills in support of the economy. The CDC Strategic Economic Priorities in the Gloucestershire Economic Strategy 2024 refer to 'community hubs, designed around health, education, culture, housing, leisure, arts, crafts and some shops.' If Broad Zones are to deliver large scale development, access to education and employment will be a vital element to delivering sustainable communities. CDC should consider revising its objectives to include specific reference to education, skills and the economy, vital to enabling a sustainable community.

Comment ID: 10124

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Myra

Comment: Locate development away from Flood prone areas

All proposed zones that have ground water run off to the Ampney Brook and feed in to Ampney St Peter Sewage works are flood prone areas. Zone 16,18,19 and Poulton. Many current residents will be forced to live in homes which are unsafe due to sewage and ground water flooding.

Transport emissions will be massively increased by the addition of such a vast number of homes in rural locations .

Country lanes are not able to cope at present. A drive from South Cerney Airfield to Ampney St Peter is hazardous at best and impassable from flooding for many days of the year. Photos can be provided.

5.3

We already have high quality green infrastructure to support well being with a fabulous network of footpaths and bridleways. Building on these sites will diminish this.

Comment ID: 10096

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Myra

Comment: It is clear that landowners in the call site were not consulted or correctly identified prior to the consultation being published, several landowners in Zone 19 have made this clear.

Comment ID: 10107

Location in consultation document: How did the Council select locations?

Name: Myra

Comment: 3.4 Zone 16, 18 and 19 will impact on the flood risk in Driffield Ampney St Peter, Ampney Crucis and properties along the A417 from Ampney Crucis to Poulton. Many of the sites already selected are in flood zones or above flood zones which will seriously impact existing homes which have already flooded or are at risk of flooding several times every year. Many of these homes are listed. Increased run off from developed land and sewage ingress will make these homes uninhabitable. These are the very houses which are of quintessentially Cotswold character. There is nowhere here for photographic evidence to be submitted, but can be provided.

3.13 Local Plan Policy EN14 requires that proposals should not increase the level of risk to the safety of occupiers of a site, the local community or the wider environment as a result of flooding.

The run off from Zone 19 Zone 18 and Zone 16 already impacted the villages of Ampney Crucis, Ampney St Peter (5 houses and and 12 under threat at least twice a year) Poulton (at least 2) and Driffield, 2, with many others under threat. This is a percentage of the tiny number of houses in each hamlet / village. All of these villages have homes which have flooded upwards from ground water, or run off from fields and sewage, in the last 25 years.

Historic Buildings : as above with listed building being flooded along the A417 in Poulton, Ampney St Peter and Ampney Crucis. I have photographic evidence of the run off the flooding and the complaints acted upon by Thames Water over a 25 year period .

There are Sites of Historic interest in Zone 16 which have not been mentioned but their very character history will be destroyed by building.

3.4 Ecology and diversity of organic farmland in Zone 19 Driffield : Ancient parkland of Harnhill Manor with exceptional flora and fauna, (greater crested Newts, barn owls, bats, little owls,) ancient oak trees, medieval ridge and furrow fields.

3.4 Historic Monuments : Zone 16 West of Poulton The impact on the site of Roman Villa in Harnhill near where a hoard of Roman coins was discovered in a lead coffin.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1021448>.

https://bgas.org.uk/tbgas_bg/v126/bg126083.pdf

3.4 Broad Area 16 West of Poulton

Ranbury Ring an historic monument Schedule monument 1003322 Historic England

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1003322>

3.4 Zone 19 Zone 16 and Zone 18 will all impact on the flooding in sewage pollution in Ampney St Peter from Sewage : It is clear from the

Ampney St Peter Drainage Strategy <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/media-library/home/about-us/regulation/drainage-reports/stage-1/ampney-st-peter-drainage-strategy-stage-1.pdf> and the Ampnet St Peter and Ampney Brook Groundwater Impacted System Manangennt Plan (page 6) that the current system is overwhelmed with ground water for long periods every year. This leads to pollution of the Ampney Brook which can be viewed on the Thames Water website and has been reported nationally <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/jan/23/thames-waters-real-time-map-raw-sewage-discharges-rivers>

Comment ID: 10112

Location in consultation document: How did the Council select locations?

Name: Myra

Comment: Such high density of housing in zone 19 would create landscape harm as the number of houses suggested in Zones 19, 16 and 18 will all destroy the character of the landscape.

Comment ID: 10120

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Myra

Comment:

There is not adequate sewage drainage in Ampney St Peter . Zone 16 18 and 19 all feed into the Ampney St Peter pumping station despite the recent upgrade to the Ampnet St Peter pumping station.

See also Ampney St Peter Drainage strategy 2015 to 2017. The implementation of this document has had minimal impact. It also states that “Urban Creep” and change of land use will have a significant impact on sewage flooding. (page 7 Q8).

Ampney St Peter and Ampney Brook Ground Water Impact System Management Plan page 6 detailing the impact of surface run off (page 7). Evidence of this ans an ongoing problem to be supplied by email and by hand. Neither of these policies of changes have improved the situation. It is clear from Thames water data that the book is still being flooded with sewage and houses are under threat. I can provide photographic and written evidence submitted to Thames Water and the Environment Agency of sewage pollution and the restricted sewage drainage / flooding of homes in Ampney St Peter.

Zones 19 to the north and 18 and 16 do not have school or shops . Building on these areas will restrict areas for walking and cycling , recreation and open space . Poulton has no mobile signal not 4 G and this is an area in the centre of proposed development.

Zone 16, 18 and 19 will impact on the flood risk in Drifffield Ampney St Peter, Ampney Crucis and properties along the A417 from Ampney Crucis to Poulton. Many of the sites already selected are in flood zones or above flood zones which will seriously impact existing homes which have already flooded or are at risk of flooding several times every year. Many of these homes are listed. Increased run off from developed land and sewage ingress will make these homes uninhabitable. These are the very houses which are of quintessentially Cotswold character. There is nowhere here for photographic evidence to be submitted, but can be provided.

Local Plan Policy EN14 requires that proposals should not increase the level of risk to the safety of occupiers of a site, the local community or the wider environment as a result of flooding.

The run off from Zone 19 Zone 18 and Zone 16 already impacted the villages of Ampney Crucis, Ampney St Peter (5 houses and and 12 under threat at least twice a year) Poulton (at least 2) and Drifffield, 2, with many others under threat. This is a percentage of the tiny number of houses in each hamlet / village. All of these villages have homes

which have flooded upwards from ground water, or run off from fields and sewage, in the last 25 years.

Comment ID: 10113

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Myra

Comment: Such high density of housing in zone 19 would create landscape harm as the number of houses suggested in Zones 19, 16 and 18 will all destroy the character of the landscape.

Comment ID: 10114

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Myra

Comment: Such high density of housing in zone 19 would create landscape harm as the number of houses suggested in Zones 19, 16 and 18 will all destroy the character of the landscape.

Comment ID: 10115

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Myra

Comment: Such high density of housing in zone 19 would create landscape harm as the number of houses suggested in Zones 19, 16 and 18 will all destroy the character of the landscape.

Comment ID: 10118

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Myra

Comment: The focus should be on creating small scale housing developments within local communities which have the infrastructure to support them, otherwise development will involve more use of cars high noise and higher pollution as well as destroying our countryside and planet. Evidence Natural England's Strategy: Recovering Nature for Growth, Health and Security

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/natural-englands-strategy-recovering-nature-for-growth-health-and-security>

Comment ID: 659

Email/Letter Representation

Name: M D Willis

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

Comment ID: 230

Email/Letter Representation

Name: M Thomas

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

Comment ID: 299

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mackenzie Miller Developments

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

Comment ID: 592

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Maggie Pocock

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

Comment ID: 210

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Malcolm Higgs

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

Comment ID: 726

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Malcolm Moseley

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

Comment ID: 607

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Malcolm Waddell

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

Comment ID: 367

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mandy Langdon

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

Comment ID: 797

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mandy Thompson

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

Comment ID: 445

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Manor Oak Homes

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

Comment ID: 393

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Marc Milligan

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

Comment ID: 321

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Marchesi Farming Limited

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

Comment ID: 405

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Marcia Turner

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

Comment ID: 467

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Margaret Sharpe

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

Comment ID: 585

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark and Anna Goodcliffe

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

Comment ID: 701

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark and Anna Goodcliffe

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

Comment ID: 136

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Bainbridge

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

Comment ID: 787

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Beken

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

Comment ID: 546

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Biddle

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

Comment ID: 147

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Gluning

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

Comment ID: 711

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Gluning

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

Comment ID: 403

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Wadland

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

Comment ID: 452

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mark Young

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

Comment ID: 222

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Marlene Broadhurst

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

Comment ID: 326

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Martin Groombridge

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

Comment ID: 149

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Martin Kingston

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

Comment ID: 346

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Martin Kirby

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

Comment ID: 697

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Martyn Adams

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

Comment ID: 510

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Martyn Dangerfield and Tracy Dangerfield

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

Comment ID: 686

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mary and Mark Meehan

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

Comment ID: 523

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matilda Jones

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

Comment ID: 700

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matilda Jones

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

Comment ID: 311

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matt Stokes

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

Comment ID: 381

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matthew Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 789

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matthew Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 139

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Matthew Jackson

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

Comment ID: 133

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Maurice and Amanda Foley

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

Comment ID: 410

Email/Letter Representation

Name: May Ritzen

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

Comment ID: 366

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mervyn Cully

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

Comment ID: 419

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mes Edwards

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

Comment ID: 703

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael and Angela Clark

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

Comment ID: 459

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael Barge

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

Comment ID: 553

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael Haines

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

Comment ID: 438

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael Reid

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

Comment ID: 502

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael Sparrow

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

Comment ID: 412

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michael Wood

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

Comment ID: 211

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michaela Wyndow

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

Comment ID: 724

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michele Wheatley

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

Comment ID: 694

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michelle Baker

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

Comment ID: 851

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Michelle Evans

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

Comment ID: 116

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Against Inappropriate Development (MAID)

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

Comment ID: 152

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 153

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 154

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 155

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 156

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 157

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mickleton Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 706

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mike and Margaret Bryan

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

Comment ID: 682

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mike Daly

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

Comment ID: 492

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mike Fielder

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

Comment ID: 511

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Mike McKeown

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

Comment ID: 304

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Miller Homes

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

Comment ID: 251

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Miranda Bromage

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

Comment ID: 324

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Moreton Wellington Ltd

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

Comment ID: 325

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Moreton Wellington Ltd

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

Comment ID: 661

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Moreton-in-Marsh Flood Action Group

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

Comment ID: 766

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Myra Bye

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