

Comment ID: 8968

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Wayne Harris

Comment: The main element of this option seems sensible but the last part about extending into areas of natural beauty which you wouldn't ordinarily provide planning permission for residential development unless forced to do so by an excessive target set by central government; Seems totally inappropriate.

Comment ID: 8969

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Wayne Harris

Comment: This would be entirely unacceptable For any significant scale of residential development and ruin the very reason that the Cotswolds are classified as an area outstanding natural beauty. I guess redundant Barnes and may be a very small hamlet not exceeding a dozen properties in a well hidden location might be

Comment ID: 8971

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Wayne Harris

Comment: These density percentage increases are just beyond reasonable and not credible let alone justifiable. an increase in density of perhaps 20% to 30% would seem just about deliverable in appropriate circumstances

Comment ID: 8972

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Wayne Harris

Comment: I would support this proposal by the council. in reality meeting the housing demand of this country and indeed within the Cotswold District Council boundary will not be delivered purely by large numbers of private owner occupier homes. The economics that drive housing development mean private developers will only build at a rate at which demand exceeds supply in order to prop up excessive costs. Some of these excessive costs have been caused by unreasonable levels of specification demand for housing making many areas of the UK unviable for development. What needs to happen is a meeting of the lower portion of demand for homes by affordable housing options, whether that be social rented, affordable rented or shared ownership homes. And given the rural nature of much of the district even retained equity by the council enabling a maximum 80% purchase of a home without any rental payment for the equity share could be appropriate for rural exception sites.

Until those in housing need can access what is currently the wealthy inadequate supply of an affordable housing product that would meet their need, they will be forced to purchase the ever in increasing the expensive private sector properties and in doing so prop up the unreasonable land values that have resulted over the last 25 years. or spend most of their life renting poor quality homes in the private rented sector.

I hope the council will endeavour to provide a much greater supply of affordable homes which I know requires central government social housing grant support rather than simply chasing the numbers of new homes required by government, The majority of which would be home ownership or private rented homes.

Comment ID: 8973

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Wayne Harris

Comment: I agree with the councils proposal for Scenario 5

Comment ID: 8970

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Wayne Harris RIBA

Comment: Increasing density within an urban fabric is a reasonable approach so long as the density is not beyond the point of being sensible and forcing development into high-rise where such a development would be inappropriate.

Comment ID: 9303

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Wessex Water

Comment: Thank you for consulting Wessex Water on the Cotswold District Council Local Plan Preferred Options. Wessex Water serve a limited area of the Cotswold District with wastewater services (principally Tetbury and surroundings).

Under the proposed development strategy, it is indicated that Tetbury will receive 50 additional dwellings (indicative additional non-strategic site allocation to 2043) with no additional strategic site allocations. The indicative strategic sites for growth post 2043 are outside of our service area. Based on this modest level of growth in the area which we serve we have no further comments on the proposed spatial strategy.

Comment ID: 9304

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Wessex Water

Comment: Our comments on the Local Plan objectives are as follows:

Objective A: Respond to the climate crisis through adaptation and mitigation

We welcome the stated objective that development should promote water efficiency. The objective could be strengthened by identifying that development should treat rainwater as a resource with a requirement for local capture, re-use and discharge back to the environment.

Objective B: Conserve and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment

The objective could be expanded by identifying the need to conserve and enhance water quality. Wessex Water are committed to progressively eliminating storm overflows. To make drainage truly sustainable, policy needs to be in place that prevents new development having any net increase in rainwater flow to existing combined sewers. Improving rainwater management through the planning process is essential to reduce flood risk and assist in eliminating storm overflow discharge.

Objective F: Ensure infrastructure and services support sustainable communities

The objective identifies the need for infrastructure to be in place to support residents and businesses. To support the achievement of this objective the Local Plan should include policy support for the delivery of water and wastewater infrastructure. We can assist with suggestions for suitably worded policy as required.

Comment ID: 10053

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Inconsistency with Local and National Planning Policy

A significant number of responses directly cite policy concerns:

- Policy DS1 of the adopted Local Plan directs development toward sustainable settlements with adequate services—not small rural villages such as Coln St Aldwyns.
- The Draft Plan departs from long-standing policy principles without settlement specific justification or proportionate evidence.
- Policy EN1, protecting built, natural and historic environments, is cited as incompatible with the proposed allocation of housing within sensitive landscapes.
- The proposals conflict with NPPF requirements for conserving National Landscapes and ensuring development is sustainable, justified, and infrastructure led.
- Multiple respondents argue that the Draft Plan fails the NPPF tests of soundness—not positively prepared, not justified, not effective, and inconsistent with national policy.

Some residents explicitly question whether the new approach to rural development proposed in the Draft Plan is lawful, given past planning decisions and the protections historically afforded to these settlements.

Comment ID: 10052

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Infrastructure Capacity and Limitations

The strongest and most frequent objection concerns the inadequacy of critical infrastructure required to support additional households. Respondents highlight multiple areas where current capacity is already at breaking point:

a. Electricity

- Coln St Aldwyns is served by ageing and constrained electricity infrastructure.
- Many households have only 8 kVA single phase connections, insufficient for modern energy demands such as heat pumps and EV charging.
- Previous attempts to upgrade individual connections have required costly, multi year negotiations and network works.
- Conservation restrictions limit solar panel installation, reducing residents' ability to mitigate supply limitations.

b. Water and Wastewater

- The sewage system frequently reaches capacity, with rainfall driven overflows into the River Coln.
- Some properties have experienced flooding due to insufficient drainage and antiquated systems.
- Respondents state that there is no evidence Thames Water can accommodate further connections without significant investment.

c. Roads and Traffic

- Main Street, Bibury Road, and other critical routes operate effectively as single track roads, heavily constrained by on-street parking and historic alignment.

- Traffic volumes have already increased significantly, with daily congestion and safety concerns for pedestrians.
- Any addition of housing is expected to add hundreds of car movements, further worsening congestion, emissions, and road safety.
- Delivery van traffic from online shopping and overflows from tourists visiting Bibury is highlighted as a major and growing hazard on narrow lanes.

d. Schools, Healthcare and Services

- Hatherop Primary School is full, with no space for expansion.
- Increased traffic at school drop off/pick up times is already dangerous.
- Healthcare access in nearby towns is strained and would deteriorate further with increased population.
- There are widespread concerns about winter maintenance, water outages, mobile coverage, and broadband, all of which fail to meet the needs of an expanded community.

Comment ID: 10056

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Traffic, Accessibility and Rural Sustainability

Respondents highlight that Coln St Aldwyns is inherently car dependent, with:

- Limited public transport (two poorly timed buses per day).
- No realistic alternative travel options to employment, shops, or services (there are virtually no full-time employment opportunities in CSA).
- Increasing delivery traffic from rural reliance on online shopping.

The combination of narrow roads, increasing volumes, and poor alternatives leads residents to conclude that additional housing is inherently unsustainable and incompatible with both local policy and national sustainability objectives.

Comment ID: 10058

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Heritage, Conservation, and Environmental Protection

Residents place exceptional value on the historic and environmental character of Coln St Aldwyns, situated within the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and including designated Conservation Areas. Across responses, there is a consistent view that:

- The settlements retain a distinctive architectural and landscape character, much of it unchanged since the 18th century.
- The rural setting depends on the presence of open paddocks, river meadows, gardens, woodland, and undeveloped gaps, all of which contribute to the villages’ identity and views.
- Development on open land would permanently alter these defining qualities, eroding the visual and functional relationship between the villages and their surrounding countryside.
- Parts of the village lie adjacent to or within flood plains, increasing the risk that new development would worsen flood vulnerability and water management issues.

Residents argue that the Draft Local Plan fails to demonstrate any exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy, to justify releasing protected or sensitive land for development. Many respondents reference decades of planning decisions that have consistently resisted expansion on the basis of protecting settlement form, landscape character, and historic setting.

Comment ID: 10059

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Social and Community Considerations

a. Dominance of Second Homes & Affordability Issues

Many respondents express concern that new homes in the area will not meet local needs, citing:

- A high proportion of second homes and Airbnbs.
- Historical trends showing that new developments in the Cotswolds tend to become high value executive housing, not affordable housing.
- The risk that further development may worsen, not improve, the social sustainability of the villages.

b. Support for Carefully Limited Affordable Housing

A small minority support modest levels of affordable or social housing, but only if:

- Infrastructure is upgraded first.
- Development is confined to sympathetic, small-scale sites.
- Design respects the Conservation Area and landscape sensitivity.

Even among supporters, large scale development is rejected.

Comment ID: 10047

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council (CSAPC) wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Throughout this consultation process, CSAPC has maintained close communication with both Hatherop Parish Council and Quenington Parish Council. CSAPC rejects CDC’s proposal to treat the three villages as a single cluster. Historically, each community supported their own amenities based on their population and needs. The scale of additional housing proposed would place local services and facilities under unsustainable pressure. CSAPC therefore requests that CDC recognise Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop, and Quenington as independent settlements when preparing the updated Local Plan.

Comment ID: 10049

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council wrote to all parish residents requesting their feedback on the draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on Scenario 5, which proposes 83 new properties within the combined “cluster” of Coln St Aldwyns, Quenington, and Hatherop. This represents a 23.6% increase in the existing housing stock across the cluster, although CDC has not provided details of potential development locations.

Most responses received were opposed to any increase in housing within Coln St Aldwyns largely due to the impacts on the character of the village and the increased pressure on already inadequate services and infrastructure.

Some respondents expressed conditional support for new housing, emphasising that it should be affordable and prioritised for individuals with existing ties to the village. Of the 86 properties in Coln St Aldwyns, over 30% are already rented, many of them owned by the local estate and offered at below-market rates. Those favouring additional homes generally supported expanding similar models. We draw CDC’s attention to GRCC’s Housing Needs Survey Report for CSA issued in July 2025. The report identified a small possible requirement for affordable properties but importantly illustrated the overwhelming need for vehicular access to obtain services such as shops, health and school.

However, all respondents—whether supportive or opposed—identified significant constraints that could make further development unviable and reduce the likelihood of positive outcomes. Comments on these constraints have been added to the relevant sections of this online consultation. CSAPC on behalf of the residents firmly believes that the issues described below must be addressed satisfactorily before the draft Local Plan can be finalised.

Comment ID: 10055

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Will Perkins on behalf of Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

Comment: Throughout this consultation process, CSAPC has maintained close communication with both Hatherop Parish Council and Quenington Parish Council. CSAPC rejects CDC's proposal to treat the three villages as a single cluster. Historically, each community supported their own amenities based on their population and needs. The scale of additional housing proposed would place local services and facilities under unsustainable pressure. CSAPC therefore requests that CDC recognise Coln St Aldwyns, Hatherop, and Quenington as independent settlements when preparing the updated Local Plan.

Comment ID: 9270

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: William

Comment: At the time of the Jan 2024 plan, no assessment that I can find was made of the serious challenges with water and waste management in the area, indeed Thames Water has consistently failed in its attempts to prevent sewage escaping from the existing works to the extent that it made front page news in the Guardian that year. It is essential that any plan properly considers the infrastructure which is woefully inadequate at the moment and will require serious investment to improve it. The root cause is, in part, flooding in the area which is frequent and widespread, especially from road run off, which will require a multi agency response.

Comment ID: 9274

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: William

Comment: The Cotswolds has woeful rural transport links already, and will need to massivley scale what's provided to stand a chance of comping with increasing density, what supporting plans are in place to cope? WHat investment in bus services is being recommended to support the housing drive?

Comment ID: 9276

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: William

Comment: I think we have to look at the existing nodes of major housing, like Cirencester, as the obvious places to expand, because they have the preponderance of connections and services, and this in turn means building higher / closer as the town develops. Building on tiny rural villages makes very little sense and will create orphan developments

Comment ID: 9277

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: William

Comment: There is a serious challenge to these plans on three fronts

1. Water and flood handling which appears to have been entirely ignored but is critical to successful delivery of new housing, and for the protection of existing housing

2. Public Transport - there's a lot of chat about Greener options than driving etc but there appears to be no provision or consideration of the massive up tick in public transport that would be required to make Scenario 5 work; it is worth noting this would be significantly more expensive over a longer period of time in rural villages than in existing towns/larger villages like Kemble.

3. Roads - the roads in the CDC area are universally poor anyway, but these tiny country roads which are now supposed to be taking thousands of new homes will need radical upgrades, and require a multi-agency response. As cars will have to be the main means by which families moving to the area move, and as we move to EVs universally, the roads are going to get pounded by thousands of new, heavier cars and simply won't be able to cope

Comment ID: 9278

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: William

Comment: Flood managment needs to be a part of this or you're going to have serious problems

Comment ID: 9273

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: William

Comment: The fundamental problem with Scenario 5 is that it involves building on, for example, fields around Driffield, at a density which on paper appears to make sense, but on the ground does not. Building 2,100 homes West of Driffield would mean building right next the dual carriageway, on tiny country lanes not suited to taking the traffic, with no amenities locally except by car, and forcing anyone on foot to go across the dual carriageway itself or walk miles to get to the nearest bridge. These small villages, like, for example, Ampney St Peter, already have a plethora of problems with flooding in particular, and are only protected by the field systems, if you don't put in *huge* investment to cope with water management you'll flood the houses there. It does not appear to me that the assessors have properly considered the options when it comes to these existing villages.

Comment ID: 9275

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: William

Comment: Please outline in detail the plans for handling water management, with approximate costs and proposed mitigation for flooding of existing settlements in the Ampney St Peter / Ampney Crucis area

Comment ID: 11114

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: William Davis

Comment: It's frustrating that this consultation could not have been held at a less busy time of year - the festive season is always chocabloc full of things in the diary and very little time for additional things, even if they are as important as this.

Comment ID: 11103

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: William Davis

Comment: It seems there a conflict between "green to the core" and the perception of protecting historic and natural landscape. The Cotswolds, especially the High Wold area, are one of the windiest places in the country and most homes could supply a significant amount of the energy they need by using small wind turbines. However, the rules of an AONB mean that planning permission is needed. The council should consider if wind turbines below a certain size could be installed under permitted development, removing the restriction currently in places for AONBs.

Comment ID: 11104

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: William Davis

Comment: Consider opportunities for making small rural brownfield sites suitable locations for startup hubs. These could be attractive for businesses working in agri-tech, but also many other technical fields where it is not necessary to be based in a town or city.

Comment ID: 11082

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: William Davis

Comment: Please don't be afraid of increasing housing density, e.g. by multi-family dwellings. Whilst I wish for everyone to be able to have their own private outdoor green space, if a development does not provide for this then there is little lost by building higher and having maisonettes or small apartment blocks. This can also increase energy efficiency, especially increasing the opportunities for using things like district heating.

Comment ID: 11105

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: William Davis

Comment: Consider opportunities for district heating and community energy systems for new developments.

Comment ID: 11087

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: William Davis

Comment: Scenario 7, because it seems to be the one which provides most additional housing in the countryside so that small communities can be sustained by providing opportunities for younger people and families to move into them and therefore make them more sustainable. Families are needed in many parts of the district to ensure sufficient children to keep rural schools viable.

Comment ID: 11092

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: William Davis

Comment: Yes, because rural communities have lots of small brownfield sites upon which many dwellings could be built. Yes, they presently lack infrastructure, but so do many of the large greenfield sites which are considered sustainable. Increasing rural population will also help regenerate rural communities by providing more incentive for rural businesses to continue to serve them, and for new ones to pop up as well, not only service industries but others as well.

Comment ID: 11095

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: William Davis

Comment: I don't really support increasing density, because it's sad that gardens keep getting smaller and smaller with newer houses. However, if a house has no garden at all, or only one large enough to store all the bins, then why not just turn it into a low-rise apartment block by adding another floor or two and increasing density and energy efficiency that way. It also provides opportunities for things like district heating which can be more efficient than heating-per-home.

Comment ID: 11100

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: William Davis

Comment: Where we live - Birdlip parish - we are so close to the areas covered by Stroud, Gloucester, Tewkesbury and Cheltenham that it seems short-sighted to consider a housing development plan in the context only of the Cotswold district. However, considering that the council needs to demonstrate 5Y supply urgently, yes I consider the proposed level of development to be sustainable, as well as very cautious and not very considerate of the long-term viability of small rural settlements which the council currently considers to be unsuitable for sustainable development.

Comment ID: 11102

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: William Davis

Comment: The proposed plan provides very little detail about development in our area, in the Ermin area, so it's not possible to provide an answer.

Comment ID: 11110

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: William Davis

Comment: The long-term vitality of rural communities is not addressed in this plan. When a village's school closes it's usually the end of any chance for revitalisation of that village, any remaining services will all generally close. Many schools in rural areas have spaces available, and some are at high risk of closing. This is primarily because of a skewed demographic in their local area, with insufficient housing available for families with young children to attend these schools. The AONB should not be there only to serve people who visit it for leisure, but to equally provide a home, community and livelihood for people who live within it. The council should make dedicated and clear provisions within it for building 2-4 bedroom houses in any village which has had a population decline or has a school which is expected to remain under-subscribed.

Comment ID: 11111

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: William Davis

Comment: Make it clear that these aspirations apply to all communities of all sizes regardless of where they are in the district. Small rural communities should not be excluded from development just because they currently lack infrastructure - the vision should include providing the required infrastructure.

Comment ID: 11076

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: William Davis

Comment: It seems that an important scenario has been missed, but perhaps the descriptions of the scenarios are not clear and what I propose has been included. What about Scenario 7, but without the unsustainable elements? It seems that we need to maximise development which is sustainable, which means including all elements of scenarios 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, plus anything else which is considered suitable?

Comment ID: 10765

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: William Garner

Comment: I wish to register a strong objection to the draft Local Plan proposals affecting Broadwell village. The requirement for at least 17 new dwellings, together with the encouragement of further development sites around the village, represents a disproportionate and unjustified level of growth for a settlement of Broadwell's size and character. Broadwell has already delivered a notable amount of new housing over the past decade. The Local Plan's apparent reliance on this previous delivery as a reason to impose a higher ongoing housing requirement — described as "windfall" development — is fundamentally unsound. Past development should not be used to justify accelerated future growth. This approach unfairly penalises villages that have already contributed to housing supply while allowing others to avoid comparable levels of development. Further expansion would cause material harm to the character and setting of the village, which is historic, rural, and inherently constrained. The scale of development proposed is not compatible with the existing settlement pattern and would erode the distinct identity of Broadwell. There are also clear and unresolved concerns regarding access, traffic generation, and highway safety. Local roads are narrow and unsuitable for significant additional traffic, and the plan does not demonstrate how these impacts would be mitigated. Given that a large proportion of the district is designated National Landscape, it is especially concerning that the Local Plan does not adequately reflect environmental and landscape constraints when allocating growth to villages such as Broadwell. For these reasons, I object to the proposed housing requirement for Broadwell and urge the Council to reconsider both the scale of development and the methodology used to distribute housing across the district.

Comment ID: 8738

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: William Lowbridge

Comment: 1. Driffield is approached from both directions via narrow lanes which hardly cope with the volume of traffic currently using them especially as they are often used as a cut through for vehicles, both private and commercial, avoiding going into Cirencester. The current volume of traffic results in constant break up of the edges of the surfaces and verges causing both damage to tyres and wheels and requiring frequent repair of the surfaces and verges. The likelihood of increased disturbance in Driffield and the potential for accidents on the lanes approaching it will increase in the proposed development were to proceed.

2. The lanes and adjacent fields frequently flood after rain and on occasion are closed to traffic. Inevitably additional housing on the scale proposed will lead to increased rain water run off and higher traffic volumes which will exacerbate the current issues of flooding along these single track lanes. There is a flood plain to the east of Driffield.

3. The concrete sections of the A419 already result in significant traffic noise pollution in Driffield and the creation of the proposed new huge settlement will result in an increase in traffic volumes on these concrete sections which will add to this.

Comment ID: 10354

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: William Underhill

Comment: I have read the response to the consultation submitted by the Siddington Parish Council and agree with their comments.

The proposals pay no heed to the importance of maintaining the existing community in Siddington village but instead propose development that will destroy that community. The proposals have no regard for existing planning policies which are important to the community in Siddington, such as preserving the gap between Siddington village and Cirencester. Siddington is not, and does not want to be part of Cirencester and there is no scope for sustainable strategic development around the village.

The evidence base for the options presented and the preferred option is poor. The assessment that Siddington is a Principal settlement is wrong and based on basic errors in understanding statistical information. This undermines the whole of the assessment and renders the conclusions reached wholly invalid. It appears from the assessment of broad locations that CDC wanted the areas around Siddington to be assessed as an urban extension of Cirencester but this was found not to be valid. The obvious urban extension of Cirencester would be further expansion of the Steadings development but this has been given inadequate consideration.

CDC has not given proper consideration to alternative approaches.

The sites around Siddington where strategic development is suggested are not suitable and would not lead to sustainable development.

The consultation period is too short, given the significance of the proposals and cannot be justified on the basis of the time required to deal with comments and prepare the Local Plan for reg 19 consultation. This has imposed unreasonable demands on members of the community seeking to respond.

Comment ID: 755

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Waldon

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

Comment ID: 319

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Wavendon Land Limited

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

Comment ID: 784

Email/Letter Representation

Name: WB Hutton

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

Comment ID: 174

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Wendy Cornell

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

Comment ID: 779

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Wendy Jennings

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

Comment ID: 202

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Weston sub Edge Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 169

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Willersey Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 247

Email/Letter Representation

Name: William Armitage

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

Comment ID: 615

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Wiltshire Council

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