

Comment ID: 8701

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: R J P

Comment: Did you meet / will reach your housing targets for the 2011 - 2031 for affordable housing, if not why not. And what is the target for this consultation

Comment ID: 8703

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: R J P

Comment: If the transport currently supplied is only 'reasonable' how do you intend to improve the services to cater for all the additional demand that these housing targets will require.

Comment ID: 8702

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: R J P

Comment: What is the planning for these developments relating to:

Hospital requirements / availability.

Doctors surgeries and relevant supports for these locations;

Transport infrastructure for additional locations.

Water and effluent discharges.

Comment ID: 10685

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Rachael Mundy

Comment: I object to the proposed allocation of 1870 homes for Fairford.

Reasons: The sewage system in Fairford is already at capacity. Thames Water data shows hours of sewage spills in since 2023. Adding additional homes will worsen this problem. The proposed growth is disproportionate compared to similar towns.

Change requested: I ask that the housing allocation for Fairford be reduced significantly, and that sewage infrastructure upgrades be completed before any development proceeds.

Comment ID: 9767

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rachel Edgington

Comment: Q1 - Agree with Scenario 5, an independent assessor would see this as reasonable. Also indicates, that the required housing stock is not readily achievable in the Cotswold Natural Landscape. If a sensible option is not put forward, others higher up (eg Government) will start to impose their requirements to meet the National Housing requirements.

Comment ID: 9773

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rachel Edgington

Comment: Q2 - No! There are other means before doing unsustainable development. Need to fully understand the stock of empty housing that can be brought back into use, a clear indication from other adjacent DCs if their housing submissions can benefit Cotswold DC (there is nothing in the document on this subject). Fully understand and influence the Government on the use of secondary homes and holiday homes in Natural Landscapes and National Parks to bring them back into primary use/ownership so to stop building more houses. To influence the Government (again in Natural Landscapes & National Parks) to have covenants on any new build housing so that it can not be used for second homes or holiday lets. Understand for all villages where there may be some small in-fill, a plot of say 10 houses etc; again this is missing from the document. Even the places as Proposed Non Principal Settlements (from walking in the Cotswolds) seem to have more 'windfall' sites than indicated, Cotswold DC need to have a much better look if small developments of 5-10 houses are feasible.

Comment ID: 9779

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rachel Edgington

Comment: Q3 - this may need to be considered as an option if nothing else is feasible, response to Q2 (and there may be other suggestions) also gives some suggestions as feasibility to reduce density. To understand what housing density is needed, it may come down to what stock is missing and in short supply in the area. (No info given on this). One example - many people retire to the Cotswolds, they may be OK in their 3 bed homes in early retirement but may be looking for a smaller property (no stairs, small garden) as they get older; these seem in very short supply and not everyone wants to live in a retirement property (with high management fees and properties being difficult to sell). If high density, it all come down to the aesthetics of the Cotswolds and ensuring it is what people want to buy.

Comment ID: 9786

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Rachel Edgington

Comment: Q4. No! Answering specifically for Moreton in Marsh (MiM) and the developments off the Fosse Way (Stow, Longborough, Broadwell and Bourton on the Hill). The road infrastructure (ie the Fosse way) is already suffering major traffic queues (summers, weekend and Bank Holidays) especially in MiM and Stow. Turning onto the Fosse from the villages can be horrible at times. Also concerned that increased housing in MiM, will put more traffic through Bourton on the Hill (with it narrow spot on the A44) causing problem. To be completely strategic, infrastructure is key to any large housing developments. It is time to start looking at a bypass for Moreton and Stow, probably on the East side and ensuring that the traffic on the A44 into MIM from Evesham is diverted onto the Stow road (road signs indicate this is the HGV route for Oxford but everyone ignores it). A bypass always releases land for housing (see Wellesbourne in Warwickshire) which could mean more houses allocated in Stow. I wonder how much your shown housing developments would change if a bypass was shown! (and be more acceptable). The sewage works needs complete replacement (and moving). There is inadequate parking at the station and in the town for anyone wanting to shop in Moreton when tourists are also present. Time for the secondary school too! Another small supermarket serving the new build so they have something close and not driving into MIM. All these should be in place before any more housing commences. On reading the document, MiM is becoming the Northern hub of Cotswold DC (Cirencester being the South hub). In summary, I am not against the development of MiM (I know many are), I realise it has the train connections, outside the Cotswold Natural Landscape and if the residents aren't careful, the developments will be imposed on the town. So my view is to ask for what you want (ie be in the driving seat) to allow for the developments to go ahead. Development in MiM needs real vision and a big strategic plan.

Comment ID: 9791

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rachel Edgington

Comment: Very surprised that in the Local Plan, no mention as been made of any new industrial areas. With increased houses, more people need more employment. It would be irresponsible to build houses where there are no jobs (unless a long commute , over 30 mins). Recognising that MiM is becoming much larger are there any sites available for industry? What is the long term future of the Fire Training College at MIM - is that going to be there in 20 years - site for industry? As previously mentioned, no indication of working with adjacent DCs. In my view thus is with West Oxfordshire and Kingham station, next door to Bledington - I'm surprised not more housing is proposed for Bledington with its rail links. Finally, no mention of the other key infrastructure in the North of the County, the railway. New station at Chipping Campden with parking/bike connection?

Comment ID: 10766

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: Scenario 5 seems the only way the council can try to meet the government targets but they need to be very careful not to overdevelop and ruin our existing developments. If an appropriate site can be found to create new settlements with their own infrastructure, services and employment this seems the boldest and best way forwards. I appreciate it will take time but seems the most sustainable way of creating new homes without being detrimental to what we already have. The numbers are too high just to add onto what we already have.

Comment ID: 10767

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: No, they need to stick to their development principals otherwise the design control will be lost.

Comment ID: 10770

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: I think within large scale housing developments there is potential to increase density with flats - perhaps within the centre of them. Or within industrial sites where the scale of buildings are larger.

Comment ID: 10774

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: No, I don't think it is sustainable you need to be bold and create new settlements rather than adding to existing settlements which have never been planned to be extended so far. For instance take Moreton in Marsh - I cannot see how the 2043 houses could be added let alone another 2000 after that?

Comment ID: 10779

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: Tourism is very important to the Cotswolds, this needs to be considered.

Comment ID: 10783

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: Yes I agree with most of the vision and objectives however I struggle to see how they can be met given the huge number of houses which are required. With regards to 'Require all new development to be zero-carbon and climate-resilient.' this seems like a perfect objective on paper but will developers and funder afford to build developments which are truly carbon zero - will it stack up financially for them? Are their pockets deep enough to invest?

Comment ID: 10771

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: Doubling the size of Moreton in Marsh is just ridiculous. Yes we have a train station but without diverting traffic from all directions by two bi-passes the town would be terrible to go to and from. There isn't sufficient employment opportunities or schools for people to be truly sustainable and live, work and school children locally.

Comment ID: 10772

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Rachel Hartwell

Comment: Why has Stow on the Wold got so little new housing assigned to it?

Comment ID: 9266

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Rachel Price

Comment: I'm horrified by this and completely forgot object. My family moved here to our forever home a couple of years ago. We wanted to live in a small village. The expansion is just ridiculous. It will no longer be the place we chose to live and worked all our lives for.

Comment ID: 9530

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: Scenario 3 would make more sense as the main centres already have a range of services, public transport and job opportunities. Surely this is more economical than attempting to provide these when development is scattered through the villages.

Comment ID: 9531

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: No, new houses should be in areas where facilities are available.

Comment ID: 9533

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: Scenario 3 makes more sense. The main centres already have services, public transport and job opportunities. Surely this is more economical than trying to provide these when new homes are scattered around the villages.

Comment ID: 9535

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: No. building houses where there are no services or transport will increase traffic. The countryside needs affordable houses and the infrastructure to go with them. Children should be able to walk to school!

Comment ID: 9536

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: Maybe three storey houses with small gardens, or small blocks of flats (no more than 4 stories) with access to gardens , but these would only work in an urban setting, not in the villages.

Comment ID: 9537

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Rachel Ranger

Comment: Poulton , if more houses were to be built here, would need some issues addressing to lessen the impact.

1. Sewage issues
2. Flooding
3. Traffic management (there have been 2 crashes outside our house in 6 months)
4. public transport.

Comment ID: 10064

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Raymond Shaw

Comment: 1) Concerning FAIRFORD - has the restrictions on the A417 at the bottom of the market place at London Street been considered. There is often road rage at that junction and we have also heard of physical abuse against drivers. The narrow road is no longer fit for purpose because of the amount of traffic that passes through Fairford at present. Considering the large amount of cars that will be introduced to Fairford via the doubling of the number of houses planned, that junction priorities has to be changed.

2) the sewerage system for the East Side of Fairford often fails in periods of heavy rain fall. Is there additional sewerage facilities planned for this side of Fairford considering the increase in population that is planned for Fairford.

3) Is additional public services belong planned for Fairford? The Doctor's surgery is totally overwhelmed at the moment. What plans are there for increasing Doctor's surgeries. Also Dentist provision and education services - at all levels of education in the local schools

4) Public transport is sadly lacking in this area. If this was included in the plan, it would reduce the amount of traffic on the A417.

Comment ID: 9908

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: I strongly support Scenario 3, which focuses development on Main Service Centres that already provide: - a broad range of services and facilities; - good transport accessibility; - employment opportunities; - and the scale necessary to support new infrastructure.

This approach would help preserve the rural and village nature of settlements such as Siddington and prevent their coalescence with larger towns. Siddington should retain a defined development boundary and its separation from Cirencester, in line with:

- the Siddington Neighbourhood Development Plan;
- the Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan; and
- the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan, which recognises the need to protect the individual identities of neighbouring settlements and avoid urban sprawl.

Without this protection, Siddington risks becoming a suburb of Cirencester, losing the very characteristics that define it as a distinct rural village.

Comment ID: 9914

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: I strongly support Scenario 3, which focuses development on Main Service Centres that already provide: - a broad range of services and facilities; - good transport accessibility; - employment opportunities; - and the scale necessary to support new infrastructure.

This approach would help preserve the rural and village nature of settlements such as Siddington and prevent their coalescence with larger towns. Siddington should retain a defined development boundary and its separation from Cirencester, in line with:

- the Siddington Neighbourhood Development Plan;
- the Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan; and
- the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan, which recognises the need to protect the individual identities of neighbouring settlements and avoid urban sprawl.

Without this protection, Siddington risks becoming a suburb of Cirencester, losing the very characteristics that define it as a distinct rural village.

Comment ID: 9915

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: Yes. Due to the fact that much of the Cotswolds is in an AONB, there is an unfair development pressure on the remainder of the area. Many settlements outside the AONB area also have special rural and village characteristics which are important to preserve. Often their settings are often in beautiful countryside. The term 'sustainable' was defined in 1997 before the internet was widely used and before working from home, supermarket deliveries, online shopping generally and electric cars. It could be argued that many AONB settlements are in fact now sustainable in reality if not by definition.

Comment ID: 9916

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: Object to increased housing density, as it is paramount that families have sufficient space within their boundaries. Having safe and suitably sized areas of outside space per property is not only necessary for leisure and social purposes, but also increases personal pride and responsibility of their property, garden and neighbours' outdoor spaces.

It has been seen too often, that the increased density results in overuse of the communal areas by a small subset of residents (or locals) and deters others from feeling able to use the space. It also increases litter, damage, lack of care and personal property being left (e.g. scooters, bike parts, chairs, etc.), thus increasing it and the surrounding area's undesirability.

Appreciating, where retirement properties are required, a higher housing density to the area is suitable due to their increased mobility limitations. However, communal areas must be available, with small private outside spaces per property with access to ground floor living also should be mandatory.

Comment ID: 9918

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: This seems unlikely unless a huge amount is invested into the existing infrastructure.

Specifically around Siddington the issues of quadrupling the number of properties will require significant infrastructure changes, that based on conversations with the Council will not be granted as the housing development volumes wouldn't meet the thresholds.

The key infrastructure requirements would be:

- improved transportation networks - currently a single road through the centre of the village that only allows a single lane of traffic at the north of the village approaching Cirencester by the post office. In addition, the roads surrounding the village are too far from the village itself to be regularly usable given the detour required.
- school - the primary school within Siddington will need to be extended. The secondary schools in Cirencester would not be able to take the additional capacity, thus a third would be required.
- healthcare - local GP surgeries are already at capacity and therefore addition ones would be required. The Cirencester hospital would need to have greater facilities, as currently different sections are being closed down. There are no major hospitals in the Cotswold District and therefore agreement would be needed by neighbouring hospitals for further expansion and investment at Swindon, Gloucester Royal and Cheltenham without significant increase in service offerings to Cirencester given two thirds of the development is planned for in and around Cirencester.
- utilities - drainage, gas, electricity and mobile signal would need to be increased. All of which are at their limits, with no mobile signal in over half of the village currently.
- flood protection - Siddington has a large flood risk from the River Churn, which has been significantly increased with a relatively small retirement development built in comparison to the proposed Preston and Siddington development proposals.

Comment ID: 9920

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: The specific needs of the rural economy should also be addressed when considering new large development sites. This could include housing for agricultural and rural workers and also support for farm diversification.

Current rurality of villages, such as Siddington, would be lost with the proposed developments. This is an important factor for many locals of Siddington. In addition, all the currently available equestrian activities for the local stables would be limited. At present, many horses pass through the village which is such a wonderful and calming thing to see. With the proposed expansion, this would not be possible, as it would become unsafe for those riding, and the horses themselves, and/or the increase to congestion in the village would make it unsustainable.

Comment ID: 9922

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Rebecca Bury

Comment: Yes, I agree that the plans are trying to make the best use of space and infrastructure. However, given the restrictions around the AOND it should be seriously considered whether areas outside these few very small and concentrated areas could be utilised across the Cotswold District Council. Small expansions of multiple areas would be a much better use and minimise the strain on resources and infrastructure. This is particularly the case, as highlight in the Siddington Village Hall meeting, where it was suggested that even the significant increase in housing would not likely result in proper enhancements and increase to the current infrastructure. Therefore, this would be very detrimental to the immediate and surrounding areas currently proposed for extensive expansion.

Comment ID: 9373

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Reyn Hauff

Comment: I believe NONE supports the aim of the Local Plan to be sustainable and green. They all seem to undermine what is the essential “ Cotswolds “. They seem to take little account of policies that have been central to Neighbourhood Plans across the district.

Scenario 5 destroys a number of small villages converting them to suburbs of larger neighbouring towns. After that the rural and community aspects of those villages - so so important to the residents and visitors alike - will be gone.

I have already written to CDC about my opposition to my village, Siddington, being treated as a Principal Settlement. If one looks properly at the data apparently supporting that treatment it is clear that Siddington cannot be so treated.

Scenario 5 is a goer only if sites are in a place where genuine infrastructure exists and it DOESN'T at Siddington.

There are 339 dwellings at present and to increase that to 1100 is wholly disproportionate destructive of the place and certainly wouldn't be a sustainable development step.

The Scenario is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations.

Comment ID: 9375

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Reyn Hauff

Comment: To adopt a Plan that provides for development locations that are not sustainable is wholly inconsistent with the NPPF and is contrary to what has been promoted in previous CDC Local Plans. This volte face would only be proper in the face of a national emergency. Central Gov decision to increase its housing requirement is not such a situation.

Siddington is being identified for PS treatment because it's outside the National Landscape NOT because it would be a sustainable step. Siddington lacks services and facilities that would be required. Unsustainable locations should never be used to meet a numbers game or to satisfy a political whim.

Comment ID: 9376

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Reyn Hauff

Comment: To reply y to this question in relation to Siddington I'd say that significantly increasing housing density here would destroy the rural village character of the place.

Comment ID: 9377

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Reyn Hauff

Comment: Of course not. In my view there's no sensible prospect of significant development in Siddington being sustainable. The village should never be treated as a Principal Settlement. The villagers depend on most services in Cirencester and I can't see that changing. There is no justification for Siddington to face development that will - not may or might- destroy its identity.

Comment ID: 9379

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Reyn Hauff

Comment: The vision is OK but in terms of my village, Siddington, the consultation doc will not deliver because inter alia

- * the village community will be destroyed

- * our landscape heritage and character are disrespected

- * if developed as suggested the enlarged place won't mature into a thriving community it'll be a series of housing estates where people live - and just that.

- * it will likely see our available green space reduced.

Comment ID: 10181

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Richard

Comment: In regards to the proposed new development near Driffield I have major concern about flooding impact locally. I live in Harnhill and the flash flooding we get in particular along the road between Harnhill to Driffield is extreme at the moment and I feel any change could have serious effects.

My other concern is the impact on the small local roads which can be challenging at times and I can not see coping with major new developments. A particular problem is the bridge on Tank lane crossing over the A419/417 which I can not imagine was sized with the potential new volume in mind?

Comment ID: 10769

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Richard Busby

Comment: I live in the village of Down Ampney and your proposal to build an additional 420 home in the village represents a tripling of the village size. This proposal has been selected WITHOUT ANY INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING and if adopted, this Scenario would;

1. Mean an increase of circa 960 residents, with no local facilities apart from a small village shop.
2. The possibly 180+ children and an already oversubscribed primary school.
3. Result in the likelihood of 600+ additional cars on already inadequate and poorly maintained local roads, exacerbated by Inadequate public transport.
4. Overload a totally inadequate sewage system, cannot cope with the current housing density, resulting in the discharge of untreated sewage into local rivers.
5. The village suffering from more extensive surface water flooding, already exacerbated by current housing developments.
6. Result in residents having to cope with X number of years disruption due to construction traffic. The current developments have caused serious disruption and road damage.

In addition to the above observations, allocating an ad-hoc number of proposed dwellings without any indication of where the proposed developments would take place smacks of a total lack of planned and sustainable development. In addition, at a time when the country is having to import excessive amounts of agricultural produce, the like loss of prime farming land is totally unacceptable.

Comment ID: 10784

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Richard Busby

Comment: Option 6, as it spreads and shares the pain of the required number of developments. There is no bar on the development of additional small developments in the Cotswold National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10786

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Richard Busby

Comment: Yes, there is no bar on the option of building small developments in the Cotswold National landscape. CDCs selection of Scenario 5 places an unfair burden on settlements outside of this area.

Comment ID: 10788

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Richard Busby

Comment: Smaller houses and flats would provide an option for both ends of the housing ladder i.e., those just starting out (single, couples and those down sizing. I wouldn't support the development of high rise flats.

Comment ID: 10791

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

Name: Richard Busby

Comment: The fact that you are suggesting a tripling in size of the village of Down Ampney i.e. an additional 420 houses, would indicate that you have failed to undertake a strategic assessment prior to this decision.

Down Ampney suffers from an inadequate sewage system, which results in the discharge of raw sewage into local rivers. Local flooding, exacerbated by recent and ongoing housing developments. A lack of public transport. Inadequate public transport. An already over-subscribed primary school and inadequate and poorly maintained roads.

Comment ID: 10100

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Richard Deeley

Comment: None of the scenarios supports the aim of the Local Plan to be sustainable and green to the core.

Of the scenarios provided, and if I had to pick one rather than none, then I would support Scenario 3 Main Service Centres over the others.

Given the large area of the Cotswold National Landscape I would argue that if that is to be protected then the CDC target should be reduced to reflect that. If the target, or a target that is still close to that proposed then unfortunately I believe that more development is required through the Cotswold National Landscape to achieve this and that its protections should be reduced. This would be a better outcome for all than continuing to protect the CNL, but completely destroy other areas nearby but outside the CNL just because the CNL needs protection.

Comment ID: 10102

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Richard Deeley

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.

In particular Siddington and some other areas are being targeted because they lie outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable.

In relation to Siddington 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: 10105

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Richard Deeley

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

This proposal of increasing housing density so is to "save" more countryside. I am against this for the following reasons. You need to consider that houses need to be lived in, with appropriate space within them and between them and to accommodate other services that are required such as roads, parks, amenities and communal facilities.. If you are going to build them then they need to have a sufficient land footprint for them to be built on. In my opinion it would be far better to build on 100 acres with a lower suitable and sustainable housing density than squeeze them all into 50 acres and double the housing density, making the housing much less suitable to be lived in, but save a nearby 50 acres from development. If houses are to be built they need to be built properly and serve the need of the residents who live in them.

Comment ID: 10108

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Richard Deeley

Comment: No I do not think the proposed level of development within Scenario 5 is sustainable.

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.

This would require a complete redesign of roads around Siddington including demolition of current properties. Regarding flooding not only would the new houses be prone to flooding if on or near the currently identified floodplains but houses that already exist would be at a higher risk of flooding due to surface water run off and reduction in current nearby countryside (now built on) to absorb and let out slowly rainfall. In relation to the Siddington proposal this would affect current properties in Siddington and nearby areas.

Comment ID: 10110

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Richard Deeley

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider or consider more fully the following:

- The incorrect Principal Settlement classification for Siddington
- The protection of village identity and cohesion for Siddington and other villages where development is proposed.
- Flood resilience. The documents refer to areas that flood, but do not state that development near areas deemed a flood risk increases the flood risk in those areas as well as those being developed. Also it needs to take account of already developed areas and the effect on them of increased flood risk and flooding of permitting nearby development.
- Rural infrastructure limits
- The importance of the green buffer between Siddington and Cirencester.

Comment ID: 10116

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Richard Deeley

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:

- Will increase flood risk and actual flooding of new and current housing.
- 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 and will require the current facilities to somehow absorb the requirements of the additional population.
- 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: 10663

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Richard Grant (Commenting on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Ltd)

Comment: Paragraph 6.5 requests updates from landowners and agents who have previously submitted sites to the Call for Sites to reconfirm the availability of their sites, and to provide any further relevant updates regarding the delivery or progress of those sites.

Blue Cedar Homes Ltd are promoting the Land at Field Close, Willersey for residential development and have previously submitted the site to the Call for Sites. We can confirm that the site is available for residential development, and is currently subject to a planning application with the reference 25/02983/OUT - Folly View, Broadway Road, Willersey.

Comment ID: 10660

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Richard Grant (Commenting on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Ltd)

Comment: It is noted that at Willersey, a total of 102 additional new homes are suggested will be provided on "Indicative additional non-strategic site allocations to 2043".

There is no indication of which sites make up this figure and so it is not possible to test whether the figure represents the true capacity of Willersey. We would note that the Land at Field Close, Willersey is currently subject to a planning application for residential development and was previously submitted to the Call for Sites. The site represents a sustainable location for development at Willersey and is well located to benefit from links to Evesham and Broadway. We would therefore urge the Council to include the site as an allocation in the Local Plan.

Comment ID: 10654

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Richard Grant (Commenting on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Ltd)

Comment: It is noted that Willersey is included in Table 2 as a Proposed Non-Principal Settlement. In the adopted Local Plan, Willersey was assessed as a Principal Settlement. Although the logic for the change is set out in evidence, we would note that Willersey has a reasonable range of facilities within the village, and also benefits from proximity to both Broadway (less than 2 miles) and Evesham (6 miles) - both of which have a far greater range of facilities including a railway station at Evesham, and can be accessed by bus. These settlements are in Worcestershire, and so the benefits of Willersey being located so close to them does not appear to have been assessed in the Settlement Role and Function Study.

We consider that the proximity of Willersey to Broadway and Evesham means that current and future residents will have access to a much greater range of facilities than in other locations in Cotswold District. We would therefore suggest that Willersey should be reinstated as a Principal Settlement.

It should also be recognised that modest growth at Willersey would mean that village facilities would be supported by additional residents, which may lead to improved facilities in the village, for example the potential for a village shop to reopen.

Comment ID: 10634

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Richard Grant (Commenting on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes Ltd)

Comment: It is noted that the Council's position is that no Scenarios set out a position where sufficient land for new homes can be identified to meet the Local Housing Need calculated using the Standard Methodology.

It is unclear what sites are included in the assessment of each Scenario and therefore not possible to test how robust the conclusions of the assessment may be. It is noted that Scenarios 6 and 7 are discounted because they involve the identification of sites considered to be unsustainable, but without knowing the sites which have been assessed it is not possible to ascertain whether some of the the discounted sites could be determined to be acceptable in the light of the need to meet the Local Housing Need figure. We would therefore urge the Council to publish the sites that make up the housing supply figures that are given for each of the seven Scenarios.

Given that the Council is suggesting that it will need to ask neighbouring authorities to accommodate some of its Local Housing Need, this information will be crucial in order to make this case. It is also noted that several neighbouring authorities are at a more advanced plan making stage than Cotswold (eg Wiltshire whose Local Plan is at Examination, and South Gloucestershire whose Local Plan is submitted). Others such as West Oxfordshire, and the Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester SLP are at equivalent stages where potential site allocations and a land supply are being set out. There seem to be limited opportunities available for neighbouring authorities to assist.

We are therefore concerned that the approach to housing need and land supply in the Preferred Option Local Plan will fail to meet housing need in Cotswold, and urge the Council to look again at options to meet the full housing need of 18,650 homes within the district.

Comment ID: 10223

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Richard Gunner, Ciren Community Railway

Comment: A- We note that a recent government announcement in the House of Commons has indicated their intention to limit the number of parking spaces which developers are permitted to include in residential developments.

While it is some way from becoming law, if it does, this limitation will reduce the attractiveness of the dwellings unless acceptable alternative transportation is provided. However, such a limitation, coupled with the establishment of a Very Light Railway service, fits neatly to support the district's Green-to-the-Core philosophy.

B- In terms of the relative cost of the VLR project, we note that a report for GCC in 2015 predicted that relatively minor improvements to the accessibility of Kemble Station could boost the local economy by £28m every year, which coupled with the increase in the developers' profits, easily justifies such investment.

Comment ID: 8936

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: We prefer Option 5. The climate crisis continues to gain momentum and all development plans should aim, as far as possible, to minimise fossil fuel motorised travel and pollution, encouraging modal shift away from the reliance on private vehicles. We agree with the CDC that Option 5 promotes the best opportunity to provide essential services and employment near to existing centres of population, and make the best use of the public transport network such as railways, particularly with regard to recent planning proposals to encourage development in close proximity to railway stations such as at Kemble and Moreton in Marsh.

However, some of the advantages of option 4 also provide benefits of great value in this respect, and we feel that more emphasis should be placed on public transport focal points within option 5.

On 18 November 2025 the Government published a statement that ‘Housebuilding around train stations will be given default “yes”’ (<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/housebuilding-around-train-stations-will-be-given-default-yes>). This includes tram stations, and so applies to Very Light Rail halts.

Integrating and expanding regular, reliable net zero public transport infrastructure is absolutely crucial to meeting the Green to the Core objectives, because it is these services which make such an enormous expansion feasible and sustainable. It should be noted that electric cars still generate a large carbon footprint and particulate pollution, as do electric buses.

To this end, protection of the corridors of the Very Light Rail link and Active Travel Route between Kemble, Cirencester, Love Lane and Tetbury and the Cotswolds Airport should be formally included in the Local Plan.

The funding for these transport schemes could be partially funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) alongside private and public fund investment and Land Value Capture support and would not be reliant on S106 funding. The Very Light Railway should be included in the forthcoming Infrastructure Delivery Plan as necessary sustainable transport infrastructure for a growing community in Cirencester. As representatives of the Cirencester Community Railway we have already made the case to CDC planning officers that it is necessary for a safeguarded corridor to be put into place between Cirencester and Kemble which would run alongside the currently planned Greenway walking and cycling route, which has already received CIL funding.

Comment ID: 8937

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: We feel that areas which are regarded as environmentally precious should continue to be protected. Firstly many natural habitats will increasingly be threatened by ongoing climate change, many species will decline, and additional habitat erosion by development encroachment would cause irreversible damage.

Secondly, as work is increasingly automated through AI and working from home, the population will need more opportunities for relaxation and open spaces. The National Landscape (AONB) will become an increasingly valuable asset to the district, and to the nation, and should be protected from degradation.

We note that significant levels of new house-building are proposed south-west of Cirencester. This development will lead to increased pressure on Kemble railway station. As more houses are built within the catchment of Kemble railway station, there will be higher demand for on-site parking, every measure will therefore be required to help commuters arrive at the station without the use of a car. The Very Light Railway proposed between Cirencester and Kemble will help reduce demand for parking at Kemble Station and the VLR should be safeguarded in the new Local Plan so that funding from sources such as private and public fund investment, Land Value Capture, CIL and other sources can be identified. If this sustainable transport route is not safeguarded now, there will be only very limited opportunities to provide off-road routes to the station from the principal settlement of Cirencester.

In addition, the proposals include development of 1,070 homes south-west of Kemble, which will create a major demand for convenient, sustainable transport into Cirencester. The Very Light Rail service will also meet this need.

Comment ID: 8938

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: Experience from other European countries shows that living in apartments can be more comfortable and environmentally beneficial, but some changes to UK legal structures to avoid unfair service charges would be needed to get the maximum benefit.

For the Cotswolds, buildings could easily be designed to accommodate two apartments vertically, or in some places possibly three, but buildings taller than three storeys would rarely fit with the local vernacular. The Steadings Development Phase 2 awaiting reserved matters approval already includes some three storey buildings.

If reduced gardens are permitted, then provision must be made for green open spaces, including 'wild' areas, ponds and trees.

Comment ID: 8942

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: If reduced gardens are permitted, then extra provision for allotments should be included.

Comment ID: 8939

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: In order for any of the proposals to be socially and environmentally viable, the provision of acceptable net zero public transport must be fundamental to the underlying design. Public transport services to Kemble must run exactly to schedule and often enough to make cars unnecessary, especially at commuting times. The failure to offer this is the reason that bus services seldom generate sufficient modal shift, and fail to attract patronage. The most cost-effective solution to this demand is Very Light Rail, which can be timed to meet all through trains and be an attractive alternative to a car.

This especially relates to the larger and higher density developments proposed around Cirencester, particularly in Broad Zones 21c, 21d, 22 and 23.

The lead time for development of new railway projects can be considerable. Nearly a decade of work has already been invested in the Very Light Railway project between Cirencester and Kemble and while construction will be a relatively swift process, time will be required to identify funding, probably from private and public fund investment and Land Value Capture, but possibly also from CIL and other sources. It should be noted that access to such rail services can be expected to significantly increase the value and marketability of both residential and commercial properties within their catchments, so Land Value Capture should be considered an appropriate source of funding. The route must be safeguarded now so that it remains available, viable and developable when the funding has been identified and when the Cirencester population will have increased to the extent that the very light railway will be a better choice than car, taxi or bus. If the route is not protected, its omission will make this very sustainable transport much more difficult to deliver.

Comment ID: 8940

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: We feel strongly that provision of a Very Light Rail (VLR) link to connect Kemble with the proposed developments west of Cirencester, with the Steadings, with the developments around Siddington and with Cirencester itself, is absolutely fundamental to making these expansion proposals environmentally sustainable.

Key points to note about Very Light Rail:

- 1- Reliance on vague promises of buses will not persuade the new residents to forgo their cars; the permanence of a rail service gives that confidence.
- 2- By utilising the old railway formation, the very light rail route can co-exist with the proposed Green Route for cyclists and walkers currently being investigated by the Walk Wheel Cycle Trust (formerly Sustrans).
- 3- The proposed future VLR branch extension to Love Lane will be convenient for the Siddington developments, and will serve the eastern end of the Steadings.
- 4- Experience shows that rail services within 20 minutes' walk of housing increase the attractiveness of dwellings, uplifting the value of new developments and facilitating sales. This is borne out by the recent move to relax planning restrictions on land in close proximity to railway stations, which could include potential new station sites such as envisaged with the VLR proposals.
- 5- The proposed new developments in Broad Zones 21C, 21D, 22 and 23 will further increase the VLR patronage above that already calculated, reducing its break-even time or reducing ticket prices, depending on funding strategy.
- 6- The VLR service will also provide convenient access to Cirencester's facilities for residents of the proposed Kemble development, Broad Zone 23, reducing reliance on the use of the motor car and ongoing issues with congestion and parking.
- 7- The large manufacturing carbon footprint of electric cars and buses means that although they can reduce the release of CO₂, they cannot get close to net zero. They also increase the wear and tear on the roads because of their increased weight.
- 8- Congestion on Tetbury Road and Stroud Road is already a major problem; the expansion in Broad Zones 21C, 21D, 22 and 23 will require major (expensive) enhancements to the road network.
- 9- Provision of sufficient buses to serve the proposed expansion will also contribute to the road congestion; this will in turn make the bus timetable more unreliable. The only solution is a rail link to shift significant numbers away from the roads. The VLR will

reduce the cost of upgrades to the road network, and in the longer term will reduce the ongoing maintenance costs of the roads.

10- The life expectancy of a rail link is at least 120 years, so it will also reduce the long-term maintenance costs of local transport infrastructure, it will meet the needs created by the estimated development up to and beyond 2043, and it will offer low running costs for many generations of travellers.

11. The VLR will also provide a sustainable transport link to the RAU Innovation Village and other proposed employment areas.

For further information please visit CirenTrain.org.uk

Comment ID: 8941

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Richard Gunner, Cirencester Community Railway

Comment: It is also important to earmark employment space of various types within walking distance of residential zones as well as the usual educational and medical facilities. The concept of 20-minute towns should be used as a guide.

This also fits well with the concept of the Kemble/Cirencester Very Light Rail proposal which would place the majority of the development within Broad Zones 21D, 22 and 23 within walking distance of a dedicated shuttle service. The extension branch line to Love Lane will also serve the Siddington expansion, Broad Zone 21c and the eastern end of The Steadings.

A battery operated VLR system such as recently trialled in Coventry City, using a dedicated route, would avoid competing with other road users and offer faster and more reliable journey times.

It is noted that Tetbury is now the second largest conurbation in the Cotswolds District, which has resulted in a dramatic increase in car journeys in and out of the town. The corridor of a VLR and Active Travel link between Tetbury, Cotswold Airport and Kemble should also be formally protected as a safeguarded route being of strategic importance in the Local Plan, in addition to the corridors between Kemble, Cirencester Town and Love Lane. Protection of the old rail alignment between Love Lane and Cricklade, via the Water Parks, should also be considered.

On 18 November 2025 the Government published a statement that ‘Housebuilding around train stations will be given default “yes”’

(<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/housebuilding-around-train-stations-will-be-given-default-yes>). This includes tram stations, and so applies to Very Light Rail halts.

Comment ID: 9593

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Richard Holmes

Comment: This is a short generic comment on the Consultations on behalf of Cirencester Ramblers. We are the local group of the national Rambler's Association. The 'Preferred Options Consultation' from CDC proposes a number of 'new strategic sites' of which five are in the Cirencester Ramblers Group area - Kemble, Cirencester and Siddington, Preston and Driffield , Ampney Crusis and Fairford.

As a small voluntary group we do not have the capacity or knowledge to reflect in detail on the questions. However as an overview Cirencester Ramblers would expect the rural nature of the District to be retained and the public rights of way to be protected and where possible enhanced.

Comment ID: 10272

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: 3.16 Moreton-in-Marsh has already seen significant development in recent years and already suffers from heavy traffic congestion and is starting to suffer from a lack of adequate facilities to support the hundreds of new homes that have already been built in recent years. I don't think this makes Moreton a viable area for large numbers of new homes. There needs to be significant improvements to infrastructure and local facilities in Moreton as it is, just to support the homes already built.

Comment ID: 10291

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh has already seen significant development in recent years and already suffers from heavy traffic congestion and is starting to suffer from a lack of adequate facilities to support the hundreds of new homes that have already been built in recent years. I don't think this makes Moreton a viable area for large numbers of new homes. There needs to be significant improvements to infrastructure and local facilities in Moreton as it is, just to support the homes already built. Further development would bring the need for massive increases in capacity for traffic and parking in the town, as well as a need for widespread extra facilities and services, such as Healthcare facilities, shops/supermarkets, Post offices, school, etc.

Comment ID: 10281

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: Although promoting sustainable transport options is commended, I don't think as much weight should be given to the existence of travel hubs or existing transport links in decision making for potential areas of development. This is because in practical terms, in a rural areas such as the Cotswolds, unless a new housing development is within max 20mins walking distance to the existing infrastructure and services within the main service area, the majority of people will still drive into the main service area, resulting in increased traffic and detrimental excess demand on existing roads and parking provision. Achieving a max 20mins walking time from a large new development of this type into the associated service centre is likely to prove impossible in most locations and only increase traffic and the demand on the existing centre and the roads around it. This negates any desired/anticipated benefit of focusing the development "near" to existing public transport hubs and infrastructure.

Comment ID: 10284

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: I don't think as much weight should be given to the existence of travel hubs or existing transport links in decision making for potential areas of development. This is because in practical terms, in a rural areas such as the Cotswolds, unless a new housing development is within max 20mins walking distance to the existing infrastructure and services within the main service area, the majority of people will still drive into the main service area, resulting in increased traffic and detrimental excess demand on existing roads and parking provision. Achieving a max 20mins walking time from a large new development of this type into the associated service centre is likely to prove impossible in most locations and only increase traffic and the demand on the existing centre and the roads around it. This negates any desired/anticipated benefit of focusing the development "near" to existing public transport hubs and infrastructure.

Comment ID: 10287

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: Creating new settlements away from main principal sites should be a greater part of the solution and plan for development. It is a great alternative to overdevelopment of existing main service centres/principle settlements and would present an excellent opportunity to improve existing ailing bus routes by making them viable again due to increased demand. Therefore encouraging use of public transport and reducing the need for driving. This could also be an opportunity to revive and connect existing rural areas with better connections to public transport and services to enhance the lives of those already in the existing villages. Meanwhile, the existing village providing a head start for the facilities needed for the new proposed housing developments.

Comment ID: 10274

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh has already seen significant development in recent years and already suffers from heavy traffic congestion and is starting to suffer from a lack of adequate facilities to support the hundreds of new homes that have already been built in recent years. I don't think this makes Moreton a viable area for large numbers of new homes. There needs to be significant improvements to infrastructure and local facilities in Moreton as it is, just to support the homes already built.

Comment ID: 10275

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Richard Noble

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh has already seen significant development in recent years and already suffers from heavy traffic congestion and is starting to suffer from a lack of adequate facilities to support the hundreds of new homes that have already been built in recent years. I don't think this makes Moreton a viable area for large numbers of new homes. There needs to be significant improvements to infrastructure and local facilities in Moreton as it is, just to support the homes already built.

Comment ID: 10712

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Richard Sharp

Comment: General Planning Notes for CDC Local Plan Consultation: Concerning Area 17 (Down Ampney)

Highway Safety and Traffic

Highway safety is a serious concern in Down Ampney village. The existing route through the village consists of narrow rural roads that were not designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic. These roads have poor visibility around bends at both ends of the village meaning pedestrians, the many cyclists and vehicles must share the same restricted space. Any further housing development would lead to greatly increased traffic bringing an unacceptable risk to highway safety and the wellbeing of existing residents.

Flooding

Any further housing development should be refused due to the well known risk of flooding in the village and on the surrounding land, which is known to have a high water table. During heavy rain surface water is already unable to drain away leading to flooding in the centre of the village with road closures. With the recent housing developments existing village drainage is already beyond capacity and any further developments with large areas of hardstanding would significantly reduce natural absorption, increase surface water runoff and make the flooding more severe.

Sewerage

The existing sewage treatment plant is already operating far beyond its intended capacity of 200 houses with regular discharges by Thames Water into the Down Ampney Brook. During periods of heavy rainfall and flooding there is back flow onto the village high street. Any further development would place more pressure on the already inadequate sewerage infrastructure increasing the number of sewage discharges. Without evidence from Thames Water on when overdue upgrades will be planned and

finished, any additional housing development cannot be considered sustainable to the local area.

Character of the Village

A development giving rise to a 2.5 times increase in the number of homes in Down Ampney will cause significant and irreversible loss to the village character. The scale and housing density of any development would not be in keeping with the historic layout, architectural style, and rural setting that define our Cotswold village and contribute to its sense of place, one of the key reasons residents choose to live in Down Ampney.

Environmental Impact

The scale and nature of any development would result in the loss of valued green space, disruption to local wildlife habitats and increased pressure on the surrounding natural environment. Greatly increased levels of traffic noise and pollution from a car dependent development would have a serious impact on the environment, a major point that does not align with the stated sustainable development principles outlined by Cotswold District Council and would be unacceptable on landscape impact and heritage grounds.

Social Considerations

The scale of development would place significant strain on the limited existing local infrastructure and services. Down Ampney village school is already at capacity and the village relies only on a small community run shop. Nearest medical facilities for basic healthcare needs require a car journey to either Cricklade, Cirencester or Swindon. Without clear and funded plans to expand these essential services, the proposal would be detrimental to the wellbeing of both current and future residents.

No Employment or Transport

Down Ampney village has no local employment opportunities and any development would increase reliance on commuting to other areas for work, placing additional pressure on the rural road network. Any feasible alternative transport to private car use would require a comprehensive bus network. Without realistic access to local jobs and sustainable transport options any development risks increasing traffic congestion, pollution and social isolation, and does not represent balanced or sustainable development for the village.

High Car Dependency

The location and scale of the development does not provide realistic alternatives to private vehicle use, given the limited public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure. This would obviously lead to increased traffic congestion, road safety concerns, and higher emissions which are contrary to sustainable development objectives and would negatively affect the quality of life in the village.

Introducing a Significant Area of Built Form into a Rural Landscape

The scale, density, and urban character of the development is not considered in keeping with the setting of Down Ampney and would significantly change the rural landscape, eroding its openness and visual amenity. Such an intrusion would be harmful to the established rural character of the area and is not consistent with the environmental stewardship outlined in the Cotswolds District Council's Vision for 2043.

Comment ID: 9267

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Richard Whiteley

Comment: How is "home" defined?

There is a need for one and two bedroom apartments, presumably in apartment blocks.
Are these envisaged and would they be defined as "homes"?

Comment ID: 9268

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Richard Whiteley

Comment: Are council houses, available for rent, included in the plan?

Comment ID: 9512

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Rob

Comment: When you say the Council has called for sites to landowners - how has that been done? What criteria did you use in selecting landowners e.g land size? We own land but have never been contacted so perhaps 9.5 acres to too small?

Comment ID: 9513

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

Name: Rob

Comment: I am assuming that land you have highlighted for potential development has already been offered by the landowner and is this information in the public domain?

Comment ID: 9515

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Rob

Comment: Siddington Village is a rural village settlement separated from Cirencester to the north by a settlement gap (Cirencester Road), which offers an imposing vista of pasture, Grade II listed St Peters Church (dating from 1150) and 13th Century Tythe Barn and farm buildings. The pasture is border to west by the Old Cotswold Canal and a footpath from The Spires. There is also a public footpath across the land, which forms part of a circular village walk. Any development on the 'settlement gap' would destroy the village's distinctiveness and identity.

Other sites that have been identified by CDC lie either side of Canal Lane. These fields are agricultural and farmed annually for crops. Access to these sites would have to be via Clarks Lane, Nursery View and Canal Lane, all of which are Unclassified Roads, mostly single track and soft verges. Access via Upper Siddington is not possible due to a 7.5t weight limit on the listed canal bridge. Consideration should also be given to the fact that connectivity to the solar farm on Ashton Road to Spratsgate Lane and beyond runs underground along Nursery View and Clarks Lane. Nursery View also has underground gas and water supplies, along with shared sewage drainage from cottages to an adjacent septic tank. Any access from Ashton Road has already been deemed not suitable by CDC on previous planning applications. All these roads form part of the village circular walk and along with the quite lane, which runs from Clarks Lane to Ewen Road are regularly used by locals and visitors, either on foot, cycles, horseback and mobility scooters. Any development would have a decremental effect on locals and visitors' wellbeing and mental health, which I'm sure CDC would endeavour to protect. In conclusion. It is essential to keep these green spaces to protect biodiversity by retaining fields, trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors.

My final but very important point is that the sheer scale of the planned developments in Siddington, and indeed surrounding areas demand major investment to the local infrastructure and community services, such as roads, transport, schools, doctors, dentists, water supply, drainage, flooding and sewage treatment capacity, to name just some. This should be planned and completed before any future development takes place.

Any development within these areas, as shown in your map, would destroy Siddington and it would just be a suburb of Cirencester.

Comment ID: 9500

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Rob

Comment: The sheer scale of the planned developments in Siddington, and indeed surrounding areas demand major investment to the local infrastructure and community services, such as roads, transport, schools, doctors, dentists, water supply, drainage, flooding and sewage treatment capacity, to name just some. This should be planned and completed before any future development takes place.

Comment ID: 9509

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rob

Comment: Area of Natural Beauty - Will there be a call for sites in this area? It may turn up some suitable sites that have been overlooked. I find it hard to comprehend that there is NO housing requirement within this area.

Comment ID: 9510

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rob

Comment: On the subject of Principal Settlements why did some villages evade future development. South Cerney for instance is a Principal Settlement and has scope to develop north of Northmoor Lane and at Upper Up. Another possible development site is The Duke of Gloucestershire Barracks, which has an airfield that is no longer in use? There are also sites within Cirencester which could be developed, namely the old Tesco building, Gardiner Haskins and the commercial premises in Querns Lane, which has been empty for years!

Comment ID: 9511

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rob

Comment: I would support denser housing developments in towns

(such as smaller houses and gardens, more flats with height restrictions). we need to encourage growth in our towns and cities. the high streets are dying, young people cannot afford to live where they grew up. Denser towns and cities would preserve our countryside and villages for everyone's enjoyment and well being.

to help meet the full housing target

Comment ID: 9516

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Rob

Comment: Just in case you missed my earlier comments - I Have now had time to read and attend a public meeting regarding potential housing developments and I am appalled that not only Siddington but all of the South Cotswolds has been 'shafted' with unacceptable housing targets.

I would like to ask if there was a study to assess the housing requirement of 'The Cotswolds' as a whole and if so, is it in the public domain? We are all fully aware of the argument that 80% of the Cotswolds falls under the area of natural beauty but was there or will there be a call for sites in this area? It may turn up some suitable sites that have been overlooked. I find it hard to comprehend that there is NO housing requirement within this area.

I would like to raise how you come to the conclusion that Siddington is a principal settlement – at the meeting it was said because we had a pub, a shop, a school and a local bus, hardly the criteria to warrant the change? I have now read your Cotswold District Role and Settlement Function Study, which is totally inaccurate, as it is based on the incorrect area and subsequently the wrong population count. It includes developments outside the village boundary. The Spires for one, yet you choose to include it in the Cirencester housing figures for planning purposes. It appears the Council want it both ways? In the Local Plan Consultation, the number of households is accurately recorded as 339 but the settlement analysis shows double that amount and a population of 1,372. Previously Siddington was designated a Non-Principal Settlement in the Cotswold District Council's planning framework, meaning it's a smaller rural village. A Principal Settlement is defined as towns with more facilities, certainly a lot more than what Siddington has? This alone deems all the figures used in determining Siddington as a Principal Settlement completely inaccurate and misleading and certainly does not make it an 'employment hub'. I therefore oppose Siddington being classed as a Principal Settlement and that it should be reinstated as a Non-Principal Settlement.

On the subject of Principal Settlements why did some villages evade future development. South Cerney for instance is a Principal Settlement and has scope to develop north of Northmoor Lane and at Upper Up. Another possible development site is The Duke of Gloucestershire Barracks, which has an airfield that is no longer in use? There are also sites within Cirencester which could be developed, namely the old Tesco building, Gardiner Haskins and the commercial premises in Querns Lane, which has been empty for years!

I would like to now address the CDC's proposed plan for Siddington:

Siddington Village is a rural village settlement separated from Cirencester to the north by a settlement gap (Cirencester Road), which offers an imposing vista of pasture, Grade II listed St Peters Church (dating from 1150) and 13th Century Tythe Barn and farm buildings. The pasture is border to west by the Old Cotswold Canal and a footpath from The Spires. There is also a public footpath across the land, which forms part of a circular village walk. Any development on the 'settlement gap' would destroy the village's distinctiveness and identity.

Other sites that have been identified by CDC lie either side of Canal Lane. These fields are agricultural and farmed annually for crops. Access to these sites would have to be via Clarks Lane, Nursery View and Canal Lane, all of which are Unclassified Roads, mostly single track and soft verges. Access via Upper Siddington is not possible due to a 7.5t weight limit on the listed canal bridge. Consideration should also be given to the fact that connectivity to the solar farm on Ashton Road to Spratsgate Lane and beyond runs underground along Nursery View and Clarks Lane. Nursery View also has underground gas and water supplies, along with shared sewage drainage from cottages to an adjacent septic tank. Any access from Ashton Road has already been deemed not suitable by CDC on previous planning applications. All these roads form part of the village circular walk and along with the quite lane, which runs from Clarks Lane to Ewen Road are regularly used by locals and visitors, either on foot, cycles, horseback and mobility scooters. Any development would have a decremental effect on locals and visitors' wellbeing and mental health, which I'm sure CDC would endeavour to protect. In conclusion. It is essential to keep these green spaces to protect biodiversity by retaining fields, trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors.

My final but very important point is that the sheer scale of the planned developments in Siddington, and indeed surrounding areas demand major investment to the local infrastructure and community services, such as roads, transport, schools, doctors, dentists, water supply, drainage, flooding and sewage treatment capacity, to name just some. This should be planned and completed before any future development takes place.

We all accept the Governments current plan is flawed and completely unacceptable but we must fight to preserve what we have and develop as we feel is required and not be dictated to by the 'fat cats' in Whitehall.

Many thanks for reading this far and hopefully I have given you some food for thought.

Best Regards

Comment ID: 9502

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Rob

Comment: I would like to raise how you come to the conclusion that Siddington is a principal settlement – at the meeting it was said because we had a pub, a shop, a school and a local bus, hardly the criteria to warrant the change? I have now read your Cotswold District Role and Settlement Function Study, which is totally inaccurate, as it is based on the incorrect area and subsequently the wrong population count. It includes developments outside the village boundary. The Spires for one, yet you choose to include it in the Cirencester housing figures for planning purposes. It appears the Council want it both ways? In the Local Plan Consultation, the number of households is accurately recorded as 339 but the settlement analysis shows double that amount and a population of 1,372. Previously Siddington was designated a Non-Principal Settlement in the Cotswold District Council's planning framework, meaning it's a smaller rural village. A Principal Settlement is defined as towns with more facilities, certainly a lot more than what Siddington has? This alone deems all the figures used in determining Siddington as a Principal Settlement completely inaccurate and misleading and certainly does not make it an 'employment hub'. I therefore oppose Siddington being classed as a Principal Settlement and that it should be reinstated as a Non-Principal Settlement.

Comment ID: 9505

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Rob

Comment: I would like to ask if there was a study to assess the housing requirement of 'The Cotswolds' as a whole and if so, is it in the public domain? We are all fully aware of the argument that 80% of the Cotswolds falls under the area of natural beauty but was there or will there be a call for sites in this area? It may turn up some suitable sites that have been overlooked. I find it hard to comprehend that there is NO housing requirement within this area.

Comment ID: 9508

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Rob

Comment: National landscapes have the highest status of national policy protection. Major development within them should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

Is this not exceptional circumstances?

Comment ID: 9514

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Rob

Comment: Siddington Village is a rural village settlement separated from Cirencester to the north by a settlement gap (Cirencester Road), which offers an imposing vista of pasture, Grade II listed St Peters Church (dating from 1150) and 13th Century Tythe Barn and farm buildings. The pasture is border to west by the Old Cotswold Canal and a footpath from The Spires. There is also a public footpath across the land, which forms part of a circular village walk. Any development on the 'settlement gap' would destroy the village's distinctiveness and identity.

Other sites that have been identified by CDC lie either side of Canal Lane. These fields are agricultural and farmed annually for crops. Access to these sites would have to be via Clarks Lane, Nursery View and Canal Lane, all of which are Unclassified Roads, mostly single track and soft verges. Access via Upper Siddington is not possible due to a 7.5t weight limit on the listed canal bridge. Consideration should also be given to the fact that connectivity to the solar farm on Ashton Road to Spratsgate Lane and beyond runs underground along Nursery View and Clarks Lane. Nursery View also has underground gas and water supplies, along with shared sewage drainage from cottages to an adjacent septic tank. Any access from Ashton Road has already been deemed not suitable by CDC on previous planning applications. All these roads form part of the village circular walk and along

Comment ID: 10351

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Rob

Comment: None, The preservation of the Cotswolds green spaces, characteristics and culture is at the core of CDC's local plans and all scenarios undermined this and have ignored local Neighbourhood plan policies.

Comment ID: 10357

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Rob

Comment: No. Siddington is an easy target because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The fact that it has been classified, incorrectly as a Principal Settlement is also an issue as the village has minimal services, transport, and infrastructure.

Comment ID: 10365

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Rob

Comment: I support the possibility of a denser housing policy but believe this should be confined to towns and not rural communities. Smaller town houses/garden and flats would boost and provide life to towns, where many are struggling.

Comment ID: 10376

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Rob

Comment: No, I do not think the proposed level of development up to and beyond 2043 is sustainable. The proposed plan for Siddington will destroy it's rural identity and it will become a suburb of Cirencester. It does not have the local infrastructure and services (roads, water supply, drainage, sewage treatment capacity, transport and school) to cope with such a vast development. Siddington is already suffering with major issues, flooding/drainage and sewage leaks which often lead to dangerous road conditions, initially from excess water and further down the line from pot-holes. This will only get worse!

Comment ID: 10591

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rob

Comment: Yes

Protect Biodiversity and green spaces (fields, trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors)

Maintain a settlements gap between Siddington and Cirencester

Address the impact any development will have on Siddington and surrounding villages with regard flooding. Areas already prone to severe flood, which will only get worse.

The Cotswold District Role and Settlement Function Study incorrectly classified Siddington as a Principal Settlement. This needs to be changed as the data used is utterly incorrect!

The protection of rural communities outside of the Cotswold National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10592

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rob

Comment: Yes

Protect Biodiversity and green spaces (fields, trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors)

Maintain a settlements gap between Siddington and Cirencester

Address the impact any development will have on Siddington and surrounding villages with regard flooding. Areas already prone to severe flood, which will only get worse.

The Cotswold District Role and Settlement Function Study incorrectly classified Siddington as a Principal Settlement. This needs to be changed as the data used is utterly incorrect!

The protection of rural communities outside of the Cotswold National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10599

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Rob

Comment: I agree with the vision but the objectives in the Consultation document will not be achieved.

Excessive growth will result in Siddington losing it's rural individuality, heritage, character and sense of community.

This will not only destroy Siddington's green spaces and wildlife habitat but have a detrimental effect on locals and visitors well being and mental health.

The sheer scale of the planned developments in Siddington, and indeed surrounding areas demand major investment to the local infrastructure and community services, such as roads, transport, schools, doctors, dentists, water supply, drainage, flooding and sewage treatment capacity, to name just some. This should be planned and completed before any future development takes place.

Comment ID: 10302

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Rob Thompson

Comment: Introduction and Summary

I am responding to the consultation for the Cotswold District Council (CDC) Local Plan Review (Regulation 18 – Preferred Options). In doing so, I am providing comments on two documents:

- C 3-1-1 Preferred Options Consultation Document; and
- C 3-6-2 Appendix A – Site Assessment Sheets (Part 1).

As a resident of Mickleton, my comments concentrate on issues affecting the village. In summary, my main concerns are:

- Mickleton is already one of the highest net exporters of workers in CDC and the consultation contains no measures to increase employment – hence the village will simply become an unsustainable car-dependent dormitory community;
- If the planned growth of 590 homes is implemented, by 2043 Mickleton will have more dwellings than Chipping Campden, Stow on the Wold or Lechlade but none of the facilities of these towns to achieve a sustainable community;
- Before considering the construction of new dwellings, CDC should urgently examine the unregulated rental market (including Airbnb) in the District by introducing a licensing scheme to ensure that properties are not left vacant for much of the year but are returned to the residential market;
- Investment in infrastructure is key to the provision of any additional housing and without an infrastructure plan it is not possible to have a sensible debate on sustainable development – the necessary infrastructure in relation to Mickleton should include power supply, water supply, wastewater treatment, schools, medical surgery, post office, segregated pedestrian and cycling facilities, parking in the village centre, and a potential bypass of the village and new rail station at Chipping Campden;
- In addition to infrastructure, to achieve sustainability for the community, there must be a commitment by CDC to fund the necessary public transport services, including regular daily bus services to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden (and beyond) which operate half-hourly between 0600 and 2300, with a new hourly link to Honeybourne station;
- Improvements to the roads through Mickleton must take into account the cumulative impact of traffic generated by potential new developments in south Warwickshire; and

- The scale of the development ignores Mickleton's sensitive landscape setting on the edge of the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB) – harm to the AONB setting or protected views must be avoided.

I do not object to housing delivery in principle, but it must be commensurate with the existing size of the community and include fully-costed services and infrastructure necessary for a sustainable community.

Finally, the Plan does not convincingly demonstrate that more suitable locations for growth within the District such as rail-served settlements, larger towns outside the AONB, or locations with existing infrastructure capacity have been fully tested as reasonable alternatives to the growth in Mickleton. As a result, the Mickleton allocation appears to be a solution of convenience, not the outcome of a robust comparative assessment.

Comments on Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation

In this section, I outline my comments on the Preferred Options Consultation Document.

The Plan proposes 590 new dwellings in Mickleton, a settlement of approximately 954 existing dwellings, equating to about 62% growth over the plan period. This represents one of the largest proportional increases proposed anywhere in the District and exceeds that proposed for many larger and better-served settlements. There is no clear explanation of how the figure of 590 dwellings specifically for Mickleton has been derived, compared with other established communities with more extensive services and a 'critical mass' of community size to create a sustainable future development. No robust evidence is provided to demonstrate that Mickleton's infrastructure capacity, service provision, transport connectivity, employment base, or environmental capacity can sustainably accommodate the growth of this magnitude.

The growth of 590 homes in Mickleton will make the village little more than a car-dependent dormitory community. The complete absence of measures in the Local Plan to generate employment opportunities in Mickleton will only exacerbate the situation.

CDC's own analysis in the 'Settlement Role and Function Study' document highlights Mickleton's current position as a net 'exporter' of workers. With 725 workplaces and an economically active population of 1011, Mickleton currently has an employment density of 140% and, of the 49 settlements across the CDC area, only two (Upper Rissington and Great Rissington) have higher levels. Furthermore, the proportion of Mickleton's employed residents who currently commute long distances (greater than 30kms) is 11.7% - 65% higher than the CDC average of 7.1%. With only 1% of CDC residents commuting to work by public transport, inevitably the bulk of Mickleton

residents will use the car to access employment. Hence, the plan for an additional 590 homes in Mickleton cannot in any way be considered to be sustainable.

The allocation of land within Mickleton must make allowance for the need to provide sufficient local employment. The economically active population of 1011 would rise to 1638 with the addition of 590 further homes, assuming the proportion of economically active within each dwelling does not change in the future. Hence, in order to achieve 'neutrality' in the import/export of workers, there would need to be an additional 913 jobs (1638-725) in Mickleton within the plan period. Although there would be some residents who work from home, significant areas of land within the village boundary would need to be set aside for employment rather than housing.

If the potential 590 increase in homes in Mickleton is achieved, this will give a total of 1543 homes by the end of the plan period of 2043. By comparison, by the same time horizon, the total of 1543 would dwarf the number of homes in established communities such as Chipping Campden (1382 homes – 89.6% of Mickleton), Stow in the Wold (1393 homes – 90.3% of Mickleton) and Lechlade (1461 homes – 94.7% of Mickleton). These existing well-established communities benefit from extensive facilities including shops, hotels, cafes, restaurants, pubs, supermarkets, libraries, surgeries, leisure centres, business parks, petrol stations, and so on which provide not only sources of employment but also social and community facilities. By comparison, Mickleton has negligible facilities and considerable resources will need to be dedicated by CDC if Mickleton is to achieve comparable local employment levels and community services that the increased population will demand and require.

Before considering the need to build new homes, CDC should look at ways of using the existing housing stock in a better way for the benefit of the local communities. The comparison in the average occupancy in homes for Mickleton and the neighbouring Chipping Campden and Stow on the Wold towns is telling. Using figures from CDC's 'Settlement Role and Function Study', average dwelling occupancy in Mickleton is 2.07 persons, while for Chipping Campden it is 1.62 and for Stow on the Wold it is just 1.34. I would suggest that a factor is the number of rental and Airbnb properties in Chipping Campden and Stow on the Wold which, with better control and licensing by CDC, could be released for purchase by local residents. Displaced tourists could in turn use the various hotels in these towns and increase their economic viability.

There is a scarcity of local community services within Mickleton with no surgery, dentist, post office, library, etc and limited retail and leisure options. Consequently, the majority of residents travel outside Mickleton to access these facilities, predominantly by car. This is because the provision of bus services is woefully inadequate. As an example, there are seven buses between 0642 and 1923 from Mickleton to Stratford on a weekday, with intervals between departures (in minutes) of 140, 79, 62, 121, 154, 145 and 60. So the public transport is not regular, convenient or frequent. Consequently, it

does not provide an attractive alternative to the car and hence cannot be considered to be sustainable at the present time. If CDC is serious about sustainability, it should consider funding (as a minimum) a regular 30 minute bus service to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden between 0600 and 2300 s to provide confidence to current car users that public transport alternatives are available. In addition, there should be an hourly bus service to the nearest rail station at Honeybourne.

Furthermore, the provision of facilities for walking and cycling do nothing to provide a sustainable alternative to the use of the private car. There are no footpaths or segregated cycle facilities on any of the roads leaving the village. Although National Cycle Network 442 passes the fringes of the village, immediately south of Mickleton it involves a 12% climb up Baker's Hill – only suitable for the most athletic cyclist and hence cannot be considered part of any reasonable sustainable alternative to the private car.

The impact of new dwellings on the road infrastructure through Mickleton must not be considered in isolation but must incorporate the cumulative impact of planned and potential developments in south Warwickshire, including those at Meon Vale and Long Marston. The largescale increases in housing, population and car ownership in south Warwickshire will generate significant increases in traffic through the centre of Mickleton, with particular negative impacts on the sensitive Conservation Area.

In terms of the infrastructure required to service the growth in homes, it will be essential to implement major (and potentially expensive) investments to serve the increased Mickleton population. The absence of an infrastructure plan to accompany the Local Plan's housing aspirations makes it difficult to have a sensible debate on the overall impact of the Local Plan. Nevertheless, I would suggest that there is likely to be shortages in a number of areas, the details of which would be estimated by the relevant statutory authority but would need to include:

- Robust power supply, including central vehicle charging points;
- Plentiful water supplies;
- Ample wastewater treatment facilities;
- Additional school facilities for primary and secondary education;
- Medical surgery;
- Library;
- Indoor sports and leisure facilities;
- Business park and other potential employment locations; and
- Increased retail options including a major supermarket.

Land within the Mickleton boundary must therefore be allocated these types of development as well as housing if a sustainable community is to be created.

Concerning specific transport measures, these should include:

- Segregated cycle and pedestrian facilities along the Stratford Road linking with the existing infrastructure at Meon Vale for onward connections to Stratford upon Avon;
- Significantly improved bus services with regular 30 minute frequency services to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden (and beyond) with an additional hourly service to Honeybourne station;
- Adequate parking in the centre of Mickleton to cater for the increased facilities necessary to cater for the larger community;
- Reopening a rail station at Chipping Campden served by improvements to existing bus services from a number of local communities including Mickleton, Broadway as well as Chipping Campden itself; and
- Bypass for Mickleton between the Stratford Road at Pages Corner and the Broadway Road near to the junction with Honeybourne Lane, to remove through traffic from the sensitive Conservation Area, especially vehicles generated by the planned and potential developments in south Warwickshire.

CDC must be clear that the provision of additional housing in Mickleton comes with the need to provide the necessary infrastructure and to fund the required services if a truly sustainable community is to be achieved.

Comments on site assessment sheet for Broad Zone 02 (Around Mickleton)

In this section, I outline my comments on the Appendix A – Site Assessment Sheets (Part 1) document.

The description of issues uses abbreviations that are not clear to the general reader e.g. 'C20', 'Neighbouring S&As', 'IRZ'. A comprehensive glossary is required

The assessment of accessibility to employment states that "18,228 jobs are accessible within 45 minutes' walk and/or bus from the central point". There is one bus to Stratford at 0642 but the next is not until 0902 so the bus is not a suitable option for feasible commuting. The first bus to Moreton in Marsh reaches there at 0909 and the first bus to Broadway reaches there at 1005. So there is negligible access to employment by bus and it is difficult to understand how the analysis has identified such a large volume of accessible jobs.

The analysis of access to other key services and facilities by public transport is based purely on in-vehicle time and does not include the walking time at each end of the

journey or the waiting time for the infrequent and irregular buses. Hence, it is not a 'real life' measure of access.

The analysis of proximity to sustainable transport networks is erroneous or misleading. Service 606 operates between Chipping Campden and Cheltenham and does not serve Mickleton. Service 608 operates a single journey on Thursday and hence is a weekly not daily operation. Hence the overall bus score should be recalculated. Although National Cycle Network 442 passes the fringes of the village, immediately south of Mickleton it involves a 12% climb up Baker's Hill – only suitable for the most athletic cyclist and hence should not be considered in any reasonable measurement of accessibility. There are no segregated cycleways or footpaths on any of the roads leaving the village.

Comment ID: 10562

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Rob Thompson

Comment: Introduction and Summary

I am responding to the consultation for the Cotswold District Council (CDC) Local Plan Review (Regulation 18 – Preferred Options). In doing so, I am providing comments on two documents:

- C 3-1-1 Preferred Options Consultation Document; and
- C 3-6-2 Appendix A – Site Assessment Sheets (Part 1).

As a resident of Mickleton, my comments concentrate on issues affecting the village. In summary, my main concerns are:

- Mickleton is already one of the highest net exporters of workers in CDC and the consultation contains no measures to increase employment – hence the village will simply become an unsustainable car-dependent dormitory community;
- If the planned growth of 590 homes is implemented, by 2043 Mickleton will have more dwellings than Chipping Campden, Stow on the Wold or Lechlade but none of the facilities of these towns to achieve a sustainable community;
- Before considering the construction of new dwellings, CDC should urgently examine the unregulated rental market (including Airbnb) in the District by introducing a licensing scheme to ensure that properties are not left vacant for much of the year but are returned to the residential market;
- Investment in infrastructure is key to the provision of any additional housing and without an infrastructure plan it is not possible to have a sensible debate on sustainable development – the necessary infrastructure in relation to Mickleton should include power supply, water supply, wastewater treatment, schools, medical surgery, post office, segregated pedestrian and cycling facilities, parking in the village centre, and a potential bypass of the village and new rail station at Chipping Campden;
- In addition to infrastructure, to achieve sustainability for the community, there must be a commitment by CDC to fund the necessary public transport services, including regular daily bus services to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden (and beyond) which operate half-hourly between 0600 and 2300, with a new hourly link to Honeybourne station;
- Improvements to the roads through Mickleton must take into account the cumulative impact of traffic generated by potential new developments in south Warwickshire; and

- The scale of the development ignores Mickleton's sensitive landscape setting on the edge of the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB) – harm to the AONB setting or protected views must be avoided.

I do not object to housing delivery in principle, but it must be commensurate with the existing size of the community and include fully-costed services and infrastructure necessary for a sustainable community.

Finally, the Plan does not convincingly demonstrate that more suitable locations for growth within the District such as rail-served settlements, larger towns outside the AONB, or locations with existing infrastructure capacity have been fully tested as reasonable alternatives to the growth in Mickleton. As a result, the Mickleton allocation appears to be a solution of convenience, not the outcome of a robust comparative assessment.

Comments on Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation

In this section, I outline my comments on the Preferred Options Consultation Document.

The Plan proposes 590 new dwellings in Mickleton, a settlement of approximately 954 existing dwellings, equating to about 62% growth over the plan period. This represents one of the largest proportional increases proposed anywhere in the District and exceeds that proposed for many larger and better-served settlements. There is no clear explanation of how the figure of 590 dwellings specifically for Mickleton has been derived, compared with other established communities with more extensive services and a 'critical mass' of community size to create a sustainable future development. No robust evidence is provided to demonstrate that Mickleton's infrastructure capacity, service provision, transport connectivity, employment base, or environmental capacity can sustainably accommodate the growth of this magnitude.

The growth of 590 homes in Mickleton will make the village little more than a car-dependent dormitory community. The complete absence of measures in the Local Plan to generate employment opportunities in Mickleton will only exacerbate the situation.

CDC's own analysis in the 'Settlement Role and Function Study' document highlights Mickleton's current position as a net 'exporter' of workers. With 725 workplaces and an economically active population of 1011, Mickleton currently has an employment density of 140% and, of the 49 settlements across the CDC area, only two (Upper Rissington and Great Rissington) have higher levels. Furthermore, the proportion of Mickleton's employed residents who currently commute long distances (greater than 30kms) is 11.7% - 65% higher than the CDC average of 7.1%. With only 1% of CDC residents commuting to work by public transport, inevitably the bulk of Mickleton

residents will use the car to access employment. Hence, the plan for an additional 590 homes in Mickleton cannot in any way be considered to be sustainable.

The allocation of land within Mickleton must make allowance for the need to provide sufficient local employment. The economically active population of 1011 would rise to 1638 with the addition of 590 further homes, assuming the proportion of economically active within each dwelling does not change in the future. Hence, in order to achieve 'neutrality' in the import/export of workers, there would need to be an additional 913 jobs (1638-725) in Mickleton within the plan period. Although there would be some residents who work from home, significant areas of land within the village boundary would need to be set aside for employment rather than housing.

If the potential 590 increase in homes in Mickleton is achieved, this will give a total of 1543 homes by the end of the plan period of 2043. By comparison, by the same time horizon, the total of 1543 would dwarf the number of homes in established communities such as Chipping Campden (1382 homes – 89.6% of Mickleton), Stow in the Wold (1393 homes – 90.3% of Mickleton) and Lechlade (1461 homes – 94.7% of Mickleton). These existing well-established communities benefit from extensive facilities including shops, hotels, cafes, restaurants, pubs, supermarkets, libraries, surgeries, leisure centres, business parks, petrol stations, and so on which provide not only sources of employment but also social and community facilities. By comparison, Mickleton has negligible facilities and considerable resources will need to be dedicated by CDC if Mickleton is to achieve comparable local employment levels and community services that the increased population will demand and require.

Before considering the need to build new homes, CDC should look at ways of using the existing housing stock in a better way for the benefit of the local communities. The comparison in the average occupancy in homes for Mickleton and the neighbouring Chipping Campden and Stow on the Wold towns is telling. Using figures from CDC's 'Settlement Role and Function Study', average dwelling occupancy in Mickleton is 2.07 persons, while for Chipping Campden it is 1.62 and for Stow on the Wold it is just 1.34. I would suggest that a factor is the number of rental and Airbnb properties in Chipping Campden and Stow on the Wold which, with better control and licensing by CDC, could be released for purchase by local residents. Displaced tourists could in turn use the various hotels in these towns and increase their economic viability.

There is a scarcity of local community services within Mickleton with no surgery, dentist, post office, library, etc and limited retail and leisure options. Consequently, the majority of residents travel outside Mickleton to access these facilities, predominantly by car. This is because the provision of bus services is woefully inadequate. As an example, there are seven buses between 0642 and 1923 from Mickleton to Stratford on a weekday, with intervals between departures (in minutes) of 140, 79, 62, 121, 154, 145 and 60. So the public transport is not regular, convenient or frequent. Consequently, it

does not provide an attractive alternative to the car and hence cannot be considered to be sustainable at the present time. If CDC is serious about sustainability, it should consider funding (as a minimum) a regular 30 minute bus service to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden between 0600 and 2300 s to provide confidence to current car users that public transport alternatives are available. In addition, there should be an hourly bus service to the nearest rail station at Honeybourne.

Furthermore, the provision of facilities for walking and cycling do nothing to provide a sustainable alternative to the use of the private car. There are no footpaths or segregated cycle facilities on any of the roads leaving the village. Although National Cycle Network 442 passes the fringes of the village, immediately south of Mickleton it involves a 12% climb up Baker's Hill – only suitable for the most athletic cyclist and hence cannot be considered part of any reasonable sustainable alternative to the private car.

The impact of new dwellings on the road infrastructure through Mickleton must not be considered in isolation but must incorporate the cumulative impact of planned and potential developments in south Warwickshire, including those at Meon Vale and Long Marston. The largescale increases in housing, population and car ownership in south Warwickshire will generate significant increases in traffic through the centre of Mickleton, with particular negative impacts on the sensitive Conservation Area.

In terms of the infrastructure required to service the growth in homes, it will be essential to implement major (and potentially expensive) investments to serve the increased Mickleton population. The absence of an infrastructure plan to accompany the Local Plan's housing aspirations makes it difficult to have a sensible debate on the overall impact of the Local Plan. Nevertheless, I would suggest that there is likely to be shortages in a number of areas, the details of which would be estimated by the relevant statutory authority but would need to include:

- Robust power supply, including central vehicle charging points;
- Plentiful water supplies;
- Ample wastewater treatment facilities;
- Additional school facilities for primary and secondary education;
- Medical surgery;
- Library;
- Indoor sports and leisure facilities;
- Business park and other potential employment locations; and
- Increased retail options including a major supermarket.

Land within the Mickleton boundary must therefore be allocated these types of development as well as housing if a sustainable community is to be created.

Concerning specific transport measures, these should include:

- Segregated cycle and pedestrian facilities along the Stratford Road linking with the existing infrastructure at Meon Vale for onward connections to Stratford upon Avon;
- Significantly improved bus services with regular 30 minute frequency services to Stratford upon Avon and Chipping Campden (and beyond) with an additional hourly service to Honeybourne station;
- Adequate parking in the centre of Mickleton to cater for the increased facilities necessary to cater for the larger community;
- Reopening a rail station at Chipping Campden served by improvements to existing bus services from a number of local communities including Mickleton, Broadway as well as Chipping Campden itself; and
- Bypass for Mickleton between the Stratford Road at Pages Corner and the Broadway Road near to the junction with Honeybourne Lane, to remove through traffic from the sensitive Conservation Area, especially vehicles generated by the planned and potential developments in south Warwickshire.

CDC must be clear that the provision of additional housing in Mickleton comes with the need to provide the necessary infrastructure and to fund the required services if a truly sustainable community is to be achieved.

Comments on site assessment sheet for Broad Zone 02 (Around Mickleton)

In this section, I outline my comments on the Appendix A – Site Assessment Sheets (Part 1) document.

The description of issues uses abbreviations that are not clear to the general reader e.g. 'C20', 'Neighbouring S&As', 'IRZ'. A comprehensive glossary is required

The assessment of accessibility to employment states that "18,228 jobs are accessible within 45 minutes' walk and/or bus from the central point". There is one bus to Stratford at 0642 but the next is not until 0902 so the bus is not a suitable option for feasible commuting. The first bus to Moreton in Marsh reaches there at 0909 and the first bus to Broadway reaches there at 1005. So there is negligible access to employment by bus and it is difficult to understand how the analysis has identified such a large volume of accessible jobs.

The analysis of access to other key services and facilities by public transport is based purely on in-vehicle time and does not include the walking time at each end of the

journey or the waiting time for the infrequent and irregular buses. Hence, it is not a 'real life' measure of access.

The analysis of proximity to sustainable transport networks is erroneous or misleading. Service 606 operates between Chipping Campden and Cheltenham and does not serve Mickleton. Service 608 operates a single journey on Thursday and hence is a weekly not daily operation. Hence the overall bus score should be recalculated. Although National Cycle Network 442 passes the fringes of the village, immediately south of Mickleton it involves a 12% climb up Baker's Hill – only suitable for the most athletic cyclist and hence should not be considered in any reasonable measurement of accessibility. There are no segregated cycleways or footpaths on any of the roads leaving the village.

Comment ID: 9061

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Robert

Comment: Given the impending restructuring of the entire council, isn't this plan premature? Should this local plan and everything it entails be done after the restructuring?

Cotswolds district council is managing a local plan when its looking likely it will cease to exist before the plan even begins to implement it. While the boundaries of the new council will mean different targets and different boundaries, particularly relevant given the limitations of the AONB and National Forest designations.

Comment ID: 10197

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Robert

Comment: South Cerney Parish Council notes that under the Council's preferred development strategy (Scenario 5), South Cerney is not identified as accommodating additional site allocations beyond existing commitments. This position accords with the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan 2011–2031, which makes no housing allocations in South Cerney, and with Policy S8, which limits development to that which is appropriate in scale, form, and infrastructure capacity.

The South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan 2021–2031, made in December 2021 following a local referendum, forms part of the statutory development plan. It was prepared explicitly in reliance on the adopted Local Plan strategy, retains the established development boundary, makes no housing allocations, and includes locally specific policies addressing flooding, settlement separation, character, sustainable travel, and infrastructure constraints.

Approximately one-third of South Cerney parish lies within the Cotswold Water Park SSSI, designated in 1994 and substantially expanded and confirmed in 2021, reflecting a high level of ecological sensitivity that is a material planning consideration. Further evidence of this is the recent rejection of a development owing to South Cerney's proximity to the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Designated Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The Parish Council welcomes the absence of further allocations at this stage. However, it notes that the Preferred Options document confirms the Regulation 18 process is iterative and that further sites may be identified as evidence is refined. It is therefore appropriate to set out the Parish Council's position should additional site(s) in South Cerney be considered during the plan-making process.

Comment ID: 10198

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Robert

Comment: The identification of additional site(s) in South Cerney would represent a material departure from both:

the adopted Local Plan development strategy; and

the made Neighbourhood Plan, which carries full statutory weight.

Any such departure would therefore require clear and compelling justification, supported by proportionate, settlement-specific evidence demonstrating infrastructure capacity, deliverability, and consistency with the development plan as a whole.

In particular, the Parish Council considers that South Cerney should not be treated as a contingency location to compensate for delayed or under-delivery of strategic sites elsewhere in the district. Such an approach would risk undermining the plan-led system and conflict with the principle of positively prepared and justified spatial strategy selection.

The Parish Council further notes that, while Scenario 5 does not allocate sites within South Cerney, the cumulative and indirect effects of strategic growth elsewhere must be carefully considered to ensure that unplanned development pressure does not arise on settlements that are not identified as suitable for growth.

Comment ID: 10199

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Robert

Comment: The Parish Council recognises that indicative figures and maps at Regulation 18 stage are necessarily high-level and subject to refinement. However, it is important that early-stage site filtering and assessment does not rely solely on nationally designated landscape constraints.

Locally evidenced constraints—particularly settlement separation, sensitive settlement edges, key views, and rapid transitions from village to countryside—are identified within the South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan Character Assessment (Appendix N) and should be treated as material considerations in any future site assessment.

Landscapes outside nationally designated areas may nevertheless demonstrate moderate to high sensitivity where they contribute to settlement identity, separation, and landscape setting. These factors should be embedded within the interpretation of indicative figures and maps as the plan progresses.

Comment ID: 10200

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Robert

Comment: Water and wastewater infrastructure

The Parish Council has significant concerns regarding wastewater and sewerage capacity, particularly when considered alongside a documented history of local flooding and sensitivity to groundwater extraction associated with development activity.

The Preferred Options document and supporting evidence acknowledge existing pressures on water resources, uncertainty regarding wastewater treatment capacity, the presence of areas within Flood Zone 3, and reliance on third-party infrastructure providers.

The made Neighbourhood Plan contains specific policies and supporting evidence addressing flooding, groundwater risk, and water management (notably Policy SC13 and Appendix K). These reflect known local sensitivities, including previous adverse ecological impacts arising from groundwater extraction during construction.

The Parish Council considers that no additional site(s) should be identified in South Cerney unless sufficient wastewater capacity can be clearly demonstrated and secured in advance of development. Reliance on uncertain or future infrastructure upgrades would raise concerns regarding deliverability and plan soundness. Cumulative impacts on sewerage infrastructure should be assessed at settlement level rather than on a site-by-site basis in isolation.

Highway and transport impacts

South Cerney is served by a constrained rural road network, with established congestion and pinch points arising from its historic settlement form.

The Parish Council is concerned that strategic growth elsewhere in the district may generate additional traffic impacts affecting South Cerney irrespective of whether development is allocated within the settlement. Any additional site(s) within South Cerney would exacerbate these pressures.

Accordingly, any future site identification would require robust, up-to-date transport evidence addressing cumulative impacts, clearly identified and funded mitigation measures, and demonstrable alignment with Local Plan transport policies and Neighbourhood Plan Policy SC15 relating to sustainable travel.

Comment ID: 10201

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Robert

Comment: South Cerney Parish Council supports a plan-led approach to development and recognises the scale of the challenges associated with meeting objectively assessed housing needs within the framework of national policy.

However, it emphasises that the adopted Local Plan and the SC Neighbourhood Plan establish a clear, evidence-based and community-endorsed strategy for South Cerney. Infrastructure constraints—particularly flooding risk, groundwater sensitivity, wastewater capacity, highway limitations, extensive SSSI coverage, and proximity to a Special Area of Conservation—should be treated as primary determinants of suitability, not secondary considerations to be mitigated at a later stage.

With regard to flood risks in the Parish of South Cerney, it must be noted that these risks have been revealed as very present and real, with nearly all the areas identified by the Environment Agency (EA) mapping as being at risk of flooding having been the subject of actual and increasingly frequent flooding since 2000. So-called 1-in-100 years flood risk events have in fact sometimes been almost annual events in practice.

There is also a further aspect of increased flood risk that must be carefully taken into account in the emerging Local Plan. South Cerney has two ‘main rivers’ (as classified by the EA), namely the River Churn, running through the villages of South Cerney and Cerney Wick, and the Shire Ditch, which runs along the western side of the parish. The latter is fed entirely by the outflow from the Cirencester Sewage Treatment Works (STW) at Shorncote. Thames Water almost doubled the capacity of Cirencester STW last year, and the increased outflow from there will therefore substantially increase the flood risks from the Shire Ditch.

South Cerney Parish Council also expects that Policy SC2 of the South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan should be fully recognised and observed in relation to the emerging Local Plan, so that the Area of Separation is preserved, for the reasons stated in the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy SC2 reads as follows:

Policy SC2 - Area of Separation

The area shown on figure 4 above is designated as an Area of Separation between South Cerney, Cirencester, Siddington and Preston. The Area of Separation covers the area to the north of the village of South Cerney down to the road to the west by Cross Roads Farm and, to the east, the track (public footpath) that runs by The Sisters Farm. All areas outside of the South Cerney Development Boundary are included, with the exception of the army camp and airfield buildings at the Duke of Gloucester Barracks and housing outside the barracks on the Cirencester Road. Subject to the exceptions provided for in

CDLP Policies DS4 and EC3, development proposed in the Area of Separation which would result in a significant erosion of the separation between settlements will not be supported.

Should additional site(s) in South Cerney be considered at Regulation 18 or subsequent stages, the Parish Council expects this to occur only where full conformity with the South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan, the statutory development plan, infrastructure capacity, settlement character and actual flood risk can be clearly demonstrated and robustly evidenced.

Comment ID: 8728

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: In 5.3a, you state you are trying to keep away from flood prone areas, however, in Moreton both with existing planning and the proposes development, many of the fields are known to flood. What measures are going to be taken to mitigate the fact you want to build on existing flood plain? What guarantees will you provided both the people of the new builds you are proposes and existing residents that these developments will not increase their flood risk and so their insurance premiums and house prices, and that they will not suffer the inconvenience of flood in homes that to date, have never been known to flood.

Comment ID: 8729

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: In Moreton, given the sheer scope of proposed development, will funding be set aside to develop the river banks into beauty spots? So they can be readily walked and enjoyed much as they already are in nearby towns?

Comment ID: 8725

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: If Moreton is going to take on the number of homes expected, a redesign of the Highstreet is going to be required as it will need to be significantly expanded.

Needless to say it would be preferable if chain stores and large retailers could be significantly limited. The most sensible place to expand the Highstreet given the current layout and existing planning, is to the west, despite the fact this is in the AONB. It would remain close to the existing Highstreet so that you don't cleave the town in two. Further, on the far side of this new Highstreet section, you could put a large car park adjacent to a new bypass. This would draw through traffic out of the centre of Moreton, making it far nicer and helping protect its character. While also properly design access for coaches and a bus stop. HGVs could then be banned from central Moreton on an "access only" basis with a partial pedestrianisation of some of the current parking areas in central moreton, turning it into green space with abundant trees to match its designation as part of the Western Forest.

Comment ID: 8723

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: While areas such as Moreton have been identified for falling in part outside of the AONB, it does entirely fall within the new "Western Forest" National Forest, as do many other non-AONB towns in the district. How has this been factored into the development of these plans?

Comment ID: 8726

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: While in the final point in this section Moreton has been singled out due to its railway station. The reality is the station is in a terrible location with poor road access and insufficient parking. This despite the developments that have taken place.

A major rethink of this station needs to be considered. Ideally, it would be moved to the western edge of the town (I suggested elsewhere an expansion of the highstreet to the west with a new, large car park off a bypass). But as it stands the current traffic congestion at the double roundabout makes accessing this station by road frequently time consuming and difficult with no obvious fixes (from personal experience recently it took 20 minutes to drive from the station to Fosseway avenue due to congestion). Even with the parking expanded in the last round of development, it is still insufficient for its current use never mind if Moreton's size is doubled.

Comment ID: 8727

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: The Cotswold District should, in my opinion. Look to have a complete series of paths off the main roads linking its various towns and landmarks, so that the entire district can be walked without need to walk alongside a road and certainly not on a road as is currently frequently the case. These could incorporate cycle routes. Further, the district should embark upon an ambitious plan for a light rail system to cover the district. This would help alleviate the weight of traffic in the area. Such a system using low profile track, underground electrics and partial electrification could be relatively unobtrusive visually and vastly assist in linking the disparate towns.

Comment ID: 8730

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: Some sort of agreement needs to be made with Warwickshire and Oxford NHS trusts regarding healthcare provision for the east of the district. These areas often sit in closer proximity to hospitals in Warwickshire and Oxfordshire but both NHS trusts remain reluctant to allow their hospitals to be used by those in the Gloucestershire Cotswolds for referrals as its "not their area". This can lead to the absurd situation where someone in Moreton might be asked to attend Cheltenham or even Gloucester Hospitals, despite Warwick or Oxford being closer or easier to reach. This is particularly notable for those living on North Cotswold train line who have a direct train to Oxford but no simple way to reach Gloucester by public transport and a far longer journey to do so. I recently had this very issue with maternity care.

Comment ID: 8724

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: No. A serious plan needs to be put in place for transit networks within the Cotswolds. I would suggest a light rail system to help alleviate the traffic issues. The roads round the Cotswolds can already be seen to be struggling with the load particularly in summer. Adding this many houses without some sort of expansion of the transit network is only going to make it worse. This is going to have to be in the AONB, there is simply no way around it. A well-designed light rail system, with power laid in the ground and low-profile track with Cotswold stone embankments, would have minimal impact on the natural environment and, given most journeys are between the larger towns, remove the need for a lot of journeys for both locals and tourists.

Comment ID: 8731

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: I think as it stands the proportional weight of housing expected to be borne by Moreton is deeply unfair. And no doubt will not be matched by a proportional investment in infrastructure for its relative size.

I think the idea of building a new town should be revisited despite the AONB. A new town on the North Cotswold line which could be properly design from the ground up would help alleviate many issues that come with expanding current towns.

For example, a town could be build north of Aston Manga, this could be outside of the AONB (and arguments around not developing countered by the fact there is a mine nearby), giving it proximal access to both the Fosse Ways and the North Cotswolds line. Or south of Evenlode for much the same reasons of access.

Alternative A new town could be situated in the AONB but near another area which negates this somewhat, such as near Cotswold Farm Park Holidays. An area which on one side has a tourist commercial development and on the other a large quarry. Not exactly most people's envisagement of an AONB.

Comment ID: 8722

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: Given the number of extra homes that have been required by Government, I would contend this is "exceptional" and therefore meets the national planning policy. A tastefully built, properly planned town could be melded with the local character far more easily than bolting a multitude of smaller developments on existing places and attempting to match the character. It also allows for the proper designing of infrastructure from the ground up rather than adapting existing, often highly insufficient infrastructure in an already confined area that doesn't really have space for it. We are more than capable of building a modern Bourton-on-the-water, we just don't because we're terrified of building new towns and take far too much of an decentralised "by site" approach. Poundbury provides an excellent example of what can be achieved with a unified core vision and aesthetic.

Comment ID: 8721

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Robert Bell

Comment: This indicates that Moreton is receiving 2.5 times more homes than the much bigger Cirencester relative to its current size. Indeed, it looks like Moreton is receiving far, far more houses than anywhere in the district after adjusting for size, how is this in any way equitable?

Comment ID: 10906

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: Moreton-in Marsh has a largely tourist economy. Despite the land space used for the Fire Service College operated by Capita, it employs very few local people and many of those are in housekeeping and grounds maintenance rather than professional and managerial functions. In the plan for an additional 4000 houses there is no mention of the provision of employment opportunities in anything like the numbers required to make such development sustainable. Instead, MiM will become a faceless dormitory town with excessive commuting around an already congested road network.

Comment ID: 10915

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: Whist Infrastructure usually means "bricks and mortar" when it comes to education, healthcare and public transport (especially road) this requires skilled people to staff the relevant premises. The two doctor's surgeries in Moreton are not able to attract doctors and clinical staff to the town because of the high cost of living in the area. This applies to the schools that will be required for the proposed amount of housing and the additional bus services to locations not currently served so that young people can access tertiary education courses (you cant train to be a plumber if you are 16 in Moreton because there is no transport service that will get you to the nearest college and back).

Comment ID: 10920

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: Moreton already has a fire station and ambulance station. In recent months, the gridlock in town as a consequence of existing development has meant emergency vehicles have not been able to get out of Parkers Lane (the road that the station is on) for minutes at a time. This is likely to be exacerbated in the immediate environs of Moreton with the proposed number of houses with a consequently dangerous increase in response times, particularly going south towards Stow-on-the-Wold.

Comment ID: 10935

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: The development of Moreton as planned will require:

- a 3/4 ring road taking traffic from N-S and either N-W or S-W (both later routes going through the Cotswold Natural Landscape. The N-S route will require a bridge over both the River Evenlode and over the railway line
- Thames Water's current plan to increase waste water capacity only takes capacity to 8000 people, not the near 20000 proposed with this plan. How and when will the required capacity be delivered?
- A new senior school and junior school will be required with consequential effects at both Chipping Campden School and Cotswold School.
- Despite comments about being "green to the core" there is no provision of any community based renewable energy project.

Comment ID: 10550

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: CDC has just two railway stations; Moreton-in-Marsh and Kemble.

Since 2000, Moreton has experienced a 100% increase in housing with no additional infrastructure - road/rail/sewage treatment or any other piece of meaningful hard or soft infrastructure. However, the MiM Town Council have purchased the ex-Royal British Legion building and are working in partnership with GWR, now part of Great British Railways, to maximise the amount of long-term parking available at the town centre station. In a public forum in early 2025 a spokesperson for GWR stated that the additional car parking provision was only commensurate with existing housing growth and not in anticipation of any further development. It was also stated that there is no opportunity to add further parking at the site due to existing residential development. The station must therefore be considered "full" and any contemplation of further development in Moreton would need to consider the addition of further parking elsewhere in town. It must be borne in mind that Moreton is already the Train hub for the North Cotswolds and will be impacted by all development in the

North Cotswolds, Shipston-on-Stour and West Oxfordshire.

As described, Moreton-in-Marsh will clearly be over-developed by the number of houses proposed through lack of rail infrastructure and failure to recognise that there is a capacity limit to existing infrastructure. Such proposed housing development in Moreton-in-Marsh is, thus, unsustainable.

Comment ID: 10558

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: When CDC launched their first attempt at updating their 2031 local plan, only Moreton-in-Marsh was "identified" as a "strategic development" site and using the phrase "garden Town" for which it met none of the criteria. This seemed a lazy and politically driven decision at the time as it was clear, and pointed out in consultation documents at the time, that there were other strategic sites that had not had the level over-development MiM had already experienced; in particular, Kemble with the only other railway station in the district with far better connections (Bristol, Bath and London) than MiM. Recent reports have indicated a £1.75bn railway investment in connecting Kemble with Birmingham (Midlands Rail Hub). It calls into question the leadership of CDC in not identifying Kemble as a vital and, potentially, huge opportunity for economic growth in the Cotswolds when linked to the existing airport at the site.

Comment ID: 10565

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: This preferred option from CDC fails to consider the earlier concept of a "garden village/town" based around an, as yet, developed settlement.

The North Cotswolds towns of Moreton-in-Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold are plagued by serious traffic congestion, made worse by constant development and provision of services/infrastructure. Any development in Moreton will have direct consequences on the volume of traffic flowing through the town's two mini-roundabouts that are already at capacity and will also have direct consequences on the traffic flowing into Stow. Whilst a 3/4 bypass of Moreton may alleviate some of the persistent traffic problems within the town, the proposed volume of housing development will have catastrophic traffic consequences for Stow, which does not have an option of a bypass. The level of development for Moreton, therefore, is unsustainable for Stow and the North Cotswolds.

However, there is the possible development of a "garden village/town" on the A436 somewhere around Adlestrop/ Daylesford and provide the opportunity for a road to connect to the Fosse Way below Mangersbury and alleviate some of the traffic currently going through Stow. The lack of consideration of a strategic settlement along a major A-road appears to be a glaring omission.

Comment ID: 10561

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Robert Eastoe

Comment: In CDCs vision they talk about development being in proportion to the size of existing settlements. However, that is not what is being presented in any of the scenarios. By distorting the allocation of development to "strategic" sites, no account is being taken of local housing needs. By developing much social housing in areas distant from employment, welfare services and local support networks it condemns those who can least afford it to long commutes, long, expensive and poorly provided bus transport and isolation from family and friends.

Comment ID: 8963

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Robert McLean

Comment: CDC already fails its existing residents by allowing new builds and extensions without taking parking, narrow roads, in to consideration. I'd suggest cameras be fitted to all vehicles doing any council related work and their information being fed to a central observation centre so any issues past present or potential that may cause issues in emergency vehicles traveling their routes or accessing properties can be identified and resolved. Where curved kerbstones exist at bends or junctions they should be manufactured permanently yellow and no parking allowed on or within 10 meters from any yellow kerbstone.

Should double decker busses be used on route 51? Upper Up South Cerney, where even if no cars were parked Double Decked busses could not pass when traveling in opposite directions. Is parking directly on a T junction such as at Siddington Post office acceptable? Should the roads be marked in such a way to encourage parking on T junctions like Meadow Way and Clarks Hay be allowed going against the Highway Code? Do planners make any reference what so ever to the highway code when passing plans? Is pavement parking on both ends of Siddington Rd permissible as there is nowhere else to park a reasonable excuse? How many years will the residents of Kemble have to put up with cars parking where it's cheaper than using the Station Car Park? Our roads have become not fit for the purpose of traveling as they are being used as car parks. I fail to see how any increase in housing will improve matters. To add insult to injury by increasing the number of houses per hectare this will result in decreasing the amount of parking spaces.

That is my example of our roads being an issue. Dare I extend in to the total lack of Dentistry, Doctors or Hospitals will this or any increase of housing alleviate this situation?

Until CDC can deal with the current situation NO consideration should be given to increasing the number of houses. IMHO new builds (including extensions) should only be allowed if there minimum of 25% of total floor space allocated for easy access parking.

Comment ID: 10209

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: The Council's preferred scenario 5 is supported. Development should be concentrated on the main service centres and transport nodes. Rural settlements have limited or no services, so are generally not suitable.

Comment ID: 10210

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: If development occurs in unsustainable locations, then it will be a waste of money and effort because people will not want to live there.

It is important to preserve the unique local rural environment and heritage.

Comment ID: 10211

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: In recent years, most development has been of traditional 'family' homes. Many people, especially the younger generation and older less affluent people would welcome smaller properties.

Comment ID: 10214

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: Developments will fail if the necessary services are not provided, especially water supply, waste water services, flood prevention and health care. Currently all of these services have difficulty meeting existing needs. It may be an especial problem with new settlements. Major investment in provision of these services will be required.

Comment ID: 10216

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: The Cotswold Water Park has been blighted by low-standard holiday homes in recent years. There should be no more approval of such developments.

Limits should be placed in vehicle size (especially SUVs), to reduce wasted space that they cause especially in parking.

Comment ID: 10220

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Robert Walker

Comment: The Vision and Objectives statement is good. The priority should be for providing homes for local people, especially neglected categories such as the young and elderly. There should be a focus on socially rented homes.

It is important to preserve the unique character of the area, especially the rural environment and historic buildings.

All new properties should have minimal energy needs, with high levels of insulation and solar panels built in. They should also have integrated rainwater collection, to reduce drainage and water usage problems. Excessive paving should not be allowed.

Comment ID: 8761

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robin

Comment: Important to include appropriate increase in provision of general practitioners to cope with extra demands taking into account the fact that many of these house will be bought by those age over 65 who have above average need for GP consultations

Comment ID: 8762

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Robin

Comment: Will planning permission be linked to the requirement to include appropriate numbers of trees on the building site to provide shade in hot summers as well as habitat for wildlife

Comment ID: 8763

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Robin

Comment: You will need to ensure you provide an increase in primary care provision taking into account the fact that many if not the majority of these new houses will be bought by people over the age of 65 who make disproportionately larger demands on GP services

Comment ID: 8764

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Robin

Comment: Your aims are audible but how will you prevent the current practice of obtaining permission for one proposal that meets your requirements but then the site is sold to another developer who changes the plan so it no longer meets requirements

This seems very common way of maximising contractor profits while minimising community benefits

Comment ID: 8765

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Robin

Comment: This seems the most likely to meet green targets and is more likely to provide affordable housing suitable for younger families which is where the big need is

Building in the rural areas is essentially providing for retirees coming from London and other large towns and most of these houses are too expensive for local people

Comment ID: 10456

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Robin

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)

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.

Comment ID: 9755

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Roger White

Comment: Scenario 5 is the best of the bunch. That does not make it a good scenario as the character of the Cotswolds particularly in the south will be seriously and adversely impacted.

Comment ID: 9761

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Roger White

Comment: Absolutely not. How can it be beneficial to home buyers/renters to provide development in unsustainable locations merely to satisfy a quota???

Comment ID: 9768

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Roger White

Comment: This idea has merit but how do you equate that with the character of the area, which your "Vision" says will be protected and with the needs of families. Again, providing the number of housing units will fail if they are cramped and unsuitable for those for whom it is designed to house. This will not provide the vibrant communities promised in your vision.

Comment ID: 9771

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Roger White

Comment: This comment relates to Moreton in Marsh. The idea that so many new house could be built in Moreton without a substantial investment in infrastructure particularly in roads , and the A429, Fosseway in particular, is ridiculous. The road system in the area cannot cope with the existing volume which carries its impact down to Stow on the Wold and Bourton on the Water. Moreton is a junction of major roads and dealing with the existing volume should be the priority before any discussion about more housing.

Comment ID: 9777

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Roger White

Comment: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should have been provided as part of this consultation. You will have to have this plan in hand before any decisions on the suitability of the sites shown in this document can be made. You are asking for comments on a plan that is only partially formed. This gives the unfortunate impression that you will be able to tick the box that says you have done a public consultation but without it having real meaning.

Comment ID: 9778

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Roger White

Comment: The vision and objectives are laudable and well written. The lack of realism they contain is depressing.

Comment ID: 9380

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Rosanna

Comment: As an expert housing provider, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the development of the Cotswolds' local plan. Habinteg is a housing association that champions inclusion by providing and promoting accessible homes and neighbourhoods that welcome and include everyone. With over 50 years' experience in housing and disability, we manage over 3300 accessible properties across England. We believe that people are disabled by barriers in society and negative public attitudes, rather than by their own impairments.

At Habinteg, we believe that stronger, clearer targets are needed for housing provision for older people. We recommend that all new homes be built to the M4(2) accessibility standard, which allows homes to be more easily adapted to support independent living as people age. These homes benefit not only older residents but also households with disabled members, as they offer greater flexibility and support.

While some consideration has been given to housing for older people, similar attention has not been extended to the needs of disabled residents. To better meet the needs of the Cotswolds' disabled population, we recommend that at least 10% of new homes be built to the M4(3) standard, which provides fully wheelchair-accessible housing.

Additionally, the Local Plan could play a key role in addressing these needs by requiring planning teams to track and report the number of homes approved under the M4(2) and M4(3) standards. This data will support more effective strategic planning and ensure that delivery aligns with local needs.

Our interest is in the type of homes required to meet the needs of the Cotswolds.

Habinteg strongly recommends that all new homes needed in the Cotswolds be built to the M4(2) accessible and adaptable standard and 10% of new homes be built to the M4(3) wheelchair user home standard.

M4(2) is essential for delivering inclusive, future-proof homes that support ageing in place and any adaptations that may be required over the lifetime of the home. This standard meets the needs of a wide range of residents, including older people and many disabled people. Hence, we recommend that 100%/ all new homes are built to the M4(2) standard.

M4(3) standard homes are designed with the long term needs of wheelchair users in mind. These must be prioritised on any local plan to address the critical shortage of wheelchair-accessible housing. Hence, we recommend that 10% of new homes are built to the M4(3) standard.

As it stands, the Cotswolds' local plan doesn't explicitly necessitate that the higher accessibility standard (M4(2)) be used as a baseline for new homes. This misses a huge opportunity to provide quality homes for older and disabled people in the area.

The benefits of M4(2) homes are plentiful, and amongst them, new homes that meet category M4(2) will deliver:

- faster hospital discharges
- less costly and speedier adaptations when required
- reduced local government expenditure on domiciliary care packages by supporting individual independence within the home
- delay or avoid moves to more expensive residential care settings
- provide a better environment for ongoing independence when needs change.

We also recommend that as a minimum, 10% of homes, both market and affordable, should be built to the M4(3) standard to deal with the rising disability housing crisis. It is estimated that 400,000 wheelchair users in England are living in unsuitable accommodation, with 20,000 estimated to be on local authority waiting lists for a wheelchair user home. Data gathered by Habinteg - via freedom of information requests and published in January 2023 - has shown that a wheelchair user joining a local authority waiting list could have to wait up to 47 years to be offered a suitable new-build property.

The shortage of accessible homes has serious impacts on wheelchair users, who risk injury, loss of independence, restricted family life and employment opportunities and can face huge costs for adapting their existing homes or moving into specialist accommodation. Many of the costs associated with 'making do' in unsuitable homes fall to the public purse, particularly in relation to health and social care provision.

The benefits of an M4(3) home are plentiful, and amongst them, new homes that meet category M4(3) will:

- Remove or reduce the cost of care assistance in the home
- Lead to disabled people earning higher salaries than if they lived in an inaccessible home
- Enable greater social inclusion and community participation for people living in secure and appropriate homes
- Reduce welfare benefits and result in greater contribution to tax and National Insurance.

Comment ID: 9956

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Rosemary Andrews

Comment: Why is Cirencester not increasing in size itself.? If one ignores The Steadings there is very little outward extension of the town, relying instead on the increase in dwellings in places such as Ampney Crucis and Driffield which will change the nature of both settlements

Comment ID: 9955

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Rosemary Andrews

Comment: Not sure whether as you allocate lots of new housing to the outlying settlements there is proper provision for schools and space for playing fields

Comment ID: 9481

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Rosemary Chute

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

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 1,400 new houses in Fairford. This is a small town with very limited facilities, overstretched infrastructure and poor access to employment.

My objections are mainly based on the following planning considerations, which I do not believe have been adequately addressed.

1. Traffic Congestion and Highway Safety

The existing road infrastructure in the town is already under significant strain.

The main road through the town contains two separate one-way traffic restrictions, where only one car can drive through at a time. These are both on London Road (the main road through town), one next to Hyperion Care Home and the other at the bottom of the High Street (next to Colosseo Restaurant). These can cause traffic queues to form very quickly, particularly at busy times of day. The only alternative route to avoid the main road is via Lower Croft and Park Street and is very much through the residential part of Fairford and is unsuitable for high traffic volumes.

An additional 1,400 dwellings would inevitably generate a substantial increase in daily vehicle movements, which the existing road network is not capable of accommodating.

2. Inadequate Parking Provision and Accessibility

The proposed housing sites (to the North East of Fairford) will be approximately 20–25 minutes' walk to the town centre with its shops and doctor's surgery. This distance would present real difficulties for:

- Families with young children or buggies
- Older residents
- People with mobility issues

In practice, this will increase reliance on cars rather than reduce it.

Whilst there is a car park at the top of the High Street and a small area for parking in the Market Square, there is already insufficient on-street parking, particularly around the supermarket and key services. Parking is frequently congested, and the addition of many more households without sufficient, well-located parking provision in the town centre will significantly worsen the problem.

3. Sewage and Wastewater Infrastructure Capacity

The sewage infrastructure in Fairford is demonstrably inadequate, and the sewage treatment works is currently operating well beyond capacity. There are discharges into the River Coln happening for significant periods.

In addition, I am personally aware of a household that has experienced serious sewage flooding problems over the past 3 years, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. In 2025, on 2 occasions, raw sewage (including faecal matter and toilet paper) has risen to within approximately 2” of the top of the toilet bowl; on 2 occasions this has overflowed onto the bathroom floor. Thames Water have had to attend repeatedly (sometimes multiple times per day) and have installed “bungs” in roadside drains to prevent sewage backing up into properties. This is totally unacceptable and Thames Water have struggled to deal with the problem.

These are not isolated or theoretical concerns. They demonstrate that the existing system is already operating beyond capacity. The addition of 1,400 new homes would significantly increase foul water demand and risks worsening an already unacceptable situation.

4. Pressure on GP and Health Services

Fairford has an ageing population and the local doctor’s surgery is already extremely busy, with long waits for appointments. A development of this size would place further strain on primary healthcare services, and it is unclear how this additional demand would be met.

5. Increased Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

Large-scale development will inevitably result in significant areas of land being covered with hard surfaces, reducing natural drainage. Given the town’s existing issues during heavy rainfall, it is unclear how additional surface water will be managed without increasing flood risk to existing properties. Robust, proven drainage and attenuation measures would be essential, yet there is no reassurance that these would be sufficient at this scale of development.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed development raises serious concerns regarding traffic congestion, parking availability, sewage capacity and access to healthcare. These issues already affect residents and would be significantly exacerbated by the scale of development proposed.

Until there is clear evidence that existing infrastructure can be upgraded in advance — and not merely promised — I do not believe this proposal represents sustainable or appropriate development for Fairford.

Comment ID: 9482

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Rosemary Chute

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

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 1,400 new houses in Fairford. This is a small town with very limited facilities, overstretched infrastructure and poor access to employment.

My objections are mainly based on the following planning considerations, which I do not believe have been adequately addressed.

1. Traffic Congestion and Highway Safety

The existing road infrastructure in the town is already under significant strain.

The main road through the town contains two separate one-way traffic restrictions, where only one car can drive through at a time. These are both on London Road (the main road through town), one next to Hyperion Care Home and the other at the bottom of the High Street (next to Colosseo Restaurant). These can cause traffic queues to form very quickly, particularly at busy times of day. The only alternative route to avoid the main road is via Lower Croft and Park Street and is very much through the residential part of Fairford and is unsuitable for high traffic volumes.

An additional 1,400 dwellings would inevitably generate a substantial increase in daily vehicle movements, which the existing road network is not capable of accommodating.

2. Inadequate Parking Provision and Accessibility

The proposed housing sites (to the North East of Fairford) will be approximately 20–25 minutes' walk to the town centre with its shops and doctor's surgery. This distance would present real difficulties for:

- Families with young children or buggies
- Older residents
- People with mobility issues

In practice, this will increase reliance on cars rather than reduce it.

Whilst there is a car park at the top of the High Street and a small area for parking in the Market Square, there is already insufficient on-street parking, particularly around the supermarket and key services. Parking is frequently congested, and the addition of many more households without sufficient, well-located parking provision in the town centre will significantly worsen the problem.

3. Sewage and Wastewater Infrastructure Capacity

The sewage infrastructure in Fairford is demonstrably inadequate, and the sewage treatment works is currently operating well beyond capacity. There are discharges into the River Coln happening for significant periods.

In addition, I am personally aware of a household that has experienced serious sewage flooding problems over the past 3 years, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. In 2025, on 2 occasions, raw sewage (including faecal matter and toilet paper) has risen to within approximately 2” of the top of the toilet bowl; on 2 occasions this has overflowed onto the bathroom floor. Thames Water have had to attend repeatedly (sometimes multiple times per day) and have installed “bungs” in roadside drains to prevent sewage backing up into properties. This is totally unacceptable and Thames Water have struggled to deal with the problem.

These are not isolated or theoretical concerns. They demonstrate that the existing system is already operating beyond capacity. The addition of 1,400 new homes would significantly increase foul water demand and risks worsening an already unacceptable situation.

4. Pressure on GP and Health Services

Fairford has an ageing population and the local doctor’s surgery is already extremely busy, with long waits for appointments. A development of this size would place further strain on primary healthcare services, and it is unclear how this additional demand would be met.

5. Increased Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

Large-scale development will inevitably result in significant areas of land being covered with hard surfaces, reducing natural drainage. Given the town’s existing issues during heavy rainfall, it is unclear how additional surface water will be managed without increasing flood risk to existing properties. Robust, proven drainage and attenuation measures would be essential, yet there is no reassurance that these would be sufficient at this scale of development.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed development raises serious concerns regarding traffic congestion, parking availability, sewage capacity and access to healthcare. These issues already affect residents and would be significantly exacerbated by the scale of development proposed.

Until there is clear evidence that existing infrastructure can be upgraded in advance — and not merely promised — I do not believe this proposal represents sustainable or appropriate development for Fairford.

Comment ID: 9480

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Rosemary Chute

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

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 1,400 new houses in Fairford. This is a small town with very limited facilities, overstretched infrastructure and poor access to employment.

My objections are mainly based on the following planning considerations, which I do not believe have been adequately addressed.

1. Traffic Congestion and Highway Safety

The existing road infrastructure in the town is already under significant strain.

The main road through the town contains two separate one-way traffic restrictions, where only one car can drive through at a time. These are both on London Road (the main road through town), one next to Hyperion Care Home and the other at the bottom of the High Street (next to Colosseo Restaurant). These can cause traffic queues to form very quickly, particularly at busy times of day. The only alternative route to avoid the main road is via Lower Croft and Park Street and is very much through the residential part of Fairford and is unsuitable for high traffic volumes.

An additional 1,400 dwellings would inevitably generate a substantial increase in daily vehicle movements, which the existing road network is not capable of accommodating.

2. Inadequate Parking Provision and Accessibility

The proposed housing sites (to the North East of Fairford) will be approximately 20–25 minutes' walk to the town centre with its shops and doctor's surgery. This distance would present real difficulties for:

- Families with young children or buggies
- Older residents
- People with mobility issues

In practice, this will increase reliance on cars rather than reduce it.

Whilst there is a car park at the top of the High Street and a small area for parking in the Market Square, there is already insufficient on-street parking, particularly around the supermarket and key services. Parking is frequently congested, and the addition of many more households without sufficient, well-located parking provision in the town centre will significantly worsen the problem.

3. Sewage and Wastewater Infrastructure Capacity

The sewage infrastructure in Fairford is demonstrably inadequate, and the sewage treatment works is currently operating well beyond capacity. There are discharges into the River Coln happening for significant periods.

In addition, I am personally aware of a household that has experienced serious sewage flooding problems over the past 3 years, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. In 2025, on 2 occasions, raw sewage (including faecal matter and toilet paper) has risen to within approximately 2” of the top of the toilet bowl; on 2 occasions this has overflowed onto the bathroom floor. Thames Water have had to attend repeatedly (sometimes multiple times per day) and have installed “bungs” in roadside drains to prevent sewage backing up into properties. This is totally unacceptable and Thames Water have struggled to deal with the problem.

These are not isolated or theoretical concerns. They demonstrate that the existing system is already operating beyond capacity. The addition of 1,400 new homes would significantly increase foul water demand and risks worsening an already unacceptable situation.

4. Pressure on GP and Health Services

Fairford has an ageing population and the local doctor’s surgery is already extremely busy, with long waits for appointments. A development of this size would place further strain on primary healthcare services, and it is unclear how this additional demand would be met.

5. Increased Flood Risk and Surface Water Management

Large-scale development will inevitably result in significant areas of land being covered with hard surfaces, reducing natural drainage. Given the town’s existing issues during heavy rainfall, it is unclear how additional surface water will be managed without increasing flood risk to existing properties. Robust, proven drainage and attenuation measures would be essential, yet there is no reassurance that these would be sufficient at this scale of development.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposed development raises serious concerns regarding traffic congestion, parking availability, sewage capacity and access to healthcare. These issues already affect residents and would be significantly exacerbated by the scale of development proposed.

Until there is clear evidence that existing infrastructure can be upgraded in advance — and not merely promised — I do not believe this proposal represents sustainable or appropriate development for Fairford.

Comment ID: 8944

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Rosie Barron

Comment: Andoversford is a village and much smaller than the other principal settlements highlighted. It should not be being considered for development in the same way as these towns.

Comment ID: 8945

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Rosie Barron

Comment: This is by far the best option, expand existing towns and do not harm rural villages and communities by effectively turning them into new towns.

Comment ID: 9265

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

Name: Rosie Zhang

Comment: Down Ampney basically has no infrastructure to support the amount of houses you are proposing to build. The village gets flooded every year since the 60+ houses being built. The drainage system and roads in the village simply cannot handle the increase anymore

Comment ID: 9961

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Russell Cameron

Comment: The standard method of calculation of housing targets is totally inappropriate for our area as 80% of it is AONB and therefore development land is extremely restricted. Applying this arbitrary rule results in an inappropriate number of houses to be built in an area of higher than average house pricing. The result means we will be destroying village cultures and communities that have existed since the domesday book

Comment ID: 9964

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Russell Cameron

Comment: Simple economic questions - who will buy these homes? Who will build them? Where will they be employed? Where will their children go to school, who will provide their healthcare how will we manage the congestion and parking? How will we preserve any of the history and culture of the villages being forced to adopt new houses and residents that will have no ties or shared culture of our villages. The plan is inappropriate and nonsensical not recognising our special circumstances

Comment ID: 9962

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Russell Cameron

Comment: Every scenario negatively impacts our tiny village (Preston) and the surrounding countryside

Preston's existence and future is outlined in the neighbourhood plan which was accepted by CDC after much good work and cost - this now being totally discarded and undermined by unrealistic national approach that doesn't fit with our local situation, circumstances and history. The proposed approach takes no account of existing infrastructure, traffic and safety problems. Who is going to pay for and provide the schools, doctors, dentists, healthcare etc that will be required? The target for Preston is to enforce a quadrupling of the size of our village and effectively destroying the village as we will just be a conjoined suburb of a greater Cirencester. We therefore insist that if such an inappropriate plan proceeds it must include:

A green buffer between Cirencester and our village (and include the recently outline planning approved housing numbers on Kingshill Lane in our quota)

Steps to prevent rat running through the village with traffic trying to avoid the congestion on Kingshill Lane

Traffic and pedestrian safety measures on Kingshill Lane and Preston Toll Barr

Improved community facilities and infrastructure to cope with the overwhelming new homes and residents proposed

Better public transport

Comment ID: 10337

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Ruth Nichol

Comment: I live in a principal settlement. If it is your preferred option for new housing I am concerned about the poor infrastructure to support more building. The main A361 road , the only north/ south route is clogged with heavy traffic at many points during the day with particularly long queues of cars , vans and lorries trying to cross the Thames at a narrow point over the ancient and crumbling bridge. This problem will be exacerbated by the occupants of new housing in any numbers. There is no cycle lane and the pedestrian pavement particularly from the petrol station is non existent on one side for a section then of very poor quality, a hazard to walkers who therefore choose to drive into town instead.

Comment ID: 227

Email/Letter Representation

Name: R P Barham

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

Comment ID: 542

Email/Letter Representation

Name: R. Emmet

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

Comment ID: 601

Email/Letter Representation

Name: RA Holland

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

Comment ID: 146

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Di Vito

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

Comment ID: 475

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Gentil

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

Comment ID: 674

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Gentil

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

Comment ID: 401

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Hand

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

Comment ID: 376

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Hutchinson

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

Comment ID: 506

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Kirk

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

Comment ID: 717

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Kirk

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

Comment ID: 354

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Roffe

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

Comment ID: 391

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rachel Smith

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

Comment ID: 279

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ranier Developments Ltd

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

Comment ID: 564

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rebecca Lewis

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

Comment ID: 267

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Reyn Hauff

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

Comment ID: 527

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rich Napier

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

Comment ID: 460

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Richard Deeley

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

Comment ID: 535

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Richard Smith

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

Comment ID: 509

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Richborough

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

Comment ID: 829

Email/Letter Representation

Name: RK Ashmore

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

Comment ID: 809

Email/Letter Representation

Name: RN Ashmore

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

Comment ID: 677

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rob Davies and Dr Claires Forbes

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

Comment ID: 343

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rob Flett

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

Comment ID: 386

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rob Waggie

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

Comment ID: 566

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robb Flett

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

Comment ID: 544

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert and Joanna Williams

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

Comment ID: 269

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 270

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 271

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 272

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 273

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 268

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Hitchens Ltd

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

Comment ID: 278

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Moss

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

Comment ID: 455

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Webb

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

Comment ID: 456

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Webb

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

Comment ID: 457

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Webb

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

Comment ID: 458

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robert Webb

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

Comment ID: 584

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robin Uzzell

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

Comment ID: 841

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Robina Sabourin

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

Comment ID: 747

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Roger and Nerys Meadow

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

Comment ID: 499

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Roger Cornwell

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

Comment ID: 380

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Roger Smith

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

Comment ID: 660

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Roger Wright

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

Comment ID: 150

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ronald Thornhill

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

Comment ID: 855

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rosanna Armitage

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

Comment ID: 689

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rosanna Stopford

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

Comment ID: 753

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rose Johnston

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

Comment ID: 430

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rosie & Dominic Arkwright

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

Comment ID: 199

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rowan Wynne-Jones

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

Comment ID: 568

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rowena Luard

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

Comment ID: 206

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Royal Agricultural University

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

Comment ID: 342

Email/Letter Representation

Name: RTG Chester Master Will Trust

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

Comment ID: 800

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Rupert Finch

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

Comment ID: 616

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Russell Jelley

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

Comment ID: 721

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ruth Nichol

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