

Comment ID: 10007

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: K Townsend

Comment: FARMING IS ESSENTIAL RE GOOD LOCAL HEALTHY FOOD. OTHERWISE WE WILL BE EATING ONLY FOOD THAT IS SO OLD IT HAS TO BE TREATED WITH CHEMICALS TO MAKE IT LOOK, AT LEAST POSSIBLY PRESENTABLE HAS TRAVELLED FROM FAR AWAY

PLACES< POSSIBLY UNKOWN IN ACTUAL FACT!!!

Comment ID: 9434

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: karen Corfield

Comment: I am commenting here as this is the preferred option.

Recent housing developments in Cirencester have put too much pressure on the roads , car parks, GP surgeries, NHS Dentists and schools, as we have seen increases in housing without the necessary facilities to accompany it .

In addition the state of the roads is terrible and the provision of public transport is poor. For example there is no proper coordinated link between the buses and the nearest main line station, which makes train travel seem unfavourable unless you have a car.

These issues need to be taken into account before new housing is built, which I accept is inevitable, but without current residents paying the price through increased council taxes to pay for future residents.

Finally , Cirencester and the surrounding area is beautiful and still a great attractor of tourists. Continuous increase in the size of the town will inevitably change the areas character and make it less attractive to both residents and tourists alike

Comment ID: 8766

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Kasia Howard

Comment: 4 - growth around transport nodes. This minimises car use, making our roads safer and reducing travel through smaller settlements.

Comment ID: 8767

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Kasia Howard

Comment: No. Put housing where it is needed.

Comment ID: 8768

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Kasia Howard

Comment: If local people can identify sites this would help development to be accepted.

Comment ID: 10595

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: The information for the plan is confusing and presented piecemeal. It is very hard to understand what is being proposed and why. There are huge amounts of information presented and a very limited time to digest them. There is a lack of clear summary or explanation of why locations have been proposed. This stage should have given an overview of what is delivered and engage with stakeholders.

Comment ID: 10598

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: The CDC district is 80% National Landscape, which should be protected from development which will damage natural beauty and special character. It is illogical that a standard national metric should be used to allocate housing in the district as this very request goes against the planning framework.

The Parish of Broadwell has consistently provided housing to meet housing supply need. Instead of being acknowledged, this is being used as a metric to require overdevelopment in the village and that it must deliver over and above neighbouring villages with more facilities. The Local Plan should instead focus on ensuring that each Parish Council meets housing supply, in line with what can be supported in their area.

Comment ID: 10625

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: It is clear from the document and supporting information that the infrastructure for development is not in place. The Plan should instead focus on how infrastructure could be put in place to support development. Ring roads will need to be created around towns, but without damaging the National Landscape. Capacity for services, especially sewerage, will need to be increased. Healthcare and education provision will need to double in line with the doubling of populations in centres such as Moreton.

Comment ID: 10693

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Why is Broadwell included here? The background data in the Settlement Role and Function study is incorrect and states Broadwell has and has access to services that it does not.

Why is Windfall used as a metric for delivery for individual villages and not the district as a whole? It is a measure for strategic overview and cannot be used to predict a precise number of houses in one small location. It is not realistic to suggest that Broadwell has an infinite supply of windfall developments and that a certain number of these can be delivered to a plan.

Why are villages which have offered no development between 2011-2024 not targeted to provide supply? They are more likely to have disused buildings for conversion or vacant lots. Villages with facilities such as Primary Schools, Shops, Business Centres have not been looked at but instead Rural Settlements such as Broadwell have been inaccurately identified as providing these services.

Comment ID: 10694

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: These maps are misleading. Each settlement is shown as the same size. Small Rural Villages are demonstrated as being the same size as towns. This influences the thinking of those looking at the graphics that they are looking at a series of similar size towns, not Greenfield and rural areas.

Comment ID: 10696

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: No it is not sustainable. The plan does not make adequate provision for infrastructure and services to support development. The plan does not challenge the inclusion of National Landscape in the development zone. The plan skews development to the North West of the Cotswold National Landscape, degrading this area to an unrecognisable degree. Broadwell is selected as a non-principal settlement despite being a small rural village with no facilities. Development as described in Broadwell would not be sustainable.

Comment ID: 10699

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: This should be completed BEFORE the Local Plan is made

Comment ID: 10700

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Infrastructure needs to be in place before housing supply is delivered.

Comment ID: 10701

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Infrastructure needs must be considered before allocating housing supply.

Comment ID: 10702

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: The Vision and Objectives need to be met BEFORE housing supply is allocated to areas.

Comment ID: 10703

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Broadwell Parish should not be included in the call for sites. It has no infrastructure or amenities to support development. The land proposed borders the River Evenlode and forms part of a flood plain, vital for natural life and also for draining from the current village area. It is a non-sustainable and environmentally unsound proposal. Zone 6 should be removed from the plan.

Comment ID: 10602

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: The period of this consultation overlaps with the Christmas period and does not take into account public holidays and business closures. It is questionable in its fairness in allowing people, especially organisations, to respond.

Comment ID: 10604

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: There is insufficient information about employment, traffic and travel, facilities and amenities to make the judgement on this plan. Proper research should be carried out before choosing towns and villages as development options.

Comment ID: 10607

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Broadwell should not be included in non-principal settlements. It is a rural settlement with no facilities. There is no public transport, no shop, no school, no healthcare and the village is accessed by narrow roads and through a ford. The information used to present Broadwell as a settlement is incorrect and it has therefore been incorrectly listed as a settlement which could support development.

Comment ID: 10612

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Density increase should, as stated be limited to town centres and areas with transport links. Broadwell is a rural settlement with no transport and cannot support increased density. The village is a scattered and sparse settlement by nature and is included in a conservation area and the National Landscape. Character and natural beauty therefore need to be protected and increased density is therefor not an option in this case.

Comment ID: 10615

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Broadwell should not be included as a non-principal settlement. It does not have amenities such as schooling, public transport, healthcare, safe traffic measures. It appears to have been included in error based on inaccurate information about the village.

Comment ID: 10619

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: All scenarios are currently based on flawed information and need better research. In particular including Broadwell as a non-principal settlement is based on erroneous data. Using the windfall factor to multiply development in one specific area is not a valid metric.

Development should be in line with the available land in the district (exception should be made for the National Landscape) and sustainable development should be the key consideration at all times. There is insufficient mention of sustainability in the proposals to make them in line with National Policy.

Comment ID: 10620

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Absolutely not. This would go against the National Policy and therefore be subject to challenge. It would damage the area and the health and wellbeing of the population as well as causing irreversible harm to nature and the environment at a time of climate crisis.

Comment ID: 10622

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Kate Burtonwood

Comment: Increasing density should be limited to town centres and industrial sites which do not have a special characteristic of scattered settlements, which are key to the character of the Cotswold National Landscape. As the district is 80% National Landscape this is very limited in scope. Attention must be paid to other sustainability and material considerations - such as transport and road safety. Building concentrations of housing with no parking and no suitable roadways is not an option as there is limited public transport in the area. There are limited employment opportunities in the area so an increased population could not be supported locally.

Comment ID: 10279

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: It is foolish to build on agricultural land when the country cannot feed itself.
Much of the land floods.

Comment ID: 10280

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Population is predicted to fall in the future

Comment ID: 10270

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Increasing density makes for poorer quality of life. It is not in keeping with the Cotswolds. It is not family friendly

Comment ID: 10285

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Infrastructure structure has not been addressed with the developments at present. I doubt it will be in the future as building companies build with profit as their guiding motive and no consideration of the wider issues

Comment ID: 10273

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Option 3 as this has the infrastructure to support growth.

Comment ID: 10277

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Obviously not. If not sustainable then it won't work. Unless you are playing a political game hoping that nothing will be built

Comment ID: 10278

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: No, you could consider building single level dwellings for older people at a smaller size. Cramped housing conditions are not family friendly. Children need outdoor space. Think we learnt this from the pandemic.

Comment ID: 10282

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Fairford needs - improved water treatment. Bigger medical practice. More or bigger shops (Co-op) Bypass to avoid the centre of the town. Amenities for young people - leisure centre. Better public transport. More employment opportunities locally to avoid unsustainable travel to work.

Comment ID: 10268

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Fairford is hardly a principal settlement. It has grown rapidly in the last few years without the appropriate infrastructure to support it. Little employment outside working from home. The road network is poor with one narrow road running through the middle with bottle necks from parked cars and the narrow bridge.

Comment ID: 10269

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Smaller developments here would not impact in the same way as massively increasing the size of towns such as Fairford

Comment ID: 10271

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Katharine Stephenson

Comment: Far too many houses for a town the size of Fairford. The infrastructure cannot cope. Thames Water is already regularly polluting the River Coln as the sewerage system cannot cope at the moment. There is one small medical practice. Three convenience shops, and a butchers. The road through the middle is congested, adding another 2-3 thousand cars is unsustainable. The bus service is poor. There are few amenities for our young people. There is limited employment opportunities beyond WFH.

Comment ID: 9351

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Katherine Kerr-Rettie

Comment: Smaller hamlets need invigorating with permanent residents, preferably in affordable houses. So many houses are now second homes and the villages and hamlets need residents to populate village schools, churches, shops and halls. Improved rural transport services such as the Robin allows for transportation into the larger towns thus mitigating against isolation. Spread the load and reinvigorate existing communities as well as building large estates. Allow for choice and diversity.

Comment ID: 9264

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Katherine Stevenson

Comment: It seems incredibly disproportionate to develop so greatly/highly in Down Ampney, a village that floods regularly and severely, it hasn't got the drainage, sewerage of ability to cope with the water usage and needs in the village already. They've just build on three new sites and have increased the size of the village. There is no infrastructure for further dwellings. As I type Thames Water are here yet again for water issues and the road flooding from leaking. Ploughing ahead with development for the sake of targets makes no sense.

Comment ID: 10579

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Katie Thorne

Comment: Current public transport options are too limited already in some of these site locations. How will this be addressed? Surely this infrastructure needs to be addressed prior to any development.

Comment ID: 9028

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Keith Salway

Comment: The whole strategy response has clearly been very well considered; I would favour option 4 or 5 but the one comment i wish to add is that when one is in our towns at night it is very apparent in shopping areas etc that upper floors are dark; there must be great potential, with imagination, to bring such wasted space into truly affordable residential use. Refer please to the current fine YMCA project to create 10,000 new spaces for young [people by conversions.

Comment ID: 9135

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Kevin

Comment: Willersey Parish Council's Discussion regarding CDC Local Plan

Having reviewed CDC Preferred Options Consultation, Willersey PC has raised a number of concerns, set out below.

The Parish Council cannot support CDC suggested option 5 and its impact on Willersey of 184 new homes.

The proposed new developments, when considered alongside recent and pending growth in Willersey and neighbouring settlements, will lead to an intolerable and critical strain on the village's already failing infrastructure and irreversible environmental harm

The CDC Options Consultation and favoured option 5 raises the following concerns:

1. Failure to Address Infrastructure Incapacity and Crisis Points

Future developments fail to satisfy the requirements of NPPF Paragraphs 98 and 101 (ensuring development is only granted where the necessary infrastructure is available or can be provided) and CDLP Policy INF1 (Supporting Infrastructure). Willersey's essential services are at crisis point and cannot absorb the impact of a further 184 homes.

1.1 Foul Sewerage, Drainage, and Flood Risk (NPPF 170 & CDLP EN14)

The foul sewerage and drainage system is severely overburdened. The existing infrastructure has already been significantly impacted by the cumulative strain from the Folly View, Willow Green, and Farncombe Estate developments joining the network.

The system, which operates as a single pipe system, is at maximum capacity, resulting in frequent and severe sewage spills. Flooding has become a regular occurrence, sometimes up to five times a year, especially during prolonged heavy rain. This affects Collin Lane, Blind Lane, and Badsey Road (under the railway bridge). Crucially, raw sewage, which has been seen floating along Collin Lane and into the stream alongside the Recreation Ground/Willow Green (ultimately feeding into Badsey Brook and the River Avon), is being discharged into floodwaters and the gardens of Collin Lane, posing a severe public health risk. This contamination causes the backup of sewage systems for properties on Collin Lane, Collin Close, and others, stopping the use of toilets and showers until the floodwaters subside.

Holding Objection from Severn Trent: The Parish Council notes that Severn Trent (the foul sewerage provider) has requested a Holding Objection to planning application xxx having been alerted to the potential for the proposed development to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding Network and Treatment Works, with the

possibility of causing further flooding or pollution. The Parish Council requests that Severn Trent's recommendations, following their investigation, are given maximum weight, noting that simply stating Severn Trent has a duty to improve the network deflects responsibility and conflicts with recommendations from the National Flood Forum (NFF).

1.2 Water Supply Network Capacity (CDLP INF1)

In addition to the foul drainage issues, the existing water supply network has been officially determined to be insufficient to serve this development, directly contradicting the requirement for necessary infrastructure to be in place. This deficiency is officially noted:

Thames Water Comments: Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. As such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional demand to serve the development have been completed... (etc.)

This official statement confirms that the necessary water network infrastructure is not currently available, placing an unacceptable risk of no/low water pressure on existing residents and directly contravening planning policy.

1.3 Health and Education Services

Local GP surgeries and dental practices, particularly those in the wider catchment area including Broadway (which is situated in the adjacent county of Worcestershire and on which Willersey villagers rely for service provision), are already severely overstretched. Waiting times are increasing, a situation worsened by developments impacting the already strained Worcestershire service provision. Furthermore, the village school is small and its site in the conservation area constrains expansion, with most year groups at capacity. An influx of new residents, particularly families, will exacerbate this crisis, forcing households to make multiple daily journeys to separate primary schools or seek education further afield, thereby undermining the sustainability of the location.

CIL Inadequacy: The Parish Council firmly maintains that these critical infrastructure challenges—including but not limited to Sewage, Fresh Water, Electricity, Gas, GPs, and Schools—will not be addressed by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) suggested by the developer. These essential infrastructure challenges must be definitively resolved before any further development can happen.

2. Irreversible Harm to the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB)

A significant proportion of Willersey lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB), a nationally protected landscape where great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing scenic beauty (NPPF Paragraphs 187-190 and Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). In such locations, the scale and extent of development should be limited, and the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' does not automatically apply (NPPF Paragraph 11). The destruction of AONBs contravenes the 1949 Act of Parliament passed to conserve such areas of the UK.

Development in Willersey must adhere to the highest level of protection, as stipulated by NPPF Paragraphs 189 and 190 (giving great weight to landscape and scenic beauty) and CDLP Policy EN5 (Conserving AONB).

2.1 Major Development and Strategic Circumvention (NPPF 182, 55-57, 64 & CDLP EN1, S2, INF1, DS1)

This proposal for 184 dwellings clearly qualifies as major development within an AONB, and under NPPF Annex 2 Glossary and Local Plan Policy EN1, it should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest—a test this application fails entirely.

2.2 Coalescence, Visual Harm, and Dark Skies

The Cotswolds AONB Landscape Strategy and Guidelines (Section 19.1 - Unwooded Vale) identifies this area as one of the most visually sensitive parts of the Cotswolds. This development contravenes core guidelines by failing to:

- Maintain the open, sparsely settled character of the Unwooded Vale by extending the settlement into an open landscape.
- Maintain open, undeveloped gaps between settlements to prevent coalescence and retain distinct village identities. Future development will continue to reduce the gap and could link the village to houses across the County boundary in Broadway.

Developments could impact the requirement to minimise light pollution and conserve existing dark skies. This would contravene AONB guidelines, and the AONB's Position Statement on Dark Skies and Artificial Light (March 2019) has not been considered by in the proposed new plan threatening to erode the area's dark skies and setting a damaging precedent.

2.3 Ecological Damage (NPPF 189, 190 & NERC Act S41)

The Parish Council asserts that further development would impact the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage, as required by NPPF Paragraphs 189 and 190. The site possesses important biodiversity, including species listed as being of

conservation concern on Section 41 of the NERC Act (Habitats and Species of Principal Importance). Documented sightings include RSPB Red List birds (e.g., lesser spotted woodpecker) and Amber List birds (e.g., tawny owl), which will lose their habitat if this field is developed.

3. Loss of Village Identity and Unsustainable Location

Further development of the proposed size constitutes unsustainable development, seriously threatening the small, rural character of Willersey.

3.1 Lack of Amenities and Transport (NPPF 8, 104-110 & CDLP DS1, DS2, INF3):

Willersey lacks the essential facilities to support this development. The village is now extremely limited, consisting only of two public houses, a garage (fuel only), and a primary school. Residents must travel to Broadway or beyond for access to shops, medical services, and schools.

3.2 This dependency on external services means residents are isolated and car-dependent, which conflicts directly with NPPF Paragraphs 8 and 104-110 and Local Plan Policies DS1, DS2, and INF3 (Sustainable Transport). The pavement to Broadway (approx. 1.1 miles/25-minute walk to the nearest shop) is frequently underwater, making the journey unsafe and unsustainable, and the direct route involves crossing the A44 near a busy roundabout, which is dangerous. This isolation and inherent car dependency will equally apply to new residents in Willersey.

4. Erosion of Character: This scheme is widely viewed by the community as a "continuous march towards urbanisation," threatening to turn this "quintessentially Cotswold Village" into an "urbanised satellite" that merges with Broadway..

5. Current Road Infrastructure

Willersey's roads are often potholed and subject to flooding. The conservation area is designated a B road with large articulated lorries driving through, potentially damaging roads and shaking houses. Any influx in development in Willersey or neighbouring areas could add to this problem.

Conclusion

The PC cannot agree to scenario five and feel that even if infrastructure was addressed, such increase in houses would render a non principal settlement a large village with no amenities. A recent application in Moreton-in Marsh was recently rejected in October 2025 due to the development being an isolated "enclave" which was poorly connected to the town. The same would be said of Willersey having 49 per cent more houses without associated infrastructure and being over a mile away from amenities.

The PC suggest the CDC further explore option three where development could have access to the necessary infrastructure, transport hubs etc.

Comment ID: 9941

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

Comment: As residents of Siddington Parish for over 50 years we think none of the scenarios presented fully support the aim of the local Plan to be sustainable and 'green'. Each scenario generally undermines the central ethos of previous CDC Local Plans Cotswolds and take little account of policies contained in Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5/five destroys the rural and community attributes of a number of small villages and arguably transforms them into suburbs of larger towns thus destroying their identity.

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

Scenario 5/five is only workable if strategic sites are placed where genuine infrastructure exists, so not Siddington. Allocating 1100 new homes in a village of 339 dwellings is inconsistent with sustainable development. The selection of Siddington from strategic development is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations, strategic alternatives throughout Cotswold National Landscape exist.

Comment ID: 9944

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

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

If Cotswold District Council (CDC) decides to locate developments in unsustainable sites it will be abandoning its good planning practice of the past and should publicly admit it.

Siddington appears to be targeted as it lies outside the National Landscape not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification appears to hide the fact the village lacks services and transport infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to support the need for housing numbers.

Comment ID: 9945

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations such as the village of Siddington is inappropriate and would arguably threaten their rural character.

Comment ID: 10823

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

Comment: Yes, The proposed Development Plan should also consider the following

- 1/ The INCORRECT Principal Settlement classification.
- 2/ The protection of Siddington village's identity and cohesion.
- 3/ Flood protection and resilience.
- 4/ Maintenance of the 'green' buffer with Cirencester.
- 5/ Rural infrastructure limits.

Comment ID: 10838

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

Comment: We generally concur with the vision outlined but the proposals in the Consultation documentation will not deliver that vision. In our view from the perspective of Siddington a village we have lived in for over 50/fifty years the proposals

1/ Do not demonstrate the delivery of a sustainable larger community, they threaten the destruction of the existing community.

2/ Will involve development that does not prioritise sound environmental stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.

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

4/ Will not permit Siddington maturing into a thriving community.

Comment ID: 10814

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Kevin & Maggie Pocock

Comment: There is no prospect of the proposed level of development outlined for Siddington being sustainable. Siddington as many villages in the surrounds of Cirencester are currently reliant on the town and we would expect this to continue.

A three to four hundred percentage expansion would merge Siddington with Cirencester, overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk and destroy the village's identity. The miss -classification as a Principal Settlement also undermines the justification for the planned level of growth.

Comment ID: 9176

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Kevin Fletcher

Comment: The proposed development for MICKLETON is not sustainable. This would result in Mickleton having 1543 houses making it the 6th largest in the region. However, the sustainability chart in Table 14 of the Settlement Role and Function Study puts Mickleton, with a score of 8.3, 14th out of the 16 principal settlements for sustainability. It also scores poorly on the sustainability chart for employment and economic activity (Table 12).

This shows clearly that there would be a huge divergence between low sustainability and high housing growth. To address this either (1) the housing target must be reduced or (2) there would need to be a massive investment in infrastructure and services in the village.

Also you should consider the impact on traffic through the village, especially bearing in mind the proposals for a new settlement of up to 10000 houses at Long Marston Airfield which, if it proceeds, will significantly increase the traffic flow through Mickleton.

Comment ID: 10641

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Kornelia Smith

Comment: I prefer options 3 - 5 as they are more sustainable. Concentrating new developments around established settlements and transport nodes will ensure good access to amenities and essential services.

Comment ID: 10647

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Kornelia Smith

Comment: I feel that locations within AONB and those previously deemed as unsuitable should be considered as a last resort. Preserving the natural beauty of the Cotswolds for the future generations should be as important as delivering a sustainable growth to the housing stock.

Comment ID: 10726

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Kornelia Smith

Comment: As residents who purchased an affordable home in a rural area, our experience highlights the real challenges that come with living in a development that is not supported by decent transport links (including public transport, footpaths, cycle lines etc). This limits employment opportunities, increases the number of car journeys, and as a result puts a further strain on the environment, infrastructure and personal budget.

While I acknowledge the pressing need for affordable housing in the district, I am deeply concerned that both scenarios 1 and 2 present significant dangers due to their unsustainable approach. The majority of non-principal settlements and village clusters targeted for development are situated within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). These locations often lack essential amenities and services, making them unsuitable for substantial new development.

Overdevelopment of these areas risks irreversibly damaging the unique rural character that makes the Cotswolds special. Furthermore, the existing infrastructure is already limited and would be quickly overwhelmed by additional housing. Proposals to improve infrastructure are likely to lag far behind the pace of development, especially given the track record of developers who prioritize profit over community needs (and wants!) and the appropriateness of chosen sites.

A particular paradox in scenarios 1 and 2 is the intent to provide much-needed affordable housing, yet doing so by locating these homes in remote rural areas with limited or strained access to healthcare, education, transport links, and other vital amenities. This approach is fundamentally flawed, as it does not serve the best interests of those who need affordable housing the most.

Rural areas require a different and carefully considered approach to development. Any plan for growth must ensure that essential infrastructure—such as water supply, sewage systems, road surfaces, healthcare funding, and sufficient local school places—is upgraded and in place before increasing the number of houses. Individually considered, piecemeal developments rushed to meet housing targets, will cause irreversible harm not only to the cherished landscape but also to existing residents. Those living in these areas will be deeply affected by ill-thought-out plans that prioritize speed and delivering the numbers over long-term sustainability and community well-being. In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider the focus of scenarios 1 and 2 and to prioritize sustainable development in locations that are already established to support

new residents, with proper infrastructure and access to essential services already in place.

It is also important to highlight that scenarios 3 to 5 offer a far more sustainable and less damaging approach. By concentrating new housing around existing, well-connected settlements, these scenarios make use of established communication links and infrastructure, reducing strain on rural and natural areas. This approach is less intrusive to the Cotswolds' unique countryside and helps preserve the area's scenic beauty and environmental integrity. Focusing development where connections to healthcare, education, transport, and other amenities already exist will ensure that new housing is both accessible and sustainable, serving the needs of residents without compromising the character of the region.

Comment ID: 857

Email/Letter Representation

Name: K Gaden

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

Comment ID: 228

Email/Letter Representation

Name: K Oughton

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

Comment ID: 277

Email/Letter Representation

Name: K Oughton

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

Comment ID: 307

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Karen Bishop

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

Comment ID: 282

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Karen Edgington

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

Comment ID: 597

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Karen Lomas

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

Comment ID: 145

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kate Lawlor

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

Comment ID: 525

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Katerina Jones

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

Comment ID: 699

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Katerina Jones

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

Comment ID: 596

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Katie O'Brien

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

Comment ID: 560

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Katrina Eglise

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

Comment ID: 308

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Keith and Cathering Glossop

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

Comment ID: 570

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Keith Salway

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

Comment ID: 801

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kelly McCauley

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

Comment ID: 332

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kemble and Ewen Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 667

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kempford Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 668

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kempford Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 651

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kenny Meacher

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

Comment ID: 331

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kevin McCollum

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

Comment ID: 121

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kevin Underwood

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

Comment ID: 476

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kim Tye

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

Comment ID: 216

Email/Letter Representation

Name: KM King

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

Comment ID: 865

Email/Letter Representation

Name: KM King

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

Comment ID: 603

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Kornelia Smith

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