

Comment ID: 9639

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Natalie Baird-Clarke

Comment:

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

Resident Response

Name: Natalie Baird-Clarke

Address: 5 Stoney Pool, Poulton, GL7 5LR

Date: 29 December 2025

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.

Regards,

Natalie Baird-Clarke

Comment ID: 10736

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: Scenario 3. Greater weighting should be given to the aim of scenario three where facilities, local transport and basic infrastructure (water, sewage, power, broadband systems etc.) can be more easily expanded. This must be more cost effective than having to do the same in ten or twenty non-sustainable settlements. Scenario 3 would focus the vast majority of future development at main service centres. These main service centres offer a broad range of services and facilities, good public transport accessibility and provide a mix of job opportunities. With more remote workers, broadband services are critical and the services outside of the major town areas is generally poor. The road network, particularly the A417 between Cirencester and Fairford is considerably damaged by potholes that only get worse over time. During periods of high flooding (increasingly more commonplace now in and around Poulton), these are often hidden underwater and are extremely hazardous. Fix the current infrastructure first.

Comment ID: 10739

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: No. Development should be targeted where facilities are available – shops, transport links to other centres, employment, education and health hubs. Focus should be on areas where these are already established and where an increased population can support further commercial and social development. To not do so will have a greater impact on the environment in terms of traffic movements, both from a pollution and traffic management point of view. It makes economic sense to improve facilities in sustainable centres rather than building small developments in many unsustainable centres, all of which will not be able to provide the same level of amenities.

Comment ID: 10751

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: No more than two floors including the ground floor to avoid obscuring natural views and impinging on others personal privacy. Outdoor space is generally extremely small in new builds as more of the plot is given over to concrete, where more consideration should be given to ecological needs and minimising environmental impacts. Solar power should be standard, and economical net-zero homes should be prioritised above those that are not. The building should be in style with the local character too. We have two adult children living at home with little or no hope of affording anywhere in the local area in the foreseeable future. It would be nice if they could afford to live here, but priority is often given to expensive homes and often even not a first home. Often new homes are purchased by outsiders who turn them into AirBnB or similar. There are already almost a dozen ABnB properties in the village and this has a negative impact on the local community. You should be prioritising the long-term sustainability of local housing, supporting and growing the local communities.

Comment ID: 10756

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: Too often local voices are not listened to, as was the case here with the Wheelers Rise development in Poulton, on land which was carpeted in springs. These were disrupted which has resulted in other properties being threatened with a greater risk of flooding. This broke a basic principle of planning permission in that development should not be permitted in areas which will increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. There are sites in all small villages which are suitable for development but it is only people with local knowledge who can determine where to build with regard to flooding, sewerage and locations in relation to the nature of a village. To be sustainable, building requirements should prioritise net-zero targets for energy efficiency and ecological requirements to minimise environmental impact. Amenities and services should be enhanced to accommodate increased sewage and energy demands. Increasing flooding risks is not a viable option and no clear plan to mitigate this is unacceptable. Broadband capacity in the village of Poulton is not technically sufficient to support an increase in remote workers. While posting these comments the internet connection dropped several times, as it typical for the village. Mobile phone coverage is virtually non-existent. What provisions are you including to address these core issues? Ultimately, any building will be unaffordable to young local adults and this is the worst outcome possible. Priority should be given to first-time buyers and those that are not buying-to-let. Low-cost, energy efficient homes is the key. And not where the insurance is unaffordable because the dwelling is on a flood plain.

Comment ID: 10760

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: The development strategy should prioritise low-cost, energy-efficient homes that are attractive and affordable to local first-time buyers. It is a significant issue that young adults who grow-up in the area of Poulton are priced-out of their own local areas. Too many homes in the village are already second homes rented-out on sites like AirBnB, eroding the character of local community. These should be homes, lived-in full-time and not leased-out for noisy weekend parties. The one and only village shop has been lost, and there is only a volunteer post office service in the village hall once per week. The local public transport is considerably expensive and only operates a couple of times per day. This places a lot more pressure on the local roads that are already crumbling and in need of repair. Drainage is poor, broadband connectivity is poor. There is a local doctor surgery in Fairford, but it is oversubscribed and difficult to get an appointment. You probably think it's okay in this day and age to encourage more local deliveries, but that puts more pressure on the road system, and erodes further from the local economy putting more wealth and power into the hands of the large supermarkets and the likes of Amazon. Seriously, what are you proposing in order to address these concerns - it's about more than just meeting a numerical target? Are you going to actually listen to people who live here?

Comment ID: 10762

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Natasha Wood

Comment: Broadly I agree that we can benefit from additional housing in the local area of Poulton, but it has to be realistic and sustainable. In the past, local concerns have been ignored and the lack of consultation, or leaving it very late, only serves to make any such response more defensive, which it doesn't need to be. Listen to the concerns and formulate a plan to address them. Don't just ignore them. Drainage and flooding is a major issue in Poulton, and it has been ignored for decades. the lack of affordable and sustainable housing for young people is not a priority when it should be. We want to grow our communities and allow people who already live here an opportunity to stay here and not be priced-out of the market. Building regulations in the UK are not focused on sustainability or low-cost energy efficiency or minimising environmental impacts. Net-zero homes should be a priority, not a luxury, and should be in the reach of those who already live in the area. The lack of local amenities in and around the village is also a critical concern - and should be supported within the local economy.

Comment ID: 9254

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: National Trust

Comment: National Trust response to Q1:

We note the Council's preferred option for its spatial strategy. This proposes significant housing growth near to Cirencester and in the south of the district. Whilst this would not directly affect National Trust places in the district, we trust that the Cotswold Beechwood Mitigation Strategy will be applied for housing sites in the identified buffer zone. There is also a need for high quality recreational greenspace to help manage and mitigate the impacts on nature, biodiversity and other designated sites. In addition, from the perspective of National Trust staff, volunteers and visitors using the local road network, we would observe that some routes already appear to be at capacity, and congested during peak times. It is likely that enhancements to transport infrastructure will be necessary to accommodate this level of growth.

We would also like to comment on more localised housing matters. We consider that the Local Plan should provide for small-scale rural affordable housing or low cost housing to support rural communities and the ongoing viability of rural villages and estates – including the National Trust's Sherborne Estate – to support the management of the estate. In addition, there should be in-principle support for sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, including adaptive re-use of historic buildings. New uses could include residential dwellings – but also employment use (workshops, offices etc) and facilities for visitors. This would support the historic environment and thriving communities across the district.

Comment ID: 9255

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: National Trust

Comment: National Trust response to Q4:

As per our comments in response to question 5, there should be provision for new and improved green infrastructure commensurate with the housing growth. It is important that this should include both recreational open space and nature-focused greenspace. Ample provision should be required on new housing sites. In addition, we would encourage initiatives, like the Cotswold Beechwoods Mitigation Strategy, to address the impacts of increasing recreational pressures on countryside sites and natural habitats. Lastly, we would ask the council to ensure a strong emphasis on the principle of, provision of, and maintenance of Biodiversity Net Gain associated with new development. This is especially given that a significant extent of the district falls within a designated landscape, the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Comment ID: 9256

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: National Trust

Comment: National Trust response to Q5:

We support the Local Plan being “Green to the Core’ and protecting the historic and natural environment, as is proposed. This should include comprehensive measures to tackle climate change and support nature recovery, including landscape-scale projects and natural flood management.

In respect of green infrastructure, there should be provision for new and improved green infrastructure commensurate with the housing growth. It is important that this should include both recreational open space and nature-focused greenspace. Ample provision should be required on new housing sites. In addition, we would encourage initiatives, like the Cotswold Beechwoods Mitigation Strategy, to address the impacts of increasing recreational pressures on countryside sites and natural habitats.

In respect of transport and visitor infrastructure, there should be specific provision for infrastructure that enables access-to-nature for all. This should include walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure, yet should also include new or expanded car parking where it enables access-to-nature (or access to cultural heritage). A number of the countryside sites the National Trust looks after are already under pressure. An example is Dover’s Hill near to Chipping Campden. Where possible, such enhanced infrastructure can include accessibility spaces, EV charging, cycle parking, and new paths for visitors. In addition, the Plan should provide for visitor infrastructure such as toilets and food and drink offers at appropriate sites, to help support the visitor experience, sustainable tourism, and the local economy. We are mindful that (developer-led and profit-driven) housing developments will – beyond the normally smaller open spaces provided on-site – rely on existing green spaces and access to the countryside provided by charities such as the National Trust, and new housing increases the local population and adds to the pressures on countryside sides, and the costs of their management. We would ask that this is given specific consideration.

Comment ID: 9257

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: National Trust

Comment: National Trust response to Q6:

We support the focus on 'responding to the climate crisis through adaptation and mitigation' and would add that new housing development should enable growth of the (electricity) grid capacity, which could then be supported by the production of green energy – in the form of appropriate developments in the right locations.

Comment ID: 9067

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Neil

Comment: Given the obvious lack of infrastructure in the Ampney's, Fairford, Poluton, Morton, Down Ampney and other areas, why have Gloucestershire CC with the District's not established a Cotswold Development Company to identify the best places to develop new Villages and Towns, compulsory purchase the land as development corporations have done previously for garden Cities and Towns (farmland for twice the current use value, brown field at market rate) using the hope / uplift value gained through developemnt to fund infrastructure and Council / Affordable Housing. The current piecemeal plan will fail to provide appropriate affordable housing as yet again it relies on private sector developers.

Comment ID: 9123

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

Name: Neil Ashley

Comment: It seems most of the housing, and a disproportionate increase, is being centred around villages just outside the AONB. These villages are simply not sustainable and cannot realistically support anything like the levels of housing you're suggesting there. Furthermore, the housing increases there would not effectively support greater productivity as they are located far from arterial transport links. The M5 corridor and Golden Vally area would be much more suitable for sustainable development, having far better infrastructure, transport links and supporting services.

Comment ID: 9168

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: If the Council is truly 'green to the core' how does that resonate with building thousands of houses on productive agricultural land?

Comment ID: 9169

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: The number of vacant retail units in Cirencester says a lot.

Despite being an attractive market town, clearly retail businesses struggle here. Is that business rates or is because retail footfall has dropped due to insufficient and expensive parking provision? I don't know the answer to that but the Council should be asking those questions.

Regarding commercial developments, what incentives exist for new employers in the Cotswold District? We are in close proximity to Swindon and their Council has been highly proactive in attracting new employers over recent years.

Comment ID: 9170

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Public perception of gypsy and traveller communities is very mixed.

They have as much right to be part of our wider community as anyone else BUT they would need to be prepared to pay their national and local taxes in the same way as any other resident. That would mean paying a commercial rent for occupation of a Council developed and provided site.

Comment ID: 9165

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

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Specifically regarding the proposed sites to the north of Ampney Crucis, this area is rich with wildlife and wild birds. There is a thriving population of red kites, owls, bats and all of the smaller wildlife that help sustain them.

The village has 53 Listed Buildings - more than 20% of the number of buildings in the village. The heritage impact of a threefold increase in the size and historically significant linear layout of this traditional Cotswold village would be significant.

The consultation document makes no reference to an archaeological report affecting the sites (Samual Rudder, 1779).

The sites are at the highest point of the village and will therefore be very visible from the Natural Landscape and they also provide excellent dark skies.

Regarding infrastructure suitability of the sites, the only current access is via single track lanes from Akeman Street (itself barely wide enough for two commercial vehicles to pass); single track lanes from the A417 along Ridings Lane or along the Village Street, much of which is single track.

Sewage and drainage has long been a problem downstream from Ampney Crucis (at Ampney St Mary and Poulton) with regular spillages into the Ampney Brook. Thames Water should be required to provide detailed waste water and groundwater assessments verified by the Environment Agency before this matter receives further consideration. In the event that Thames Water cannot (or will not) commit to upgrade current infrastructure.

Comment ID: 9160

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: We live on a small island which has seen huge population growth over recent years. Increasing density cannot be written off as a viable option but because of the heritage considerations (impact on heritage assets, the National Landscape, reduction of productive agricultural land etc), increased density in new extensions to existing Principal Settlements has to be a serious option.

Comment ID: 9167

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: I have commented extensively on infrastructure needs elsewhere in this submission.

Comment ID: 9171

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Regarding digital infrastructure (telecoms), the initial rollout of Fastershire (BT) and the subsequent rollout of Gigaclear has resulted in a two-tier service. The centre of Ampney Crucis is tied to BT's Fibre to the Cabinet, whilst either end of the village has the option of Gigaclear (Fibre to the Home).

The Gigaclear option is only available to homes in the BT area on payment of significant installation costs. Those homes also have to suffer the rapidly deteriorating road surfaces along either end of the Village Street due to Gigaclear's failure to make good following digging and backfilling their installation trenches. Despite repeated complaints from residents, County Highways have failed to hold Gigaclear to account.

Comment ID: 9162

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: ALL of the scenarios are fundamentally flawed as they are based on data the origins of which appear to be arbitrary.

If I have to choose any option, it would be Scenario 6 with significant amendments:

- * National Planning Policy has effectively been written off by Government and whilst it still has value, CDC shouldn't be dogmatic in its adherence;
- * Sensitive development should be permitted in the Cotswold National Landscape (small scale developments that provide for accessible and affordable housing);
- * Higher density housing should be mandated with developers where outline permission has already been granted on the edges of Principal Settlements and on future applications;
- * All new applications would need to pass a "sniff test" regarding the extent and future of employment opportunities for new residents; and
- * Any proposals to remove productive agricultural land should be heavily scrutinised.

Comment ID: 9163

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: NO.

If the Council believes a location is unsustainable, they should tell the government so and (politely) remind government that they work for voters, tax-payers and residents - not the other way around (although it often feels that way!)

Comment ID: 9164

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: I DO support greater housing density, subject to care and consideration being given to the heritage environment and reasonable access for residents to green spaces. The relatively new Kingshill development shows how a new development can be built with properties of varying heights and densities without detracting from the wider view of Cirencester from its access roads.

Comment ID: 9166

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: There needs to be a fundamental rethink at local and national level regarding the role and functionality of communities.

If a town the current size of Cirencester and its satellite communities has to rely upon overstretched hospitals in Swindon and Gloucester for health care, what will be the situation in 2043?

Community based hospitals and Minor Injury Units are being downsized or closed without a commensurate increase in regionally based facilities.

Demand for food and other retail facilities in Cirencester will only grow but retail facilities are closing, due in part to ever increasing parking charges. For village residents, public transport is not a long term solution.

None of the scenarios comment upon needs for increased employment, local facilities, schools and primary healthcare.

Comment ID: 9172

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: If provision of additional housing in the Cotswolds is such a significant issue, the Council should consider introducing greater disincentives on second homes and Air BnB properties across the Cotswolds. Ampney Crucis has seen a very significant increase in the number of houses where there is no resident on the Electoral Roll. Each of these houses represents a house that, if occupied by a permanent resident (as owner or tenant) would reduce the demand on new housing targets.

Comment ID: 9173

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: The Vision and Objectives tick all of the political boxes.

BUT:

5.3 a. Totally support this

5.3 b. The distinct character and nature of the Cotswolds its buildings is at real risk and once lost, it will be lost forever. The Cotswolds and the green environment is inextricably linked to agriculture. Once agricultural land is built upon, it is gone forever. A wise man once said, "they stopped making farmland a long time ago!"

5.3 c. Totally support this

5.3 d. Totally support this

5.3 e. I support the aspiration, but doubt the ability of any local authority to deliver this

5.3 f. The only way that infrastructure, services and facilities that meet the needs of residents and communities will be if developers and infrastructure service providers are contractually bound to deliver on their "promises". If there is any 'wiggle room', residents will be left to pay.

Comment ID: 9136

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: This makes much more sense than simply dumping large numbers on whichever communities have land that owners have proposed for development.

Comment ID: 9138

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: In deciding upon allocation of sites, significant regard must be given to:

- * Local need for housing and how that can be kept as 'affordable';
- * Existence and capacity of local infrastructure (schools, medical facilities, local shops etc);
- * Capacity for local highways infrastructure to support any significant or disproportionate increase in housing and related population;
- * Capacity for existing sewage and drainage infrastructure to cope with often very significant increases in population;
- * Capacity for nearby Principal Settlements to be able to service a significant increase in population (secondary schools, hospitals, emergency services such as fire & ambulance services).

In short, to what extent are these proposals sustainable and will development and provision of the essential community, drainage and highways infrastructure be led by the development of new housing, or lag behind it?

Developers must not be allowed to dictate when or even IF that essential infrastructure is to be provided.

Comment ID: 9139

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Allocating development sites to small villages and hamlets would require a disproportionate investment in increasing highway, sewage and drainage capacity. Lack of sustainable employment opportunities would inevitably result in increased traffic movements and resulting pollution and congestion on narrow (often single track) lanes.

Comment ID: 9140

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Developers invariably find rural sites more attractive than urban sites (no clean-up costs etc) but would any permissions granted be conditional upon essential highway and drainage infrastructure being provided ahead of commencement of construction work and community infrastructure being provided in tandem with housing construction?

Comment ID: 9141

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: It appears that this has effectively been discounted as so many of the settlements with potential to be Main Service Centres sit within the National Landscape.

The boundaries of the former AONB (now the National Landscape) were randomly established.

If the National Landscape is to be so strongly maintained, significant recognition also needs to be given to the impact on the National Landscape resulting from large scale or disproportionate development at or close to its boundaries, including the impact on 'dark skies'.

Comment ID: 9142

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Main Service Centres tick many of the sustainability boxes in that they should encourage greater investment in core facilities (hospitals, schools and transport infrastructure) with the latter providing improved access to employment.

A first step towards this would be to identify any brownfield sites in those areas - unpopular with developers, but they don't generally live here! Greater use of brownfield sites would also help preserve agricultural land and the National Landscape. If elements of the National Landscape need to be sacrificed for the greater good, so be it!

Comment ID: 9151

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: The Cotswolds is renowned for its towns and villages that are set in a rural and agricultural landscape - that is what attracts tourists from across the world.

Developing significant new settlements and village extensions is not the sustainable way forward - on the contrary, it will set precedents across the Cotswolds for further large scale and inappropriate development.

Development that is sensitive in design, pricing and economic accessibility in towns and villages across the Cotswolds will not harm the National Landscape - on the contrary, it will help support and develop healthy communities.

Dumping 660 houses on the edge of a village with 250 homes will destroy that community. Dumping 2,100 houses on the edge of 2 villages that are little more than hamlets will destroy those communities. Such proposals may go a long way towards giving the numbers that the government has imposed, but it is simply unsustainable. Governments come and go - the Cotswolds will be living with the consequences forever of this, all based on an arbitrary allocation of housing numbers.

Comment ID: 9153

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: This may be contrary to National Planning Policy, but it appears that the government targets have effectively run a coach and horses through Policy.

IF these targets are to be delivered, however ill-founded they are, they cannot effectively be focused on a small area to the south of the National Landscape. Communities within the National Landscape area will need to play their part.

There are also considerations regarding employment - where are all of the occupants of these new homes work when most of them will have Cirencester as their focal retail and services centre?

Comment ID: 9155

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Neil Holt

Comment: Scenario 7 is simply a tweaked Scenario 6 and my comments and questions as follows also apply:

This may be contrary to National Planning Policy, but it appears that the government targets have effectively run a coach and horses through Policy.

IF these targets are to be delivered, however ill-founded they are, they cannot effectively be focused on a small area to the south of the National Landscape. Communities within the National Landscape area will need to play their part.

There are also considerations regarding employment - where are all of the occupants of these new homes work when most of them will have Cirencester as their focal retail and services centre?

Comment ID: 9068

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Neil Shackell

Comment: The Governments strategic approach seems not to take into account commercial demand and that 84% of the land cannot be substantially developed. A New Town approach including commercial / employment development sited closer to Bristol and Stroud M5/M4 access and stations would provide the best option. An area Development Corporation could be established to provide this along with the majority of the c19,000 homes demanded,

Comment ID: 9943

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Neil Shackell

Comment: 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: 8760

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Neil Withnell

Comment: The important objective of delivering inclusive, healthy and affordable homes is welcomed. A diverse mix of different housing types could be amended to delivering inclusive housing across all tenures rather than seeing it as separate issue? Mandating all homes to be built to AD Part M4 (2) standard would achieve this and is low in cost to deliver - a wide ranging government consultation in 2022 reached this conclusion. A percentage of homes also need to be built to AD Part M4 (3) standards to meet the needs of our residents and ensure that their homes are barrier free.

If made clear it becomes specific, enforceable and measurable. Thank you.

Comment ID: 9475

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nicholas

Comment: These answer relate to Poulton Village.

I don't think that building 30 additional homes in Poulton is sustainable.

- Infrastructure Deficit: Poulton lacks essential services—public transport, schools, healthcare, shops—making it unsuitable for significant development.
- Transport Limitations: No viable public transport; reliance on cars increases congestion, emissions, and road safety risks.
- Flooding & Sewage Risks: Existing issues with flooding and inadequate sewage capacity; further development would worsen these problems.
- Scale of Proposed Growth: Adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints.
- Environmental & Heritage Impact: Development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm rural character and Cotswold landscape.
- Affordable Housing Concerns: New housing often unaffordable for locals; risk of properties being bought by outsiders or used for Airbnb.
- Planning Process Issues: Lack of meaningful early engagement with Parish Councils; local knowledge on flooding and infrastructure often ignored.
- Preference for Strategic Growth: Support for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.

- Opposition to Dispersed Development: Small-scale allocations in villages seen as inefficient, environmentally damaging, and contrary to sustainability goals.

Comment ID: 9472

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Nicholas

Comment: All the points below refer to Poulton.

- Infrastructure Deficit: Poulton lacks essential services—public transport, schools, healthcare, shops—making it unsuitable for significant development.
- Transport Limitations: In Poulton there is no viable public transport; reliance on cars increases congestion, emissions, and road safety risks.
- Flooding & Sewage Risks: There are existing issues with flooding and inadequate sewage capacity; further development would worsen these problems.
- Scale of Proposed Growth: Adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints.
- Environmental & Heritage Impact: Development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm rural character and Cotswold landscape.
- Affordable Housing Concerns: New housing often unaffordable for locals; risk of properties being bought by outsiders or used for Airbnb.
- Planning Process Issues: Lack of meaningful early engagement with Parish Councils; local knowledge on flooding and infrastructure often ignored.
- Preference for Strategic Growth: Support for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.
- Opposition to Dispersed Development: Small-scale allocations in villages seen as inefficient, environmentally damaging, and contrary to sustainability goals.

Comment ID: 9473

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Nicholas

Comment: Again, all these comments and objections relate to Poulton.

- Infrastructure Deficit: Poulton lacks essential services—public transport, schools, healthcare, shops—making it unsuitable for significant development.
- Transport Limitations: No viable public transport; reliance on cars increases congestion, emissions, and road safety risks.
- Flooding & Sewage Risks: Existing issues with flooding and inadequate sewage capacity; further development would worsen these problems.
- Scale of Proposed Growth: Adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints.
- Environmental & Heritage Impact: Development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm rural character and Cotswold landscape.
- Affordable Housing Concerns: New housing often unaffordable for locals; risk of properties being bought by outsiders or used for Airbnb.
- Planning Process Issues: Lack of meaningful early engagement with Parish Councils; local knowledge on flooding and infrastructure often ignored.
- Preference for Strategic Growth: Support for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.
- Opposition to Dispersed Development: Small-scale allocations in villages seen as inefficient, environmentally damaging, and contrary to sustainability goals.

Comment ID: 9474

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Nicholas

Comment: These comments refer to the village of Poulton.

- Infrastructure Deficit: Poulton lacks essential services—public transport, schools, healthcare, shops—making it unsuitable for significant development.
- Transport Limitations: No viable public transport; reliance on cars increases congestion, emissions, and road safety risks.
- Flooding & Sewage Risks: Poulton has existing issues with flooding and inadequate sewage capacity; further development would worsen these problems.
- Scale of Proposed Growth: Adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints.
- Environmental & Heritage Impact: Development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm rural character and Cotswold landscape.
- Affordable Housing Concerns: New housing often unaffordable for locals; risk of properties being bought by outsiders or used for Airbnb.
- Planning Process Issues: Lack of meaningful early engagement with Parish Councils; local knowledge on flooding and infrastructure often ignored.
- Preference for Strategic Growth: Support for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.
- Opposition to Dispersed Development: Small-scale allocations in villages seen as inefficient, environmentally damaging, and contrary to sustainability goals.

Comment ID: 9499

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nicholas

Comment: The sheer scale of the targets imposed from above ensures that none of the scenarios supports the aim of the “Local Plan” to be sustainable and “green to the core”. The preservation and enhancement of the Cotswolds both within and outside the Natural Landscape has been central to previous CDC Local Plans. The scenarios, including scenario 5, take little account of the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5 may “build on” the current adopted strategy but is significantly different from it. It destroys the rural and community attributes of a number of small villages and, in some cases transforms them into suburbs of larger towns thereby destroying their identity.

I do not support any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being treated as a Current or Proposed Principal Settlement. This designation reflects (1) the major employers based at the southern end of Love Lane that happen to fall just within the Siddington Parish boundary and (2) its proximity to Cirencester, where virtually all of its facilities and services are based. The designation does not reflect Siddington’s true level of infrastructure, employment and services. The existing settlement limits the capacity to develop them.

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

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

- Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape. The communities there deserve and can support a future built on more than unplanned “windfall” development.
- Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.
- Allowing a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan.

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

Comment ID: 9501

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nicholas

Comment: No. 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.

CDC should not abandon good planning practice to locate developments in unsustainable sites.

Siddington is being targeted because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable.

The incorrect Principal Settlement classification ignores the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure and that the potential to develop them is limited. Unsustainable development should not be undertaken to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 9503

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nicholas

Comment: All developments should be appropriate for and meet the needs of the local communities. Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations (such as Siddington) simply to meet inappropriate targets is not acceptable.

Comment ID: 9504

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nicholas

Comment: No. The proposed expansion would merge Siddington with Cirencester and would not be “contained” by tree lines as claimed. It would overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk, and destroy the village’s identity. The village's misclassification as a Principal Settlement further undermines the justification for this level of growth.

Comment ID: 9506

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Nicholas

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

- Previous plans
- The incorrect Principal Settlement classification
- The protection of village identity and cohesion
- Flood resilience, which relies heavily on the land being targeted for development
- Rural infrastructure constraints and limits
- The cumulative impact of the developments (Steadings, Preston, Kings Hill extension, Siddington Park, Driffield) all proposed close to each other and near Cirencester
- The importance of the green buffer between Siddington and Cirencester

The current open space between Siddington and Cirencester provides important open space, and is recognised in current policy. This becomes even more vital if there is further development and should be preserved. If there is further large development around Siddington then this open space should be retained and used to provide public amenity, not built on to the benefit of current landowners.

Comment ID: 9507

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Nicholas

Comment: The vision is good, but the scale of development being imposed means that it will not be delivered. From the perspective of Siddington, the proposals:

- Do not deliver a sustainable community
- Will involve development that is all about housing numbers and does not prioritise environmental stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.
- Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.
- Will not result in Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community.
- Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington.
- Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington.
- Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks.
- Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately
- Will reduce the green space available to the Siddington community while its population nearly quadruples

Comment ID: 9987

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Nicholas

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

Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

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

Name: Nicholas Bradstreet

Address: Priory Fields, Cricklade street ,Poulton -resident]

Date: 31st December 2025

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.

Nicholas Bradstreet

Comment ID: 9988

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Nicholas

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

Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

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

Name: Nicholas Bradstreet

Address: Priory Fields, Cricklade street, Poulton-resident]

Date: 31st December 2025

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.

Nicholas Bradstreet

Comment ID: 9287

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We prefer a combination of scenarios 1,2 and 3.

We understand the Council proposes scenario 5 as it's preferred option because it envisages building a number of homes most closely approximating to the number of homes required by the Minister applying the Standard Methodology. We think this approach is flawed.

The NPPF allows a Local Authority to propose lower (or higher) annual numbers of houses than would be the case by simply applying the revised Standard Methodology, if there are good reasons for doing so. We believe there are such good reasons.

The standard methodology simply compares house prices in an area to incomes of those working in an area in order to determine whether housing supply in the area should be increased. Unfortunately, this methodology is too simplistic to be applied to the Cotswold District because house prices in the district are influenced by a number of factors unrelated to the incomes of those working in the District.

The main factor behind the high house prices in the District is that the Cotswolds is a very attractive place to live and it is surrounded by major conurbations. This has led to a demand for housing by commuters who work in highly paid jobs outside the District and house prices which reflect their earnings from outside the District – not the earnings of those who work in the District. This factor when combined with demand from weekenders and the conversion of housing to profitable Air B n B, has resulted in the highest average house prices in Gloucestershire and surrounding areas. At the same time Cotswold District has the lowest median and lower quartile job earnings in Gloucestershire and the result is a high ratio of house prices to local incomes but there is no relevant relationship between the two facts when it comes to deciding how many houses should be built in the District.

If as a result of application of the standard methodology more house are built in the district they will simply be used to satisfy the types of demand referred to above and will not lower prices for those working in the District. The high ratio between house prices

and local incomes will continue despite an increase in the number of houses beyond that which the District Council has determined are objectively needed.

There has already been a pattern of ever-growing commuting into and out of the district. And this would be exacerbated by new housing resulting from the application of standard methodology. This would be very damaging in environmental terms and put a strain on the road network which will lead to increased expenditure not only on road improvements such as the Air Balloon but also ordinary maintenance – the potholes are already notorious. This is a direct cost to the economy.

The Minister says in her letter to CDC dated 18th August 2025 that we must build houses in the places “where people want to live and work”. New houses in the District would provide houses where people want to live but they would not also be working in the district so would not satisfy the test which the Minister has set.

An important landscape character of the Cotswolds is the way the countryside flows into the historic built environment. So far CDC have managed to place development such that this symbiosis is maintained and the preliminary view is that can be continued with an annual housing number of around 450 to 500 pa. (which would result from a combination of scenarios 1,2 and 3). Eventually a new settlement might be required but there are a very limited number of large sites which could accommodate a new settlement so use of these should be delayed as long as possible to secure steady long term sustainable growth beyond the strategy period. The higher number of around 1000 pa (applying the Standard Methodology) would accelerate the need for a new settlement as well as needing extensions to principal settlements into open countryside and thus damage the setting of settlements and pre-empt the long term growth of the District.

Comment ID: 10639

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: I am answering on behalf of CPRE.

We prefer a combination of scenarios 1,2 and 3.

We understand the Council proposes scenario 5 as it's preferred option because it envisages building a number of homes most closely approximating to the number of homes required by the Minister applying the Standard Methodology. We think this approach is flawed.

The NPPF allows a Local Authority to propose lower (or higher) annual numbers of houses than would be the case by simply applying the revised Standard Methodology, if there are good reasons for doing so. We believe there are such good reasons.

The standard methodology simply compares house prices in an area to incomes of those working in an area in order to determine whether housing supply in the area should be increased. Unfortunately, this methodology is too simplistic to be applied to the Cotswold District because house prices in the district are influenced by a number of factors unrelated to the incomes of those working in the District.

The main factor behind the high house prices in the District is that the Cotswolds is a very attractive place to live and it is surrounded by major conurbations. This has led to a demand for housing by commuters who work in highly paid jobs outside the District and house prices which reflect their earnings from outside the District – not the earnings of those who work in the District. This factor when combined with demand from weekenders and the conversion of housing to profitable Air B n B, has resulted in the highest average house prices in Gloucestershire and surrounding areas. At the same time Cotswold District has the lowest median and lower quartile job earnings in Gloucestershire and the result is a high ratio of house prices to local incomes but there is no relevant relationship between the two facts when it comes to deciding how many houses should be built in the District.

If as a result of application of the standard methodology more house are built in the district they will simply be used to satisfy the types of demand referred to above and will not lower prices for those working in the District. The high ratio between house prices and local incomes will continue despite an increase in the number of houses beyond that which the District Council has determined are objectively needed.

There has already been a pattern of ever-growing commuting into and out of the district. And this would be exacerbated by new housing resulting from the application of standard methodology. This would be very damaging in environmental terms and put a strain on the road network which will lead to increased expenditure not only on road improvements such as the Air Balloon but also ordinary maintenance – the potholes are already notorious. This is a direct cost to the economy.

The Minister says in her letter to CDC dated 18th August 2025 that we must build houses in the places “where people want to live and work”. New houses in the District would provide houses where people want to live but they would not also be working in the district so would not satisfy the test which the Minister has set.

An important landscape character of the Cotswolds is the way the countryside flows into the historic built environment. So far CDC have managed to place development such that this symbiosis is maintained and the preliminary view is that can be continued with an annual housing number of around 450 to 500 pa. (which would result from a combination of scenarios 1,2 and 3). Eventually a new settlement might be required but there are a very limited number of large sites which could accommodate a new settlement so use of these should be delayed as long as possible to secure steady long term sustainable growth beyond the strategy period. The higher number of around 1000 pa (applying the Standard Methodology) would accelerate the need for a new settlement as well as needing extensions to principal settlements into open countryside and thus damage the setting of settlements and pre-empt the long term growth of the District.

Comment ID: 9288

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We assume that this question refers to allocation of sites in the plan. The answer is definitely NO:-

a) as outlined above, the Government housing target is based on a methodology inappropriate to the Cotswold District and the Council should not be aiming to meet it.

b) The largest area which is considered unsustainable for development is the National Landscape area. This valuable and unique national asset of wide expanses of undeveloped countryside is enjoyed by people from all over the UK. A key characteristic is that the small historic towns and villages have a symbiotic relationship with that countryside. The landscape character of the Cotswolds is described in depth by the Cotswold Conservation Board's assessments.

c) This does not mean that there should be no development but that it should be on a case by case basis . The sites which arise are usually too small to warrant a specific plan allocation. In effect this is covered by the allowance for windfalls contained in the strategy and local plan.

Comment ID: 10640

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We assume that this question refers to allocation of sites in the plan. The answer is definitely NO:-

a) as outlined above, the Government housing target is based on a methodology inappropriate to the Cotswold District and the Council should not be aiming to meet it.

b) The largest area which is considered unsustainable for development is the National Landscape area. This valuable and unique national asset of wide expanses of undeveloped countryside is enjoyed by people from all over the UK. A key characteristic is that the small historic towns and villages have a symbiotic relationship with that countryside. The landscape character of the Cotswolds is described in depth by the Cotswold Conservation Board's assessments.

c) This does not mean that there should be no development but that it should be on a case by case basis . The sites which arise are usually too small to warrant a specific plan allocation. In effect this is covered by the allowance for windfalls contained in the strategy and local plan.

Comment ID: 9289

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We believe that maximising density, including multiple occupancy of buildings, is an important tool in meeting housing need while minimising the use of the scarce resource of sustainably developable land. Higher density should apply to any new settlement as part of the character of the settlement. We appreciate that there is a potential conflict when applied to new development as extensions to existing settlements. Historically the density of housing has been less at the edge of settlements as they merge into the open countryside. Careful design and layout should minimise this possible conflict. Overall it would be worth sacrificing some of the traditional approach in the overall interest of maximising land use. Clearly within the development boundaries of the principal settlements density can be maximised without causing visual conflict provided design and materials are of the highest standard.

Comment ID: 10642

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We believe that maximising density, including multiple occupancy of buildings, is an important tool in meeting housing need while minimising the use of the scarce resource of sustainably developable land. Higher density should apply to any new settlement as part of the character of the settlement. We appreciate that there is a potential conflict when applied to new development as extensions to existing settlements. Historically the density of housing has been less at the edge of settlements as they merge into the open countryside. Careful design and layout should minimise this possible conflict. Overall it would be worth sacrificing some of the traditional approach in the overall interest of maximising land use. Clearly within the development boundaries of the principal settlements density can be maximised without causing visual conflict provided design and materials are of the highest standard.

Comment ID: 9290

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We have no answer to this question as it is not clear what aspects of sustainability it refers to. Please clarify ?

Comment ID: 10645

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: We have no answer to this question as it is not clear what aspects of sustainability it refers to. Please clarify ?

Comment ID: 9291

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: No

Comment ID: 10648

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Nicholas Dummett for CPRE Cotswold Districts

Comment: No. We have nothing to add to the above.

Comment ID: 10667

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Nicholas Holden

Comment: Cotswold District Council

Preferred Options Consultation

1. I support the Council's preferred development strategy as set out in Scenario 5 for the reasons set out by the Council.
2. I consider that against the background of the well-established national planning policies, which restrict greatly the opportunities for development in the Cotswolds National Landscape, Scenario 5 provides the best policy framework. Scenario 5 is a sound attempt at providing increased housing provision while protecting the character of the Cotswolds National Landscape.
3. In addition, as the Council notes, designation of conservation areas and listed buildings also restrict the opportunities for development.
4. Further Scenario 5 continues to give due weight to the national planning policies supporting sustainable development. The majority of smaller settlements in the Council's area have no or very limited services in the form of social or leisure and health facilities, employment opportunities or schools and other educational provision and the only realistic transport choice for the overwhelming majority of people is by car.
5. The economic well-being of the Council's area is dependant to a significant extent on tourism (see: The Economic Impact of Gloucestershire's Visitor Economy 2023. Produced on behalf of Cotswold District Council by The South West Research Company Ltd November 2024). It is the character of the Cotswolds National Landscape which attracts the high number of visitors. The impact of even small housing and other development can have a considerable impact on the character of settlements and the landscape generally. It is, of course, always difficult to sustain the argument that a small development will damage the character of a settlement and the perception of the character if the wider area. However, the cumulative impact of such developments does eventual change the character and also encourages further development as the character changes. To quote Joni Mitchell's prophetic song Big yellow Taxi from 1970:

"Don't it always seem to go

That you don't know what you've got 'til it's gone

They paved paradise, put up a parking lot

They took all the trees and put'em in a tree museum."

6. The dangers of short termism are both obvious and real. The National Landscape designation, listed buildings and conservation area policies have been successful in protecting the character of both large areas of landscape and of the built environment. The general perception that these policies lead to high levels of refusals of permission is not borne out by the statistics.

7. From a personal perspective it is the character of the landscape and the many traditional buildings and settlements set in that landscape that give the Cotswolds its unique character and make the area visually attractive. For the reasons I have given I think that the Council's preferred Scenario 5 has the best chance of preserving the unique character of the Cotswolds National Landscape and providing increased housing without significant damage to the objectives of the national policies dealing with sustainable development.

Comment ID: 9294

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Nick Wilkins

Comment: The current infrastructure would have no way of supporting the amount of houses you are proposing to build in Down Ampney area. We are already suffering flooding issues as it is. The fields around the village are all full of water whenever it rains hard. If you take all that away as building sites, can't imagine how the village and existing houses will cope

Comment ID: 9888

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: I agree with the council's decision broadly, see above comments.

Comment ID: 10672

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: (At the risk of repeating myself, I have had to come back to it and I am not sure if previous comment have been logged.)

Broadly I support the council's choice, largely because it is probably the least worst option. I support the need for social housing - I am aware that 'affordable' does not necessarily meet that brief - across most of our communities. Clearly the National Landscape needs protection but we also need to recognise that there is much of crucial value to nature and to our existing communities outside that landscape which should not be casually lost - it could be.

I've lived in Fairford for 40 years, I know the area and the fields North East of the town along the footpath to South Farm have ancient hedgerows which contain an extraordinary number of bird species. I was asked to mention this at the local consultation - the loss of such public goods is not sustainable and that is just one example.

Infrastructure. Within Fairford this is a huge issue - Doctor's surgery, Primary School, sewage are the obvious ones all suffering at the moment without the population doubling. Although the traffic flow is apparently within acceptable limits it does not feel that way to those in the town as there is only one way through and the width is something like 3 metres. The conundrum is that the town is largely a dormitory one, more housing will mean more car journeys through the centre and to the centre. How is this in any way sustainable? Not to mention larger delivery lorries etc. It goes without saying that more employment nearby and more frequent public transport needs to be part of the infrastructure.

If Glos is about to become a Unitary authority, what difference will that make to this Plan? I fully appreciate that this has to happen anyway and consultation is essential but that question does need asking.

With apologies if I have expressed my concerns in the wrong place.

Comment ID: 9891

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: No, this would be counterproductive and put more pressure on the creaking local infrastructure.

Comment ID: 9893

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: To some extent this could work as the main need is surely for 'affordable' housing but only with much care so the nature of our towns and villages is not damaged irreparably. It would be good to have some architectural variation on the identikit building currently favoured and this could be an opportunity for good, sustainable design which saves on energy.

Comment ID: 10653

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: I agree with the objectives. I would add that there is only a general mention of conserving landscape, no mention of the need to ensure that the protection of the natural world in and around all our communities, including outside the national landscape, should be paramount.

Comment ID: 9884

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Nicky Turner

Comment: In general I am supportive of the CDC's decision to support this scenario as it is preferable to building in the National Landscape. They are between a rock and a hard place. Presumably it will be possible to add a mix of responses. There does seem much sense in locating building near transport hubs, particularly Kemble and in principle settlements which have the infrastructure.

Comment ID: 8915

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nicola

Comment: Siddington and Cirencester

Getting in and out of Cirencester is already challenging as the area is saturated with traffic. Long queues to get to the supermarkets and limited parking in town. My husband is a wheelchair user and there is limited parking for us in the town centre. Pavements in Siddington are barely suitable for him to use; we cannot support hundreds of new homes here before we provide better infrastructure for existing residents. There is too much traffic coming through the village already.

Comment ID: 9816

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Nicola Alers

Comment: Please note, this is a comment on the whole plan, and not a particular section. As a resident of Broadwell I am very concerned about the proposal to build 17 new homes within the village.

Firstly the allocation is not fair. Other small villages are not expected to accommodate this number of new buildings. Why should Broadwell bear the brunt of this? The impact will be devastating for us as a village. Where will these new properties be built? How will they be accessed? Our roads are narrow and already have to accommodate increasing traffic when people cut through the village to avoid long queues on the Fosseway. There are few places where the roads are wide enough to accommodate more than one vehicle and gridlock occurs easily when the village is flooded with traffic. This situation will deteriorate exponentially if the proposed plans go ahead. There are no paths in many areas of the village, and residents need to walk in the road. Given the narrow roads with blind bends, an increase in traffic will put the safety of residents and visitors in danger.

There is also the issue of increased risk of flooding with run off from more development within the village. Broadwell has many natural water sources and sits at bottom of a hill, and we have already experienced flood events after heavy rainfall.

The proposed developments both in Broadwell and the surrounding areas will have a grossly negative impact on the National Landscape (previously AONB) which appears in conflict with compliance with planning policy.

The proposed expansion of Moreton is also extremely alarming for residents of the entire area, where GP services are already completely overstretched, and schools beyond capacity.

If Moreton effectively doubles in size how will the Fosseway cope with the increase in traffic? It is already gridlocked at busy times, making trips to shops, GP surgeries etc difficult. How will emergency services negotiate huge queues safely? We already have unacceptably long waiting times for ambulance services in the country.

Comment ID: 9725

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Nigel

Comment: If every community was required to grow by 10% there would be no need for disproportionate allocations. Small hamlets could add e.g. 3 houses to 7 current without major impact.

Comment ID: 9727

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nigel

Comment: Scenario 5 is a reasonable allocation of housing across the region.

Comment ID: 9729

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nigel

Comment: I do not support increased housing density. The Cotswolds is a unique and scape and should be treated with respect. It doesn't lend itself to high density construction.

Comment ID: 9733

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Nigel

Comment: Kemble has been singled out de to the railway connection. However the proposed scale of development would totally destroy the village by morphing into a town. The character of Kemble is maintained by a single post office / shop, a small school and the church. The community who live here do so because it offers village life, not town living which we have all tried to escape from/

Comment ID: 10979

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Nigel

Comment: This has nothing to do with needs of the area or CDC's residents. This increases crime and with it policing and local services costs. Crime increases and criminal damage is experienced twice a year at the Stow Horse Fair. This section is political correctness for the sake of it and should be deleted.

Comment ID: 10951

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nigel

Comment: There are only 3 practical scenarios, 4, 5 and 7. Scenario 4 automatically includes Principal Settlements. New Settlements should be considered only where they can be sustainably developed with effective infrastructure. Strategic Extensions are merely disproportionate extensions of Principal Settlements - they are not strategic but a tactical attempt at meeting Government set targets. Scenario 7 should also be followed and parallels to inner city examples are misleading. There is no problem in developing 4-5 storey buildings in Principal Settlement town centres or increasing density by redeveloping brown field sites (such as disused garage sites). No settlement should be considered without a rail connection as to do so merely encourages car use and therefore contradicts CDC's objectives.

Comment ID: 10959

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nigel

Comment: CDC should refuse to agree to unsustainable development. Much of the proposed development is by its nature unsustainable. There are no proposals to materially invest in road improvements, flood and waste water, rail expansion (capacity on the North Cotswold Line is constrained by the single track section south of Charlbury), Digital Comms, etc and these are outside the control of CDC. In short, CDC should refuse the Government targets and if necessary fight these through the courts.

Comment ID: 10963

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nigel

Comment: Increased housing density should be a principal objective. It concentrates development in existing, larger settlements served by existing infrastructure and transport links and relieves pressure on rural green field sites. See also comments to Q1.

Comment ID: 10978

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nigel

Comment: The proposed plan is fundamentally unsustainable. It requires investment in infrastructure that not only is outside CDC's control but historically, required investment to support previous developments has not materialised. There has been no material investment in the road infrastructure (most importantly the A429), no development in waste water treatment resulting in record pollution levels in the rivers Evenlode, Windrush and Cherwell, no twinning of the North Cotswold Rail Line between Charlbury and Hanborough, no expansion of the 5G network resulting in dead spots in a number of North Cotswold Villages and curtailed development of fibre optic coverage to smaller settlements. The GigaClear rollout installed the main trunk system because that generated its Government grant but homes in villages such as Broadwell remain disconnected because it is not economic for GigaClear to connect). These are problems that CDC cannot control. CDC should therefore challenge Government targets until this is resolved. In particular, the 3x extension of Moreton-in-Marsh is a prime example. It is out of proportion with the current settlement and will fundamentally change the town's character. The train line has limited capacity and the associated road network is already incapable of absorbing peak traffic demands. The River Evenlode is increasingly polluted by Thames Water (the Broadwell treatment station discharged raw sewage into the water course over 600 times in 2023). There are no major employers in the area resulting in the majority of new home owners driving to work outside the area. New development should be concentrated in areas of employment (Cheltenham, Gloucester, Swindon, Oxford etc) - CDC should not be required to meet the housing demands created by these cities. The whole plan is based on a false premise.

Comment ID: 10981

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Nigel

Comment: Yes! CDC should have consulted on whether to reduce the plan to truly sustainable levels and to challenge Government targets through the courts if needs be.

Comment ID: 8927

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Nigel Mitchell Green

Comment: I support Scenario 5 of the Local Plan Review: Preferred Options Consultation Document (November 2025), which advocates for the creation of a separate new settlement (or strategic extension). I propose this new settlement be located on the flat land beyond the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB) edge, such as the area between Willersey and Weston Sub-Edge.

This approach is necessary because expanding the existing village of Willersey is unsustainable and is heavily constrained by existing infrastructure failures and environmental designations.

Critical Infrastructure Constraints

The current infrastructure in Willersey is wholly inadequate for new development:

The single-pipe sewage system is overloaded, frequently resulting in the discharge of raw effluent into the village during periods of heavy rainfall.

Thames Water has already confirmed an inability to provide the required fresh water pressure to service new homes.

Developing sites without addressing these fundamental issues contradicts the direction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, which requires a consistent and effective approach to planning for major infrastructure and expects development to "align growth and infrastructure". The strategic approach of Option 5 allows for the necessary large-scale investment to "boost public services and infrastructure"—one of the key objectives for strategic sites in the NPPF 2024.

Environmental and Service Constraints

Landscape and Heritage: Willersey is situated on the edge of the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB) and possesses a historic conservation area at its heart. The NPPF 2024 gives "great weight" to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes and requires planning to protect the historic environment. A separate settlement, located strategically, offers a superior solution to protect the setting and historic character of the village.

Service Capacity: New developments must holistically address the need for additional school places at the primary and local high schools. Furthermore, consideration must be given to the heavy reliance on already strained health and other services provided by Wychavon, which is itself subject to significant development pressures.

Therefore, the creation of a separate new settlement (Option 5) is the only sustainable strategy to meet housing need while upholding the requirements of the NPPF 2024 to deliver necessary infrastructure and protect cherished landscape and heritage assets.

Comment ID: 10404

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Nigel Moor FRTPI (Rtd)

Comment: This whole exercise is flawed from the outset because there is no agreed strategic plan for Gloucestershire. Each of the six districts are being considered in isolation. As a consequence Cotswold District with a significant part of the district area included in the Cotswolds Natural Landscape is being asked to provide more housing than the other districts particularly Gloucester and Cheltenham. A new garden town is being promoted at Ashchurch and it needs to be clarified what will be the scale of housing there before looking to build in the protected landscapes. Gloucestershire County Council are working on a spatial strategy for the county. The current exercise needs to be paused so that the implications of that strategy are considered amongst the six districts. It really is time that Gloucestershire is planned in a comprehensive and sustainable manner rather than the current exercise of non-plan.

Comment ID: 10419

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Nigel Moor FRTPI (Rtd)

Comment: I have earlier commented on why I think this exercise is flawed and it is difficult to see how an Inspector can consider whether the plan is sound in the absence of an agreed strategic spatial plan for Gloucestershire.

Comment ID: 9855

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Nigel North

Comment: The affordability multiplier used in the standard method to calculate the doubling of housing need in Cotswold District should be challenged further. People moving into the area are often able to afford higher prices for larger properties due to wealth accumulated in their homes, particularly in the South East.

Comment ID: 9857

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Nigel North

Comment: How will moving to a Unitary Authority affect the plan?

Comment ID: 9886

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Comments specifically on the development of businesses in Fairford and the challenges faced.

Local well-paid jobs will be need to be developed to support any increase in housing.

It is not clear what the major development of Lakes by Yoo complex between Fairford and Lechlade will be able to offer to the local economy. In hindsight could this land have been developed for more local needs in mind.

Small industrial units off Coronation Street, Fairford are being developed by Ernest Cook Trust which should provide a location for local businesses to develop. However, the impact (parking and access) of increased traffic on the local area is unknown and it is not obvious how many units will be developed in the long run. Indeed, a large barn just off of the Welshway just outside of Fairford has recently been built, would this have been a better location for the business units where land and access are less constrained. This gives concern that due consideration is not being given to infrastructure when plans for building are approved.

The major increase in housing over the last 10 years in Fairford has not resulted in a significant increased support for local shopping facilities in the High Street, the update of local plan needs to resolve this problem.

Comment ID: 9894

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Comments specifically related to Fairford.

Traffic flows are constrained in Fairford on the A417 at the junction with the High Street (single lane) as well as in Lechlade at the junction of A417 and A361. An alternate A class road route will be needed around Fairford for non-local traffic.

There is a need to understand the impact of housing proposals will have on traffic along the A417 into and out of Fairford as well as Lechlade. Assume there are census data showing current flow. Is there historical data showing the impact of the housing developments on the east and west side of Fairford? Where do Fairford residents travel to work – Swindon, Cirencester, Cheltenham, Oxfordshire?

Parking issues in and around Milton Road and Coronation Street are hindering traffic flow. Also, car park/s needed within Fairford to alleviate on road/pavement car/van parking. This may be exasperated by the Coln School and Old Yells Yard developments where there is limited parking.

Better local bus services will needed to facilitate greener travel.

Increase in the capacity and accessibility of overstretched health services in Fairford is required.

The major increase in housing over the last 10 years in Fairford has not resulted in a significant increase in support for local shopping facilities in the High Street, the update of our local plan needs to resolve this problem.

There should be opportunity to support the development of better leisure facilities (all weather pitch, swimming pool, sports centre) Fairford. Lechlade for example appears to have good facilities based at their Memorial Hall.

The lack of sewage treatment capacity in Fairford is causing major impact on water quality in the river Coln and SSSI lakes. A deliverable long plan to meet existing and future sewage treatment needs is required before any further housing is built.

Comment ID: 9898

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Yes I agree. Nothing else to add.

Comment ID: 9859

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Nigel North

Comment: The affordability multiplier used in the standard method to calculate the doubling of housing need in Cotswold District should be challenged further. People moving into the area are often able to afford higher prices for larger properties due to wealth accumulated in their homes, particularly in the South East.

Comment ID: 9869

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Nigel North

Comment: I would keep to Scenario 1. The population increase from 2011 to 2021 appears to be about 8000, which is about 800 extra people per year. If we build at the current rate this would support past population increase.

Comment ID: 9870

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Nigel North

Comment: No. If we build a plan that is "Green" we must avoid building in areas that are a flood risk for example. With climate change this will only limit areas we can build on.

Comment ID: 9871

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Only increase housing density where it is appropriate to apartments or flats.

Comment ID: 9875

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

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Brownfield sites are included in selected locations?

Comment ID: 9877

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Nigel North

Comment: It will be difficult to build a robust plan that will not need changing out to 2043. How often will it get reviewed in light of real data and new information?

Comment ID: 9879

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Nigel North

Comment: Highly unlikely. Without knowledge of the infrastructure plans and any proposals for business /industrial sites it will be difficult to plan for sustainable housing.

Comment ID: 9882

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Nigel North

Comment: The affordability multiplier used in the standard method to calculate the doubling of housing need in Cotswold District should be challenged further. People moving into the area are often able to afford higher prices for larger properties due to wealth accumulated in their homes, particularly in the South East.

Comment ID: 8855

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Nigel Payne

Comment: Mickleton and Chipping Campden are Proposed Principal Settlements, and Willersey is a Proposed Non-Principal Settlement. In practice, these three are in close proximity and it is therefore important to consider the impact on this small part of the Cotswolds in aggregate. The number of proposed new houses per square kilometre in this area is inappropriate and represents a much more highly concentrated impact than the average for the Cotswold region as a whole. It is therefore inequitable.

Furthermore, the idea, as shown in the mapping, that Mickleton could be expanded to such an extent that it adjoins Weston-sub-Edge is particularly egregious. Weston-sub-Edge is a small village with no employment, no shop and no school. It already suffers from heavy traffic on the B4632 (the former A46). Additional housing in the village would be a disaster.

Comment ID: 623

Email/Letter Representation

Name: N and A Lane

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

Comment ID: 735

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nancy Fielder

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

Comment ID: 389

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Natalie Baird-Cullick

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

Comment ID: 692

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Natasha Finch

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

Comment ID: 131

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nathalie Magson

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

Comment ID: 178

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nathan Govier

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

Comment ID: 369

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nathan Simandoux

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

Comment ID: 183

Email/Letter Representation

Name: National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc

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

Comment ID: 814

Email/Letter Representation

Name: National Grid Electricity Transmission

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

Comment ID: 620

Email/Letter Representation

Name: National Highways

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

Comment ID: 186

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Natural England

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

Comment ID: 238

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Neil Holt

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

Comment ID: 432

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Neil Shackell

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

Comment ID: 609

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Neil Walton

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

Comment ID: 195

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Neil White

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

Comment ID: 333

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Newland Homes Ltd

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

Comment ID: 334

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Newland Homes Ltd

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

Comment ID: 663

Email/Letter Representation

Name: NHS Property Services Ltd

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

Comment ID: 580

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicholas Ayers

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

Comment ID: 478

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicholas Redfern

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

Comment ID: 371

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicholas Robinson

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

Comment ID: 635

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicholas Tanner

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

Comment ID: 171

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicholas Winkfield

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

Comment ID: 678

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Dawes

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

Comment ID: 681

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Dawes

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

Comment ID: 480

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Ktoris

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

Comment ID: 498

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Paddison

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

Comment ID: 446

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Payne

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

Comment ID: 610

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Sanford

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

Comment ID: 744

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nick Tovey

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

Comment ID: 328

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nicola Whittet

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

Comment ID: 365

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nigel and Dagi Beasley

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

Comment ID: 217

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nigel Hugh-Smith

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

Comment ID: 112

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Nigel Magson

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

Comment ID: 385

Email/Letter Representation

Name: North Lechlade Residents Group

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