

Comment ID: 9720

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: E. A. Bassom

Comment: Why spoil small Cotswold settlements and villages? you will ruin the look and history and most do not have the infrastructure to cope. This Labour government and Labour councils seem intent on ruining the rural environment!

Comment ID: 11042

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Ed

Comment: To date, the debate seems to be around how to accommodate the ridiculous target CDC have been set by central Government rather than challenging it. This is missing the point. We need to start by making a far more robust challenge to the overall target for the Cotswolds.

Central Government must reconsider the unrealistic figures being placed on the Cotswold District.

All parties, including the Cotswold District Council Planning team and Councillors, appear to be in

agreement that the overall target of 18,650 homes, that has been imposed on the Cotswolds, is too

high. It places a disproportionate burden on the District as compared to other parts of the country.

There appear to be two main reasons for this:

1. The top-down methodology and algorithm used by Central Government to drive the allocation is

flawed, and certainly inappropriate for regions like the Cotswolds

2. No adjustment has been made to take into account the fact that 84% of the land area, within the

Cotswold District Council, is designated part of the Cotswold National Landscape (previously

AONB), and therefore is effectively out of bounds for any material new housing development. This

has resulted in the vast majority of the target needing to be fulfilled in just 16% of the area which

will inevitably lead to unsustainable development.

While we agree that it is important for CDC Planning to take ownership of creating a new Local

Plan to accommodate the new target, and to consult fully with local residents as they are doing, we

believe that in parallel there should be a separate process to put forward a robust legal challenge of

the imposed targets back to the National Government.

We are concerned that action to date in this regard has not been robust or urgent enough.

CDC appears to have been relatively passive to date compared to other Councils who have engaged

legal teams and are seeking King's Counsel's opinion. From what we understand, CDC's approach

to date has amounted to sending two letters, one to Angela Rayner and one to Steve Read (and they

are still awaiting a response from the latter).

Comments such as "we are keeping a close eye on how East Hampshire are getting along with their

appeal" feel a little passive, and "we will be seeking Counsel's input at a later date", does not have

enough urgency. These targets need to be challenged and appealed robustly as soon as possible

before it is too late to have any chance of getting them amended.

We would like to see CDC adopting a more aggressive and proactive approach to appealing this

target. They should urgently be working closely with other Councils who are in a similar situation;

sharing learnings and collaborating to show a united front, by teaming up together to share the costs

of engaging a top Kings Counsel, aggressively lobbying MPs, ministers and other interest groups.

In the meantime, it is extremely concerning and obfuscatory that "Areas of Interest" are suddenly and sneakily introduced on page 38 of the document - in particular "Zone 14", without any other reference to the nature of this. It is clear that this particular area has

absolutely no infrastructure to absorb this. WHY HAS THIS BEEN SNEAKILY DROPPED
IN without any rationale or explanation??

Comment ID: 11067

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Ed

Comment: To date, the debate seems to be around how to accommodate the ridiculous target CDC have been set by central Government rather than challenging it. This is missing the point. We need to start by making a far more robust challenge to the overall target for the Cotswolds.

Central Government must reconsider the unrealistic figures being placed on the Cotswold District.

All parties, including the Cotswold District Council Planning team and Councillors, appear to be in

agreement that the overall target of 18,650 homes, that has been imposed on the Cotswolds, is too

high. It places a disproportionate burden on the District as compared to other parts of the country.

There appear to be two main reasons for this:

1. The top-down methodology and algorithm used by Central Government to drive the allocation is

flawed, and certainly inappropriate for regions like the Cotswolds

2. No adjustment has been made to take into account the fact that 84% of the land area, within the

Cotswold District Council, is designated part of the Cotswold National Landscape (previously

AONB), and therefore is effectively out of bounds for any material new housing development. This

has resulted in the vast majority of the target needing to be fulfilled in just 16% of the area which

will inevitably lead to unsustainable development.

While we agree that it is important for CDC Planning to take ownership of creating a new Local

Plan to accommodate the new target, and to consult fully with local residents as they are doing, we

believe that in parallel there should be a separate process to put forward a robust legal challenge of

the imposed targets back to the National Government.

We are concerned that action to date in this regard has not been robust or urgent enough.

CDC appears to have been relatively passive to date compared to other Councils who have engaged

legal teams and are seeking King's Counsel's opinion. From what we understand, CDC's approach

to date has amounted to sending two letters, one to Angela Rayner and one to Steve Read (and they

are still awaiting a response from the latter).

Comments such as "we are keeping a close eye on how East Hampshire are getting along with their

appeal" feel a little passive, and "we will be seeking Counsel's input at a later date", does not have

enough urgency. These targets need to be challenged and appealed robustly as soon as possible

before it is too late to have any chance of getting them amended.

We would like to see CDC adopting a more aggressive and proactive approach to appealing this

target. They should urgently be working closely with other Councils who are in a similar situation;

sharing learnings and collaborating to show a united front, by teaming up together to share the costs

of engaging a top Kings Counsel, aggressively lobbying MPs, ministers and other interest groups.

In the meantime, it is extremely concerning and obfuscatory that "Areas of Interest" are suddenly and sneakily introduced on page 38 of the document - in particular "Zone 14", without any other reference to the nature of this. It is clear that this particular area has

absolutely no infrastructure to absorb this. WHY HAS THIS BEEN SNEAKILY DROPPED
IN without any rationale or explanation??

Comment ID: 11063

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Ed

Comment: Zone 14 is completely out of the blue and WITHOUT EXPLANATION.. This is unacceptable. We need to demand an explanation and evidence of what correspondence has been circulated to landowners, agents and developers.

You will have already received multiple objections to why Poulton's infrastructure, drainage, sewerage, traffic issues make it entirely unsustainable for even one further dwelling.

Comment ID: 9052

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Since your 'call for sites', we have heard the paddock land around Plummers Farm in Siddington is being considered as a site for development. We moved into our house in December 2024 before this Consultation was published. We are extremely concerned at the prospect of this site being developed for the following reasons:

1. The fields are currently used for equestrian purposes with livery facilities which is clearly an important rural service.
2. Ashton Road, which would be presumably the access point, is the main road through Siddington. It is narrow and experiences dangerous speeding traffic at this point on the edge of the village. Any addition to traffic volumes will be even more dangerous for both traffic and pedestrians.
3. The site is located on an extremely wet area of land near the River Churn where flooding has been recently present. Siddington is located in a flood risk area and we are particularly concerned about the disruption of natural drainage and the output of drainage from any new houses (particularly surface water runoff from hard surfaces) if the site was developed. I was unable to leave the village on the 9Dec25 morning due to the water level surrounding the village on all roads preventing it from being drivable – only road accessible road would have been Siddington Road, but that was closed due to roadworks.
4. We have heard rumours that 40 new homes are envisaged. The scale and density of this is clearly excessive for this location and will cause harm to views and the landscape character of the area and not be in keeping with existing village properties nearby.
5. The fields are currently an important greenspace and wildlife habitat.
6. The rear of our house overlooks these fields, and this is one of the reasons we bought it 12 months ago. We are extremely concerned about the possibility of loss of privacy, noise, light pollution and security.
7. A construction site behind our house others and would cause an unacceptable level of construction noise, dust, vibrations which will seriously affect our family life and other nearby properties.

Comment ID: 9047

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

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Greater consideration should be taken to accepting available sites within the AONB, albeit relatively small as the infrastructure requirements will not meet the thresholds. The Cotswold District is unfairly required to increase the housing in a very confined area due to the AONB. As a result, this should be a sufficient reason not to be able to meet the government's housing requirements or there needs to be degrees of acceptance to build in areas that are currently unavailable due to being within the AONB.

Comment ID: 9043

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Option 3 is our preferred option, i.e. Main Service Centres. They offer an existing broad range of services and facilities with good transport and a mix of job opportunities.

This would help preserve the special rural/village nature of some Principal Settlements such as Siddington which should retain a development boundary.

The options which include existing villages (including those such as Siddington which have now been designated as Principal Settlements) are in danger of losing their separation between themselves and new development and attaching them to larger settlements. The quintessential English village with so many important characteristics is in danger of being lost.

Comment ID: 9044

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Edward Bury

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

Comment ID: 9046

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Edward Bury

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

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

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

Comment ID: 9049

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Edward Bury

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

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

The key infrastructure requirements would be:

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

Comment ID: 9050

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Edward Bury

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

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

Comment ID: 9051

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Yes. Agree with the vision and objectives, however the proposed plans do not necessarily appear to meet these.

Comment ID: 9045

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Increasing density has multiple negative impacts, with the key ones being, breaching the capacity of utility services, light and other pollution in an AONB, requiring material infrastructure changes for transportation to limit congestion and (most importantly that often is forgotten) having sufficient outside space rather than overcrowding that prevents families from letting their children have the space and freedom in their own garden and requires community land to be used, which with the requirement of overuse will result in groups forming in the community spaces and deterring younger families and the elderly from feeling comfortable to use them.

Comment ID: 9048

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Edward Bury

Comment: Increasing the strategic extension of The Steadings, land availability permitting, would be a better option than tripling Siddington and creating the new settlement west of Driffield as both of these areas already suffer from flooding issues with the current housing population. In addition, Siddington will see further flooding issues with the large proposed increase in housing in and around Preston. The recent retirement home development has seen significant increases to the flooding in the neighbouring area, and the large solar farms have also seen partial road closures given the increased run off.

Comment ID: 9518

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Edward Jamieson

Comment: The proposals lays waste to heritage and nature to build more and more homes on green belt and fields.

A disastrous urbanisation of AONB - this isn't sustainable just weak politics giving into targets and greedy developers.

Be rational - when will you draw the line, when the last field is gone?

Comment ID: 9519

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Edward Jamieson

Comment: This is disingenuous - trying to me out little impact on Cirencester when such aggressive numbers swamping Siddington / Preston effectively destroying the green belt

Comment ID: 10185

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Elaine

Comment: Down Ampney now a Non - Principle settlement has a Neighbourhood Plan effective up to 2031.

The village has already had substantial development for a small village 65 houses built or underway. To increase the housing by 420 dwellings would double the size of the village and give one of the highest percentage increase in the CDC area.

There is no public transport in the village.

The village school is full and not allowed to accept more pupils. As are other local village schools.

The village road is already subject to flooding. Most proposed development land is categorised as flood plain and regularly underwater when it rains.

Village amenities such as the shop and Village Hall are volunteer run.

Down Ampney has already had more than its fair share of development any more will completely change the character of the village.

Comment ID: 10203

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Elaine

Comment: Down Ampney has a Neighbourhood Plan.

65 houses have been built or are underway. To increase this to 420 houses would double the size of the village and be one of the highest percentage increases in the CDC area.

There is no public transport.

The road floods when it rains.

The sewage system already blocks and overflows.

The village school is full and not allowed to take any more pupils. As are neighbouring schools.

There is no employment in the village .

A lot of proposed development land is designated flood plan and underwater when it rains.

The Village Hall and shop are community run.

Development should take place where there are facilities to support it.

Comment ID: 10482

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Elaine

Comment: Down Ampney has a Neighbourhood Plan

Comment ID: 10948

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Elaine

Comment: Scenario 3

Cotswold villages are unsuitable for housing development due to poor public transport. Most have no employment opportunities.

Roads not suitable for extra traffic. Some flood.

Many cannot support any more sewage as often it is already being discharged inappropriately.

Extra housing would spoil the character of the villages.

Comment ID: 10969

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Elaine

Comment: Down Ampney has a Neighbourhood plan.

We have already had 65 houses built or being built. To increase this to the proposed 420 houses would double the size of the village and be one of the highest percentage increases in CDC area.

Village Road has bends at both ends and already floods and has to be closed when it rains heavily.

Most of the proposed development land is flood plain and often underwater.

There is no public transport or employment in the village.

Sewage system already blocks and overflows and there is constant unauthorised discharge.

The village shop and village hall are community run.

Planning for 8 houses was recently refused on environmental grounds.

Comment ID: 10182

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Elaine Eddy

Comment: Scenario 3 Cotswold villages are unsuitable for development.

Poor if any public transport.Village schools cannot take more children.Roads unsuitable for increased traffic.Sewage systems cannot cope so flooding occurs.

Comment ID: 10192

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Elaine Eddy

Comment: Cotswold villages are not suitable for development.

Poor if any public transport.

No employment.

Roads unsuitable for increased traffic.

Many roads subject to flooding.

Village schools often full.

Development in villages destroys the character of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 8798

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Eleanor

Comment: I would prefer this option: a) Allocate sites in Principal Settlements and b) Create new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement. I think these should be excluded: c) Non-Principal Settlements or Village Clusters and d) Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements.

Comment ID: 8799

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Eleanor

Comment: These should be included with a limit to height so that it fits appropriately in the landscape. I think everyone should have access to private outdoor space of their own.

Comment ID: 8800

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Eleanor

Comment: Include co-working spaces

Comment ID: 8801

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Eleanor

Comment: I don't live there so I have no skin in the game, but the extension around Amply Crucis seems like a terrible location for so many additional houses. It is on the edge of protected land and, but for a historic sweep of the pen, would have been included because it fits with the protected character of the area. This site feels like it will be changed for the worse with so many houses across the fields.

Comment ID: 8802

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Eleanor

Comment: I think there should be strict limits on multiple property ownership with the new housing. There are a lot of wealthy people who could own multiple properties, which negates the real endeavour of additional housing stock. I think there should be limits on ownership for visitors rather than people who live and work here.

Comment ID: 9459

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Eleanor

Comment: For the relevant consultation outlined above to effectively happen, the supporting documents to the Preferred Options Consultation document including Development Strategy Options Paper, the Housing Land Supply Report, and the Strategic Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment, need to take mitigating (reaching net zero) and adapting (becoming climate resilient) into greater consideration when determining strategic locations and sites. As a starting point, the Development Strategy options paper needs to compare strategic locations to both the climate risks and vulnerability assessment and net zero pathways work to ensure settlement hierarchy takes climate change into consideration and relevant risks and mitigation measures are identified at an early stage. In addition, relevant climate evidence, again including the climate risk and vulnerability assessment and net zero pathway work also need to be embedded into the Housing Land Supply Report / Site Assessment, especially within stage 3 - Sieve of Clearly Undeliverable Sites and Stage 4 Integrated Impact and Constraints Assessment. This will enable environmental and climate risks beyond flooding to be considered, and potential mitigation requirements identified that might need to be included if certain sites are selected.

Comment ID: 9458

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Eleanor

Comment: Additional consideration, when adopting a preferred option approach and subsequently choosing development sites, needs to be given to climate adaptation beyond flooding - Option 5, the preferred option, is currently likely to have a significant negative effect in relation to climate adaptation set out within the Integrated Impact Assessment. Consideration should start with the utilisation of the Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment published in November 2025 by Climate Leadership Gloucestershire and should include the consideration of increased risk to overheating, water efficiency etc., and how this will be exacerbated if the local plan increases density across the district, as suggested in the consultation. In addition, mitigation to the loss of greenfield land in option 5 and the need for new development to focus on the delivery of green infrastructure is key, as well as considering how BNG can be delivered to provide maximum benefits to interconnected habitats and adapting to climate change.

Comment ID: 9457

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Eleanor

Comment: As the Preferred Options Consultation document set out, there are still likely to be impacts in relation to climate change, both in terms of impacts on reaching net zero targets, adapting and becoming resilient to climate change, and wider socioeconomic implications linked to option 5. These issues primarily link to the lack of sustainable transport and wider community infrastructure within Non-Principal Settlements and Rural Settlements. Therefore, where the Preferred Options paper outlines opportunity for significant new infrastructure development to be created through option 5, the local plan must be strategically developed to ensure these benefits can be delivered in a way that considers the need to meet net zero targets already set out by the district and ensure it is designed and developed in a way that creates climate resilient communities. For example, this could include insuring CIL and S106 requirements are allocated to sustainable infrastructure, and design principles are based on climate mitigation and adaptation.

Comment ID: 9456

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Eleanor

Comment: Favouring option 5, as set out in the Preferred Options Consultation document, to ensure 'major positive effects across the economy and employment and equalities are unlocked while acknowledging the negative implications loss of open countryside, habitats, and productive agricultural land', scenario 6 being the only one achieving the governments housing target, puts the local plan in a good position in terms of responding to climate change, especially in relation to the natural environment. This is strengthened by the clear importance climate change has in both the revised vision and objectives of the local plan.

Comment ID: 8792

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Eleanor Harrison

Comment: These increased numbers only make some sense if there are parallel strategies to limit individuals owning multiple properties. This is a national level problem.

Comment ID: 9437

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Eleanor Jones

Comment: As a resident of Siddington, I'm very concerned about the proposal to increase the size of our village by nearly 300%. We are disproportionately affected by these proposals in comparison with other settlements, and Siddington's needs are being undervalued and downplayed.

It is critically important that Siddington retains its identity as a village. Residents have chosen to live in a village community with a rural character, and our culture and social values should be respected and supported.

Siddington lacks the infrastructure and services to support a significantly increased population. In particular, due to environmental constraints, we are already under substantial stress in terms of water supply, flood risk and sewer capacity.

Comment ID: 9438

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Eleanor Jones

Comment: I can't see any consideration of developments within the Cotswold Lakes. It is obscene that so many second home/holiday properties have been allowed to be constructed without suitable amenities, when pressure for additional housing is then being applied to local villages.

My suggestion is that no future second home developments be permitted within the district and that properties within the Cotswold Lakes are either made available as primary residences only or subjected to substantial additional council tax to offset the adverse impacts to be experienced by the communities under threat from these proposals

Comment ID: 9439

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Eleanor Jones

Comment: I fully support increasing housing density to meet housing targets. For too long, low density developments of large 'executive' homes have been permitted, with the consequences now expected to be borne by rural communities through unsustainable housing targets. The provision of higher density housing will reduce the land required to deliver proposed targets, but also help to reduce the growing inequality in access to housing and meet the needs of smaller households

Comment ID: 9966

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Eliza Abel Smith

Comment: None of the above scenarios are acceptable. These proposals must be challenged far more robustly. Each plan is fundamentally flawed and, frankly, inconceivable. This has become an ongoing battle in which none of the core issues are being properly addressed.

Start with water and infrastructure. Thames Water has been called out repeatedly to Quenington over the past three years, the system is already unable to cope with the newest developments and existing demand. How can it possibly support a significant increase in usage? (Quenington also already has a proposed new development plan to be build at Xylem.)

Roads and transport are no better. Local councils cannot afford to repair deep, dangerous potholes as it is—what happens when traffic increases threefold?

Schools are already beyond capacity. Farmor's School, for example, has class sizes so large that some pupils do not even have a clear line of sight to the whiteboard, with classes bending awkwardly around corridors. Add to this the likely influx of pupils from private schools due to VAT changes, alongside thousands of new residents, and the pressure becomes completely unmanageable.

Then there is healthcare. NHS waiting times, GP shortages, and chronic underfunding are already well documented. How on earth is the system expected to cope with yet more demand?

The environmental impact cannot be ignored either—waste, sewage, loss of green space, and the destruction of habitats. Where exactly is the wildlife supposed to go? Agriculture and forestry will be sacrificed, making a mockery of Labour's so-called "green policies".

And finally, the housing itself. These developments are visually intrusive and entirely out of keeping with the character of the Cotswolds. What is their actual lifespan? Are they

built using cutting-edge, genuinely sustainable design? Are they interesting, well-thought-out, low-cost homes? The answer appears to be no. Instead, developers seem motivated solely by profit, permanently damaging the British landscape in the process.

Which raises the most important question: who can actually afford these houses? Are they genuinely affordable or social housing—what this country desperately needs—or are they yet more £500,000 properties that sit empty for years because few can afford them and fewer still want to live in them?

Comment ID: 10128

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Elizabeth Gaffer

Comment: It seems that to meet the Government's target only option 5 is viable. However assuming option 3 and 4 have potentially less impact on the surrounding countryside and the natural environment by using existing transport provision and the local infrastructure to support increased populations, these would be my preference.

Comment ID: 10123

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Elizabeth Gaffer

Comment: I would prefer the council to consider higher density where possible and use any brownfield sites available where there is less likely to be an impact on the natural environment (ie nature).

Comment ID: 10111

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Elizabeth Gaffer

Comment: Is responding to the climate crisis enough? The rate of change in the natural environment means that we ought to be proactive rather than responsive. Is there anything else we and the council can do to be on the front foot to protect the natural environment for future generations?

Comment ID: 10127

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Elizabeth Gaffer

Comment: I agree with the objectives, but ask if they go far enough (see earlier comment from me).

Comment ID: 10387

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Paragraph 1.7: what do you mean by 'unsuitable'? Surely the fact that a location is unsuitable for housing should rule it out?

Comment ID: 10438

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: I fully support the intention to "protect the historic and natural environment" of this area.

Comment ID: 10420

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: It's very important to get the infrastructure in place before developing locations, otherwise they are set up to fail.

Comment ID: 10440

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Please add GP access to the list of infrastructure requirements.

Comment ID: 10408

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Scenario 2: while we expect that people of all income levels will want to live in the Cotswolds, those with more money are likely to prefer houses in the small villages with no or few facilities, where they can live the Cotswold dream. Dispersing the houses throughout the region, including these small villages/hamlets, would be better than concentrating entirely on market towns such as Moreton-in-Marsh, which, thanks to recent growth, are already at breaking point infrastructure-wise (i.e. sewerage, parking for shopping, parking for the train station, very restricted bus service, very congested roads).

Comment ID: 10409

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: I don't understand the question - poorly phrased!

Comment ID: 10410

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: I would support it where it is practical and achievable. I agree with the Council's position that the densities that might be needed to meet the government target would not be appropriate in this area, but would ruin the aesthetic appeal and run contrary to current restrictions.

Comment ID: 10437

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: The proposed level of development to 2043 and beyond is not sustainable without destroying much of what makes the Cotswolds special. The provisions required to make it possible include: the creation of major (disfiguring) roads to enable easy movement around the region; massive investment from Thames Water (for Moreton-in-Marsh in particular, possibly other places too) to make sewerage systems fit for purpose; serious investment in public transport, e.g. buses; and significant expansion of hospital and GP services (GPs are over-subscribed in Moreton-in-Marsh already).

If the current plans are implemented, the market town atmosphere of Moreton-in-Marsh will disappear entirely as it becomes another soul-less place like Witney.

Andoversford would be a better place to develop for housing than Moreton-in-Marsh, particularly as it's closer to a major work centre (Cheltenham).

Comment ID: 10443

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: I largely agree, but would like to see the more market towns designated as transport hubs, not just Moreton-in-Marsh - so that the burden of development can be spread proportionately across the region.

Comment ID: 10393

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Many of the people who want to live in the Cotswolds would like to live in the small villages. They have cars and would be prepared to use them to shop, travel to work, etc.

Comment ID: 10359

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: It would have been helpful to have specified which towns/villages are the Main Service Centres. Assuming that Moreton-in-Marsh is one: please be aware that our Town Council have probably over-egged the pudding for this town, which is almost at a standstill already. We need massive investment in sewerage, road, and public transport infrastructure before we can live up to our billing. It will not be long before everything grinds to a halt here.

Comment ID: 10366

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: While I can see the theoretical sense in this, it makes no sense on the ground for Moreton-in-Marsh. Given the asymmetric development of Moreton and the position of the railway station, most new houses will require occupants to drive to the station. Once there, there is very limited parking. There is also very limited parking in the High Street for the number of people who use it. We don't want rail users clogging up High Street parking.

Comment ID: 10367

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Development of the Glebe Field as a car park would ease the parking situation in Moreton-in-Marsh considerably.

Comment ID: 10370

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh's bus service is sparse, and needs to be drastically improved if people are to be encouraged to leave their cars behind. We need more frequent services and a better choice of destinations - currently there are no buses to Chipping Norton!

Comment ID: 10373

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: I'm delighted to hear that this is NOT considered a viable option!

Comment ID: 10375

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Completely support the decision to ask neighbouring authorities to contribute to the delivery of housing.

Comment ID: 10377

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: Paragraph 2.7, final sentence - should 'unable' be 'able'?

Comment ID: 10399

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Elizabeth Royle

Comment: This table is not as clear as you may think!

Comment ID: 10477

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Emma Ashton

Comment: In 4.12 Table 8 Broadwell does NOT have a primary school. The "play area" is only a double swing and a see-saw. I am concerned that this incorrect data is slewing the profile for Broadwell and may indicate that we can supply more houses than we should be required to supply.

Comment ID: 10480

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Emma Ashton

Comment: I am confused that the distance to every facility from Broadwell has been marked "fair" i.e. blue on the chart except the Post Office which is marked "good" i.e. green. The Post Office should be marked "fair" (blue) like all the other facilities. We do not have a post office in the village.

Comment ID: 8719

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Emma Bray

Comment: Whilst I fully understand the position you are in as a council.. there has to be a way that all councils across the UK come together and refuse to meet these targets.. it is absolutely ridiculous!

Our country is full and a complete mess.. nothing works, and all these extra houses cause nothing but more problems.

Just a few examples - 1) the work on the road into Cheltenham from Shurdington has caused horrendous traffic for too long, and really affects my work commute.

2) there are never any extra services to go with the houses- doctors, dentist, etc

3) all new builds tend to be built on flood plains and have a management company- we had a horrendous experience of both in our first home- it is a complete scam and huge problem waiting to explode.. should never be allowed to happen

4) we are ruining our countryside for poorly build houses

I have nothing positive to say, the list goes on.. Please find a way to take action against the government.

Comment ID: 8923

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: I am against the idea of providing 'reward' for a group of people that choose to live outside civilised society. These people do not pay tax or contribute to society and should not therefore be provided with support. In Moreton-in-Marsh travelling communities have caused criminal and environmental damage, terrorised local businesses and intimidated local elderly people.

Comment ID: 8921

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: Scenario 5...as per previous comments

Comment ID: 8922

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: Absolutely not. This is a ludicrous suggestion. Why would any developer build in a place that was unsustainable when their main driver is profit?

Comment ID: 8924

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: I agree

Comment ID: 8919

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: Development in the national landscape should be avoided. Our rural heritage is the envy of most of the world and we should be preserving and enhancing it. The idea that we would destroy habitats, exceptionally beautiful and sensitive landscapes and views is ludicrous given the abundance of brownfield sites and non sensitive areas across the country and indeed in our district. Please focus on areas outside the landscape area.

Comment ID: 8920

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Emma Carter

Comment: I agree this is the best option as long as the District Council honours the statements here, paras 2.9 and 2.11. I would also want to see a full strategic masterplan. For example, Moreton-in-Marsh may well be a strategic site because of the train station but its services and facilities are woefully inadequate for its current inhabitants. We need a more connected and more frequent local bus network to allow people to access work locally (rather than London, Oxford or Worcester). We need better sewage and drainage facilities, We need NHS dental services, a further doctor's surgery and shops that provide the goods and services local people need. We also desperately need greater employment sites across a range of sectors. Currently we have manual / agricultural opportunities, hospitality industry opportunities, some retail but very few professional or high level opportunities. If developers want to sell houses here there is much to be done to make it a place worth moving to.

Comment ID: 10658

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Emma Payne

Comment: Re: Preferred Options Consultation – Proposed development of 660 homes north of Ampney Crucis

I am writing to object to the proposed allocation of land for approximately 660 homes to the north of Ampney Crucis, as set out in the Preferred Options consultation document.

My objection is based on the scale of the proposed development and the serious concerns it raises in relation to flooding, road capacity, environmental impact, and the loss of the village's rural and unspoilt character.

Scale of development

Ampney Crucis is a small rural village. An additional 660 homes would increase the size of the settlement by around 300% compared to the existing village. This is an extremely large and disproportionate level of growth that would fundamentally change the nature of the village.

Such a dramatic expansion would overwhelm the existing community and infrastructure and would no longer represent organic or sustainable village growth. The scale alone makes this proposal unsuitable for Ampney Crucis.

I understand that this site has been considered in previous plan making exercises and was dismissed as being an unsustainable location for development. I am unclear what has materially changed since those earlier assessments that would now justify allocating a development of this scale at Ampney Crucis. The village's size, infrastructure, road network, flood risk, and limited services remain largely unchanged. Without clear evidence explaining this change in position, it is difficult to see how this allocation can be considered justified or sustainable

Flooding and drainage

Flooding is already an issue in and around the village. Surface water regularly runs off the surrounding fields and through the village during periods of heavy rain. I attach links to video evidence showing that the existing drainage and watercourses cannot cope with current conditions. This happens every time there is heavy rainfall and is not a one off event.

IMG_5291.MOV

IMG_5292.MOV

Introducing a development of this size would significantly increase hard surfaces and surface water runoff, making flooding more frequent and more severe unless major interventions are made. Given that problems already occur under current conditions, I am very concerned that this proposal has been identified without clear and convincing evidence that flood risk can be properly managed, both now and in the future as rainfall events become more intense due to climate change.

Road network and traffic

The roads serving Ampney Crucis are narrow, rural lanes with limited capacity and few footways. They are already used by local traffic, agricultural vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians.

A development of 660 homes would generate a substantial increase in daily traffic, including peak time commuting. I do not believe the existing road network can safely or realistically accommodate this increase without extensive changes, which would themselves further erode the rural character of the area. At present, it is unclear how traffic impacts would be addressed or whether appropriate improvements are even feasible.

Environmental impact and wildlife

The fields, hedgerows, and trees around the proposed site support a range of wildlife, including a thriving bat population and tawny owls that nest in trees bordering the fields. These species rely on dark, quiet, and undisturbed habitats.

The loss of habitat, increased noise, and disturbance from construction and long term occupation would have a significant negative impact on local wildlife. I am concerned that the presence of protected species has not been fully accounted for at this stage.

Loss of dark skies and rural character

Ampney Crucis currently has very limited street lighting, which is a valued and defining feature of the village. The absence of artificial lighting creates dark night skies, contributes to the sense of tranquillity and benefits both residents and wildlife.

A development of this scale would inevitably introduce street lighting, vehicle headlights, and domestic lighting, resulting in permanent light pollution. This would fundamentally alter the character of the village and harm nocturnal wildlife, particularly bats. Once lost, this dark-sky environment cannot be restored, and mitigation would not prevent widespread impact given the size of the development.

For all of the reasons above: the disproportionate scale of growth, existing and future flood risk, inadequate road capacity, environmental harm, and the loss of dark skies and rural character, I strongly object to the proposed allocation of land for 660 homes north of Ampney Crucis.

I respectfully ask that this site is reconsidered and removed from the Preferred Options, and that any future development proposals for the area reflect the scale, character, and limitations of the existing village.

Comment ID: 11142

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Emma Stuart

Comment: The number of homes proposed for Down Ampney in the preferred option is excessive, and completely disproportionate to the size of the village. Down Ampney cannot cater for significant new homes due to the clear impacts there will be on the landscape, local village character, heritage, highway safety and local flooding and drainage. This is not a location which is, or can be made to be, suitable for significant new housing and alternative locations should be found.

Looking at the evidence that has been prepared, I see that the number of dwellings (440) that the council says should be in and around this village is contrary to the findings of the council's own Site Assessment Part 2 which says, amongst other things, that:

'Down Ampney itself is modest in scale, with limited physical or visual capacity to support large-scale expansion without

compromising its landscape setting. Development at scale would risk eroding rural character and introducing new built form into an otherwise undeveloped landscape, particularly where containment features are absent. The zone's limited Public Rights of Way access and former military

land use contribute further to its distinct identity, suggesting only limited capacity for landscape-led integration of development'.

The same assessment also says there is only waste water capacity for 225 dwellings, whilst I also know that much of the village is liable to surface water flooding regularly. The evidence used to date suggests that this is a low flood risk area - it is not, and updated evidence should be prepared after talking to the parish and local residents.

Lastly, travel to and from Down Ampney is via narrow country roads, and there are limited chances to widen them to add footpaths or cycle lanes. The number of extra cars on the roads would create serious issues for safety, particularly on the road north to Meysey Hampton which is used by horses, and would make it more dangerous for young children attending Down Ampney and Meysey Hampton schools at peak travel times.

Comment ID: 11143

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Emma Stuart

Comment: Please see my longer comments and justification above on the 'indicative numbers' section re. number proposed for Down Ampney being very excessive given the local context and constraints. Alternative locations should be considered.

Comment ID: 9342

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

Name: Eva White

Comment: Indeed, further assessment is necessary. For example, zone 19 is frequently flooded and more construction would make this worse. There are issues with water supply and sewage. There are multiple obstacles to developing on this land (Esso fuel line, sensitive rivers etc). I find it surprising that it has been included at all in the development plan.

Comment ID: 9362

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Eva White

Comment: Regarding new village West of Driffield - the scale of this suggested new village is totally disproportionate to the existing hamlets of Harnhill and Driffeld. The proposed development would overwhelm these villages' historic scale and appearance. There's a high density of listed buildings in Harnhill and Driffield - there are in fact 20 (TWENTY) listed buildings in Harnhill and Driffield including the two churches St Michaels and St Mary's - mentioned in the Domesday Book.

Comment ID: 9055

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Eva White

Comment: Preferred scenarios are 3 and 4. Build near existing services, town centres, jobs and transport hubs. The other scenarios are harming existing countryside, ruining the character of existing historic villages and hamlets, increasing traffic on small already dangerous country lanes, affecting wildlife and natural habitats, disrupting farming and local food supply plus affecting the environment negatively (pollution, increased flooding etc). The important tourism industry will also be harmed if countryside is ruined by new developments out of scale and proportion.

Comment ID: 9056

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Eva White

Comment: No. Safeguarding and preserving National Landscape is the highest priority.

Comment ID: 9339

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Eva White

Comment: No absolutely not. This government and its policies will pass. Our landscape and countryside will remain. We have got no right to destroy nature. There is no return.

Comment ID: 9057

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Eva White

Comment: Increased density only in urban areas, to house for example students and young professionals. Preferably on urban brownfield sites and near major road infrastructure areas such as Birdlip site.

Comment ID: 9059

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Eva White

Comment: Concerning the area West of Driffield, Ampney Crucis, Poulton, - NO I do not think this plan is sustainable in any shape or form. The number of new homes is beyond any feasible proportion in comparison to the existing villages, overwhelming the villages' historic scale and appearance. It is too far from the Cirencester town centre, the road network could not support the huge number of additional cars, the air pollution would be considerable and against the Government's clean air strategy. Precious farm land, wildlife and its rare species' (frogs and owls) habitats and popular secluded country public foot paths would all be lost and ruined. The frequent flooding making the road between Driffield and Harnhill virtually inaccessible, putting even more strain on other narrow country lanes. There are no safe bike roads or pedestrian access to services. The scale of this proposed development is totally out of proportion and would disrupt farming, destroy the rural character and setting of the existing small villages, ruin the countryside and harm the environment. Our villages have no street lights and a development of this scale would destroy our dark landscape. Our villages have had another continuous hose pipe ban and water pressure is sometimes an issue. Surface water is an issue running off into the Ampney Brook or the Churn, both fragile and prone to flooding surrounding areas. The unique identity of our small historic villages must be protected from coalescence with the urban area of Cirencester. Save the open countryside for future generations. Preserve our sensitive landscape.

Comment ID: 9361

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Eva White

Comment: This government's plan to end homelessness cannot consist of building social homes in the rural landscape (as in the suggested West of Driffield site for example) - ending homelessness should also be aiming at ending poverty and offering people a way to participate fully in life by acquiring skills and work opportunities to eventually support themselves. This type of accommodation must be created in places where people can have access to apprenticeships or any type of education or government supported work schemes. Any new social housing development must be in immediate proximity to transport hubs.

Comment ID: 9346

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Eva White

Comment: In terms of supporting renewable energy : I find solar panels a joke - it ruins the landscape being an eye sore in a country where the sun never shines. Invest in and encourage geothermal energy instead. Invest in Waste-to-Energy incinerator plants.

Regarding promoting a diverse mix of housing types and focus on socially rented homes - The emphasis on any construction must be that it is of quality and in harmony with the historic construction type - using cotswold stone. Socially rented homes tend to be cheaper types of construction and are not desirable in this area. Any social housing must be in areas where there is employment and must adhere to upmarket building standards.

As for encouraging cycling - maybe cycling lanes can be created in urban areas but our country lanes with beautiful hedgerows are dangerous for cyclists. Leave those country lanes as they are! They are very much part of the fantastic historic landscape.

Comment ID: 9058

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Eva White

Comment: Planning for a new settlement near Driffield is absurd in its scale and size - beyond all proportion to existing historic hamlets and sustainable country life. A development of this scale would negatively impact the rural historical landscape, increase flooding in Harnhill - Driffield area, negatively impact traffic on already dangerous and saturated country lanes, such as Tank Lane, disrupt wildlife and the protected species (frogs and owls etc) that live in and around Driffield and Harnhill, harm the sustainable organic farming providing food for local communities, overwhelming the waterways, putting further strain on the sewage system that already cannot cope, putting too much strain on our fantastic village schools, GP surgeries, increasing traffic to Cirencester on the dangerous and already deadly roads. Our beautiful countryside with its small historic villages, narrow hedgerow lined lanes and "close to nature way of life" has to be preserved for future generations. Farming has to be supported, local food production is to be encouraged. Do not let our unique market town of Cirencester become another Swindon!

Comment ID: 9338

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Eva White

Comment: The Cotswold District Council must preserve our precious landscape, countryside, farmland and historic villages for future generations. The policies of the current government regarding housing targets for the next 30 years have to be regarded with scepticism. This government only got 9.7 million votes in the 2024 election and birth rates in the UK are declining since 2010. Are all these projected new villages really necessary? Are the jobs and transport nearby? Are these the right locations for more urbanisation? I would say NO to all the above. So what right has this government got to physically demolish our green landscape and pour concrete over precious farmland that should be prioritised for local food production for generations to come. I do not think we have the right, as current custodians and voters to allow this. Please consider the bigger scheme of things. Nature, wildlife, open landscapes and UK farming must be an absolute priority.

Comment ID: 9292

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Evenlode Parish Council

Comment: EVENLODE PARISH COUNCIL SUBMISSION RE: CDC REG 18
CONSULTATION

ON DEVELOPMENT IN MORETON IN MARSH dated December 2025. Statement &
Footnotes

Evenlode PC [EPC] has read the Reg 18 Consultation document together with
associated

documents referred to, as well as the May 2017 CDC commissioned Survey of SLAs.

It understands the need for some development and appreciates CDC's difficult position
in

fulfilling central government demands for 18,650 dwellings to be built in the period up to
2043 where the Cotswold District comprises 80% National Landscape and 4% flood
zones

– thereby leaving only a theoretical 16% of the District available for development.

Technical reports commissioned by CDC regarding infrastructure to support this level of
development are not currently available, making it difficult for consultees to make
submissions addressing the adequacy of these or otherwise. Consultees cannot take
an

overview of CDC's proposals until they see the detail underlying the development
options

and plans. For the level of development proposed the infrastructure requirements will
be

huge, needing vast amounts of detail to show the basis of how their conclusions are
arrived

at.

Having said that, EPC has submissions to make on Strategic Spatial Development and
Broad Locations for Development in the Consultation document, with specific
reference to

Zone 6 and the area south of Zone 6 as it relates to the village of Evenlode.

EPC wishes to bring back to the Council's attention the May 2017 Final report Special Landscape Areas Review – Landscape Context and Physical Changes which it commissioned for the previous Local Plan review. It particularly draws CDC's attention to

the contents of paragraph 2.21 and 6.72 of that document.

That SLA report, taken together with the contents of the NPPF December 2024 Paragraphs

1873 and 1884 and the contents of the current CDC Local Plan 2011-2031 Policy EN45 all

indicate that that where land is not within- but is contiguous to- National Landscape, there

is still a hierarchy among sites to be recognised, so that CDC should allocate development

to the least sensitive of non-NL sites.

It is not just a question of NL land which cannot be built on versus other land which can be built on.

1 Special Landscape Areas Review – Landscape Context and Physical Changes (May 2017) Paragraph 2.2 by Whites

Consultants for Cotswold District Council:

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1fwlz4gk/a5-3-5-special-landscapeareas-review-may-2017.pdf>

2 Special Landscape Areas Review – Landscape Context and Physical Changes (May 2017) Paragraph 6.7 by Whites

Consultants for Cotswold District Council:

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1fwlz4gk/a5-3-5-special-landscapeareas-review-may-2017.pdf>

3 National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) Paragraph 187

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf

4 National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) Paragraph 188

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf

5 Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-31 (Adopted 3rd August 2018) Policy EN4

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/k2kjqv3b/cotswold-district-local-plan-2011-2031-adopted-3-august-2018-webversion.pdf>

The hierarchy of sites (national and local) dictates which land should be developed in the

light of the overarching requirement in NPPF paragraph 187 and EN4 paragraph 1. Taken with the Consultation document which sets out CDC's Development 'Visions', the paragraphs quoted all emphasise the need for CDC to reconcile carefully these constraints

against the need to fulfil central government development quotas. The contents of the quoted policies and paragraphs set a very high bar and contra-indicate any development in

this part of the pastoral lowland Vale of Evenlode.

Evenlode sits in an area south of the Option Zone 6. It is the principal village in the area to

the south with its large proportion of pastoral use and it has a distinctive (split) nucleated

form and village green (and associated ridge and furrow). It has a distinctive form of the stone built settlement (two groups separated by the large gap of the village green) The railway line passes between it and Moreton in Marsh and the river Evenlode and the streams

which feed into it criss-cross the land. These lend a disconnection and separateness from

Moreton in Marsh.

Its status as a SLA remain valid and important as an exemplar of the very nature and importance of Cotswold landscape (as detailed in paragraph 6.7 of the 2017 SLA Review final report). The Evenlode SLA enhances the area's landscape and significantly contributes

to the special nature of the Cotswold District away from the A429 Fosseway. The importance

of this part of the SLA is further acknowledged in the Council's recent Assessment of Broad

Development Locations⁶

. We agree with the Council's own assessment that the impact of a large scale development in this part of the SLA would cause significant harm and would be difficult (in our view, impossible) to mitigate.

Evenlode Parish Council submits that CDC owes a duty to protect the particular characteristics of the village of Evenlode and the area south of the Zone 6 Broad Locations document for reasons set out. Its submission reinforces the requirements of NPPF and CDC's own commissioned documents and Plans.

6 Cotswold District Council : Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations November 2025 Appendix C –

Landscape Sensitivity Proformas Page 24

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/tm4pnf1r/appendix-c-landscapesensitivity-assessment-proformas.pdf>

FOOTNOTES

1. Special Landscape Areas Review – Landscape Context and Physical Changes (May 2017) by Whites Consultants for Cotswold District Council:

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1fwlz4gk/a5-3-5-special-landscape-areas-review-may2017.pdf>

Para 2.2

There are significant pressures on the district to accommodate development at all scales,

on the edge of settlements as well as in the countryside itself. The constraint of the AONB,

where great weight is placed on the consideration of landscape by National Policy, places

additional pressure for development on the landscapes outside. Some of these landscapes

are very similar to the adjoining AONB landscapes, or are a continuation or transition to other landscape character types. Some also act as part of the setting to the AONB.

Therefore, where this is the case, it is considered that these landscapes have a value above ordinary landscapes and it could be argued that there is a need to protect them as

far as possible, balanced with the need for sustainable development. Other areas have distinctive qualities or features over a reasonably wide area which mean that they have a

value above ordinary landscapes.

2. Special Landscape Areas Review – Landscape Context and Physical Changes (May 2017) by Whites Consultants for Cotswold District Council:

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1fwlz4gk/a5-3-5-special-landscape-areas-review-may2017.pdf>

Para 6.7

The Pastoral Lowland Vale LCT runs south from the watershed and is contiguous with the

Pastoral Vale LCT within the AONB to the west. All the key characteristics apply to the southern part of the SLA either side of Moreton-in Marsh. In summary, they include:

- Farmed pastoral vale with flat or gently undulating land defined by the rising slopes of the

(virtually surrounding) Farmed Slopes (in the AONB).

- Pattern of rivers and streams, dominated by the River Evenlode and its tributaries.

- A generally secluded, intimate scale landscape, interspersed with areas of open character where vegetation cover is minimal and more expansive views are possible from

locally elevated areas.

- Productive and verdant landscape predominance of improved and semi-improved pastures together with areas of arable land.

- Areas of wet meadow and species rich grassland bordering river channels.

- Varied field size, although the pastoral land is generally within small to medium scale

fields and arable in larger scale enclosures.

- Network of hedgerows of varying height and condition with intermittent hedgerow trees.
- Limited woodland cover, although in places hedgerow and waterside trees combine with

woodland copses to create a sense of well wooded character.

- Generally sparse settlement pattern dominated by scattered farmsteads and dwellings.

3. National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) Paragraph 187

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf

ber_2024.pdf

Paragraph 187

Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
- c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at

unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and

f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

4. National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) Paragraph 187

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67aafe8f3b41f783cca46251/NPPF_December_2024.pdf

Paragraph 188

Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework⁶⁵; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the

enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority

boundaries.

5. Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-31 (Adopted 3rd August 2018) Policy EN4

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/k2kjqv3b/cotswold-district-local-plan-2011-2031-adopted-3-august-2018-web-version.pdf>

Policy EN4

THE WIDER NATURAL AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPE

1. Development will be permitted where it does not have a significant detrimental impact

on the natural and historic landscape (including the tranquillity of the countryside) of Cotswold District or neighbouring areas.

2. Proposals will take account of landscape and historic landscape character, visual quality

and local distinctiveness. They will be expected to enhance, restore and better manage the natural and historic landscape, and any significant landscape features and elements,

including key views, the setting of settlements, settlement patterns and heritage assets.

6. Cotswold District Council : Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations

November 2025 Appendix C – Landscape Sensitivity Proformas Page 24

<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/tm4pnf1r/appendix-c-landscape-sensitivityassessment-proformas.pdf>

Broad Zone 06 is a low-lying, expansive and highly sensitive rural landscape located entirely within a Special Landscape Area. It contains multiple small-scale villages, historic

rural field patterns, and an open visual character defined by flat topography and sparse tree cover. While the river and railway corridor provide some structure, the overall scale, openness and perceptual integrity of the landscape would be fundamentally compromised

by new settlement-scale development. A new settlement would appear disconnected, visually intrusive and out of scale with local form and pattern. The zone's role in maintaining separation between Moreton and other settlements, and in reinforcing a tranquil and scenic landscape, is significant and would be difficult to mitigate.

Comment ID: 684

Email/Letter Representation

Name: E J Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 201

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Edward Bury

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

Comment ID: 625

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Edward Pigott

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

Comment ID: 666

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Edward Robinson

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

Comment ID: 671

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Edward Robinson

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

Comment ID: 776

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Eleanor Hardman

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

Comment ID: 390

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Elizabeth & John Anderson

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

Comment ID: 537

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Elizabeth Parker

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

Comment ID: 843

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Elizabeth Pile

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

Comment ID: 397

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Elliot Fonte

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

Comment ID: 132

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Emily Bainbridge

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

Comment ID: 463

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Emma Neilson

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

Comment ID: 431

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Emma Payne

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

Comment ID: 281

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Emma Stafford Michael

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

Comment ID: 158

Email/Letter Representation

Name: English Rural Housing Association

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

Comment ID: 664

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Environment Agency

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

Comment ID: 262

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ernest Cook Trust

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

Comment ID: 606

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Esra Howe

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

Comment ID: 318

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Eva White

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