

Comment ID: 9815

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: S Wilson

Comment: Moreton is already choking on traffic, this proposed development will require a ring road which will destroy the character of the town

Comment ID: 10514

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Samantha

Comment: I am concerned about the number of houses suggested for Down Ampney. While I am not against providing homes for people here in the village, the infrastructure to support this many additional houses is not there. We have already had a number of new housing developments in the village over the past few years, and the infrastructure is unable to cope, leading to regular flooding of not just the roads, but also homes. The services in the village are inadequate for the current level of homes. The sewage and water services are very old and cannot cope with the increased level of usage at the moment. Increased intensity of rainfall due to climate change, combined with the antiquated and insufficient drainage system is leading to regular surface water on the roads across the village, leading to road closures costing Highways and the tax payer money to implement. We have only a small village school, with a very old temporary mobile classroom that serves the infants that should have been decommissioned 20 years ago. The rest of the school will struggle to cope with additional student numbers. The increase in housing in the village will already change the nature of the village, an additional 400 homes will have a hugely negative impact, changing it completely. Down Ampney is a site of huge historic importance. During the Second World War, the village was the site of an RAF airfield from which missions including the D-Day, Operation Market Garden and the recovery of the injured from the frontlines took place. More significantly, it was home to the Flying Nightingales, the first women in active service sent to the frontline of a war by the British Government. Their contribution to the war effort is now being finally recognised. Much of the village's identity is tied up in this history. The village church has a garden of remembrance, where many of those who served from RAF Down Ampney during the Second World War have chosen as their final resting place. The church has a stunning Dakota Stained Glass window. The Arnhem Memorial at the Old Airfield site is still a place of remembrance and commemoration for people from across Europe. This small village was of huge significance. It would be such a shame if this historic site was lost in a mass of housing and the knock-on consequences of flooding, over-population and loss of identity. Promoting and celebrating the village as something unique, as more than just a pretty Cotswold village, is something that can make a difference to the district.

Comment ID: 10609

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Sara Kincla

Comment: The 'Settlement Role and Function Study' is not fit for purpose. It has been used to define where to/to not build new houses and increase the population. The flaw is that the focus is on what facilities the settlements have but there has been no investigation into the capacity of those facilities. For example, yes Fairford has a secondary school, but it's already over capacity so cannot cope with an increase in the population. Yes there is also a GP Surgery, but it currently takes 2-3 weeks to get an appointment and the local pharmacy (Boots) is also struggling to deal with all the prescriptions, so again no space for an increase in population. There is also the sewage system to consider, they are currently pumping sewage out of houses and into the River Coln! Then there is traffic, there has just been a 20mph limit imposed through the town due to how dangerous the roads are. So, the study concludes that Fairford is a primary settlement because it has infrastructure, but it's completely overlooked the fact that this infrastructure does not have the capacity to cope with the proposed population increase. I suggest that the logical and proper thing to do is to expand this research to include investigation into capacity and how many people these facilities can support, otherwise it's pointless and the options which have been proposed for the Local Plan on the back of it are invalid.

Comment ID: 10385

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sarah

Comment: Scenario 6 seems the only sensible option. It is mad to think that the current small settlements in the area referred to in the previous scenarios would be able to integrate the additional housing without destroying the character of those settlements and exacerbating existing problems with logistics, availability of services and flooding which is already common in the Cirencester and Moreton on the Marsh areas. Even if anti flood measures are put in place for those new houses, water is likely to be pushed to new areas and cause problems there.

Starting a new settlement would enable appropriate infrastructure to be put in place and if large enough, could support additional bus routes or other public transport.

It would also seem sensible to consider flats, as long as they are well built and with suitable green spaces - these would be suitable for an ageing population and potentially lend themselves better and more economically to lower income families and could be better suited to flood prone environs.

Comment ID: 10389

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Sarah

Comment: Building onto the AONB seems the only suitable and sustainable situation. The beauty of the Cotswolds is in its villages rather than the countryside surrounding them so let's not destroy the character of those villages.

Comment ID: 10392

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sarah

Comment: Absolutely would support development of more affordable housing in the form of flats or smaller houses. More single floor living spaces are essential to meet the needs of an ageing population.

Comment ID: 10412

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah

Comment: No it's not sustainable. There is no way you can increase the size of Siddington by 300% and expect the local infrastructure to be adequate. The lower half of the village already floods and it can be insanely difficult to get out onto the dual carriageway in the mornings even without the additional traffic. The same applies to the other small villages in the plan.

Comment ID: 10415

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Sarah

Comment: Yes. See below

The character and independence of the villages should be preserved.

Local flooding across the whole county is a concern for all current village residents should new developments be built.

It's the scale of the building rather than the building itself that is so unpalatable, it is totally in excess of availability of local resources such as parking, access to healthcare and potentially supply of water unless significant upgrades are made.

Comment ID: 10425

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Sarah

Comment: I understand where the vision comes from, however the proposals seem most likely to destroy or at least irrevocably worsen the character of the principle settlements. It is simply not feasible to squeeze all these additional habitats into such a small area.

Where will all these people work? How will they even get to work on the surrounding small roads? the local hospital has closed - how will healthcare be manageable, particularly for those people who do not drive?

How can so many new people successfully integrate into the small village that is Siddington? Local fields are already covered in solar panels, how could it ever be possible that such a large expansion could be done without destroying so much local ecology and habitat and causing additional flood risks?

Comment ID: 9495

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sarah Basley

Comment: Many thanks to CDC planning department for a clear and well-reasoned presentation. The fact that this is having to be done is, to be honest, quite appalling and we will be contacting our MP etc to express our objections to the number of units allocated and the reasons why this should be urgently reconsidered.

In the meantime, as far as your efforts to accommodate the revised numbers are concerned, we have the following comments given that these numbers are confirmed and HAVE to be accommodated (which we would far rather was not the case).

1. Firstly, it is clear that a lot of work has been undertaken to produce the options presented but no attempt (until now) to consult with local residents for suggestions or preferences. Could you not have considered running a Citizens' Assembly to consider the problem and how best to address it?

2. There are seven different scenarios but none proposing a complete new town. This could be centred on

Driffield/Down Ampney with its easy access onto the A419.

Alternatively, it could be centred on the new A417 link road area, where the countryside has already been destroyed and with links to the Severn Valley, the A40, the M5 etc.

Or, another alternative, between the B4425 and the A40 (outside the AONB).

A new town near Moreton-in-Marsh would also be worth considering as it has access to the Cotswold Line and the M40, with access to to the Midlands and Oxford.

If the principle of new towns is accepted then perhaps split them with one in the north of the area (Moreton), one in the south (Driffield/Down Amply), or one in the west (Birdlip)

These would seem to be valid and reasonable options worth pursuing. Yes, it could well involve the compulsory purchase of land but without this option we are left to the whims of landowners to decide planning outcomes. This would accord with the Government's latest proposals.

The attempts to split the numbers up, adding a large estate here and another one there just ends up destroying far larger areas of landscape. A single (or two) new settlements would also solve the problems of lack of infrastructure which are in a critical state in most of the existing settlements, most notably related to water supply and sewage management. Large single settlement developments would mean completely new infrastructure (new STWs etc) rather than relying on eg. Thames Water to upgrade

several STWs, which they have signally failed to do in spite of a notorious record of sewage spillages.

3. Of the seven alternatives it would appear that only 2 are really practical options as far as achieving Government approval. Why present options which are unlikely to be accepted? CDC itself excludes scenarios 6 and 7. Given the remaining options then clearly scenarios 1 and 2 would be preferable but I suppose that given an intransigent government then it has to be scenario 5.

4. However this issue is resolved, it is vital that necessary supporting infrastructure is built and funds for services properly allocated and protected. We cannot accept construction which depends on promises of improvements or upgrades in infrastructure which never materialise.

Comment ID: 8843

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Sarah Louise

Comment: Why havent CDC not considered the large open expanse areas of the existing airfields (Fairford, next to Gloucestershire barracks) as areas for housing rather than choosing sites that are within greenfield areas. Surely the expansion of Cirencester has had enough development? Without an active hospital there should be no further extension to Cirencester. Plenty of underused MoD sites to consider.

Comment ID: 8845

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah Louise

Comment: Preston, Siddington and Cirencester - no more expansion of Cirencester. Utilise the massive expanse of airfield land (Fairford, Gloucestershire barracks) - flat tarmaced land ready for housing rather than encroaches on more and more greenfield land.

Comment ID: 8846

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah Louise

Comment: No further expansion to Cirencester should be allowed. Development so far has blighted the historic core of the town which is flagshipged as Cotswolds Capital City. Use redundant and unused PDL e.g airfields. The one next to Gloucestershire barracks is never used, well one a year for the steam fair!

Comment ID: 8844

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Sarah Louise

Comment: Why cant CDC consider the site of the Gloucestershire Barracks - large open area of flat tarmaced land ready for housing rather than choosing the greenfield land opposite (land south of preston).

The extension to Cirencester (strategic extension north, south and west of Siddington farm) should not be allowed. the sprawl of development around Cirencester is unacceptable and detracting from its historic core and sense of place as Cotswolds Capital.

Comment ID: 9381

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The following representations are made in response to the Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review (CDCLPR) Preferred Options Consultation document (November 2025) on behalf of Catesby Estates. These representations are made in respect of their land interest at Land North of Broadway Road, Mickleton, which is partially referenced as site MK20 in the Cotswold Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – October 2021. A copy of these representations has been submitted using the Council's online consultation portal.

An updated call for sites form has been submitted for Land North of Broadway Road, Mickleton (which covers a larger site than identified under HELAA Site Ref: MK20), and is submitted with these representations.

Comment ID: 9402

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The following representations are made in response to the Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review (CDCLPR) Preferred Options Consultation document (November 2025) on behalf of Catesby Estates. These representations are made in respect of their land interest at Land East of Evenlode Road, Moreton-in-Marsh which is referenced as site M70 in the Cotswold Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment – October 2021. A copy of these representations has been submitted using the Council's online consultation portal.

These representations should be read in conjunction of previous representations submitted as part of the March 2024 Regulation 18 Consultation.

An updated call for sites form has been submitted for Land East of Evenlode Road (HELAA Site Ref: M70), Moreton-in-Marsh and is submitted with these representations.

Comment ID: 9395

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Scenario 5, is agreed to be the preferred scenario as identified in the Consultation document. A development strategy that focuses development within and adjacent to the Principal Settlements and sustainable locations is supported. It is acknowledged that the Council has an increased housing target under the new Standard Method, but the strategy should balance the need for development with sustainable aims to avoid overdevelopment in areas sensitive to change.

Catesby Estates wish to make the following comments on each of the options presented.

Scenario 1 proposes 7,840 homes in the plan period, which is 42% of the Government's target of 18,650. These homes are proposed at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal settlements and Village Clusters, with support for Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements. The focus is for the majority of growth at Principal Settlements, which is supported in principle. However, this option represents a lower quantum of housing in the district, not coming close to the government housing target, and therefore is not supported.

Scenario 2 proposes 8,230 homes which is 44% of the government's housing target for the district. This scenario proposes that homes are located at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements, Village Clusters and Rural Settlements. This scenario steers growth toward the district's Principal and Non-Principal Settlements, which is supported, as well as located in small villages. This is supported so long as allocations are sustainable. However, it should be noted that this option represents a lower quantum of housing in the district, not coming close to the government's target and is therefore less preferable.

Scenario 3 allocates 9,420 homes making up 51% of the government's target of 18,650. This scenario focuses the vast majority of development in main service centres. This scenario is not supported as it misses out on opportunities to maximise growth potential at Principal Settlements, which are sustainable locations for allocating further development to assist in getting closer to meeting the identified housing need figure.

Scenario 4 allocates 9,190 homes making up 49% of the governments housing target. This scenario suggested it focuses growth around transport modes and key public transport corridors (those proposed on the Expressbus network). Generally a scenario based around public transport corridors provides a sustainable approach to allocating homes. However, this scenario fails to consider the opportunity for growth along other bus corridors, other than just the Expressbus network. Sustainable growth along these other corridors would provide the opportunity for existing services to be improved due to the increased demand which comes with new development, providing benefits for new and existing residents. As such, in its current form, this scenario is not supported.

Scenario 5 allocates 14,660 homes equating to 79% of the governments housing target. This scenario allocates sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters, with support for rural exception sites in rural settlements and the creation of new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s). This proposal is supported as it includes development/growth of differing scales, which can provide a range of benefits. It allows for smaller sites to be allocated that can deliver at the beginning of the plan. Whilst larger strategic sites can supply housing needed in the later stages, which can provide a range of uses and additional infrastructure. It also supports sustainable development at Principal settlements whilst avoiding development in the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Scenario 6 allocates 19,320 homes equating to 104% of the governments housing target. The scenario proposes development at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters, with support for rural exception sites in rural settlements and creation of new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s) and major development within the Cotswolds National Landscape. As stated in the consultation material, this scenario would meet the governments housing target, however, is it contrary to national planning policy due to allocating housing in the Cotswolds National Landscape. As paragraph 11b and footnote 7 in the NPPF states, this is a protected area providing a strong reason for restricting development in the plan area, and therefore scenario 6 is not viable.

Finally, Scenario 7 allocates 16,200 homes, 87% of the governments housing target. This proposes to maximise growth across the district with sites assessed to be unsuitable for development (for example, via additional new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions beyond those already identified but have been assessed to be

unsuitable although been declared to be available). This combines all the proposals in the other scenarios (excluding scenario 6). We agree with the Council's view that this scenario is not sustainable as it would involve a high level of development across the district which is not viable in the context of the Cotswolds.

Overall, Scenario 5 is supported as the preferable scenario as it provides one of the highest percentages of housing delivery against the government's target, through delivering housing in sustainable locations at Principal Settlements.

The delivery of housing at Principal Settlements which have been identified through the settlement size, employment role and provision of services and facilities, is considered an appropriate approach to take to support sustainable development. In particular, development is encouraged at Mickleton, as a Principal Settlement. Therefore, sites such as Land North of Broadway Road, Mickleton (partially assessed under HELAA Site Ref: MK20), located at Principal Settlements are key to deliver the needed housing in the district.

Comment ID: 9403

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Scenario 5, as identified in the consultation document, is agreed to be the preferred scenario as identified in the Consultation document. A development strategy that focuses development within and adjacent to the Principal Settlements and sustainable locations is supported. It is acknowledged that the Council has an increased housing target under the new Standard Method, but the strategy should balance the need for development with sustainable aims to avoid overdevelopment in areas sensitive to change whilst also maximising housing supply in the district.

Catesby Estates wish to make the following comments on each of the options presented.

Scenario 1 proposes 7,840 homes in the plan period, which is 42% of the Governments target of 18,650. These homes are proposed at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal settlements and Village Clusters, with support for Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements. The focus is for the majority of growth at Principal Settlements, which is supported in principle. However, this option represents a lower quantum of housing in the district, not coming close to the government housing target, and therefore is not supported.

Scenario 2 proposes 8,230 homes which is 44% of the governments housing target for the district. This scenario proposes that homes are located at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements, Village Clusters and Rural Settlements. This scenario steers growth toward the district's Principal and Non-Principal Settlements, which is supported, as well as located in small villages. This is supported so long as allocations are sustainable. However, it should be noted that this option represents a lower quantum of housing in the district, not coming close to the government's target and is therefore less preferable.

Scenario 3 allocates 9,420 homes making up 51% of the governments target of 18,650. This scenario focuses the vast majority of development in main service centres. This scenario is not supported as it misses out on opportunities to maximise growth potential at Principal Settlements, which are sustainable locations for allocating further development to assist in getting closer to meeting the identified housing need figure.

Scenario 4 allocates 9,190 homes making up 49% of the governments housing target. This scenario suggested it focuses growth around transport modes and key public transport corridors (those proposed on the Expressbus network). Generally a scenario based around public transport corridors provides a sustainable approach to allocating homes. However, this scenario fails to consider the opportunity for growth along other bus corridors, other than just the Expressbus network. Sustainable growth along these other corridors would provide the opportunity for existing services to be improved due to the increased demand which comes with new development, providing benefits for new and existing residents. As such, in its current form, this scenario is not supported.

Scenario 5 allocates 14,660 homes equating to 79% of the governments housing target. This scenario allocates sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters, with support for rural exception sites in rural settlements and the creation of new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s). This proposal is supported as it includes development/growth of differing scales, which can provide a range of benefits. It allows for smaller sites to be allocated that can deliver at the beginning of the plan, whilst larger strategic sites can supply housing need in the later stages, which can provide a range of uses and additional infrastructure. It also supports sustainable development at Principal settlements whilst avoiding development in the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Scenario 6 allocates 19,320 homes equating to 104% of the governments housing target. The scenario proposes development at Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters, with support for rural exception sites in rural settlements and creation of new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s) and major development within the Cotswolds National Landscape. As stated in the consultation material, this scenario would meet the governments housing target, however, is it contrary to national planning policy due to allocating housing in the Cotswolds National landscape. As paragraph 11b and footnote 7 in the NPPF states, this is a protected area providing a strong reason for restricting development in the plan area, and therefore scenario 6 is not viable.

Finally, Scenario 7 allocates 16,200 homes, 87% of the governments housing target. This proposes to maximise growth across the district with sites assessed to be unsuitable for development (for example, via additional new settlement(s) and/or

strategic extensions beyond those already identified but have been assessed to be unsuitable although been declared to be available). This combines all the proposals in the other scenarios (excluding scenario 6). We agree with the Council's view that this scenario is not sustainable as it would involve a high level of development across the district which is not viable in the context of the Cotswolds.

Paragraph 20a) in the NPPF should also be noted that "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision for: a) homes (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development". Scenarios 1-4 do not make sufficient provision for homes when set against the need identified by the government's new Standard method. Therefore, if this level of housing were to be provided there is the possibility that there would be a need for an immediate local plan review, if the plan is not found unsound. This also applies to other scenarios that do not meet the government's housing target. Therefore, if it is decided that a lower level of housing supply is delivered by the local plan compared to the Standard Method, sufficient evidence will be required to support this position.

Overall, Scenario 5 is supported as the preferable scenario as it provides one of the highest percentages of housing delivery against the government's target, through delivering housing in sustainable locations at Principal Settlements.

The delivery of housing at Principal Settlements which have been identified through the settlement size, employment role and provision of services and facilities is considered an appropriate approach to take to support sustainable development. In particular, development is encouraged at Moreton-in-Marsh, as a Principal Settlement, due to it being a sustainable location with a number of facilities and services, and a train station with regular services (services to Oxford, Reading, London Paddington, Worcester, Hereford, Great Malvern and Evesham). Therefore, sites such as Land East of Evenlode Road (site M70), located within in and adjacent Principal Settlements are key to deliver the needed housing in the district.

Comment ID: 9396

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Development should be in sustainable locations to balance the need for development whilst avoiding overdevelopment in areas sensitive to change. This follows the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

It is acknowledged that the Council has a significantly increased housing target under the new Standard Method. However, this does not mean that the Council has to consider locating development in locations that are considered unsustainable.

The district has a number of Principal Settlements it can develop further, which are already sustainable. Additional housing can support the continued viability and vitality of the existing service provision. Indeed, by allowing more development within these settlements it will ensure a critical mass of service provision which will be a betterment to existing residents.

Sites that are demonstrated to be sustainable, deliverable and achievable such as at Land north of Boardway Road, Mickleton (partially assessed under HELAA Site Ref: MK20) should be allocated. This is due to its location adjacent to Mickleton, a highly sustainable location that could help deliver wider public benefits to the local economy, highway infrastructure, affordable homes, promote health and wellbeing, a low carbon environment and sustainable travel options.

Scenario 5 proposes new settlements, which if planned comprehensively and are of the right scale, will enable the right housing with the necessary infrastructure to be provided, resulting in another form of sustainable growth.

Comment ID: 9404

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Development should be in sustainable locations to balance the need for development whilst avoiding overdevelopment in areas sensitive to change. This follows the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

It is acknowledged that the Council has a significantly increased housing target under the new Standard Method. However, this does not mean that the Council has to consider locating development in locations that are considered unsustainable.

The district has a number of Principal Settlements it can develop further, which are already sustainable. Additional housing can support the continued viability and vitality of the existing service provision. Indeed, by allowing more development within these settlements it will ensure a critical mass of service provision which will be a betterment to existing residents.

Sites that are demonstrated to be sustainable, deliverable and achievable such as at Land East of Evenlode Road, Moreton-in-Marsh (site M70) should be allocated. This is due to its location near existing services and facilities in Moreton-in-Marsh, a highly sustainable location that could help deliver wider public benefits to the local economy, highway infrastructure, affordable homes, promote health and wellbeing, a low carbon environment and sustainable travel options.

Scenario 5 proposes new settlements, which if planned comprehensively and are of the right scale, will enable the right housing with the necessary infrastructure to be provided, resulting in another form of sustainable growth.

Comment ID: 9397

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The delivery of housing should be relevant to local context to ensure new development is appropriate to the setting and in keeping with existing development. This has been the strategy for the design of Land North of Broadway Road, Mickleton (partially assessed under HELAA Site Ref: MK20), which has an average density of 33 dwellings per hectare. This is considered appropriate for the site's setting in Mickleton on a rural edge to mitigate impact on the surrounding area.

In certain areas it may be more appropriate to have higher densities and higher buildings. For example, new settlements could have higher density development and include flats within a neighbourhood / local centre. As stated above the design of the site must be seen within the context of the site's location and its surrounding area. A blanket approach therefore to increasing housing density is not supported.

The percentage density increase, as detailed in Table 1 of the Consultation document shows very high, unrealistic densities is not supported as this would not be suitable in the context of the Cotswolds District.

Comment ID: 9405

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The delivery of housing should be relevant to local context to ensure new development is appropriate to the setting and in keeping with existing development. This has been the strategy for the design of Land East of Evenlode Road, Moreton-in-Marsh (site M70), which has an average density of 33 dwellings per hectare. This is considered appropriate for the site's setting in Moreton-in-Marsh on a rural edge to mitigate impact on the surrounding area.

In certain areas it may be more appropriate to have higher densities and higher buildings. For example, new settlements could have higher density development and include flats within a neighbourhood / local centre. As stated above the design of the site must be seen within the context of the site's location and its surrounding area. A blanket approach therefore to increasing housing density is not supported.

The percentage density increase, as detailed in Table 1 of the Consultation document shows very high, unrealistic densities, is not supported as this would not be suitable in the context of the Cotswolds District.

Comment ID: 9399

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The proposed level of development is sustainable and supported so long as sites, like Land North of Broadway Road (partially covered by HELAA Site Ref: MK20), in Mickleton that are sustainable, achievable and deliverable, are allocated to meet housing need in the Cotswolds District Council.

It is also key that smaller sites are allocated as part of the plan to ensure early delivery of housing to meet need, as larger strategic sites could struggle to deliver in the first years of the plan. As discussed in the consultation documentation, strategic sites have long lead in times from conception of the idea to the first spade being put in the ground. The indicative numbers identified in Table 3 on strategic sites also needs to be reviewed and supported by evidence to ensure that these numbers are deliverable and achievable within the plan period.

The strategy therefore of allocating sites in and adjacent to the Principal Settlements and identifying new settlements is supported.

Comment ID: 9406

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The Cotswolds District Council should provide robust evidence to demonstrate that the proposed sites in their supply are deliverable, and demonstrate that sufficient supply is available for the plan period. Therefore sites such as Land East of Evenlode Road (HELAA Site Ref: M70), in Moreton-in-Marsh that are sustainable, achievable and deliverable, should be allocated to meet housing need in the Cotswolds District Council. If evidence for sustainable sites is not provided, then the supply will not be sustainable, and the local plan may be found to not be sound.

It is also key that smaller sites are allocated as part of the plan to ensure early delivery of housing to meet need, as larger strategic sites could struggle to deliver in the first years of the plan. The site at Land East of Evenlode Road (HELAA Site Ref: M70), in Morton-in-Marsh, is deliverable in the short term (0-5 years) and therefore would support the delivery of housing the early stages of the plan period. As discussed in the consultation documentation strategic sites have long lead in times from conception of the idea to the first spade being put in the ground. The indicative numbers identified in Table 3 on strategic sites also needs to be reviewed and supported by evidence to ensure that these numbers are deliverable and achievable within the plan period.

The strategy therefore of allocating sites in and adjacent to the Principal Settlements and identifying new settlements is supported.

Comment ID: 9400

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The local plan relies upon evidence-based policy making and thus should be based around this when appropriate evidence is available on required infrastructure.

As the Council is proposing new settlements in addition to development at the Principal Settlements, necessary work should be undertaken to test the right quantum of housing and infrastructure is identified to ensure that the proposed new settlements are sustainable and viable.

An understanding of how new developments and the benefits they bring should also be developed, working in partnership with developers and landowners. Catesby would be happy to collaborate and work with the Council on this.

Comment ID: 9407

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: The local plan relies upon evidence-based policy making and thus should be based around this when appropriate evidence is available on required infrastructure, and deliverability of housing supply, including viability.

As the Council is proposing new settlements in addition to development at the Principal Settlements, necessary work should be undertaken to test the right quantum of housing and infrastructure is identified to ensure that the proposed new settlements are sustainable and viable.

An understanding of how new developments are shaped to contribute to meeting housing needs and the benefits they bring should also be developed working in partnership with developers and landowners. Catesby would be happy to collaborate and work with the Council on this.

Comment ID: 9401

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Overall, the vision and objectives are an appropriate framework for the emerging Local Plan and its policies. The aspirations of the Council to respond to the climate crisis, conserve and enhance the Cotswolds National Landscape, deliver sustainable communities, encourage economic vitality whilst delivering a diverse range of high-quality housing to meet the wider needs of the district is received positively and supported.

Nevertheless, there are some aspects that require consideration to ensure they are deliverable and not overly onerous, leading to impacts on the delivery of housing in the district.

Requiring development to be zero carbon is not in accordance with the Written Ministerial Statement on Energy Efficiency (13 Dec 2023) and the subsequent Court of Appeal judgement (Rights: Community: Action Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, July 2025) which states that the government does not expect plan makers to set local energy efficiency standards that go beyond the current and planned building regulations. However, should it be deemed appropriate to go beyond the current and planned building regulation the Council will need to justify their case clearly so that development remains viable. Therefore, the implementation of zero carbon should be further considered with evidence produced to ensure it meets the requirements set out above, to ensure development will be viable and deliverable.

Comment ID: 9408

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Sarah Twist

Comment: Overall, the vision and objectives are an appropriate framework for the emerging Local Plan and its policies. The aspirations of the Council to respond to the climate crisis, conserve and enhance the Cotswolds National Landscape, deliver sustainable communities, encourage economic vitality whilst delivering a diverse range of high-quality housing to meet the wider needs of the district is received positively and supported.

Nevertheless, there are some aspects that require consideration to ensure they are deliverable and not overly onerous, leading to impacts on the delivery of housing in the district.

Requiring development to be zero carbon is not in accordance with the Written Ministerial Statement on Energy Efficiency (13 Dec 2023) and the subsequent Court of Appeal judgement (Rights: Community: Action Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, July 2025) which states that the government does not expect plan makers to set local energy efficiency standards that go beyond the current and planned building regulations. However, should it be deemed appropriate to go beyond the current and planned building regulation the Council will need to justify their case clearly so that development remains viable. Therefore, the implementation of zero carbon should be further considered with evidence produced to ensure it meets the requirements set out above, to ensure development will be viable and deliverable.

Comment ID: 9199

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: option 1

I don't believe that just because an area is AONB then no growth is allowed, if housing is built the schools, shops and services stay open.

Comment ID: 9200

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: yes, what comes first the homes or the services? you will continue to have unstainable places if no homes are delivery and rural communities become more isolated, Elderley and exclusive. Affordable homes are needed greatly in the Cotswolds

Comment ID: 9201

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: Higher density doesn't really work for the Cotswold's, you don't have any city's and its a very unique area which needs to remain so.

Comment ID: 9202

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: when talking about sustainability you have both physical infrastructure, roads, services, green space, but you also need places of worship, community spaces,. you need to take an holistic place based approach, just tagging 100's of home onto existing settlements driven by profit developers does not create a good welcoming community to live in and causes dissatisfaction with the current residents.

Comment ID: 9197

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: scenario 1 should allow some for many of the villages even those in the AONB to have some housing, a small number of homes makes a bit difference in the rural villages

Comment ID: 9198

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Sarah Walker

Comment: agree this is probably the best of both world as allows for RES but also delivery the larger number of homes needed

Comment ID: 8742

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Sharon Jehu

Comment: Please can leases be changed on shared ownership houses in Boxbush Road, South Cerney. Bromford says it is down to CDC. Allowing us to buy our house fully after living here for 26years, bringing up our Family, extending and making it our home. After all if we can't buy all of our house while we are working who will be paying our rent once we retired? As pension will not cover that! Has that been thought of? If you have to pay rent on a shared ownership for life, not fair! Should be given the opportunity to own it outright. Please consider this and give us the option. Thank-you.

Comment ID: 10396

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Shelley

Comment: On behalf of our client, O&H Land, we support the Council's preference of Scenario 5 in recognition of the significant number of homes required over the plan period. This scenario looks to allocate sites in Principal Settlements such as Lechlade which would see an 18% growth in dwellings over the plan period (220 additional dwellings).

O&H Land's site in Lechlade (coded as L16a in the 2021 SHELAA) adjoins the development boundary and could provide between 30-50 dwellings. It is suitable for a range of other uses including nursing and residential care accommodation, hotel and retail. The site has existing vehicular access directly off the A361 and has no major constraints.

The 2021 SHELAA set out that the site has high ground water flood risk however the latest Government flood mapping data shows no surface water flooding (or any other form of flooding) in the developable area of the site and any potential risks could be mitigated. The SHELAA also set out that development for residential use would have a negative impact on the surrounding landscape and would not be in keeping with the existing settlement pattern.

We are proposing a lower quantum of development on site (30-50 dwellings) than proposed in our earlier Call for Sites submission (90 dwellings) which would be in keeping with the existing settlement pattern and result in a low, edge of settlement, type density (15-20dph).

The site sits within Zone 10b of the Site Assessment land categorisation which considered the impact of strategic extensions on Principal Settlements such as Lechlade. This assessment found that development in the area of between 500-1000 homes would have a medium impact on landscape. This should mean a development of our site of circa 50 homes, which would be designed to minimise landscape harm, would have a neutral or low impact on the surrounding landscape. Further, the site falls outside of the Cotswold National Landscape.

The land also falls within the boundary of the Cotswold Water Park and the owners, O&H Land, also own the adjacent lakes as well as the Wildlife Trust site to the south west. O&H Land would be interested in working with Cotswold District Council to see how housing can be brought forward in the Water Park in such a way that contributes to the aims of the Cotswold Water Park Nature Recovery Plan.

Bringing forward O&H Land's site in Lechlade would support the current strategy of focussing the majority of additional growth at Principal Settlements.

Comment ID: 10401

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Shelley

Comment: Currently, development outside of Principal Settlements development boundaries is not supported however, in order to meet the housing commitment, these boundaries would need to change. O&H Land would like to see policy support for development in Principal Settlements that adjoin a development boundary in recognition that this approach is more sustainable than development in the open countryside.

Comment ID: 10402

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Shelley

Comment: O&H Land supports increased density in certain locations (such as near transport hubs) and on a site such as the land in Lechlade (coded as L16a in the 2021 SHELAA) density could be higher along the boundary to the A361. Policy should allow for flexibility in approaches to density while also ensuring the development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Comment ID: 10403

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Shelley

Comment: The proposed level of development is ambitious, particularly as opportunities for strategic extensions are limited and where they exist it is recognised that larger sites take longer to come forward. In order to grow sustainably, Lechlade would benefit from improved active travel routes such as footpaths and cycle lanes, improving connectivity from the north to the south of the settlement. O&H Land's site in Lechlade (coded as L16a in the 2021 SHELAA) could also provide elderly care facilities which would enable more residents to stay local as they age. The site could also be used for retail or tourism, supporting the local economy.

Comment ID: 10405

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Shelley

Comment: Smaller sites of 30-50 dwellings, such as O&H Land's at Lechlade (L16a in the 2021 SHELAA) are typically delivered by Small to Medium Housebuilders (SME) and the Government is looking to put in place support in order to accelerate the delivery of site such as this as part of their 'Plan for Change'. A new 'Medium Site' Category is proposed in the consultation draft of the NPPF for sites with 10–49 homes which would have reduced regulatory burdens, including potential exemptions from the Building Safety Levy and simpler Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) obligations.

We would like to see acknowledgement and policy support for the development of medium sites, in line with national government policy as well as policy support for SME housebuilders to encourage them to take Medium Site's, such as ours, forward.

Comment ID: 9040

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Sian Bernard

Comment: This is a HUGE concern! I'm a local of Fairford, will my children have a local secondary school to go to if this moves ahead. Where will they go otherwise. It's wholly irresponsible if the school capacity for both the primary and secondary setting aren't addressed!

Comment ID: 9776

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Simon

Comment: Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of Evenlode, near Moreton in Marsh and I am writing in response to the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation.

I have serious reservations about the proposed scale and speed of housing growth around Moreton, particularly given the cumulative impacts on infrastructure, traffic, flooding, landscape and environmental quality. These concerns are heightened by the fact that the town's population increased by approximately 44% between the 2011 and 2021 censuses, representing a very substantial level of recent growth for a small market town. As a result the town's infrastructure is already strained and thus to have identified Moreton as one of the CDC towns for the most planned growth is, in my view, deeply flawed.

Flooding, drainage and insurance:

The land surrounding Moreton, particularly towards the Evenlode Valley, is low-lying marshland that is already prone to surface water and fluvial flooding. Sewerage infrastructure is operating at or beyond capacity, with regular sewer overflows affecting the River Evenlode and frequent flooding of roads and surrounding fields. Thames Water tankers are routinely required to manage excess water, including water emerging from manhole covers. Further large-scale development would increase hard surfacing, disrupt the water table and materially worsen flood risk for existing and future residents. This raises serious concerns about the long-term availability and affordability of flood insurance, potentially undermining the sustainability and insurability of both new and existing homes.

Infrastructure and traffic:

Transport infrastructure is already under significant strain. While the railway station is cited as a justification for growth, station parking is very limited and feeds directly onto the A429, exacerbating congestion. Overspill parking impacts the town centre and the A429/A44 junction is already a major pinch point affecting both Moreton and Stow-on-the-Wold. The Evenlode Road has increasingly become a rat-run despite being narrow,

unlit, lacking in pavements and poorly maintained and is unsuitable for increased traffic given its regular use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. It is regularly subjected to impassable flooding.

Landscape, countryside and light pollution:

Although some proposed areas lie just outside the AONB boundary, they sit immediately adjacent to it within a highly sensitive Cotswold landscape that includes the conservation villages of Broadwell, Evenlode and Chastleton. Development in these areas would erode the rural setting of Moreton, harm valued views, including those from Chastleton House towards Broadway Tower, and introduce light pollution into the Evenlode Valley, diminishing dark skies, tranquillity and wildlife habitats.

Local facilities:

Moreton has no secondary school and only one primary school, which is already at capacity. Additional development would inevitably increase car journeys for education, worsening traffic and congestion. GP services are also at capacity, with long waiting times already unacceptable.

While I recognise the national need for new housing, priority should be given to genuinely affordable homes and to brownfield development in larger, better-resourced towns. Rural settlements such as Moreton have limited capacity to absorb further large-scale growth without unacceptable impacts on infrastructure, the environment and community wellbeing.

Given the very significant level of growth already experienced in recent years, I believe Moreton-in-Marsh requires deep consideration of its environment (landscape, flooding, water and light pollution etc) but also substantial investment in its infrastructure (traffic, drainage, local facilities etc) BEFORE any further expansion is contemplated.

Yours faithfully,

Simon Beale

Anchor Farm

Evenlode

GL56 0NY

Comment ID: 9954

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Simon

Comment: Cycling/electric cycles must be always in the equation as this mode of transport is becoming more important.

Why can't CDC have the ambition to persuade central Govt to make disused railway tracks into cycleways? Stow to Cheltenham, Moreton to Stratford via Shipston???

Comment ID: 9953

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Simon

Comment: Given that Moreton in Marsh is a principle settlement, good road connections and especially a railway station it seems right that you have identified it as a place to build more homes. It also has the advantage of the current fire college which in the future has massive potential to be a business park providing employment to those in the new homes. I hope this is considered and that site is seen as only as its potential to build houses.

Comment ID: 10225

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Simon

Comment: I believe it is a mistake to include Bourton on the Hill as a Non-Principle Settlement, rather it should have been classified as a 'Rural Settlement'

Comment ID: 8739

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Simon Dailley

Comment: The proposed increase in housing numbers within the Proposed Non-Principal Settlements, seem excessive and unsustainable particularly in the likes of Down Ampney. The tables indicate potential increases of between 100-200% in population. These levels of increased housing would completely disrupt the current nature and feel of such villages, destroying the very fabric of the village, its setting, and its historic feel. It seems highly unreasonable to subject these small villages outside of the Cotswolds AONB to be expected to accommodate 80% of the increases in housing targets, based on the new universal Government targets. Especially, given that these new housing targets are, in themselves, are completely unreasonable within the Cotswolds itself, particularly the historic small villages that give the region its heritage and character. These villages, would have their heritage and character negatively impacted forever, should these excessive targets be taken through to fruition.

Comment ID: 10781

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Simon Henry

Comment: Such expansion in the north of the county can only be sustainable and viable with a material investment in infrastructure and there appears no material financial commitment in the document; areas such as roads, medical and school provision must be included as a minimum.

Comment ID: 10780

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Simon Henry Kenner

Comment: Accpeting the need for more housing, I feel the proposed locations of housing extensions at Moreton in Marsh should be less focused on the south of the town and more evenly spread as the south of the town has in the relatively recent past been prone to flooding particularly in 2007/08, steers development towards the AONB which is unhelpful and will at a tactical level develop areas that were allocated for breeding areas for skylarks as part of the concession for the recent development south of the town making that provision meaningless and ineffective; moreover the infrastructure pressures as a result of a single directional focus for development is unwise and unnecessary

Comment ID: 10509

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Sir Michael Griffiths

Comment: Appalling that Mickleton is targeted to receive almost as much extra housing as Stow, Chipping Campden and Broadway combined. The amount of building in South Warwickshire south of Stratford has already led to huge increase in road traffic through a narrow and winding village. Without a by-pass for the village, this is a flagrant disregard of the character of a Cotswold village. The village has had enough. Not a NIMBY, but the lack of infrastructure makes this expansion totally unacceptable.

Comment ID: 10512

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Sir Michael Griffiths

Comment: Appalling that Mickleton is targeted to receive almost as much extra housing as Stow, Chipping Campden and Broadway combined. The amount of building in South Warwickshire south of Stratford has already led to huge increase in road traffic through a narrow and winding village. Without a by-pass for the village, this is a flagrant disregard of the character of a Cotswold village. The village has had enough. Not a NIMBY, but the lack of infrastructure makes this expansion totally unacceptable.

Comment ID: 10530

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Sonya

Comment: Why is Mickleton being asked to increase by another third when this has already happened in the last plan without any improvement to infrastructure, health facilities, schools, employment or shops. Mickleton is a village not a town but is an easy out post for extra housing with no facilities.

Comment ID: 9852

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stella M

Comment: These comments are general to the whole plan, centred on Broadwell, Stow and Moreton.

This elevated visual rural part of the Cotswolds National Landscape should be protected as once it is lost, there is no return.

Development should be centred around the main service centres as these would have the infrastructure to cope with expansion.

Stow, Moreton, and Broadwell are already over capacity for traffic, services and drainage situations without further increases. Moreton has already over-expanded with no comparative improvements in road structures, and the outlying villages in this area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) make this impossible.

Any new houses around Broadwell/Stow would be clearly visible across the Evenlode valley as it is in an elevated position. This does not fit with an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) or in a conservation area. Also, high-rise buildings do not fit the appeal of the Cotswolds National Landscape for which tourism is of such importance.

Broadwell, a conservation area, seems unfairly labelled as a settlement to incorporate 17 new houses as there is not sufficient infrastructure for the development in a village smaller than others with lower/no allocations. There are already traffic issues in the village from external cars avoiding Stow and Moreton and the inevitable traffic, cutting the corner off to travel between the Fosseway and chipping Norton, Kingham, Daylesford, Bledington area etc., and across to Moreton. The village is small with minor roads, and lots of children and pets, and is also on the cycle route. We do not want to make it an unsafe race track.

The A429 Fosseway is already horrendously congested between Stow and Moreton, already being at a total standstill the majority of the time especially in summer. This already impacts the community of Broadwell as people search for alternatives and cut through the village without realising the danger of the mainly single-track roads throughout Broadwell.

Road safety is therefore a concern, with potential for bad accidents with more traffic as more people with children and dogs regularly use the roads which have no pavements

and are mainly close to single-track. Cyclists on the designated cycle route, including tourists on organised tours, will also be at greater risk.

Flooding is already a risk to be dealt with in the area, with surface run-off problems whenever we have good rainfall – which is only going to worsen anyway due to climate without development of Stow, Moreton and Broadwell. The region's drainage network is already over capacity. Treatment plants need major upgrading in the current situation, even without further development.

Smaller gardens and higher constructions will only worsen flooding throughout the area.

There are already insufficient GP services or District nursing in the area. Traffic problems on the A429 cause serious delays for emergency vehicles and assistance when needed. Ambulance response times are already longer than targets due to the rural location far from hospitals, and this will only get worse. This would be even more concerning if so many extra new homes were to be built around Moreton and Stow.

Train services and parking are over subscribed already in Moreton/Kingham. And if families move into all these proposed housing, then there are insufficient schooling options in the area.

Comment ID: 9697

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Stephen Bowles

Comment: Looking at the allocation of new houses it seems that far more new homes are being proposed in the south of the area. this affects me as I live in Lechlade where it is proposed 220 new homes would be built with 150 near sensitive ecological sites. the numbers in the neighbourhood plan have been met in full.

CDC say they are "green to the core" yet they are considering building on good arable land and habitat of protected species. not very green!

The council seem to change their tune to fit with what they want.

The infrastructure in Lechlade will find it hard to cope with an 18% increase in housing with little room to extend schools and gp practices.

The traffic can extend from the market place all the way to old railway close on some days. public transport is not very frequent making it hard to commute from Lechlade unless of course you drive. employment in Lechlade will not be increased but the traffic will be. there is a flood risk in Lechlade and further investigation has not been carried out. this greatly reduces the amount of land suitable for development. surely brown field sites should be looked at before farm land.

I would like to see the number of houses to be built in Lechlade reduced and it would make sense for new developments to be in larger towns preferably with good rail links to limit the increase in traffic.

Comment ID: 8953

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stephen Butt

Comment: I think the standard method to calculate the number of houses needed is flawed and should be challenged.

The benchmark used at the start of the calculation is the existing housing stock. The Cotswolds is a very popular holiday destination. A significant proportion of the housing stock are second homes or holiday homes. The benchmark should be adjusted to omit these.

The benchmark is adjusted by an affordability ratio (a ratio of house prices to median earnings). The ratio for the Cotswold is 14.3 vs a ratio of 7.84 for the UK. The significantly higher ratio is largely a result of lower earnings rather than higher house prices. This is because most of the employment in the Cotswolds is agricultural or hospitality (largely minimum wage). Also there is a significantly higher proportion of pensioners in the Cotswolds (27.5%) vs the UK (19.0%) and pensioners are lower than average income earners.

Finally, net migration figures are now reducing and so the requirement for new housing should reduce accordingly.

Comment ID: 8956

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stephen Butt

Comment: If any of these scenarios has to be chosen it should be scenario 4 - focus growth around transport nodes.

The existing infrastructure is inadequate to cope with further development. In our villages we do not have enough work, medical centres, dentists, shops, schools, etc ,,, People have to travel by car to get to the limited facilities we have because our bus service is sporadic or even non-existent in some locations, particularly during off-peak periods. Our rural roads are narrow, busy and in poor condition with potholes, subsiding edges and damaged verges. Any further development should be close to transport nodes, work and amenities. The argument that infrastructure will follow is simply not credible given what has (not) happened in the past and the current financial position of the district council.

Comment ID: 9836

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stephen McAllister

Comment: Of all the scenarios detailed on the document, my preferred option would be option 4, as it is focussed around transportation hubs.

Having previously lived in Northamptonshire, my biggest criticism of committing to large scale new housing expansion is creating the infrastructure around the developments so new housing doesn't paralise roads, doctors & hospitals. The infrastructure build needs to either precede or worst case happen alongside the housing development rather than the all too common approach of after.

Comment ID: 9840

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stephen McAllister

Comment: In answer to Question 2...Should the Council consider locating development in locations it considers unsustainable to meet the government housing target? Please explain

No

This short term approach will clearly have consequences for the local communities across the Cotswolds for years and years to come. Responding to a short term politically motivated government agenda will not work. The council has to be custodian of the long term vision for it's residents and also, critically for the Cotswolds, all of the many tourists that come to the Cotswolds every year from all over the world. The danger of short term thinking could be that the reputation and desirability of the Cotswolds is damaged.

Comment ID: 9841

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stephen McAllister

Comment: In answer to Question 3...To what extent would you support increasing housing density in

developments (such as smaller houses and gardens, more flats or higher buildings) to help meet the full housing target? Please also explain why.

This would not be consistent with a part of the UK that is supposed to be classified as an area of outstanding natural beauty. The beauty of the cotswolds is the consistency and luxurious feel the area and the rest of the UK admires and respect the Cotswolds for it's consistency and discipline on how to keep the area aligned to it's historic beauty with no compromises.

Comment ID: 9844

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Stephen McAllister

Comment: Looking at the settlement table with all of the towns & the proposed numbers of additional housing for each town, I find it difficult to understand how the whole Cotswold area can function efficiently with the additional overloading of houses in the area.

I personally live in Chipping Campden and the town cannot currently cope with the volume of people & traffic as things currently stand before adding a potential 20% increase in houses for the town!

This will not only affect local residents significantly day to day, this will also have an impact on tourists who come to holiday in Chipping Campden.

Our villages/towns in the Cotswolds are precious and steeped in history and have been protected for a reason over the many years.

Responding to a politically-led short term government initiative to build more homes has to be pushed back on and Cotswolds district council should not make short term decisions that affect the long term prosperity and beauty of this amazing area we are all lucky to live in. Increasing housing in Chipping Campden is only going to serve to clog up the area further and make for unhappy residents who are also struggling to find basic services to support their daily needs. e.g schools, quality GP access, dentists, hospitals, non gridlocked roads etc etc.

Comment ID: 10027

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Steve Barrett

Comment: Lack of plan for road infrastructure, a ring road is already required. No plans for secondary school. No plan for increase capacity at doctors surgery or provision for a NHS dentist. Unclear on provision on additional shops and town parking. Reliance on cash strapped Thames Water to update already at full capacity sewage system, absolutely no additional houses should be agreed until this issue is resolved including the 420 already given permission. No provision for additional policing, a town of the planned size should expect a manned police station. Major disruption to the town during the build period as experienced with the recent Ellenbrook development. The plan would completely change the character of the Cotswold town.

Comment ID: 9642

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Steve Cordell

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: Steve Cordell

Address: Vicarage Cottage, Vicarage Lane, Poulton GL7 5HU

Date: 29th 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.

Signed: Steve Cordell

Comment ID: 9650

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Steve Cordell

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: Steve Cordell

Address: Vicarage Cottage, Vicarage Lane, Poulton GL7 5HU

Date: 29th 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.

Signed: Steve Cordell

Comment ID: 10276

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Steve Hill

Comment: I am disappointed by the scope of this consultation, which is far too general with regard to the local proposals in my town, Northleach. I attended an event put on by the developer and expected to be able to make representations more formally. Apparently not, unless that is planned for some future time.

I am Chairman of the Rixon Road Management Committee, which is responsible for managing common parts of 35 houses on the Westwoods Estate, which lies to the south of the proposed Northleach development. We are directly affected by the proposals. There have been several comments by local people on Northleach Facebook pages, and it is a shame that these views are unable to be incorporated here.

Assuming that there will not be a more detailed consultation process, I will have to outline my views here.

Our initial concern was due to a proposed link from the new development into our (Rixon Rd) drainage systems, which would have meant a) more than doubling the likely flow through our systems but also b) disturbing the roots of well-established and protected trees on our side of the main road.

When it rains, the amount of water running off the main road here turns the path from the kissing gate into the southern field into a river (I can supply video of this) . The new development will likely exacerbate that.

Water management and drainage are acknowledged issues.

I was told Thames Water says the drains have the capacity to deal with sewage & waste water but the local water treatment plant does not. Given the 2018 local plan said that drainage was already 'grossly overloaded' this must be fully explored. Thames has to agree the sewage treatment works.

I appreciate supportive points made about safeguarding the use of the local school. No doubt local businesses also generally support the prospect of more local custom. However, the town's capacity to absorb more and its character are already under threat.

Parking at the market 'triangle' and along the roads into and out of town are already under pressure and without improved public transport and parking, inability to park will discourage visitors and local shoppers.

The developer could not tell me how many extra people would be housed by their proposal but lets assume at least 100. The original plan (<https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/gxzdza5x/northleach-with-eastington-np-made-plan.pdf>) for 17 houses might have meant about 35-50 people, so this development more than doubles that. We note the current plan said :

'No significant change... is proposed.... The combination of the town's relatively isolated location within the AONB and its special heritage interest is considered to mean the town cannot sustain any significant growth in its population, jobs or services. Hence, its housing proposals are modest.... '

The proposed extra housing is said to help CDC meet the Govt's new targets, but how that is achieved all remains to be agreed. There was meant to be a green infrastructure ring around Northleach (plan F) seen now to be compromised by the current proposals with housing. If these go ahead, what is to stop further development in the southern field owned by the Council?

The planning issues are also a concern. The original local plan was limited to 17 dwellings along the line of Westwoods development (Rixon Rd). The proposal now is for 48 dwellings. I was told CDC and the Town Council had already approved the extra allocation of housing here. If that is the case why were residents not consulted directly?

This proposal is already blighting the local environment. The field has been extensively dug over apparently for archeological purposes and the farmer is fencing off surrounding fields which have been used for years by local dog walkers.

To summarise, our views question the need for and impact of these proposals which reduce our green spaces, negatively impact the character of the local environment and will require substantial infrastructure development.

Comment ID: 10832

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Steve Hill

Comment: I'd like to add that the additional proposed housing contradicts a key conclusion of the 2021 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, namely that: 'This should not extend

beyond the line of built form of the recently completed 40 dwelling development to the south.'

Comment ID: 10300

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Steve Hill

Comment: We would not support increasing density to meet the government target. The current density standard, 21 dwellings per hectare, is considered a moderately high, urban-focused residential density, often featuring terraces, townhouses, or smaller apartment blocks. The proposed development site is essentially rural, on the extreme edge of town. If it goes ahead, it must be in keeping with its rural location and character.

Comment ID: 10754

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: I'm curious as to why the Council chose to conduct this consultation in such a way that comments from the public are not visible. A 'public consultation' in this manner suggests a lack of transparency on the CDCs part.

Comment ID: 10730

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 1: The CDC finds itself in a difficult position trying to meet the growing demand for houses set by the government targets. With this in mind, Scenario 5 appears to be the best scenario from all those suggested, as it includes the building of better amenities and infrastructure, while also adding to the property numbers. However, Scenario 5 fails to take into consideration the imbalance created by not building in the CNL. This has led to a total disproportionate weighing of where these properties will be located and little consideration to the cultural, history and biodiversity which would be destroyed in the affected locations. Preserving the National Landscape is important, but the social and economic polarization between the areas of the Cotswold's within the National Landscape and the rest of the district, which will be forced to take the brunt of the planned housing is unacceptable.

All of the proposed scenarios do little to comfort the small village of Preston that has existed for over 1000 years and runs the risk of being completely overwhelmed and annihilated by any of these proposals. To consider these proposals, it is impossible to see which one would not totally destroy a historical village of less than 90 homes, with the construction of nearly 3000 new build houses in the surrounding fields. Any new development should be separate and detached from the existing village, with a significant buffer and no access to the village from any future development.

While the village of Preston is not part of the CNL, it does have a history, community, significant conservation area, and listed buildings, while being surrounded by green agricultural land and wildlife, which would be destroyed by this development.

The Local Authority needs to be challenging the government, with legal proceedings, to oppose these figures, given that most of the area (80%) is within the National Landscape. This is unduly prejudiced and biased on the rest of the Cotswolds, and will cause massive wealth and societal imbalances.

Comment ID: 10732

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 2: No, they should not consider unsustainable locations because it would lead to a loss of key areas of already protected land, such as the Cotswold National Landscape, as well as the possible destruction of sites of important historical and cultural interest.

The expectation set by the government to allocate areas for these new houses does not take into account the large proportion of the Cotswold's that is part of the National Landscape. This has resulted in a ridiculous imbalance in the proposed placement of these properties. This imbalance will result in building developments of such vast proportions that the proposed locations would be unsustainable levels of expansion.

In the case of Preston, the proposed increase from 90 to over 2000 properties would be result in growth that is unsustainable and untenable for a village of its size. The proposed expansion does not take into account its over 1000-year history, village identity and community which would be decimated by such an expansion. It also has not considered the lack of employment opportunities, transport links, and infrastructure, the recent downgrading of Cirencester hospital, or considers where people actually want to live.

The earmarking of numerous fields within the same area for multiple different sizeable developments is clearly the council ticking boxes to meet the housing target demanded by the government, regardless of how sustainable the locations are for the surrounding communities.

Comment ID: 10734

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 3: Depending on the increased scale of housing density it would affect the extent I would support it.

In urban locations, such as town centres, then higher buildings would be more in keeping with the existing housing density and architecture. Any new buildings should not be built any higher than the existing architecture to prevent the loss of the town's character.

In more rural villages, however, it would be totally unacceptable to build houses or flats higher than 2/3 stories tall. Any higher would dwarf existing properties and destroy the village's feel and identity. Smaller houses and gardens would be more appropriate for a village setting, and would not detract from a village's community, feel, and history, but only in small quantities. Larger scale developments should be set away from current settlements and allowed to develop their own identity and history.

In the village of Preston, a high rise would be totally out of touch with the rest of the village and obliterate 1000 years worth of history and identity. Much of the village is covered by a conservation area with many listed buildings, so any new builds should be in keeping with Preston's history and Neighbourhood development plan. Smaller properties or gardens would be more suitable than any high-rise, although with any high-density housing, it would need to be supplemented with adequate facilities and green spaces for people's physical and mental wellbeing.

Comment ID: 10737

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 4: Preston- The proposed level of development for Preston is totally unsustainable and is unduly biased against our village. No provisions would be acceptable for the scale of development which is suggested for such a small village and, to try to meet the scale suggested would lead to the irreparable destruction to the history and character of the village. As evidenced by your own data and graphic representation the scale of the proposal affecting our small village is exceedingly disproportionate to the number of existing properties leading to the total decimation of the community. The level of urban crawl towards our village through previous developments both built and approved has already diminished the green buffer between Preston and Cirencester which made the village a distinct settlement. To continue to expand in this manner with the proposed development would lead to the total destruction of our village history.

Preston is a small historical village with only 89 properties currently, it has no public amenities or facilities, other than a small church and village hall around which the community is based. To meet the scale of the development proposed, new public amenities such as new schools, library, doctors, shops, leisure centre, and parking would need to be built as a part of any development to match the increased demand. Several of the recent accidents along the A419 have required the field currently earmarked for the Preston development were used to land air ambulances. Additional facilities would need to be made to continue this support.

All of the village is reliant upon oil for fuel as there is no gas connection. Phone signal is also spotty in the area.

Due to current water demands, the village has medium to low water pressure. Drainage is also an issue during heavy rain, leading to localised flooding across the village and surrounding fields. Properties being built on the surrounding fields will make the drainage issues worse. Much of the utilities within the area need to be improved with additional drainage and importantly these should be in place before any new development is even considered.

Access to the village is currently off the Kingshill Road from the A419. The road through the village itself is nearer single track in parts. Road access for any proposed development would therefore need to be via an alternative entrance- from the main A-road and not via the village to help minimize traffic build up and accidents. Avoiding a rat-run mentality would also be essential to keep villagers and pedestrians safe. Only one bus line goes through Preston, in the direction of Cirencester with no returning bus

route. The nearest train station is in Kemble, which has limited parking. There are no transport resources, in Preston or the wider Cirencester area, to support the increase of people- they would have to rely on road travel, making the already dangerous roads much more congested and dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians. As Preston's pedestrian access currently relies on pedestrians crossing major A-roads which, for vulnerable residents of Preston can feel like target practice, a cycle and foot path crossing all main roads and going into Cirencester would be an essential priority prior to any developments being built. Any development, or construction traffic should not have road access to the village to reduce the traffic impact on the historic village. Public transport links for Preston and the surrounding areas should be massively improved to mitigate some of the reliance on roads. At present any new additional houses would likely be forced to rely on private vehicles, majorly increasing traffic and congestion, leading to dangerous roadways.

The village of Preston is currently surrounded by woodland and agricultural fields, which contribute significantly to the biodiversity of the area. The loss of this green space would directly impact the village, as the only children's play park in the village is a rented, privately owned field (the funds for which come directly from the village residents), the loss of any surrounding green space would be significant. Villagers rely on the surrounding agricultural fields and footpaths.

We therefore want a designated biodiversity corridor surrounding the whole of Preston village to minimize the impact to wildlife and the lives of the residents of Preston. A green space gap between the village and any new development, at a minimum of a 2 roads width, would help to retain the village's character and provide space for wildlife. Parks and green spaces should also be a requirement within any proposed development to minimize flooding risks and encourage the wildlife to continue to flourish in the area.

Comment ID: 10738

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 5:

- Biodiversity and wildlife
- Job opportunities for any new development
- Local shops
- Coffee shops, food and drink outlets (cannot rely on the McDonalds on the roundabout)
- Leisure facilities- cinema/ theatre, swimming pool, parks
- Refuse collection
- Schools
- Transport (highways)- to accommodate increased traffic levels and access points for any new development
- Flood mitigation measures

Comment ID: 10740

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: Question 6: While on paper this vision and objectives (of forming sustainable developments taking into account current dwellings) sounds good, this would be impossible to achieve on the scale proposed. Developments of this size would totally obliterate the history and culture which has stood for over 1000 years. In the case of Preston village, the proposed plan would devastate a village of under 90 homes. Building nearly 3000 houses as part of the village would be an increase of over 2800%. How can anyone consider such an increase with so little regard for the destruction of our village? This village has existed for over 1000 years with 8 properties being grade II listed and a significant conservation area which is vigorously cared for and maintained by the villagers. All of this will be wiped out in a single generation. The proportion increase in dwellings is completely excessive and unjustifiable. Building on the fields around the village will destroy the character, historic value and cultural identity of Preston village. It will cause an increased flood risk for all houses in the village, including the listed buildings, due to the fields earmarked often flooding during heavy rain. The areas biodiversity will be obliterated should this development go ahead. Transport and infrastructure challenges that are already a growing concern would be unable to cope with an increased demand, and should be a priority.

Comment ID: 10748

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Steve Rawlinson

Comment: If the CDC are objecting to or legally challenging the government over the allocation of housing figures (given the the majority of the area is within the National Landscape), could proposing to build in such protected areas be utilised as an incentive or bargaining chip for the government to reconsider their requirement for the district? A one size fits all does not and cannot apply here.

Comment ID: 10033

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: steven Cole

Comment: Yes I agree with the vision and objectives

Comment ID: 10093

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: steven Cole

Comment: The number of hoses proposed at Down Ampney seems excessive compared to the size of the village and the accessibility off the A417 seems poor. This needs a further review.

Comment ID: 10094

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: steven Cole

Comment: The number of hoses proposed at Down Ampney seems excessive compared to the size of the village and the accessibility off the A417 seems poor. This needs a further review.

Comment ID: 10021

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: steven Cole

Comment: Overall I think CDC have done a robust job of reviewing the District in terms of locations resources (shops schools etc) and where best to locate development. I definitely support sustainable development in accessible locations. Remote and poorly accessed sites should and have been ruled out.

I do have a number of concerns:

Cotswold road network - there is need of a review along with this document i.e the ability of the A417 to carry increased traffic relating to proposed developments at Fairford and Ampney Crucis going through to Cirencester.

The adequacy of local facilities to meet demand from increased population - again looking a Fairford with recent development and no increase in schools or healthcare.

The report covers a wider range of topics under infrastructure. This does not mention demand for minerals which will be vital for construction. While this is a county matter CDC will must be mindful and supportive of the need. # There is also an issue of safeguarding of potential mineral sites to prevent development sterilizing potential reserves.

Comment ID: 10372

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: In the Introduction above it says this is an expensive area for housing. Surely, areas of lower cost of housing would be better suited to higher levels of development.

Comment ID: 10436

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: This suggestion would not maintain the requirement for development to be in keeping with the existing area

Comment ID: 10469

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: On paper Fairford may look attractive to develop extensively even if it appears spatially viable.

The town has limited connectivity.

Inadequate bus service that is not suitable to visit surrounding towns beyond Cirencester or link to train services.

The main road A417 in the centre of town cannot be passed in opposite directions at the same time.

The bend at the Town Bridge requires larger vehicles to cross into the oncoming lane to negotiate the corner.

People find car use too easy and many locals drive into Fairford. Parked cars will fill the surrounding roads and park without regard for the rules of the road. This already occurs near Farmors School during the school run.

The town is served by limited resident resources.

The GP surgery needs additional resource.

The dentist surgery has closed its books for years.

Sports centre facilities are minimal.

The hospital is under utilised, perhaps incorporate a new GP surgery and Dentists.

Cirencester Hospital seems to be in decline when it should be the opposite.

Comment ID: 10481

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: Fairford wasn't included in the Cotswold AONB as it was mainly flat farmland. The country needs to provide food for its inhabitants as well as housing. Perhaps there is a need to consider the use of the countries limited farmland for houses.

Comment ID: 10490

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

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: The land north of Fairford delivers ground water as springs at this time of year. Development of these areas must take into account any impact this water may have on the new and existing properties.

Comment ID: 10498

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: Increasing density in a rural area would be restricted by the need for two parking spaces plus adequate visitor parking per property. New home owners to the area will first factor the use of cars for their travel needs, including visiting local facilities.

Comment ID: 10507

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is all important and must tie in with developments. A consequence could be challenging conditions for the authorities and also the new and existing members of the community.

Comment ID: 10517

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: Fairford doesn't currently have enough pavement to keep walkers safe, or cycle ways, or roads wide enough for current traffic levels. The bus services have been reduced so there is a lot to do to promote the vision above.

Current planned housing doesn't have solar electric and water panels, heat exchangers, car charging points, water butts. All this is falling behind the expected requirement of new housing

Comment ID: 10520

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Steven Edwards

Comment: Having read through and added comments (hopefully) I think this is an awkward document to navigate, and understand the way the feedback window works (even blocking the text from reading). I haven't been able to review my input and don't have confidence that my submission has been successful.

I'm concerned that many worthy contributors will have given up.

Comment ID: 9842

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: Para 3.15 states that the Council has not yet received the results of a WSP feasibility study looking into strategic development at Moreton-in-Marsh. However, the public is being invited to comment when it has had no sight of any plans, feasibility work, or technical information. This undermines the purpose of this Regulation 18 consultation because consultees do not know what they are being asked to comment on, beyond a single statement that Moreton might be suitable for strategic development.

Comment ID: 9839

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: I accept that Scenario 5 is the most appropriate approach, given the growth targets which must be met, but there needs to be more of a balance between the allocation of new sites in existing settlements and new strategic growth.

Comment ID: 9835

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: Has CDC attempted to quantify a higher level of housing provision under Scenario 1. The development strategy in the current Local Plan targets a lower rate of growth, so could Scenario 1 assumptions be tested against a higher growth rate?

Comment ID: 9854

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: In setting out the issues which need to be considered under Option 5, para 2.6.19 of the Reg 18 Plan proposes a presumption against major development taking place within the Cotswolds National Landscape but fails to consider the status of the Special Landscape Area (SLA). Paragraph 2.5.19 should refer to the important contribution which the SLA makes to the natural landscape. This principle is clearly set out in Paragraph 187 of the NPPF which states:

"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"

To comply with the NPPF, the Local Plan policy should not solely focus on the Cotswolds National Landscape but should also seek to protect and enhance the SLA.

In addition, there should be a recognition of the hierarchy of designated sites (both national and local), and Local Plan should then “allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value” (NPPF para 188).

The existing Local Plan recognises the importance of SLA's. A review of SLA's undertaken by consultants for the Council in 2017 stated:

"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."

I believe significant weight should be given to the protection and enhancement of Special Landscape Areas within the district. By definition, SLAs are of higher landscape value, above that of ordinary landscapes, which means every effort should be taken to protect them as far as possible, balanced against the need for growth. The Plan should explicitly recognise this important role which SLAs perform in the District, and any consideration of locations or sites for strategic development should address the question of harm to the SLAs in determining suitability for large scale development.

Comment ID: 9843

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh is being for the following growth:

- i) Units identified in current Local Plan to be carried into the new Plan: 420 units
- ii) Strategic development within the new Plan to 2043: 1,710 units
- iii) Strategic development beyond the new Plan period (past 2043): 2,260 units

That indicates the current size of Moreton (2,663 units) is planned to grow to 4,793 units by 2043, and then to 7,053 units beyond 2043.

This is a huge level of growth which will have significant effects for the town and the surrounding area. Yet, the Council has not undertaken, or shared with the public, a vision as to how this level of development could be accommodation, the impacts which it would have, and how some of these impacts could be mitigated.

Comment ID: 9838

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Steven Ferris

Comment: The Council's decision to pursue Scenario 5 is understandable, given the growth target which have been imposed. However, the preferred approach seeks to continue with a modest level of growth under Scenario 1 (7,840 units), supplemented by 6,820 from strategic sites. In other words, over 46% of the housing numbers are proposed to come from strategic sites. This places an unrealistic burden on some existing settlements which are being asked to bear the brunt of the growth which has been targeted.

Comment ID: 10017

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Steven Larcombe

Comment: The Vision needs to reflect the need to conserve not only the National Landscape area but the area adjacent to it, which is often equally attractive, historic and particular. The character of this area should not be destroyed to meet some arbitrary housing target. And the Council should continue with its objective of being "Green to the Core".

Comment ID: 10511

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Steven Larcombe, Chair Ampney St Peter Parish Meeting

Comment: To the Planning Policy Team, Cotswold District Council,

I am writing on behalf of Ampney St Peter Village Meeting, with the full support of the residents, to object formally to the "Preferred Options (Scenario 5)" outlined in the Regulation 18 Consultation and proposed as the way forward. Having reviewed the supporting evidence, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Water Cycle Study, and Landscape Sensitivity Assessments, it is clear that the proposed concentration of development in the "East of Cirencester" corridor is unsound. We appreciate that the CDC is in a difficult position, having been instructed to add a huge amount of housing to its Plan without consideration for the local context, but Scenario 5 and its specific proposals are not the way forward.

While the Council has rejected "Scenario 6" on the grounds that it would harm the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly AONB), it appears to treat the non-designated countryside around the Ampneys, Driffild and Preston as a "dumping ground" for housing. This approach ignores the CDC's own evidence that much of these areas are of "High Sensitivity" and suffer from critical infrastructure deficits that cannot be mitigated. CDC rightly prides itself that future development should be "Green to the Core" and we are very supportive of that, but these proposals for widespread housing development will inevitably destroy the character of the beautiful Cotswold landscape that the Council wishes to protect. We are not arguing for building on the National Landscape instead, but insofar as the current housing targets are upheld, then development should first be more around existing settlements and then brownfield sites such as airfields.

Our objection is based on the following technical and planning grounds:

1. Critical Infrastructure Failure: Sewerage and Water Supply

The Water Cycle Study (July 2025) and local evidence demonstrate that the infrastructure in this corridor has already failed and cannot support the proposed 2,400–5,000+ new dwellings.

Groundwater & Sewerage Inundation: The Thames Water Ampney St Peter Groundwater Impacted System Management Plan, updated November 2025, already identifies the local sewer network as being overwhelmed by groundwater ingress. Adding a strategic extension at Ampney Crucis and a new settlement at Driffield will catastrophically overload this fragile system. The Ampney St Peter Sewage Treatment Works (STW) discharged sewage into Ampney Brook for more than 3,000 hours in 2024-25, more than a third of the total hours in the year, despite a prolonged drought in the summer. Ampney St Peter itself experiences frequent sewage pollution incidents already (several just in December 2025). The TW plan claims there will be an upgrade operational by 2027 - but in 2024 TW claimed it would be upgraded by 2026. In any case, this upgrade is designed just to meet current load expectations, not the envisaged additional housing. Existing sewage issues are not grounds for objection in themselves, but the parlous financial state of Thames Water is well-known and any realistic assessment of likely infrastructure upgrades must conclude there is minimal chance of them meeting the scale or timeframe required. The danger - indeed the probability - is that Ampney Brook becomes akin to a mediaeval sewer.

Water Supply Security: The Council is proposing massive growth in an area of severe water stress. A Temporary Use Ban (hosepipe ban) was in force for this area until as recently as 27th November 2025, following prolonged resource shortages. It is logically inconsistent to propose a "New Settlement" of this scale in a zone where existing residents faced water restrictions less than two months ago.

2. Flood Risk

The proposed sites, particularly around Ampney St Peter and the lower grounds of Preston, are highly susceptible to groundwater flooding. Covering vast areas of agricultural land with impermeable hardstanding will accelerate runoff, bypassing natural filtration and exacerbating flood risk for downstream settlements. Ampney St Peter already experiences flooding, including of houses in the lower part of the village, whenever there is heavy rainfall. The identification of the land R495 (on the south side of the A417) for housing in the CDC SHELAA would increase disastrously that flooding risk.

3. Electricity Grid Constraints

Grid Instability: Residents in Ampney St Peter already experience frequent power outages due to infrastructure fragility - several days without mains power in the northern half of the village in November 2025 for example. There is no evidence in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that the massive grid upgrades required to support 5,000 new electric-vehicle-dependent households have been secured. It is appreciated again that existing infrastructure shortcomings are not a basis for objection, and it is understood that there is a CDC Infrastructure Assessment in train. However, these existing weaknesses are indicators of the delicate state of the system and the historic trend of capital investment, and provide a context for any realistic assessment of the likelihood of infrastructure upgrades.

4. Roads and Transport

Despite the CDC's laudable aim of being Green to the Core, the expectation would be that Ampney Crucis extension, the new Driffield settlement and any new Ampney St Peter housing would largely served by road vehicles rather than public transport. This would add enormous stress to a limited road network. The predominantly single-lane roads of the area, such as Tank Lane (which is already difficult enough with HGVs, coaches and farm vehicles) would be overwhelmed. The A417 would become even more dangerous particularly the cross-roads in Ampney St Peter, the crossroads in Ampney Crucis and the corner by Ampney Park. It is likely whole new access routes would be required at enormous cost both in land and capital (and subsequently revenue).

5. Irretrievable Loss of Resources

The proposal risks "locking in" and sterilising valuable natural resources, specifically Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land (Grades 2 and 3a). Concreting over this resource permanently prevents its future use, contradicting sustainable development principles regarding biodiversity, food security, climate resilience and mental health.

6. Landscape Sensitivity and the National Landscape (AONB)

The Council's justification for Scenario 5 is that it avoids the National Landscape (AONB) (Scenario 6). However, this relies on a false dichotomy that non-AONB land is of "low value."

High Landscape Sensitivity: The Council's own Landscape Sensitivity Assessment identifies the rural edges of Cirencester and the open countryside around the Ampneys (as well as Driffield and Preston) as having "Medium-High" to "High" sensitivity to change. The landscape of the Ampneys/Driffield/Preston/Poulton is one of small historic settlements separated by mixed farming and woodland blocks. This very particular and attractive Cotswold character would be swept away by the Scenario 5 proposals.

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) principles suggest that development should not merge distinct historic settlements. This proposal creates a continuous urban ribbon from Cirencester to Poulton, destroying the rural buffers that the planning system is meant to protect.

7. Failure of Mitigation - Local Precedent (The Steadings)

The Consultation Document relies on the premise that designating land as "Allocated" ensures that necessary infrastructure upgrades will be delivered via Conditions and Section 106 agreements. I formally object to this assumption based on the clear local precedent of failure seen at The Steadings (Chesterton). CDC, we expect, is fully aware of the problems arising from these planning assumptions and the enormous difficulty of ensuring promised or assumed infrastructure is delivered.

The "Mitigation Fallacy": At The Steadings, promises regarding timely infrastructure delivery, road improvements, and utility upgrades were made at the allocation stage. In reality, the community has seen houses delivered ahead of infrastructure ("infrastructure lag"), continued utility disruption, and the dilution of commitments via viability assessments.

Lack of Confidence: If the Council and developers have failed to deliver seamless mitigation for a site directly adjacent to the main town (Cirencester), there is zero confidence that they can successfully mitigate the complex utility and transport

challenges of a remote "New Settlement" in Driffield or large extensions in Ampney Crucis.

Irreversible Harm: Once land is allocated in the Local Plan, the principle of development is established. The "details" of mitigation are left to the application stage, where they are frequently value-engineered out or delayed. Given the existing fragility of the Ampney/Driffield water and power networks, we cannot afford to rely on theoretical mitigation that history proves will not materialise.

Conclusion

The "Preferred Option" (Scenario 5) is fundamentally flawed. It relies on infrastructure that is demonstrably failing (sewage/water), ignores the recent evidence of water stress (November 2025 hosepipe ban), and relies on mitigation promises that have been proven unreliable by the Steadings development.

I request that these Strategic Allocations be removed and that the Council re-evaluates Scenario 1 (Focus on existing settlements) or disperses growth to areas with genuine infrastructure capacity.

Yours faithfully,

Steven Larcombe

Chair, Ampney St Peter Parish Meeting

The Manor House

Ampney St Peter

GL& 5SH

Comment ID: 9846

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: Stow on the Wold Town Council prefers a hybrid version of scenarios 5 and 6.

It cannot currently support Scenario 5 as it rules out any major development in the National Landscape. This not only significantly undermines Stow's viability as a sustainable town but also focuses growth on a much smaller part of the District.

The scenario would have the effect of exporting Stow's wants and needs to Moreton-in-Marsh, which is not sustainable and not an outcome the Town Council has prompted or would want to see. Aside from the effects on Moreton itself, the impact of 15,000 vehicle movements a day on the A429 between the towns which is already overcapacity would be unmanageable, particularly through pinch points in Stow and Moreton. It may also increase traffic in Stow trying to avoid Moreton.

But the Town Council cannot support Scenario 6 either, because it makes an unnecessary and implausible assumption on the scale of housing growth for Stow. The scenario has been set up to fail and therefore should not have been regarded as a 'reasonable' alternative in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA).

Instead, the Town Council would support a growth strategy based on the housing target for the town of approx. 150 homes of Scenario 5, but that enables that growth to come forward through a different mix of allocation(s) and windfall. Given the lengths to which CDC has gone to stress its spatial strategy is only indicative, it is premature and unnecessary for the Local Plan to come to such a firm view (in its Table 2).

CDC should also know that using historic windfall data to forecast future supply is unhelpful when in Stow almost all of the windfall of the last decade is the result to two large 55+ age-restricted housing schemes. There is nothing to indicate that scale of unplanned development outside the settlement boundary will be repeated in the next plan period and, in any event, the Local Plan presents the crucial opportunity to plan for change.

Comment ID: 9847

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: Stow on the Wold Town Council considers that of course the spatial strategy should not lead to development in unsustainable locations, but recognises that there are different balances to be struck between social, economic and environmental objectives in defining 'sustainable' that may vary from location to location across the District.

The challenge for Stow is that the town has been and could remain a sustainable location, albeit one with a unique set of circumstances in the District. Those trends highlighted in the Settlement Role & Function Study are:

- Declining overall population since 2001 (which continues to worsen with the town's exposure to short-term lets and second homes)
- Its very low population of 0-15 ages and very high population of 65+ ages
- Its low economically active population and very high importer of workforce

These trends are combining to increasingly undermine the town's social and economic sustainability. In the Town Council's view, as expressed in more detail in Q4 below, if left unaddressed by this Local Plan, the town will become unsustainable as its permanent resident population continues to fall and age, its social infrastructure is out of kilter with its special needs and its businesses are undermined by over tourism and labour scarcity.

To inform this representation, the Town Council surveyed the primary school and local employers, as it did for the neighbourhood plan a few years ago. Only now, the problems highlighted then are getting worse. For example, the school is increasingly concerned about its falling school roll, now down to 70% of available places, putting staffing levels and class sizes at risk. And employers continue to recruit and retain staff that are mostly in lower paid hospitality and care roles but having to travel many miles to Stow given the lack of affordable and lower cost housing.

The Town Council has also reviewed the latest data available on the number of second homes and short term lets in the town. If that number – 16% in 2021 but likely higher now – is added to the 24% of homes that are age-restricted, perhaps only just over half of the town's housing stock is available for working age people to live in. Combined with a decrease in average household sizes as its population ages, it is therefore no surprise its overall population is in decline.

Comment ID: 9848

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: The Stow & Swells Design Code allows for a higher density of housing development in some parts of the parishes than is the average for the District. Its assessment of the character areas notes that many are traditionally built at high densities and the Town Council would expect any new development to make as efficient use of the land as possible within its special historic design constraints.

Comment ID: 9849

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: Stow on the Wold Town Council acknowledges that CDC has a difficult balance to strike between housing growth and environmental constraint, given the large part of its area that lies within the National Landscape. For decades that balance has been struck in the same way: avoid any major development in the National Landscape and accept the inevitable social and economic harm that results.

Although Scenario 5 is perhaps a sign that CDC accepts the balance must now shift, that shift is uneven and inconsistent in its proposals for those Principal Settlements within the National Landscape. The growth proposed at Stow is 12% of its existing stock (exc. extant permissions). Only Tetbury (9%) and Bourton on the Water (12%) are of a similar scale, and both have seen far more conventional housing development (i.e. family not age-restricted homes) in the last twenty years than Stow. The growth proposed at Chipping Campden (20%), Blockley (21%) and Andoversford (43%) is much higher, with only the former having a similar range of local services. The consultation documents offer no explanation.

The Town Council sought to make this problem clear in its Neighbourhood Plan and nothing in the Local Plan evidence base indicates its core sustainability argument was invalid. The town needs to reverse its population decline and deliver lower cost and affordable homes that are permanent residences. And it needs to do so in a way that can enable those houses to deliver other tourism management and community benefits, that small incremental windfall schemes will not achieve.

The Town Council welcomes the proposal in the draft National Planning Policy Framework to redefine the weight attached to the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes from 'great' to 'substantial'. It also supports the Framework's proposals to promote more development close to main railway stations like Moreton-in-Marsh.

However, it notes the Framework's wording on the exceptional circumstances to justify major development in National Landscapes remains unaltered and it contains a new provision for mitigating adverse impacts. It also considers there has to be a point at which avoiding any harm to the National Landscape by exporting problems to another town with a railway station becomes illogical.

If the Local Plan does not allow for these issues to be tackled then its proposals for Stow will be in conflict with its stated vision and objectives for what is one of the District's highest profile towns.

Comment ID: 9851

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: The Town Council considers that CDC must achieve a deeper and more holistic understanding of these other important matters and how they relate to housing supply, particularly in some Principal Settlements like Stow. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) cannot be relied upon, as it looks at infrastructure types in isolation and takes a proposed spatial strategy as an input to propose what infrastructure is required, rather than as an output. IDPs are not iterative with plan making and do not normally look at settlements holistically; certainly there is no evidence in this IDP for Stow.

Comment ID: 9853

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Stow on the Wold Town Council

Comment: Stow on the Wold Town Council cannot argue with the vision as it is so general it can accommodate any combination of policy objectives that may be in conflict. For example, it envisages 'development will have been guided by a spatial strategy that prioritises environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic vitality, while respecting the District's unique landscape, heritage, and character'. It also expects 'existing Principal ... settlements will have grown proportionately, enhancing their role as local service centres while maintaining their distinct identities'.

However, as noted in Q4, the current Local Plan policy proposals for Stow (in Table 2 as part of preferred Scenario 5) are in conflict with both this vision and set of objectives.

There is no social equity in a town with continuing population decline and with such a skewed demographic profile.

There is no economic vitality in a town with a high dependency on a low paid, primarily tourist-driven, hospitality and residential care workforce.

The town's enviable heritage and character are not respected if the harmful effects of tourism cannot be mitigated.

The town's local services will not be enhanced if there are too few families and too many old people and non-residents living in it, they risk being under or over supplied.

None of these outcomes need be inevitable. It is within CDC's gift to offer Stow the type of flexibility in managing its growth that it seems willing to offer some other Principal Settlements. The Town Council has no desire to see future development scarring the town or the National Landscape. But past and current trends need to be halted, at least, if not reversed, if Stow is to remain a town of which its community and CDC are rightly proud.

Comment ID: 11124

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: I cannot support any scenario, particularly Scenario 5, which overloads small settlements like Kemble (388 homes) with disproportionate growth (590 homes) solely to meet targets. While I understand the Council's housing challenge, selecting sites based on "least resistance" rather than "existing capacity" is flawed. My preference would be a strategy that legally secures infrastructure before allocating housing, rather than "reverse engineering" a village's status to fit a target.

Comment ID: 11125

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: No. Meeting government targets should not come at the cost of creating unsustainable "dormitory" estates. A location is only sustainable if it currently possesses the necessary infrastructure. Designating a small village like Kemble as a "Principal Settlement" purely to justify growth—when it lacks the services of even "Non-Principal" villages—is effectively locating development in an unsustainable location by administrative sleight of hand.

Comment ID: 11127

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: I support density only where it aligns with the existing character of the settlement. For a rural village, high-density urban-style building is inappropriate. Instead of simply increasing density, the Council should prioritise 'Green to the Core' principles and Net Zero construction standards (Policy INF7). Quality and sustainability must take precedence over cramming units into a site to hit a numerical target.

Comment ID: 11131

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: The proposed 150%+ population increase is currently unsustainable. To make it sustainable, six legal protections must be written directly into the Site Allocation Policy: 1) A 'Grampian Condition' preventing occupation until water/sewage upgrades are operational (Policy INF8); 2) Pre-commencement funding for a new 2-Form Entry School (Policy INF2); 3) S278/S106 agreements for a roundabout and bus services (Policy INF3); 4) Ring-fenced NHS funding (Policy INF1); 5) Net Zero construction commitments; and 6) Immediate delivery of Principal-level services.

Comment ID: 11136

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: Yes. The risk of the 'Call-In' process. Since the Council admits the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is 'unfinished', there is a risk that the principle of development is established before infrastructure funding is secured. The Local Plan must explicitly state that the safeguards listed in Question 4 (A 'Grampian Condition' preventing occupation until water/sewage upgrades are operational (Policy INF8); 2) Pre-commencement funding for a new 2-Form Entry School (Policy INF2); 3) S278/S106 agreements for a roundabout and bus services (Policy INF3); 4) Ring-fenced NHS funding (Policy INF1); 5) Net Zero construction commitments; and 6) Immediate delivery of Principal-level services.) are non-negotiable 'material considerations'. This ensures that if the Council refuses a non-compliant application, the Secretary of State cannot easily overrule it to meet housing targets.

Comment ID: 11137

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Stu Banham

Comment: I disagree with the objective of reclassifying small villages as 'Principal Settlements' solely to justify growth. The data shows Kemble (388 homes) is currently smaller than many 'Non-Principal' designated villages in the District. The Vision must be corrected to reflect reality: if a village is to be labelled 'Principal', the Plan must mandate the immediate funding of Principal-level infrastructure (full-time GP, full-sized school, frequent transport) to validate that status.

Comment ID: 10833

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stuart

Comment: None of the scenarios support the aim of the Local Plan to be "green to the core". The scenarios take little account of the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5 destroys the rural attributes of a number of small villages and in some cases turns them into suburbs of larger towns thereby destroying their identity. In particular, Siddington will be turned into another neighbourhood of the ever expanding small country town that was; namely Cirencester.

I reject any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being treated as a Principal Settlement because this designation does not reflect its level of services or capacity. The village is connected by narrow country roads which are often very busy and traffic is often impeded by the locals parking requirements, particularly in the vicinity of the shop, playing field and village hall. The area is also subject to flooding from the river Churn and this causes roads to be closed and more traffic caused by more housing would only add to the ensuing chaos that this causes.

The infrastructure for the allocation of 1,100 new homes in Siddington does not exist. The number of new homes is totally disproportionate when considering that the present size of the village approximates to 340 dwellings.

Possible alternatives worthy of consideration could include the change of designation of the holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes; smaller developments within the Cotswold National Landscape and, as a last resort, larger expansion of the Steadings to the South of Cirencester. The latter suggestion would not increase the pressure on the river Churn flood plain but would increase the pressure on the narrow roads connecting to Cirencester.

Comment ID: 10837

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stuart

Comment: This flies in the face of everything that has been promoted in previous CDC Plans.

The only reason that Siddington is being allocated 1,100 new homes is because it happens to lie outside the boundary for the National Landscape. The idea that this development would be sustainable is misguided, due to the lack of transport, services and infrastructure.

CDC needs to come clean and make a public admission that it intends to abandon good planning practice if it decides to allocate new houses to unsustainable sites.

Comment ID: 10840

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stuart

Comment: Increasing housing density in rural locations is inappropriate and would destroy their rural character.

Comment ID: 10846

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart

Comment: No. A massive expansion of Siddington would merge it with Cirencester, overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk and destroy the village's rural identity.

Comment ID: 10848

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Stuart

Comment: The plan should consider the following:

The incorrect Principal Settlement classification

The protection of the village identity

Flood resilience and the associated increased potential for economic and emotional damage

Rural infrastructure limits

The importance of the green buffer zone separating the village of Siddington and the market town of Cirencester.

Comment ID: 10857

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Stuart

Comment: The vision is wholly commendable, but from the perspective of Siddington, the proposals:

Do not deliver a sustainable community;

Involve development that shows little regard for environmental stewardship;

Impact negatively on the character and heritage of the village;

Provide zero employment opportunities in Siddington;

Provide no essential facilities;

Are unlikely to provide infrastructure and essential transport networks;

Will involve a disproportionate growth in the village;

will reduce the surrounding green space so essential for mental and physical recreation and wellbeing.

Comment ID: 9752

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Hamilton

Comment: I wish to express strong concerns about the scale and density of development proposed for the North Cotswolds in the emerging Local Plan. The area does not have the infrastructure, employment base, or public services to support the level of growth currently envisaged.

The North Cotswolds is not a major employment centre. Large-scale housing development here will inevitably create a commuter belt, with most new residents travelling to Oxford, Cheltenham, Stratford, Warwick, and beyond. This directly contradicts the plan's sustainability objectives and increases reliance on private cars.

Road infrastructure is already under severe pressure. Moreton-in-Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold experience daily congestion on the A429, A44, and surrounding routes. Without major investment—including serious consideration of bypass provision—additional development will worsen traffic, air quality, and road safety.

Healthcare provision is overstretched. GP surgeries are at capacity, and the nearest 24/7 emergency care is over 30 miles away. Increasing population without guaranteed healthcare investment poses clear risks.

Flood risk remains a major concern. Moreton's 2007 flooding demonstrated the vulnerability of local drainage systems. Many proposed sites lie within sensitive catchments where additional hard surfacing will increase runoff and heighten flood risk.

Education capacity is insufficient. Primary schools are oversubscribed, and there is no local secondary provision for over-11s without bussing pupils long distances. Development without funded school expansion is unsustainable.

The area's topography and dispersed settlement pattern limit realistic alternatives to car travel. Public transport is infrequent and cannot absorb significant growth. High-density development also risks eroding community cohesion and harming the nationally important landscape.

For these reasons, the proposed development density in the North Cotswolds is neither proportionate nor sustainable. A more balanced distribution of growth—aligned with employment centres and existing infrastructure—would better meet the district's long-term needs.

Comment ID: 10926

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Stuart Locke

Comment: There is a very high proportion of the new housing allocated to the South Cotswolds. Surely to have less impact on all communities and infrastructure the housing requirements should be spread more evenly across the district.

Comment ID: 9553

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Setting a target ignoring the National Landscape percentage area in the Cotswolds results in that target being unachievable. Getting close to it then unfairly swamps villages such as Preston with a hugely disproportionate number simply wiping these villages from existence. Any final plan must surely reflect these facts and set an achievable target.

Comment ID: 9554

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: 2.4 - Other authorities must be contacted as an early stage action of this process. Reviewing all the options put forward this is clearly the only action that can be taken given the disproportionate amount of National Landscape.

Comment ID: 9555

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Other locations must be found beyond the options currently proposed. Preston village proposals fundamentally destroy the village itself. Preservation of the village and its community, its character and appearance have to be maintained in any agreed plan, with expansion proportionate to keep the village's character.

Comment ID: 9564

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Preston Village is not a town centre and does not have good transport links. It is entirely unsuitable for high density development. Given the example given for what is suitable for high density development, it must be clearly stated in any strategy that it is not suitable for these reasons. Preston requires low density development nearby to keep the character of the area, with the green buffer remaining to separate any development and retain the village itself, without which it would be swallowed into a mass urban sprawl.

Comment ID: 9567

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Other locations must be found beyond the options currently proposed. All Preston village proposals fundamentally destroy the village itself. Preservation of the village and its community, its character and appearance have to be maintained in any agreed plan, with expansion proportionate to keep the village's character.

Comment ID: 9568

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Kingshill Lane leaving Preston already provides a congested point in the road network, as does the Tesco roundabout. Significant infrastructure work would be needed as part of any development. Current the only pedestrian exit from the village is across Preston Toll Bar, where pedestrians have to look back across a fast, busy road and an adjacent junction to run the risk of crossing. Drivers exiting Kingshill Lane also have to look for fast moving traffic from the right and look back to the left pavement to avoid any risk of colliding with pedestrians. This junction is not suitable for the increased risk associated with development.

The Kingshill junction at Preston Toll Bar also regularly floods as the drains and fields fail to cope with the rainfall. The pedestrian route from there to Tesco also cannot cope with the route closed in the past week resulting in no route at all without a car. Significant investment would be needed as this would of course worsen with further development.

In summary a high level of investment would be needed as part of any plan to ensure increased flooding risks are alleviated, pedestrian safety is addressed and the village does not become a route to avoid the main roads and Tesco roundabout congestion.

Comment ID: 9569

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Preston Village is not a town centre and does not have good transport links. It is entirely unsuitable for high density development. Given the example given for what is suitable for high density development, it must be clearly stated in any strategy that it is not suitable for these reasons. Preston requires low density development nearby to keep the character of the area, with the green buffer remaining to separate any development and retain the village itself, without which it would be swallowed into a mass urban sprawl

Comment ID: 9556

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Preston village has forever had development plans accepting that with its village life and character, it should not be adjoined to Cirencester and the green buffer that so clearly separates it as a village shall be maintained. Any development must retain these core principles to prevent a material impact on the area both visually and from a community perspective. It's current character, appearance and scale means any development plans must be in proportion to maintain these key components of a village.

Comment ID: 9560

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Stuart McAllister

Comment: Kingshill Lane leaving Preston already provides a congested point in the road network, as does the Tesco roundabout. Significant infrastructure work would be needed as part of any development. Current the only pedestrian exit from the village is across Preston Toll Bar, where pedestrians have to look back across a fast, busy road and an adjacent junction to run the risk of crossing. Drivers exiting Kingshill Lane also have to look for fast moving traffic from the right and look back to the left pavement to avoid any risk of colliding with pedestrians. This junction is not suitable for the increased risk associated with development.

The Kingshill junction at Preston Toll Bar also regularly floods as the drains and fields fail to cope with the rainfall. The pedestrian route from there to Tesco also cannot cope with the route closed in the past week resulting in no route at all without a car. Significant investment would be needed as this would of course worsen with further development.

In summary a high level of investment would be needed as part of any plan to ensure increased flooding risks are alleviated, pedestrian safety is addressed and the village does not become a route to avoid the main roads and Tesco roundabout congestion.

Comment ID: 10013

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: A combination of 3, 4 and 6.

Development should be focussed on main service areas with good public and road transport. Consideration should be given to all such areas regardless of whether they sit in the AONB or not - given the preferred scenario continues to dump the vast majority of the housing requirements on the Wiltshire border while leaving the rest of the District untouched.

In any case significant commitments to improved road and public transport infrastructure should be secured and implemented in advance of development.

Comment ID: 10014

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: It would have been helpful to define how the council is using the term "sustainable here" given can mean different things

All development should be as environmentally neutral and sympathetic to existing developments as possible.

Development should meet the needs of the area not just tick boxes. Thus focus should be on where people want to live for 1) work and 2) transport capability, not just where it is easier for the council to put extra houses on a map.

We shouldn't just be building large houses tacked onto our rural villages for people to retire to/second-home-owners

In particular, development near the population centres of Gloucester, Cheltenham, Stroud, Stratford and the Severn would be far more useful than around Fairford and Lechlade!

Comment ID: 10015

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Strongly support.

If we need more homes to support a growing population we should look at the needs of our district. This should be focussed on keeping young people in the area with (relatively) affordable homes and should be in areas near to where job creation will be happening (i.e. nearer to the large cities and towns to the west of our district).

Comment ID: 10016

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: We should be more creative with our developments - rather than identikit houses arranged around identikit street layouts we see throughout the district, why not design more interesting places for people to live.

People will object less to three/four storey buildings if they are interesting and cohesive to the natural and built environment.

Comment ID: 10024

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: It is difficult to see the justification for the expansion of Ampney Crucis to the degree suggested. It sits as a small, attractive village on its own with minimal community infrastructure or public transport available. There will be little employment available in the surrounding area and the feeling of the Ampneys as a whole will be substantially changed by this development.

Comment ID: 10028

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Given the significant concentration of development proposed in the Fairford, Ampney Crucis and Down Ampney triangle - please make sure an appropriate highways strategy is implemented and adopted - including for the significant heavy traffic that will be required for the developments themselves.

In particular:

The main route from Fairford to the M4 currently runs through the centre of Meysey Hampton, Down Ampney and Latton and the route west to Cirencester runs through the centre of Poulton. Through these villages the road is narrow and between them the roads are in awful condition.

Additionally, the road through Down Ampney (and the alternative route via Marston Meysey) regularly floods.

A better route between Fairford to the A419 near Cricklade should be established which bypasses Meysey Hampton and Latton and integrates into/with access from the new developments at Down Ampney and/or Driffield to reduce through traffic from the middle of the historic villages.

This road should be wider, less bumpy, more resilient to frequent traffic and importantly built on higher embankments with good drainage to ensure remains open all year around.

Comment ID: 10031

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Little information is provided as to where new development at Down Ampney is to be provided. We should ensure our plans are linked up are we with future development plans in North Wiltshire for Cricklade, Marston Meysey, etc.

Comment ID: 10032

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Both water and electricity have failed in recent years across the Fairford area, in addition to the well publicised sewage issues. Assurances should be given that utilities will be sufficiently upgraded before development starts to ensure no further issues for current residents.

Comment ID: 10020

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Given the significant concentration of development proposed in the Fairford, Ampney Crucis and Down Ampney triangle - please make sure an appropriate highways strategy is implemented and adopted - including for the significant heavy traffic that will be required for the developments themselves.

In particular:

The main route from Fairford to the M4 currently runs through the centre of Meysey Hampton, Down Ampney and Latton and the route west to Cirencester runs through the centre of Poulton. Through these villages the road is narrow and between them the roads are in awful condition.

Additionally, the road through Down Ampney (and the alternative route via Marston Meysey) regularly floods.

A better route between Fairford to the A419 near Cricklade should be established which bypasses Meysey Hampton and Latton and integrates into/with access from the new developments at Down Ampney and/or Driffield to reduce through traffic from the middle of the historic villages.

This road should be wider, less bumpy, more resilient to frequent traffic and importantly built on higher embankments with good drainage to ensure remains open all year around.

Comment ID: 10009

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: Both public transport and road condition is woeful across the district but particularly in the south-east corner around Fairford, Lechlade and the Ampneys where much of the proposed development is focussed.

The opportunity should be taken to integrate improved transit into the regime in support these developments rather than just dismissing the option because that transit doesn't currently exist.

e.g. requiring developers to subsidise regular reliable bus transport all the way along the route from Lechlade (or potentially beyond into Oxford i.e. Burford) to Cirencester and Kemble/Swindon - in my view this would be a much better use of funds than the proposed light railway that would just terminate in Cirencester.

building better quality (i.e. wider, more resilient and less prone to flooding) new road routes so the main transport to the new developments do not go through the centre of old villages/towns (e.g Poulton, Down Ampney, Meysey Hampton, Fairford, Lechlade)

Comment ID: 10010

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Stuart Richardson

Comment: I think we should challenge ourselves on this assertion. There is plenty of "brown-field" across the AONB which is of little aesthetic or scientific value, where building high-quality developments, sympathetic with the surroundings would be far preferable than totally destroying the character of the small section of the district focussed around Cirencester not inside the AONB which includes many small villages equal to those inside the AONB.

Comment ID: 9658

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: Increasing density appears difficult given the rural nature of the area. Larger settlements maybe able to accommodate taller buildings however in more rural settings that are characterised by open spaces between houses / groups of buildings, increased density is unlikely to be satisfactory.

Comment ID: 9663

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: Scenario 5, allocating development to existing settlements ensures there is both basic infrastructure to new residents while providing the opportunity of service improvements to existing residents over time. The benefits of development should not be focussed solely on main settlements noting modern work practices that do not always involve a commute to an office etc al.

Comment ID: 9664

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: No, the Councils approach appears to be considered and holistic, the opportunity for some development (through windfalls) should be considered (maybe with a softening of policy in this areas to have the door to development half open (i.e. reuse existing buildings etc) but appears unlikely to significantly contribute to the housing (etc) need.

Comment ID: 9666

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: In limited circumstances where facilities exist to compensate for lack of indoor or outside space. With that said, a nearby laundrette is unlikely to be sufficient offset for a smaller kitchen with no washer space or drying area and so quality of life for residents and their neighbours should be carefully weighed against what's is being preserved. It might be that low value 'green space' is less important than higher quality buildings. I am not convinced by the argument that 'the whole of the countryside is going to be built up on' and so higher density in towns may be appropriate (i.e. to provide sheltered units close to medical etc services) but is less likely to be appropriate in more rural settings to afford better quality living space.

Comment ID: 9668

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: Cirencester - provision of a new southern distributor road to allow traffic to avoid the town centre. maybe from opposite the RAU on Tetbury Road and towards the South Cerny airfield area to remove traffic from town.

Comment ID: 9669

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: I fear this question has been overlooked by those seeking to object to development. The headings of infrastructure etc seem to be complete, delivery will of course vary from site allocation to site allocation and its intended housing stock mix; smaller schemes may have little need of new infrastructure where as larger sites could see a need for school spaces, healthcare, roads (on and off site) etc.

Comment ID: 9671

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: I agree with the vision and objectives. No new points to add.

Comment ID: 9660

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Stuart Wellman

Comment: Building on existing settlements is hoped to bring infrastructure needs forward in those areas such as waste water management, road improvements and employment / local facilities (eg shop / medical / bus).

Comment ID: 8794

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Su Moody

Comment: Options 3 or 4

Comment ID: 8795

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Su Moody

Comment: No. Development that is unsustainable puts huge and unnecessary strain on existing inhabitants and infrastructure

Comment ID: 8796

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Su Moody

Comment: It is certainly a possibility, but not in communities where such developments do not already exist e.g. not sticking a block of flats in a rural community. The unique character of any settlement should be maintained wherever possible.

Comment ID: 8797

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Su Moody

Comment: I broadly agree with the objectives, however, consideration should be given to the impact of changes and development to the existing environments. For example, in Down Ampney we have lost habitats for wildlife to new housing causing the displacement of many animals (we've had rodent problems around the housing developments). There has been an increase in flooding in the centre of the village. The amount of traffic though the village has increased. The constant noise and mess from the building works has caused significant stress to villagers and their pets. Some homeowners have reported damage to their homes believed to be caused by vibration from nearby building works. All these 'small' things add up to cause stress and expense to existing inhabitants of what was a quiet village.

Comment ID: 8790

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Su Moody

Comment: This seems the most logical solution as it is the most sustainable with infrastructure already in place.

Comment ID: 8791

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Su Moody

Comment: Again, a sustainable option with infrastructure already in place

Comment ID: 8793

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Su Moody

Comment: As a village (Down Ampney) that has already undergone considerable development it is not sustainable to have further development in non-principal locations and village clusters. Not only does it destroy the very thing that makes these villages so attractive, but it is simply unsustainable. In Down Ampney we have ancient sewers that should have been updated 90 years ago, leading to flooding in even moderately heavy rain. Building has taken place on the fields in the village that were soakaways before. We have no employment in the village, nor any public transport to speak of, the village primary school is at capacity, and what few amenities we do have (football club, village hall and village shop) are all run by volunteers. Any further development in the village is simply not sustainable.

Comment ID: 10472

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: My preferred option would be either

i) Scenario 6 because it would not result in the decimation of those towns/villages unlucky enough not to be within the current Cotswolds National Landscape and would enable smaller developments which would not impact the Cotswolds as a whole as much as large scale developments in concentrated areas and would achieve 104% of the Government target; or

ii) Scenario 3 because it makes more sense to develop around Main Service Centres rather than rural locations where the infrastructure does not exist. We were told at the local consultation meeting that it was up to the residents to chase developers for the required infrastructure and was not part of CDC's responsibility. I sincerely hope that isn't true because if it is, I can see we're just the scapegoats for achieving targets and no-one at CDC really cares what impact your decisions will have.

Comment ID: 10479

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: I do not support increasing density in developments unless it is in areas which can support the building of tower blocks without it affecting the landscape ie in a large town. Smaller houses and gardens is not ideal either, especially in a rural area as, again, these are more suited to urban areas. The Government is apparently also suggesting that in future developers should build houses with only one parking space to encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport instead of a car. This most definitely does not work in rural areas where it's often impossible to walk due to lack of a footpath, cycle due to dangerous road conditions, and lack of decent public transport, and just results in cars being parked erratically in roads due to lack of space.

Comment ID: 10506

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: Unfortunately, I do not believe that you will be able to deliver your revised vision and objectives.

It all sounds great on paper, but you won't be able to reduce transport emissions in rural areas unless you provide a viable alternative to using the car. I have read that Gloucestershire County Council is looking to cut bus services, so not exactly what we are being sold in your vision for the Local Plan.

You plan to practically double the size of Fairford by 2043, BUT you won't stop people using their cars because it's the only way to get to main service centres where employment, hospitals, and the main facilities are located. You need buses that run regularly during the day and in the evenings, including Sundays.

If you go ahead with Scenario 5, the majority of green spaces in Fairford and the surrounding areas will have been built on. Plus because you have allowed vacant High street premises to be converted into homes rather than encouraging new businesses to the area, the vitality and viability of Fairford as a town centre is already diminished. I would be interested to know how doubling the number of properties in a small town can improve its vitality.

If the Councils are merging in the near future, would that not mean that the areas that you can choose for development will cover a larger area? As such, rather than each current individual council submitting their own Local Plan for their immediate areas, would it not be possible to work together and fulfil the required targets in a more constructive way to provide the best solution to the housing requirements?

I fully understand and accept the need for the provision of housing and support small scale developments which are in keeping with the Cotswolds towns and villages and provide the necessary infrastructure to support the increasing demands.

However, in all honesty, I feel that none of the suggested scenarios are a particularly good option, considering the very restricted areas that the development plans have been concentrated on. You simply cannot develop these areas in such high density and suggest that it will not impact the environment or the health and wellbeing of the residents.

Comment ID: 10333

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: This Scenario makes the most sense to me because occupants of new housing developments need to have access to broad range of services and facilities, good public transport accessibility, and employment. A lot of the other options do not provide this.

Comment ID: 10335

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: Again, developing areas close to transport hubs such as train stations allows public mobility, rather than expanding other areas which are not close to reliable transport links.

Comment ID: 10417

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: Whilst this is your favoured scenario, your criteria does not always apply because some of the sites you are suggesting are not supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities, including a genuine choice of transport modes.

For example, Fairford has a GP surgery which is already at breaking point and struggling to serve the current population; the primary school is full; the bus service is very limited and, as a non driver, it would take me 2-2.5 hours each way using several different buses to reach hospital appointments in either Swindon or Gloucester. Fairford's former hospital is unfortunately now just a base for district nurses with only occasional clinics being held there, and Cirencester Hospital is gradually being downgraded/closed at a time when it should be being redeveloped to support the planned growth in population in Cirencester and the surrounding villages. It appears that most residents choose to drive rather than walk around Fairford, so the High Street and London Street are often choc a block with traffic and/or parked cars. Plus the A417, which on paper looks like a main road, actually goes down to single file between historic buildings on the London Street/Bridge Street section. It must be the narrowest A road in England! So, unless there are major plans to build a by-pass, at least one other school (or limit the existing one to Fairford residents only), and provide more healthcare facilities, plus a new sewerage treatment plant to replace the current one which cannot cope with current demand and regularly spews raw sewage into the River Coln, Fairford would be unable to cope with development on the scale that you are planning. Just because the local landowner has eagerly offered the land for large scale development, it doesn't mean the location is fit for that purpose.

Comment ID: 10451

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Sue Edwards

Comment: It is surprising that not all areas within the CDC boundary are classed as Cotswolds National Landscape. I understand that the Commission Officer in 1980's decided that although the areas you have highlighted for development had Cotswold characteristics, particularly drystone walls and buildings in Cotswold vernacular, the quality of the landscape was lower than elsewhere purely because of large intensively farmed fields with little tree cover. That decision was made a long time ago, does that description of these areas still apply in 2026?

Whilst I appreciate you can see this as a way to fulfil your revised Government quota, it seems extremely unjust that the majority of the large scale developments are being squeezed into the small areas outside the Cotswold National Landscape which were deemed inferior to the adjacent areas purely because of the agricultural practices in the area at the time. These areas still have Cotswold features which attract so many visitors every year. Large scale developments in these areas would destroy the things that make these areas so attractive, it would be much less impactful on the environment and people's enjoyment of the area if smaller developments in more locations were planned.

Comment ID: 9102

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: The Vision does not reflect the demographics of the Cotswolds and should make reference to the fact that the Cotswolds have a significantly older population so housing should reflect this

Comment ID: 9099

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

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: Why has Northleach have a very low allocation compared to all the other principal towns?

Comment ID: 9093

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: Scenario is the only option that meets the Council's needs to met the housing targets

Comment ID: 9092

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: No there is no rationale for this

Comment ID: 9095

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: I would support the provision of higher density housing in areas where there is already housing of this type. Many Cotswold towns and villages have three storey buildings with courtyard gardens. I would support greater provision of retirement flats and starter homes in towns where there is a greater need.

Comment ID: 9100

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: Any large housing developments will need infrastructure such as public transport, access to health services, leisure facilities, education

Comment ID: 9101

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: The Council should consider the building of new towns with all the facilities than people need rather than extending existing towns that are stretched to capacity

Comment ID: 9103

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: Objective c should include the word targeted when referring to housing. We need more housing that is suited to older people and young people looking for starter homes. We do not need any more 4/5 bedroom detached houses.

Objective c needs to include a statement about reducing the number of second homes to allow for greater housing provision to those that need it

Comment ID: 9091

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Sue Prichard

Comment: How can Scenario 5 be the council's preferred option if the density of housing is more suited to inner London than the Cotswolds. Why wouldn't Scenario 7 be a more suitable option in terms of density of housing and numbers provided?

Comment ID: 10380

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Susan badger

Comment: Scenario 5 is my preferred strategy. It allows for building growth but takes amenities, infrastructure, historic relevance and fits in with the national planning policy

Comment ID: 10383

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Susan badger

Comment: No. If it's unsustainable then it shouldn't be considered

Comment ID: 10398

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Susan badger

Comment: I would support increasing housing density in developments such as smaller houses and gardens, more flats, but not higher buildings. This would be beneficial to first time buyers and small families. It would allow buyers to eventually move to a larger property releasing the current one to other first time buyers. Flats are ideal for singles and couples with no families at present. Higher building would be out of place in the Cotswolds

Comment ID: 10234

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

Name: Susan Lipthorpe

Comment: The selection of Moreton -in-Marsh for excessive new housing development is predicated on the so-called good transport links. Sadly, public transport is not an option for many people who continue to drive everywhere and the traffic jams are a common occurrence. The new bike stores are under used. Commuting by train is presumably only an option for those who work in central Oxford or with suitable public transport at the end of their commute.

Comment ID: 10235

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Susan Lipthorpe

Comment: The levels of proposed development are not sustainable. It is ridiculous that housing targets from central government have by necessity to be crammed into smaller areas around the national landscape areas. As so much of CDC is within that landscape surely the levels of housing in the so-called permitted areas should be reduced accordingly. If the area around the national landscape is crammed with new builds the charm and beauty of the public realm would be lost. It will deter visitors and tourists from coming to spend their money in the area, causing business failures and a big decline in the economy.

Comment ID: 10826

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: We need to have more safe cycle routes linking Moreton, Stow and Bourton. Side roads and becoming too dangerous. There are no footpaths outside the towns. We never get any investment in cycling and walking routes out here (north cots), just more and more traffic to drive more people into cars.

Comment ID: 10827

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Housing prices put off working age adults, if there is work local in the north Cotswolds people drive for miles to work here.

Comment ID: 10821

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

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Isnt there a problem with radion gas round the cotswolds? have you thought of thate

Comment ID: 10825

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Emergency health care is a problem in Moreton and the North cotswolds. It is as far away from an Emergency Department as it is possible to get. Gloucester Royal is over an hour with normal traffic. Banbury, Warwick, Oxford and Worcester hospitals are all about 1 hr away. The North Cotswold Hospital is never going to deliver A&E or specialist care. Ambulance response times have always been slow.

Comment ID: 10829

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: What will be done to upgrade the sewerage systems to cope with the massive increase in houses in Moreton? the Sewage system does not cope now, it gets into the Evenlode river.

Comment ID: 10815

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: 2 as the homes are more dispersed.

We need to promote intergration and inclusive community

Comment ID: 10819

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: No because targets are likely to change and priority should be focused elsewhere like sustainable food production locally, health, wellbeing and education

Comment ID: 10820

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Definately smaller affordable homes, there are enough mansions and grand properties in the north Cotswolds already

Comment ID: 10831

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: We need to get funds for Children's education in rural communities.

Support for community shops.

Transport - Footways on rural roads to give people the option to walk between conurbations without being run over.

Cycle path from Bourton to Moreton along the fosse way.

Comment ID: 10836

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Yes i agree. But we need targets for achieving leisure, walking and cycling facilities as there things wont happen. Its no good just saying 'we are committed to...,,,

There are targets for how many houses, what about how many miles of new cycle track or foot paths?

Comment ID: 10797

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: Public transport is not good and residents have to rely on owning a car for transport, leading to congested minor roads and there are insufficient major trunk roads serving the area.

Comment ID: 10808

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Susan Lockett

Comment: To increase the number of homes in Moreton in Marsh as proposed would require vastly improved road and transport infrastructure to link the area with the rest of the county. The fosseway can not cope with the traffic on it now as people use it as a major route from the midlands. Minor roads are becoming rat runs; it is no longer safe to cycle between villages and the local towns. Busses are held up in traffic and unable to keep to time,

Comment ID: 10876

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: I recognise the need for additional housing, but I have significant concerns about the Council's Preferred Option for the Spatial Strategy, which proposes significant growth around Cirencester, including Down Ampney, the strategic extension north of Ampney Crucis, and Driffield.

This option places disproportionate growth pressure on Cirencester and surrounding villages, without sufficient evidence that infrastructure, public transport, environmental capacity, or genuinely affordable housing can be delivered alongside the proposed scale of growth.

The preferred option appears overly reliant on car-based development, optimistic infrastructure assumptions, and dispersed village growth that risks long-term harm to the character and sustainability of the area. I urge the Council to explore alternative distributions that better balance housing needs with infrastructure capacity, environmental protection, and the character of local communities.

Comment ID: 10877

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: The South Cotswolds map showing “indicative additional new homes” illustrates a high concentration of housing allocations around Cirencester, Down Ampney, north of Ampney Crucis, and Driffield.

This raises concerns about:

Unequal distribution of development pressure across the district

Increased cumulative impact on environmentally sensitive areas and villages

Lack of clear justification for why this area should accommodate such a large share of growth

If the map is intended as indicative only, greater clarity is needed. If it reflects the Council’s direction of travel, stronger evidence is required to justify this distribution and demonstrate it is sustainable in terms of infrastructure, transport, environmental protection, and village character.

Comment ID: 10880

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: The preferred spatial strategy and associated development locations will place significant strain on existing infrastructure in Cirencester and surrounding villages:

Roads are already congested at peak times, and proposed improvements are not clearly deliverable in line with housing.

Healthcare (GP and NHS) provision is already limited, and there is no evidence of expansion sufficient to meet additional population.

Public transport is infrequent, indirect, and vulnerable to reductions; dispersing growth to villages like Down Ampney, Ampney Crucis, and Driffield will increase car dependency, contrary to sustainability objectives.

Additionally, the proposals do not adequately address flood risk, surface water drainage, or sewage capacity. Existing infrastructure is under strain, and climate change increases the likelihood of extreme rainfall events. The plan lacks sufficient reassurance that water and sewage services can cope with dispersed village growth.

Comment ID: 10881

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: The Preferred Option mentions provision of affordable housing, but experience shows that in practice:

“Affordable” homes are often priced beyond the reach of local people

Viability arguments frequently reduce delivery

Housing does not reflect local wages or actual community needs

Without stronger safeguards and enforceable mechanisms, the proposed developments risk delivering primarily market housing, failing to meet genuine local needs in Cirencester and the surrounding villages.

Comment ID: 10884

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: Cirencester and surrounding villages affected by the Preferred Option lie within, or form part of the setting of, the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly AONB). The Council has a statutory duty to conserve and enhance natural beauty, which must be afforded great weight in decision-making.

The scale and distribution of development proposed around Down Ampney, Ampney Crucis, and Driffield risks:

Harm to the landscape character and tranquillity of the National Landscape

Incremental erosion of its setting

Cumulative impacts from multiple developments near Cirencester

The plan does not demonstrate that less harmful alternatives have been explored or that environmental protection is being prioritised over housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10885

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Suzan Gunnee

Comment: I urge the Council to reconsider the scale and distribution of growth around Cirencester, strengthen commitments to infrastructure and transport delivery, ensure genuinely affordable housing provision, and give greater weight to cumulative environmental, flooding, sewage, and National Landscape impacts.

Without these changes, the Preferred Option risks leaving Cirencester and its surrounding villages less sustainable, more congested, and environmentally degraded.

Comment ID: 9358

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

Name: Suzanna

Comment: When assessing potential sites can you please include potential land contamination. Any potential sites around The Fire Service College in Moreton-in-Marsh should be fully tested for PFAS contamination to ensure appropriate remedial measures are implemented before building commences, this includes sites in the flood plain of tributaries leaving the college site.

Comment ID: 9355

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Suzanna

Comment: Option 5 gives the widest scope

Comment ID: 9356

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Suzanna

Comment: I would like to see the AONB protected, as far as is reasonably possible. When assessing the sustainability of a location for housing can the potential employment opportunities be taken into account? Without suitable local employment, particularly for lower income roles, where people can't afford to commute, there will be an increase in rural poverty. This is already seen in Moreton-in-Marsh where 21% of the children in the Primary School are eligible for free school meals and many others have parents with unpredictable work in the hospitality sector.

Comment ID: 9357

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Suzanna

Comment: I do not agree with increasing housing density to the inner-city levels described. Some density increases could be included, for example buildings that allow for multi-generational living. Smaller dwellings are likely to house people on lower incomes. Without suitable local employment, particularly for lower income roles, where people can't afford to commute, there will be an increase in rural poverty. This is already seen in Moreton-in-Marsh where 21% of the children in the Primary School are eligible for free school meals and many others have parents with unpredictable work in the hospitality sector.

Comment ID: 9360

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Suzanna

Comment: The map of Moreton-in-Marsh shows potential development to the north of the town, along the Todenham Road. Any development in this area must not increase the risk of flooding in the town. Water from this site should be diverted away from the town.

Comment ID: 9359

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Suzanna

Comment: Where do you think people moving into Moreton-in-Marsh will work?

Where do you think 16 /17/18 years olds, living in Moreton-in-Marsh who are not staying in sixth form will go to college?

Comment ID: 9594

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Suzanne Lee

Comment: Most development needs to be near existing Principal settlements. This needs to be done with sufficient infrastructure to be viable.

Comment ID: 821

Email/Letter Representation

Name: S Charlton

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

Comment ID: 233

Email/Letter Representation

Name: S J Passarelli

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

Comment ID: 840

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sally Fisher

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

Comment ID: 322

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sam Benson

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

Comment ID: 300

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Samuel Bishop

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

Comment ID: 221

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sandie Sowler

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

Comment ID: 820

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sandra Charlton

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

Comment ID: 240

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sandra Holt

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

Comment ID: 373

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sanjay Saxena

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

Comment ID: 551

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sanjay Saxena

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

Comment ID: 188

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Borg

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

Comment ID: 817

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Borg

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

Comment ID: 500

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Cornwell

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

Comment ID: 514

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Head

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

Comment ID: 550

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Head

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

Comment ID: 416

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah MacGregor

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

Comment ID: 680

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sarah Taylor

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

Comment ID: 761

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Savills (UK) Limited

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

Comment ID: 649

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sean Kirby

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

Comment ID: 782

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sebastian Cooper

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

Comment ID: 185

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Serena Wallace-Turner

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

Comment ID: 104

Email/Letter Representation

Name: SF Planning Limited

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

Comment ID: 151

Email/Letter Representation

Name: SF Planning Limited

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

Comment ID: 874

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sheila Robinson

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

Comment ID: 676

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Shipton-under-Wychwood Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 280

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sian Defferary

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

Comment ID: 218

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sian James

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

Comment ID: 486

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Siddington Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 408

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Beale

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

Comment ID: 636

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Eglise

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

Comment ID: 541

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Hall

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

Comment ID: 241

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Holt

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

Comment ID: 698

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Johnston

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

Comment ID: 709

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Jones

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

Comment ID: 691

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Jose

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

Comment ID: 451

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Simon Stanbrook

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

Comment ID: 435

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sonal Keay

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

Comment ID: 293

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sophie Kingsley

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

Comment ID: 327

Email/Letter Representation

Name: South Gloucestershire Council

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

Comment ID: 348

Email/Letter Representation

Name: South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

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

Comment ID: 612

Email/Letter Representation

Name: South West Housing Association Planning Consortium

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

Comment ID: 292

Email/Letter Representation

Name: South Worcestershire Councils

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

Comment ID: 313

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stantonbury Building and Development Company

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

Comment ID: 539

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stephen Andrews

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

Comment ID: 845

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stephen Bailes

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

Comment ID: 846

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stephen Barton

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

Comment ID: 264

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stephen Lawrence

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

Comment ID: 653

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stephen Mytton

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

Comment ID: 103

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Steve Bradley

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

Comment ID: 394

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Steve Cordell

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

Comment ID: 245

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Steve Keay

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

Comment ID: 260

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stuart and Yvette Green

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

Comment ID: 637

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stuart Jenkins

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

Comment ID: 685

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stuart Jenkins

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

Comment ID: 413

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Stuart Kirk

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

Comment ID: 469

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sue Arnold

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

Comment ID: 643

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sue Edwards

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

Comment ID: 160

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sue Napier

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

Comment ID: 470

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Sue Napier

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

Comment ID: 812

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Susan Bown

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

Comment ID: 362

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Susan Green

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

Comment ID: 548

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Susan H Bown

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

Comment ID: 447

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Susan Hunt

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

Comment ID: 485

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Susan Philip

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

Comment ID: 215

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Suzanne Hill

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

Comment ID: 382

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Suzanne Lee

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

Comment ID: 288

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Swindon Borough Council

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