

Comment ID: 10822

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: F broughton Pipkin

Comment: I am horrified by the suggestion in the CDC Local Plan that Blockley parish should be expected to carry a further 130 new houses, increasing the current total by a fifth. One has to wonder whether the planners have actually visited Blockley. As a glance at the 1:25,000 scale Ordnance Survey map of the Cotswolds would have shown, it is an old ribbon development at the mouth of a steep-sided valley. All through road access is narrow, whether by B4479 coming north from A44, by Greenway coming east from A44 or by the lane from Broad Campden. B4479 is used by HGVs going to/from the industrial estate at Draycott, and there is a dangerous, completely blind bend on it, at Lower Brook House, within the village limits. Within the village itself, the High Street (a “No Through Road”) is de facto single-track, depending on the goodwill and good sense of drivers and pedestrians, as are all the other “internal lanes”. There is effectively no level ground within the old village.

Another aspect related to the Cotswolds National Landscape is that, at present, Blockley is effectively a hidden village until one is actually in it, because of character of the valley within which it lies. From the footpath going from the top of Bell Lane up to Dovedale, the village is effectively invisible, even within a hundred yards. The same is true coming down B4479, and going along the lane to the west of Batsford. This is rare in England and beautiful, and is another reason for restricting the overall scale of development in Blockley.

Public transport links are also rare (the bus), and those unable to drive are now effectively confined to the village unless family or organisations like the “Cotswold Friends” can help them. This, however, is common to most villages, given the economics of running bus services in rural areas.

Where is the work which young adults need, in Blockley? Tourism is now the main employer in the Cotswolds, but the hubs for that are market towns and larger.

The Government’s doubling of the housing target for the Cotswolds National Landscape is inexplicable, and does not appear to have been justified by them. Development should be centred on or near the major towns, with at least some employment, transport and social infrastructure already in place.

Comment ID: 9231

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: Fairford Town Council prefers a hybrid version of scenarios 4, 5 and 6.

It supports Scenario 4 in principle, which is the most consistent with national policy in seeking to use existing and potential public transport corridors and hubs to focus housing growth. The scenario assumptions are clear that this would rule out Fairford as a valid strategic location as the town is unique amongst the Principal Settlements in its relative isolation from the strategic highway network and has only modest bus and other local services. However, the Town Council recognises that the non-strategic level of growth for the town (approx. 470 homes) is reasonable, even in this scenario.

It cannot currently support Scenario 5 as it rules out any major development in the Cotswold National Landscape (CNL). The Town Council disagrees with the absolutist approach taken by CDC in this regard, which is contrary to national policy (Ref NPPF para 190). If access to high quality public transport services in particular is an increasing priority in national policy, even in hitherto the most protected areas like the Green Belt, then it is wrong to rule out the opportunities to create new or enlarge existing settlements in the CNL in taking Scenario 4 further.

The Town Council would also argue that if Fairford is not well enough located to be part of Scenario 4 then why has that fact not prevented the inclusion of a 1,400 urban extension to the town as part of Scenario 5?

But it cannot support Scenario 6 either, because it makes unnecessary, implausible assumptions for the scale of housing growth in a number of settlements in the CNL. 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 proposed 265 net new housing target for the town, which it assesses to be the maximum level of growth in extending the immediate edges of the town. Even this scale of growth will depend on a further upgrade to the WwTW (Sewage Treatment Works) (a problem incorrectly understated in the evidence base, as the Town Council can evidence) and new strategies for tackling the town's ground water and drainage constraints, which are well-acknowledged but again absent in the evidence base.

In addition, any spare capacity at the schools, and especially the one primary school, will be absorbed by this scale of growth. It is currently unknown whether the GP surgery in Fairford has the capacity to cater for the proposed increase in population, taking account of the likely demographics.

Depending on the location of the proposed sites, there may also be site specific issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed.

These issues point to a wider problem hidden in the Settlement Role & Function report for Fairford. The town is barely a Principal Settlement in practice, certainly compared to others in the District. It does not have the potential to improve its local commercial and public services in its centre – which were never intended to support a larger population – meaning that any improvements must be on its periphery. This presents a critical challenge now the town has grown beyond the ideal 800m walking distance from the centre and its main east-west road (A417) is too narrow to handle additional internal or external traffic without harmful heritage, air quality and pedestrian safety effects that cannot be mitigated. The latter is a major constraint that is relevant to any major development within around 5 miles either east or west of Fairford.

Should CDC continue to identify the Fairford area as a strategic growth location then those proposals must result from (and be supported by) a comprehensive detailed impact assessment and proper master planning exercise through 2026 with the meaningful engagement of those stakeholders that know the town and its issues best (including Fairford Town Council). That work must ensure that the outcome does not lead to the worst of all worlds: too much growth for the town to absorb, but not enough to finance and deliver the necessary timely infrastructure upgrades.

Fairford Town Council acknowledges that the major local landowner's preference is for any major strategic development to be in Broad Location 12A on the eastern side of the town, extending from the A417 about as far north as the schools and with potential for some commercial or community development south of the Southrop road. This would link between the schools and facilities along the A417, with its own 'spine' road. However, it would require careful consideration to be given to access to the town centre (including parking) as well as the mitigation of E-W traffic flows through the town.

The Town Council agrees that Broad Locations 12C and 13 are not appropriate for either extensions of Fairford/Horcott or new settlements. Also, any proposal for major development on the west or south-west side of the town (including in 12B) would require a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment and mitigation plan, because of the fact that the Totterdown/Dudgrove brook catchment drains via culverts through the Air Base and the discharge rate at the eastern end is subject to a strict constraint because of flood risk issues in Kempsford/Whelford. This is in addition to the physical constraints at the A417/Horcott Road/Coronation Street junction.

There are many inter-related issues in planning long-established towns like Fairford. Whether adopting an 'onion ring' urban extension or 'hub and spoke' new village settlement model for growth, or a combination of both, it is vital to understand those inter-relationships.

For example, the town centre is very small and with no practical opportunity to increase its size or increase parking provision, to better enable new residents in peripheral housing estates or new villages to visit by car or to use more shops or services. Note that the town does not have two supermarkets (per the Settlement Role & Function Study) – it has one small and two medium size convenience stores, none with any opportunity to increase their size or associated parking provision. But new commercial floorspace on the town edge would risk undermining the town centre unless it was designed and could be maintained in future to be clearly complementary. It is unclear how this could be ensured.

In addition, with the existing primary school located beyond the town's NE edge, any absorption of spare capacity by school age population on that side of the town may skew and undermine its catchment area for the southern and western areas of the town.

A further factor may be the accommodation strategy of RAF Fairford. To date it has sought to locate a small proportion of its personnel within the town with others over a wider area or on the Base itself. There is also the Royal Air Force Charitable Trust, who have their HQ adjacent to the Base. This is shown in the employment and travel to work data in the evidence base, in terms of the higher proportion of the town's workforce travelling less than 2km for work than the District average.

It is understood that the future role envisaged for RAF Fairford has recently changed and it is unclear what the implications for housing required in Fairford are. This is always to some extent subject to changes in US policy. The base already attracts a significant number of commuting trips through Fairford, and the recent major housing developments have generated high levels of out-commuting from the town. There continues to be a moderate amount of out-commuting to RAF Brize Norton, although this may reduce due to the availability of more housing there.

Comment ID: 9232

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: Fairford Town Council considers it neither acceptable nor necessary for CDC to propose allocating land in unsustainable locations. The problem created by CDC in the Local Plan scenarios is the opposite. It is choosing to avoid strategic development in some very sustainable locations because they are located in the CNL and is taking no account of how the strategic planning of such development could ensure the potential for harm to the CNL is avoided or mitigated.

Outside the CNL in areas like Fairford, the Scenario 5 strategy carries a high risk of harming the sustainability of established towns and villages in a relatively small geographic area with its cumulative effects. Neither the strategy nor the Integrated Impact Assessment have understood or tested the potential for these effects or identified associated mitigation measures.

Comment ID: 9233

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: The made Fairford Neighbourhood Plan allows for a higher density of housing development in some parts of the town than the average for the District. Some parts of the town 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 taking account of the demographics it is intended to cater for (e.g. families or retired people requiring gardens) and design constraints including height restrictions on buildings due to the proximity of RAF Fairford and RAF Brize Norton.

Well planned and laid out, modest urban extensions can follow the same higher density 'pattern book' for building without necessarily harming the town's special historic character. However, the Town Council would not regard much of what has been built in the town over the last decade to be of that high standard and would look to the Local Plan, or a refresh of the Neighbourhood Plan or new design code, to require and deliver higher standards in the future.

Comment ID: 9234

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: Fairford Town Council accepts that the District is likely to be able to demonstrate valid reasons why the Local Plan cannot meet in full the Standard Method housing requirement. However, it is vital that the Local Plan passes its examination quickly to resecure the benefits of an up-to-date development plan, especially for those parts of the District like Fairford that are most exposed to the 'tilted balance' when housing supply performance fails. CDC must therefore seek to plan as positively as possible to minimise the risk of the Local Plan failing its examination, while also ensuring that it is realistic, so it is not doomed to fail later due to under-delivery.

In this regard, Fairford Town Council acknowledges that CDC has a difficult balance to strike between housing growth, the need for local employment, services and infrastructure to support this, and environmental constraints, given the large part of its area that lies within the National Landscape. For decades that balance has unfortunately been struck in the same way: avoid any major development in the National Landscape and accept the inevitable social and economic harm that results both inside and outside the area.

For decades, the much lower housing levels planned for by CDC have not exposed this trade-off and those settlements outside the CNL like Fairford have been regarded as necessary and sustainable 'pressure valves' when housing supply and delivery have not met targets. In the case of Fairford, this has meant housing development that has overloaded local infrastructure and services including the town's sewage system and been at the expense of the loss of commercial space in the town centre and a number of small employment sites in the town, making it less sustainable.

The new national standard method has brought the trade-off into much sharper relief, as the cumulative scale of growth in the arc SE and SW of Cirencester outside the CNL is unprecedented and very likely undeliverable and undevelopable. The weaknesses of this strategy are made clear in the Development Strategy Options Topic Paper (commentary to Table 6 on pp31-32).

Of those weaknesses, we would highlight these:

- High risk of delays due to infrastructure, land assembly, or viability issues
- There are several strategic sites within close proximity of each other, which may potentially be delivering housing at the same time
- Complex governance and delivery – often involve multiple stakeholders, landowners, and delivery partners.

- Requires strong leadership, coordination, and long-term stewardship

None are about the character or function; they are instead about the individual and cumulative risks that would require careful, focused, well-resourced and ongoing long term management to manage effectively.

There are few local planning authorities in the country that could and have met these challenges successfully. In the Town Council's view, CDC has never had to build and maintain the skills and resources necessary to manage this type of development strategy. And impending Local Government Reorganisation will only likely hinder any prospect of managing this scale of change over the critical first five years.

It would therefore propose that an important means by which the final strategy is stress tested is the ability of this and the next local planning authority to lead and deliver it.

There are very likely some growth options, even those of a large scale, that will be easier to deliver, with fewer inter-dependencies, than some of the proposals CDC seems to favour. Some may require trade-offs with subjective environmental constraints, including the CNL, but better they are made than a failure to manage and deliver the more difficult strategy (where those trade-offs have been avoided).

The Town Council considers Fairford is far more vulnerable to strategy failure than its Principal Settlement counterparts. The downside risks are more likely to happen, the downside effects will be more profound, and the risks are more difficult to manage.

Given the level of development proposed in Fairford, even without the strategic extensions suggested in some scenarios, basic improvements that are required to ensure the town remains sustainable include: additional parking and commercial space adjacent to the town centre (which would need to be negotiated with the major landowner) and a further upgrade to the town's sewage system. Careful assessment and planning of these things is required to maximise the benefits and avoid unintended undesirable impacts.

If a larger scale of development were still to be contemplated, other facilities such as a new primary school would certainly be required, and it is unclear how the longer term road constraints problem would be solved.

Comment ID: 9235

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: Other matters that need to be addressed in association with the large scale of housing development being proposed include local employment (other than for the construction), local services including the capacity and accessibility of local health services, green infrastructure and publicly accessible space, and the phasing of the provision of all this to avoid unacceptable burdens on existing services and the local community in the short term. It is clearly more sustainable if housing is planned and developed in parallel with local employment and services so as to avoid simply creating yet more out- and in-commuting. If there is to be any hope of Fairford playing a role as a 'main service hub', a town centre study is needed to address how this could be done so as to improve the vitality and viability of the centre after the losses of commercial space that have been allowed to happen over recent years. This seems to have been done successfully for other small towns such as Cricklade, with the help of a proper town centre and economic study.

The Town Council considers that CDC must achieve a deeper and more joined-up understanding of these other important matters and how they relate to housing supply, particularly in some Principal Settlements like Fairford. The town's rapid, largely unplanned expansion over the last decade has exposed it to the risks identified in Q4.

An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) cannot be relied upon to resolve everything, as it looks at infrastructure types in isolation and takes a proposed spatial strategy as an input to propose what infrastructure is required as an output. IDPs are not iterative with plan making and do not normally look at settlements holistically. The infrastructure requirements need to be properly assessed, costed and identified in advance for each of the settlements and proposed developments in the Plan, both individually and in combination, so that appropriate funding can be secured for implementation.

Comment ID: 9236

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Fairford Town Council

Comment: The 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'.

For Fairford, the Town Council is not confident these objectives can all be realised with potentially damaging compromises being made and risks being taken in terms of planning and co-ordination.

Comment ID: 8948

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Fergus Dignan

Comment: Scenario 3 would be my preferred option. Services infrastructure is already available in the large settlements and are easier to develop further with housing demand than in rural locations with small settlements. Brownfield sites within the large settlements need to be exploited much more than they currently are.

Comment ID: 8949

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Fergus Dignan

Comment: In all of the housing development planning, consideration must be given to Nature. Planning departments need more planning officers in order to enforce what has been promised by construction companies, such as the planting of trees and hedgerows.

Comment ID: 10503

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Fergus Reid

Comment: I live in top farm in kemble (a new development only 8-9yrs ago). I grew up in a neighbouring village, worked for kemble farms before being bought by the bathurst (ie the farm yard where i now live) but ultimately now work in london to earn a much higher salary to be able to afford a family house in the area.

When top farm was built other than a modification to west lane, little else was added to kemble in terms of infrastructure (and the ~50 additional houses represented a ~15% increase in housing stock at the time.)

I have 2 small children and my eldest will hopefully be attending the school this year. There are 15 HIGHLY contested places. We are not even sure as residents of the village if we will get a place at the local school less than 250m (as the crow flies) from our house!

With small children, we are also well aware of the amenities for young families. A singular weekly playgroup in a village hall that is being outgrown by the village (and also supported by residents from surrounding villages) is the main offering. If "affordable" family homes are to be built then a better community hub needs to be built with them. A larger village hall/coffee shop/community hub (similar to fentons in south cerney) would definitely be needed.

In terms of safety, i commute from kemble to london using the rail link. The singular crossing point at the lower end of the village is not adequate on a busy road. On a busy road there needs to be better traffic calming (and probably a lower speed limit)(potential camera to enforce?) and an additional pedestrian crossing for the side of the village that is south of the a429 probably near the railway tunnel.

On the railway, there is alot of discussion around building affordable homes but i do not feel the use of the "golden valley line" and "affordable" go hand in hand.

The frequency of the trains is not enough to justify the extremely expensive price tag. The once hourly service is extremely busy at peak time (wander down to kemble for the 0642 to paddington on a tues-thursday) and the train journey to cheltenham takes so long that it is quicker (and probably cheaper) to take the car anyway (which then puts more pressure on the already badly maintained and crowded roads in the county).

The annual season ticket to london is in excess of £11 thousand, and ultimately kemble and the surrounding villages have enjoyed high (and unaffordable) house prices for years as those seeking country space have dealt with the expensive train ticket and longer commute but still earnt a much larger london weighted salary. Building

"affordable" homes for locals will simply not work as economics steps in. Homebuilders are well aware of the commuter crowd and will build to their taste and budget! This immediately prices locals out and the perpetual "locals can't afford newly built houses" issues continues. Building in kemble only feeds this fire further! The last homes built in kemble were certainly not affordable, probably averaging for a 4 bed house somewhere near £1million. A quick poll of those living there now will likely uncover most of them are not originally local and many probably commute! Ultimately you cannot use a good rail link as a reason to build more homes when the use of the rail link is NOT affordable for most!

On transport infrastructure, a roundabout is definitely needed at the awful a433/a429 junction with more homes being built at the steadings (irrelevant of homes being built in kemble or not.)

The village is served well by a small surgery but this would need expanding with more homes.

There has been talk in many guises of reopening the old kemble/cirencester rail line. Many seem extremely expensive (monorail?) but surely a more affordable and sustainable (and possibly pleasant!) option would be to utilise some of the old railway bed as a hard packed cycle track (something similar to the south cerney/cricklade cycle track?) (also offer some walking/recreational space for residents?)

Comment ID: 10899

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Fiona Perry

Comment: West of the high street of Moreton-in-Marsh is situated within the Cotswolds National Landscape any proposed development areas for the town unbalance the town centre scenario. I understand the need for new housing; I am not against the suggestion of allocating a percentage to MIM; please be mindful that a large number of developments would be detrimental to the balance of a town centre community.

Comment ID: 10965

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Fiona Perry

Comment: When will residents see the results of the Housing and Employment Needs Assessment which is expected to have been completed by now?

Comment ID: 10961

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Fiona Perry

Comment: Infrastructure re Moreton-in-Marsh :

Concerns regarding:

Healthcare - overstretched GP Practices already in the town. As the town is located on the edge of Gloucestershire in 2025 journeys for various medical appointments included Stroud (68 miles journey time 2hrs) Gloucester hospital (62 miles journey time 2 hrs) Cheltenham hospital (48 miles Journey time 1 hr 20 mins) . Public transport to these hospitals is very limited/non existent in some cases.

Public transport - limited (see above).

Transport (Highways) - Traffic congestion on Moreton high street is dreadful during the summer months with tailbacks of at least 30 mins on some occasions.

Walking and Cycling - Submission of realistic options for Cycle lanes within Moreton-in-Marsh for any new planning/development applications. There appears to be a "greenwashing template" on some recent consultation documents submitted by development companies.

Sport and recreation - part time Fire College sports centre is not adequate to accommodate the proposed number of houses/additional residents.

Waste water - service needs to be updated

Comment ID: 10973

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Fiona Perry

Comment: re point e. Promote sustainable transport use and connectivity.

Sounds great in principal and I agree with it but "encouraging" is one thing and providing practical solutions is another. If the percentage of housing in Moreton-in-Marsh increases to the scale of any of the scenarios people will be driving to the shops as they will be too far to walk to, thereby increasing the traffic congestion on the high street.

Will you be conducting a transport feasibility study for the Moreton-in-Marsh area?
Focusing on the impact of additional traffic on the small feeder roads in the area?

Please come and talk to the residents on Evenlode Road to find out how an increased traffic flow will impact on their lives.

Comment ID: 10917

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Fiona Perry

Comment: How are you going to reassure the residents of these various proposed sites that infrastructure will be put in place before development?

With regard to Moreton-in-Marsh, will you be able to reassure the residents that a proper assessment/analysis of the "Forever Chemicals" that may exist at the Fire College site is undertaken and that a report would be available for public scrutiny?

My concern is that if the chemicals are still prevalent in the soil they will leach into the water course/rivers/streams in the local area. If this is the case then I think any future development around Moreton in Marsh should be limited

Comment ID: 10435

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Fran Embleton-Smith

Comment: It would be more helpful to have indication of how infrastructure is to be improved and how that is to be financed. The housing increases planned can only work with significantly improved services - nothing in this plan indicates firm commitment in finance and intent to provide for the communities most affected

Comment ID: 10423

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Fran Embleton-Smith

Comment: The number of proposed new houses in Fairford (where I live) is unsustainable - I don't see plans to improve infrastructure. The utilities (water & waste especially), roads and services are already stretched beyond capacity. I would also question what 1200 new houses would mean to the balance of the good community feeling in this small market town. We have already had several 100s of new homes built in the past 10 years - it has increased road traffic beyond reasonable use for the size of road, the number of people needing to access services like the doctors' surgery has meant they are stretched far beyond capacity. The effect on flood plain must be questioned too.

Comment ID: 10445

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Fran Embleton-Smith

Comment: Vision & objective - it's saying all the things you would expect from a local council, but in such vague terms it's promising nothing. The basic objectives with such expansion really have to focus on making infrastructure improvements to sustain development. I would like to know how that is going to happen before planning permission is granted.

Comment ID: 10430

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Fran Embleton-Smith

Comment: I understand the need to protect areas of outstanding natural beauty, but feel that by focusing on settlements at the edges of the area eg Fairford, the plan is sacrificing the delicate balance of community as well as imposing unsustainable levels of development in those towns / areas. The fact that Cotswold District is dominated by the untouchable AONB is to the detriment of the rest of the district left to bear the brunt of a target generated by an algorithm.

Comment ID: 9110

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Francesca Marqus

Comment:

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

Comment ID: 10541

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Francis Lata

Comment: I write concerning the proposed housing developments in Kemble Parish. I support the views of the Parish Council and would further add :- The Council's preferred approach at Kemble results in a community, which now has 388 dwellings, accommodating an additional 619 in the period to 2043.

This represents a 160% increase in the size of Kemble.

The intention at Kemble appears to be overdevelopment and of a kind which would completely swamp the existing community.

The addition of 619 new dwellings to a community of 388 cannot be legitimately referred to as an extension of the existing community!

Comment ID: 275

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fairford Town Council

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

Comment ID: 276

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fairford Town Council

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

Comment ID: 296

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Farmington Trust

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

Comment ID: 297

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Farmington Trust

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

Comment ID: 298

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Farmington Trust

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

Comment ID: 142

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Felicity Jackson

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

Comment ID: 746

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fiona Johnston

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

Comment ID: 575

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fiona Uzze

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

Comment ID: 429

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Florence Lazenby

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

Comment ID: 196

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fowkes

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

Comment ID: 825

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Frank Perkins

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

Comment ID: 426

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fraser Anderson

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

Comment ID: 733

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Frederick Fielder

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

Comment ID: 790

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Fynn Robinson

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