

Comment ID: 10355

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: H Argo

Comment: I believe this is the most sensible and fair approach to dispersing additional housing within the Cotswold District. Just because a settlement is within the AONB should not give it immunity to additional housing. Smaller developments throughout the Cotswold villages will have less impact on the district rather than dumping all the housing on the south of the district in huge housing estates which will distort the existing village/town. Additional housing should be worked out using a formula in direct relation to the current size of the town, village, hamlet or cluster of houses. Why shouldn't places like, for example, Coln Rogers or Turkdean, for example, be allowed to expand by one or two houses?

Comment ID: 10454

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: H Argo

Comment: I believe you need to look at the settlement scoring determining Kemble as a Principal Settlement.

The Settlement Role and Function Study uses the ONS figures for Kemble Civil Parish which includes Ewen, Kemblewick and part of Cotswold Airport.

This Local Plan Review specifically states the proposed principal settlements refer to the settlement only and not the whole parish.

Therefore, if the population and settlement, employment and economic, and the community facilities and services figures for Kemble in the Settlement Role and Function Study are recalculated, the 388 houses of Kemble village may not meet the criteria to be a principal settlement site.

Comment ID: 10466

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: H Argo

Comment: I believe you need to look at the settlement scoring determining Kemble as a Principal Settlement.

The Settlement Role and Function Study uses the ONS figures for Kemble Civil Parish which includes Ewen, Kemblewick and part of Cotswold Airport.

This Local Plan Review specifically states the proposed principal settlements refer to the settlement only and not the whole parish.

Therefore, if the population and settlement size, employment and economic activity and community facilities and services figures for the civil parish of Kemble are recalculated, Kemble village may not meet the criteria for a principal settlement.

Comment ID: 11059

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: H Marson

Comment: Infrastructure is key to future development. eg sewerage and drainage in Down Ampney is currently at breaking point and the health of the occupants of the village will be at risk if the current sewage system is not updated ahead of any more housing development. The village floods when there are periods of heavy rainfall. This will make properties uninsurable and consequently unviable for habitation.

Comment ID: 11044

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: H Marson

Comment: I do not consider any development in an area with no public transport to be sustainable as it would necessitate increased use of private cars in the area

Comment ID: 11071

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: H Marson

Comment: I find this whole document too vague for me to be able to agree with. I would have liked the document to have had greater clarity. From reading the document it is very difficult to understand what the district will look like in 20 years time.

Comment ID: 10306

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: H Tonks

Comment: Re: Cirencester and Siddington proposals (and, to some extent, the Kemble proposals)

1. The developments in Cirencester and Siddington suggest significant numbers of properties being built between now and 2043 and beyond. All development appears to be south of the town with no suggested development north of the town. Any residents living in these new developments, who need to travel north of the town, will use the network of roads surrounding Love Lane and the Fire Station roundabout. It should be understood that residents are unlikely to drive south from The Steadings area and Siddington to access the A417 and will, in order to drive north out of town, drive through Somerford Road/Love Lane/Fire Station areas, and possibly use the one way system through the town centre. Whilst acknowledging the benefits of the recent highway works around the fire station roundabout, there are still queues at peak times. Any additional houses will add to these queues.

New residents in Kemble, driving north, will also add to congestion on the Fire Station roundabout or in the Town Centre.

What action will be taken to mitigate these problems?

2. What action will be taken to ensure that there is sufficient parking in the town centre for these additional residents? These areas are too far out of town for many people to walk in. This parking needs to be sympathetic to the town.

3. What action will be taken to ensure that the town centre thrives as a result of these additional homes?

4. What sustainable transport networks will be put in place (eg, bike paths and safe bike parking) to reduce the number of cars accessing the town centre?

Comment ID: 9596

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: The calculation using the standard method for housing targets is skewed because of the vast AONB within the Cotswold District and disproportionately negatively affects communities which sit outside the AONB. I propose that the standard methodology be robustly challenged and the target weighted to take into account the large proportion of the District which is unavailable for development.

House prices within the AONB are generally higher than average, which surely influences the affordability factor in the standard method algorithm.

The end result is disproportionate pressure on land and communities which fall outside the AONB with the almost certain consequence being further social and environmental polarisation between the communities in and outside the AONB.

Comment ID: 9598

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Test to see whether this comment posts

Comment ID: 9599

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: The calculation using the governments standard method for calculating targets is skewed due to the vast area of the district which is National Landscape (NL) and consequentially unavailable for development. Communities which sit outside the NL are disproportionately negatively impacted by the proposal. The standard methodology should be robustly challenged and the targets proportionately revised to reflect the proportion of the district which is in fact available for development.

This, combined with the fact that property prices within the NL are generally higher than those outside it, has the inevitable consequence of further social and environmental polarisation between the areas within and outside the NL.

Comment ID: 9620

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: I would oppose the building of higher density developments for the reasons set out in my response to 2.8 above. It is not suitable outside urban settings and is out of character for the District. Any such development outside of the main service centres would destroy the character, appearance and visual appearance of the landscape.

Comment ID: 9623

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: The relative increase in the number of dwellings in and around Preston is completely disproportionate and if realised will have an apocalyptic affect. I would suggest the following are the minimum required for any scenario to proceed:

- green buffer between Preston and Cirencester and Preston and any new development
- safe, continuous walking and cycle routes
- no access to developments through the village - any access should be from the major A roads
- pedestrian crossing solutions for both the A419 and A417
- provision for medical and emergency services
- improved community facilities and car parking within Preston
- transport upgrades
- better public transport facilities
- provision of schooling, doctor, dental surgeries, leisure facilities and outdoor recreation spaces for children - these must all be in place before the development is complete.

Comment ID: 9601

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: If a fair reduction in the target is not achieved, the CDC must, as a matter of urgency, liaise with neighbouring local authorities with a view to sharing development needs. In doing so, both the current shortfall and the fact that the size of the NL prohibits development in the majority of the District should be taken into account.

Comment ID: 9604

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Every scenario disproportionately affects Preston in a negative way. How objectively is the CDC looking to find other locations to more evenly distribute the required housing? Spreading houses more evenly between different settlements (even outside the NL) would reduce the devastating impact on the small village.

Comment ID: 9608

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Focussing the main development on existing service centres is the most logical solution from an environmental and socioeconomic viewpoint. Outside the main service centres there are limited services and facilities, negligible public transport and no job opportunities. Significant development outside the main service centres will result in substantial environmental damage as a result of unsustainable levels of traffic and a loss of nature in development.

Comment ID: 9609

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Every scenario negatively impacts the village of Preston and the surrounding countryside. The parish is composed mainly of countryside with scattered housing and small businesses. Residents value its rural setting, village life and the existing green buffer between the village and Cirencester.

Comment ID: 9612

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: The proposal's impact upon Preston is devastating. It will be engulfed by urban spread from Cirencester, eroding its distinct setting and rural character. It will no longer exist as a village to the detriment of all who have chosen to live in and contribute to a rural village community.

The impact upon traffic, road congestion and safety cannot be supported and significant infrastructure investment would need to be guaranteed in order for any of the scenarios to progress.

Comment ID: 9614

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Increasing the density of development with the proposed area is not in keeping with the District and will negatively impact the wider view and usual appearance of the landscape. Any development within the parish should have lower density and plenty of open space and trees in order to ensure the rural and historic character and scenic beauty of Preston is maintained. Please refer to the Design in Preston Statement and Preston's Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013-2031.

It is imperative that the rural buffer between Cirencester and Preston is maintained and that any scenario which proceeds provides for a substantial green buffer between Preston and any new development.

Comment ID: 9616

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: Scenario 3 is our preference. It is the most environmentally sustainable and has the least negative impact on the rural communities in the District.

Comment ID: 9617

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Hannah Curtis

Comment: If locations are not sustainable housing should not be built there.

Comment ID: 10580

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Hannah Woloszczynska

Comment: Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

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

Name: Hannah Woloszczynska & David Woloszczynski

Address: Hazel Cottage, Cricklade Street, Poulton/ Poulton resident]

Date: 2.1.2026

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:

Hannah Woloszczynska

David Woloszczynski

Comment ID: 10184

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Hayley

Comment: I would like to understand more about the infrastructure that will be increased to support this proposed development in Fairford. Dcotors? Schools? Roads?

Comment ID: 9938

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Heather

Comment: No - 'Unstustainable' seems to answer the question. I am concerned with Moreton in Marsh and the significant flood and water drainage risks. The current development has already added to the risk, and more is inappropriate.

Comment ID: 9939

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Heather

Comment: I do not support higher buildings. The landscape is one of the principal attractions of this rural area, and why we love living here.

Comment ID: 9940

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Heather

Comment: No, and I am concerned with Moreton in Marsh. I don't agree that Moreton is a transport Hub. There are buses, but the roads are so congested that the buses are slow and not used. The train station services Worcester or Oxford, but people don't commute From Moreton to jobs in those locations; they do and will continue to drive - and that's unsustainable. The train is used for some trips to Oxford but mostly to London by commuters and by tourists. There will be less tourism with 3000 more homes. Where do you think all these people are going to work?

Comment ID: 9942

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Heather

Comment: I think the vision is admirable, and I would agree with it. We live in this area as it is ' rural' and we appreciate the vital natural landscape and all it has to offer. We like that children can go to good schools which are at capacity, that there is healthcare which is also full. we do need more affordable housing. This must not come at the expense of the the over all wellbeing of the people living here now. Further development that adds more cars to a creaking infrastructure will put all this at risk.

Comment ID: 8824

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Allocate every high street as a regeneration and development site

Comment ID: 8830

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Why are you still allowing developments without soar?

Comment ID: 8835

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Our vision should be that 90% of homes are occupied by locals not 10 by locals and the remainder second homes or holiday let's. The balance in villages has gone, and house prices unaffordable as forced up by this. There should be a strategy that any new housing must be locally occupied as in Devon, Cornwall snc Yorkshire.

Comment ID: 8837

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Any landowner is going to offer you their poor quality land for example that which floods to maximise their profit margin. If it's offered its for a reason....

Comment ID: 8828

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Moreton has no infrastructure, no secondary school 2 small doctors. Sort this first! No infrastructure no homes.

Comment ID: 8831

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: In our area you have to fpgo 20 miles for employment opportunities that are not poorly paid tourist jobs. Quality employment before tourism.

Comment ID: 8832

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: If they are travellers then sites should be transitory only, no permanence,

Comment ID: 8825

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

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Brownfield sites are everywhere as is high street regeneration. If you ask people to allocate sites they will try and allocate unsuitable sites so they can make a profit.

Comment ID: 8819

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Every high street now has empty property unlikely to be occupied as retail.
Turn it into live/work units for local artisans.

Comment ID: 8826

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: The government target are ridiculous because they all want second homes.....

Comment ID: 8833

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: I look forward to finding out where in the Cotswolds actually has these things on this list in there entireity! Developers build first then find excuses not to upgrade these accordingly.

Comment ID: 8821

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Scenario 3 and with local occupancy only.

Comment ID: 8822

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: No, it's unsuitable for a reason.

Comment ID: 8823

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Flats, maisonettes and brownfield regeneration will help local people only if it comes with an occupancy restriction, otherwise they will be snapped up as investments, left empty or turned into 2nd homes.

Comment ID: 8829

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: No. Nowhere has the infrastructure to cope. Infrastructure first. Pointless increasing populations without doctors, dentists, roads, sewage schools etc

Comment ID: 8834

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Ensure developers put the infrastructure in place before housing builds are commenced. In Plymouth a new town has been built, promising leisure, health and lots more, none of which transpired as the developers said they had no money. Residents are not happy as they bought into the promise not the delivery.

Comment ID: 8836

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Infrastructure should be in place before anything else.....

Comment ID: 8812

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: There is no point in allocating sites when 70% or more of any homes built will be sold as holiday homes, holiday let's or second homes which remain empty. Stop allocation sites and deal with the empty homes we have already. Provide planning permission on brownfield only and use initiatives to turn empty shops into quality housing, then you don't need greenfield and AONB.

Comment ID: 8813

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Too many villages have empty homes due to vast swathes of second homes. New housing should carry a principal or local occupancy restriction as in Lake District, Yorkshire Dale's, South Devon and Cornwall. Too much new housing is built for second home owners and holiday let's in this area and it should be controlled as it forces prices out of the hands of the young and the local.

Comment ID: 8814

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: This is preferred but needs to be for principal occupancy ONLY of you will create housing which ends up empty 90% of the time.

Comment ID: 8815

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: As half of new homes in Motreton for instance are empty Mon to Friday it needs control that the homes are principally occupied. Transport hubs are fine but where is the employment? London?

Comment ID: 8816

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Stop sprawl. Use brownfield only, and use empty shops for new housing.
The days of the high street are long gone everyone shops online or at retail parks.
Revitalise town centres with new housing for LoCALS.

Comment ID: 8817

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Any housing must be for local people not as second homes, holiday let's or left empty as an investment. We don't constantly want luxury detached homes.

Comment ID: 8818

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Support regeneration not greenfield sites. Use empty homes, empty shops and turn them into affordable homes for locals, ban sales to people who do not intend to live here but run holiday let's or as second homes or investments only.

Comment ID: 8827

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: Willersey cannot cope with any new housing due to regular sewage overflow into gardens and watercourses. It's a public health issue. No infrastructure should equal no homes and that goes for everywhere

Comment ID: 8820

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Heather Rothwell

Comment: The Councils preferred option will just turn 50% or more of the housing into second homes for the rich, change planning policy that any new home must be principally occupied.

Comment ID: 8809

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Helen

Comment: The calculation using the standard method for housing targets is skewed because of the vast (80%) National Landscape (NL) area within Cotswold District. In this case it is unfair and should be weighted to reflect unavailable areas. Alternatively the standard method should be robustly challenged.

Development land is extremely scarce within the NL, meaning sites must be concentrated in the remaining portion of the Cotswolds district which is not designated NL. Additionally, house prices in the National Landscape tend to be higher than average, impacting the affordability factor in the standard method algorithm. The end result is unfair pressure on land and communities outside the NL and the high likelihood of further social and environmental polarisation between the areas in and outside the NL.

Comment ID: 8811

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Helen

Comment: Although higher density development may be appropriate in urban settings, it is unsuitable for rural villages (or non-principal settlements). It is essential to ensure their rural and historic character and scenic beauty is retained whether inside or beyond the National Landscape. In such areas any development should have a lower density and plenty of open space and trees and also include a substantial green buffer to firmly separate existing villages from new development.

Comment ID: 10186

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Helen Haresign

Comment: I am surprised to see Poulton on the list of strategic sites identified for development. Poulton is not a sustainable location, with long standing flooding and sewage issues - a recent development in Bell Lane was passed on appeal (despite strong local opposition due to risk of increased flooding) with the planning inspectorate stating the proposal provided a 'betterment' to surface water management - yet within a couple of years houses were flooded downstream of this development yet again!! We cannot unbuild the houses but to add more to this location would be wrong - it is development in the wrong place. Poulton does not have the infrastructure (no general store, no school, no doctor's surgery, no meaningful bus service) - it has no mobile phone signal nor high speed broadband. It should be removed as a strategic location for development with only small individual infill permitted until the flooding and sewage issues are addressed.

Comment ID: 8810

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Helen Lynas

Comment: Every scenario negatively impacts Preston, the village and surrounding countryside.

The parish of Preston is composed mainly of countryside with scattered dwellings and small businesses. Part of the village is designated Conservation Area, defined in part by its rural setting and its separation from nearby Cirencester. Residents highly value village life and the existing rural buffer between Cirencester and Preston.

The proposed scenarios engulf Preston Village with suburban sprawl from Cirencester, harmfully eroding its distinct setting and predominantly rural character. Additionally they raise serious concerns about the impact on traffic, road congestion and safety, particularly adding further pressure to already congested points on the road network, including Kingshill Lane, the Tesco roundabout and Preston Toll Bar.

Significant infrastructure investment will be required to support the proposed scale of growth, including major upgrades to transport, utilities, schools and healthcare.

If any of these scenarios go ahead, it must be with due notice of the Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan and with full consideration for the long-term wellbeing, identity and safety of the village and its residents.

Ameliorating measures must include:

- A robust and substantial green buffer between new housing and Preston Village to preserve rural separation and identity. This is essential.
- Safe, continuous walking and cycling routes extending between Cirencester and Preston, including new off-road paths linking to schools and other facilities.

- Steps to prevent rat-running through Preston Village, protecting its quiet character and safety. Access to any new development be via the major A-roads and should not cut through the village.
- Crossing solutions where Kingshill Lane meets the A419 at Preston Toll Bar.
- Addressing flooding on the A419 at Preston Toll Bar and along adjacent Cricklade Road.
- Traffic and pedestrian safety measures at Preston Toll Bar and along Kingshill Lane.
- Provision for emergency services - The recent fatal accidents at the roundabout on the tollbar required the field where development is proposed to be used as a landing spot for helicopter ambulances.

Improved community facilities and car parking within Preston village.

- Better public transport provision for both the village and new developments.
- Improved provision of schooling, doctor and dental surgeries, shopping etc.

Infrastructure - transport upgrades, utilities, healthcare and schools must be put in place before development is complete.

Comment ID: 8867

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Helen McMaster

Comment: Existing infrastructure issues need to be addressed in Willersey before any further building is permitted. These include:

Sewerage - the current system can not handle the existing houses with raw sewage frequently being discharged onto Collin Lane and Badsey Road and polluting the brook which runs along side the recreation ground.

Flooding - Collin Lane and Badsey road flood with heavy or prolonged rain. Linked to the sewerage issues and means residents gardens are subjected to flood and sewerage.

Doctors Surgery - it is already difficult to get a doctors appointment. This will become worse with further housing in Willersey and Broadway.

School already under pressure, no shop and limited public transport.

The current road system can not cope with current traffic which will only be increased. There have been a number of accidents on Collin Lane build outs and roundabout.

These fundamental infrastructure issues must be addressed before subjected to further load from even more new houses.

Comment ID: 10785

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Henry Kenner

Comment: Environmental considerations needs to be addressed as part of these proposed developments particularly given the adjacency of the AONB to much of the proposed development.

Moreover, within proposed developments proactive requirements for the provision of easy cost effective solutions such as native plants in hedging, provision of hedging, planting of native trees and bird boxes/bricks etc will go some way to help mitigate the effects of the developments and moreover help to provide BNG locally and not distantly which would be appropriate

Comment ID: 10787

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Henry Kenner

Comment: An emphasis on affordable social housing is important to ensure that these developments provide for thriving, sustainable and balances communities

Comment ID: 10789

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Henry Kenner

Comment: The vision is admirable, but to ensure it is realised will require some assertive requirements made of developers and communities in ensuring the existing environment is conserved. The proposals clearly are in contradiction of some previously agreed objectives; as an example at Moreton in Marsh a recent development was built on existing nest sites for Skylarks amongst other ground nesting birds. The ESA recognised and provision was required and duly made for localised near adjacent sites to be dedicated to assisting these birds in their breeding; however, it appears that future development will build on these dedicated areas thus negating the previous efforts and requirements; so considerably more resource needs to be focused here to ensure this risk is not realised and the Council's vision to conserve is indeed realised; currently this is not addressed or resourced.

Comment ID: 10792

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Henry Kenner

Comment: The provision at Broadwell (and no doubt others) seems to have been based on some erroneous and misconstrued data. As such understanding the justification for the proposed number is difficult to understand and justify. Moreover, this is a village that is largely within the AONB so more clarity as to what is proposed would be helpful.

Moreover, the scale of the ask of Broadwell seems disproportionate to its size and when a closer inspection is made of the village the lack of infrastructure in general and flooding in particular together with a lack of tangible commitment to any such infrastructure appears to further question the credibility of such a proposal.

Comment ID: 10076

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Hugh

Comment: I would suggest that Kemble is, comparatively, very underdeveloped and is not in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It has a service to London by train in just over an hour as well as a train travel time of less than three quarters of an hour to Cheltenham. There is easy access to the M4 to Oxford, London and Bristol. There is an underused site of 532 acres that is currently the privately owned Cotswold Airport that is used primarily for leisure and only open six days a week. If this site were to be developed with medium density housing it would provide in the region of four thousand homes.

If the 'Cotswold Airport' site were considered it could reduce the pressure on other sites such as Moreton in Marsh that is already due for over development, does not have the such speedy access to London or other major areas of employment and already suffers from the lack of infrastructure to support its current population.

Comment ID: 10080

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Hugh

Comment: Why has no additional infrastructure of any sort that should include schooling, traffic calming, parking, sewage, pavements/footpaths, and entertainment, to name but a few, been instigated in spite of Moreton in Marsh doubling in size over the past twenty years.

Comment ID: 10088

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Hugh

Comment: Despite Moreton in Marsh doubling in size over the last twenty years, little or no effort has been made to develop the necessary infrastructure. The risk of flooding continues, with warnings from the Environment Agency a regular occurrence. Raw sewage is pumped into the rivers at an unacceptable level. Doctors and. Doctors have been put under an unreasonable strain to provide medical care. Opportunities for new employment remain limited, and parking remains an unresolved issue after fifteen years. Despite being a 'principal settlement', Moreton only has a primary school with no secondary education within walking distance. The list goes on, with no effort given to encourage improvements in standards.

Comment ID: 10089

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Hugh

Comment: Despite Moreton in Marsh doubling in size over the past twenty years, why hasn't any additional infrastructure been instigated? This should include schooling, traffic calming, parking, sewage, pavements/footpaths, and entertainment, to name but a few.

Comment ID: 10087

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Hugh

Comment: Developing the Cotswolds to the extent proposed by the Government would be counterproductive. The area's popularity as a tourist destination stems from its rich history, historic buildings, and farmed countryside, which have been cultivated over centuries. The Government's plan to wipe out this heritage in less than twenty years would create an urban landscape that would not attract tourists and significantly reduce foreign income. While the area has a diverse range of businesses, many of which rely directly or indirectly on tourism, the proposed level of urbanisation would destroy the goose that lays this golden egg of tourism, not just for the Cotswolds but for the entire country. It's important to remember that tourism is the UK's second-largest source of income, after financial services.

Comment ID: 10086

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Hugh

Comment: Kemble is comparatively underdeveloped and not in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, it has a train service to London in just over an hour and a train travel time of less than three quarters of an hour to Cheltenham. There's also easy access to the M4, which leads to Oxford, London, and Bristol.

Currently, the privately owned Cotswold Airport, a 532-acre underused site, is primarily used for leisure and only open six days a week. If this site were developed with medium-density housing, it could provide around four thousand homes in the region.

Considering the 'Cotswold Airport' site could reduce the pressure on other sites like Moreton in Marsh, which is already due for overdevelopment. Moreton lacks the speedy access to London and other major employment areas and struggles with inadequate infrastructure to support its current population.

Comment ID: 10077

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Hugh Wainwright

Comment: Developing the Cotswolds to the degree that has been proposed by the Government will be counterproductive. The main reason that the area is a popular tourist destination for people from all over the world is the history, the buildings and the farmed countryside that has been created over centuries. The Government propose to wipe out all of this in less than twenty years creating an urban landscape that will not be a draw for tourism and will reduce foreign income considerably. Whilst there are a variety of businesses in the area many of them rely directly or indirectly on tourists.

Whilst no area should be held in aspic and a reasonable level of development must be expected the proposed level of urbanisation will destroy the goose that lays this golden egg of tourism, not just for the Cotswolds but the whole of the country. It must be borne in mind that after financial services the main source of income to the UK is tourism.

Comment ID: 10079

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Hugh Wainwright

Comment: In spite of Moreton in Marsh doubling in size over the last twenty years there has been little or no effort taken to develop the required infrastructure. Risk of flooding continues with warnings from the environment agency a regular occurrence. Raw sewage is pumped into the rivers at an unacceptable level. The doctors are under an unreasonable strain to provide medical care. Opportunities for new employment remain limited. Parking remains an issue that after fifteen years remains unresolved. In spite of Moreton being a 'principal settlement' it only has a primary school with no secondary education within walking distance. The list goes on with no effort given encourage a rise in the standards.

Comment ID: 253

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hal Moggridge

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

Comment ID: 166

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hall

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

Comment ID: 335

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hallam Land

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

Comment ID: 336

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hallam Land

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

Comment ID: 337

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hallam Land

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

Comment ID: 338

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hallam Land

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

Comment ID: 256

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hannah McCollum

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

Comment ID: 175

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hannah Walker and Luke Armitage

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

Comment ID: 421

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Harold Porter

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

Comment ID: 806

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Harold Stevens

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

Comment ID: 605

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Harper Crewe

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

Comment ID: 602

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Harriet Waddell

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

Comment ID: 849

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Harvey Barton

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

Comment ID: 488

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hatherop Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 159

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hazel Nichols

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

Comment ID: 453

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Heather Baker

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

Comment ID: 759

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Heather Jefferies

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

Comment ID: 781

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Helen Haiselden

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

Comment ID: 198

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hilary Apsley

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

Comment ID: 818

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hilary Apsley

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

Comment ID: 472

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hillary Becque

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

Comment ID: 683

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hillary Becque

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

Comment ID: 258

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hills Homes Developments Ltd

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

Comment ID: 294

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Historic England

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

Comment ID: 687

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hodges

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

Comment ID: 624

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Holly Robinson

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

Comment ID: 647

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Home Builders Federation

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

Comment ID: 873

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Home Grown Hotels Ltd

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

Comment ID: 168

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Honeybourne Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 854

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Hugo

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

Comment ID: 688

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Huw Jones

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