

Comment ID: 9498

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Valerie

Comment: Scenario 2 seems to be the fairest option in that it proposes spreading the responsibility for providing additional homes throughout all settlements from our larger towns down to the smallest hamlets. This may be a more challenging option but it would have less alarming impact. Farms with disused barns and yards, houses with large gardens, garage conversions, disused sheds, odd bits of unused land and buildings are scattered around us so if these were identified, owners approached with help to create homes (maybe subsidised architect consultations to help size up and cost a conversion/new build) then you could avoid enlarging our towns even more. Homes are needed by all sorts of people at different stages of their lives so you need creative not easy solutions perhaps! Small scale developments would not strain existing infrastructure. It's the large scale developments that put pressure on roads, water and sewage provision etc.

Comment ID: 9602

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Vic

Comment: I support the Councils preferred option subject to infrastructure improvements especially roads and healthcare.

Comment ID: 9605

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Vic

Comment: NO. Local councils, informed by local residents, are best placed to determine sustainability of developments in their area

Comment ID: 9607

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Vic

Comment: I don't support increasing density in North Cotswolds. It would adversely affect the character of the area.

Comment ID: 9652

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Vic

Comment: I do not think the proposed level of development up to 2034 is sustainable particularly in relation to the additional dwellings proposed in Mickleton and Willersley. The B4632 that runs between these settlements would require significant investment and structural improvement straightening bends and providing traffic calming measures in villages along its route in order to accommodate the increase in traffic which would follow such development. The B4632 is already struggling to cope with the volume of cars and heavy lorries, a significant number of which exceed the speed limits on these roads, causing a high risk of accidents and noise nuisance to residents living near the road.

Comment ID: 9653

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Vic

Comment: I do not think the proposed level of development up to 2034 is sustainable particularly in relation to the additional dwellings proposed in Mickleton and Willersley. The B4632 that runs between these settlements would require significant investment and structural improvement straightening bends and providing traffic calming measures in villages along its route in order to accommodate the increase in traffic which would follow such development. The B4632 is already struggling to cope with the volume of cars and heavy lorries, a significant number of which exceed the speed limits on these roads, causing a high risk of accidents and noise nuisance to residents living near the road.

Comment ID: 9654

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Vic

Comment: I do not think the proposed level of development up to 2034 is sustainable particularly in relation to the additional dwellings proposed in Mickleton and Willersley. The B4632 that runs between these settlements would require significant investment and structural improvement straightening bends and providing traffic calming measures in villages along its route in order to accommodate the increase in traffic which would follow such development. The B4632 is already struggling to cope with the volume of cars and heavy lorries, a significant number of which exceed the speed limits on these roads, causing a high risk of accidents and noise nuisance to residents living near the road.

Comment ID: 10312

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Vicente Rodriguez

Comment: None of the scenarios supports the aim of the Local Plan to be “green to the core”. They all undermine the ethos of the Cotswolds, the preservation of which has been central to previous CDC Local Plans. The scenarios take little account of the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

Scenario 5 destroys the rural and community attributes of a number of small villages and, in some cases transforms them into suburbs of larger towns thereby destroying their identity.

I do not support any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being treated as a Principal Settlement, because this designation does not reflect its true level of services or capacity.

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

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape.

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

Allowing a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan.

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

Comment ID: 10313

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Vicente Rodriguez

Comment: Adopting a plan that provides for development locations that are not considered sustainable is inconsistent with the NPPF and goes against everything that has been promoted in previous CDC Local Plans.

If CDC decides to locate developments in unsustainable sites it should admit publicly that it is abandoning good planning practice.

Siddington is being targeted because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10315

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Vicente Rodriguez

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations (such as Siddington) is inappropriate and likely disproportionate and would threaten their rural character.

Comment ID: 10319

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Vicente Rodriguez

Comment: Answer: There is no prospect of the proposed level of development in Siddington being sustainable. Siddington is currently reliant on Cirencester and we expect that would continue.

No. A three- to four-fold expansion would merge Siddington with Cirencester, overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk, and destroy the village's identity. The village's misclassification as a Principal Settlement further undermines the justification for this level of growth.

Comment ID: 9348

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Victoria

Comment: I do not believe the proposed level of development is sustainable.

For example, in Down Ampney, there is now frequent flooding each year (which didn't happen in the past) where access in and out of the village becomes impassable. Adding further large scale development in the village is likely to make this situation worse without substantial investment in the drainage infrastructure for the whole village.

Doctor's services in the area are already highly over subscribed and additional homes will place these under unsustainable pressure. Substantial investment would be needed to ensure sufficient medical services are available.

Similarly, local primary schools are at capacity and there are limited services / facilities in the village, nor is there a great public transport network. Promises to invest in services, infrastructure are always made with new developments but as shown for Down Ampney - there is little to show for the promises and impacts are worse (e.g. the flooding).

This goes to a broader challenge with the required level of housing provision - there are many family homes occupied by 1-2 people in the village, who understandably may not want to move. However, this leaves a very inefficient system - with supply challenges and below optimal occupation. So my question really is how confident are we in the housing needs figures and are the development sites proposed really aligned to that need (as what might work for a developer might not be aligned with what is actually needed, as this might not maximise profit).

That aside, when will the development stop!? This is just the latest round of projections but suitable sites are finite and as is often highlighted, we are an island and we're not making any more land - it feels like the assumption is that we can build indefinitely. Small scale development and enhancements to towns and villages makes good sense, when this is sensitive to the heritage, environment and socio economics. Large scale development across the district just can't be sustainable.

On top of that, as a nation with nature in such a poor state, this level of development can only make things worse. BNG offers something but doesn't really address the complexity and extent of impacts on the environment from development.

Comment ID: 9352

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Victoria

Comment: Nature recovery needs more emphasis in the vision & objectives. BNG is not sufficient on its own to deliver nature recovery (as it is a relatively simple measure of biodiversity and doesn't address all the impacts of habitat loss from development (e.g. on key species etc)). Support and action for initiatives that create additional diverse habitats, enhance those that already exist, help connect habitats across the landscape. Ecological complexity, functionality and diversity need to be promoted, and local communities involved in the process.

The addition could reference the LNRS to ensure joined up planning.

Plus the vision / objectives also should consider both land use change and land management (including nature-friendly farming for example).

Quality BNG should be promoted too to ensure this is not just a tick box exercise but it should be part of a wider, deeper commitment to nature recovery in the district.

Comment ID: 10982

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Victoria

Comment: The scenarios as outlined not only fail to plan positively for the development and infrastructure in the CDC area but certain of the underlying data and its assessment are flawed.

The CDC Local Plan 2011-2031 states, “The Cotswolds is internationally renowned for its natural beauty. The distinctive local building stone, used in the construction of the many magnificent historic buildings, is a hugely important part of the character that makes the Cotswolds a famous tourist destination. The interplay between the built and natural environment is a defining characteristic throughout the District, especially within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The distinctive heritage includes its numerous market towns and villages and their settings, as well as individual heritage assets. The quality of the District's built and natural environment is reflected in the high number of environmental and heritage assets (both designated and non-designated).”

It is a distinct challenge that 80% of the CDC area falls within the National Landscape; however, the adopted scenario should continue to support this “throughout the District”. Quite simply it is not sustainable, nor equitable, for 20% of an area to absorb a nationally-led housing allocation of 18,650 for the total CDC area.

Rather than contributing to the aim of sustainable development as required by the NPPF, the CDC-recommended Scenario 5 reflects the above situation which would result in the decimation of numerous small rural villages, some being swallowed up into towns, their community and identity lost to suburbia.

As a resident of Siddington, I strongly object to the adoption of Scenario 5 as drafted. On paper Siddington has been mistakenly classified as a Principal Settlement – the reality is a village of 339 dwellings without existing infrastructure capacity nor community facilities to provide a foundation for sustainable extension (including issues relating to transport links, parking, water supply, and flooding). Allocating 1,100 homes to a village of 339 dwellings is wholly disproportionate and inconsistent with sustainable development.

Thriving villages and their local communities should be respected and supported; development should be both proportionate in scale to and complement village character.

Accordingly, I would support Scenario 3 — growth based on the Main Service Centres which have the infrastructure, facilities, and jobs to provide a foundation for sustainable development as opposed to swamping small rural villages such as Siddington.

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

- Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape.
- Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.
- Allowing a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan.
- The selection of Siddington for strategic development is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations.

Comment ID: 10983

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Victoria

Comment: No, unsustainable locations should not be used to meet the government housing target. Siddington has been selected because it is outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable.

It is a distinct challenge that 80% of the CDC area falls within the National Landscape; however, the adopted scenario should continue to support this “throughout the District”. Quite simply it is not sustainable, nor equitable, for 20% of an area to absorb a nationally-led housing allocation of 18,650 for the total CDC area.

The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure.

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

- Smaller, non-strategic developments throughout the Cotswold National Landscape.
- Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.
- Allowing a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan.
- The selection of Siddington for strategic development is inconsistent with the conclusions of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations.

Comment ID: 10984

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Victoria

Comment: As a minimum any development should complement or enhance existing street plans and the Cotswolds distinctive vernacular architecture.

I would support increasing housing density but only where appropriate and sustainable ie. NOT in rural/village locations such as Siddington, and only in a complementary architectural format and where infrastructure allows.

For instance, in Scenario 3 “quiet densification” would be an appropriate approach to extending from main service centres: bastide-style development rather than the incongruous suburban sprawl of rows of small detached houses and gardens, or urban overly tall buildings. Found in SW France, bastides are planned villages or small towns centred around a market square often with covered arcades hosting shops and amenities – they are walkable, sociable, promote community and jobs (like the urban “15-minute city” idea). Bastides not only support a higher density centrally but have a village-style setting. This type of master planning (as opposed to a series of builder-led developments) provides community: suitable housing together with infrastructure, facilities, and jobs.

Comment ID: 10985

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Victoria

Comment: No, the proposed levels of development up to 2043 and beyond are not sustainable in relation to Siddington. These appear to be based on Siddington's mistaken classification as a Principal Settlement.

Siddington is a village of 339 dwellings currently supported by creaking rural infrastructure (including issues relating to transport links, parking, water supply and flooding) – it is an unsustainable (and unrealistic) foundation to extend for a further 880-1,100 dwellings.

Comment ID: 10986

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Victoria

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

- The incorrect Principal Settlement classification
- The protection of village identity and cohesion
- Flood resilience
- Rural infrastructure limits
- The importance of the green buffer with Cirencester

Comment ID: 10987

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Victoria

Comment: I agree with the vision but the proposals in the Consultation document will not deliver that vision. From the perspective of Siddington, the proposals:

- Do not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing community.
- Will involve development that does not prioritise environmental stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.
- Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.
- Will not result in Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community.
- Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington.
- Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington.
- Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks.
- Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately
- Will reduce the green space available to the Siddington community.

Comment ID: 11122

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Victoria

Comment: I think that high rise buildings of flats would be significantly out of keeping with the Cotswold vernacular appearance- as would small dwellings with insufficient car parking to meet modern needs (and causing local congestion). Therefore I have significant concern that high-density housing would detract from the historical pattern of dwellings across Cotswold district.

Comment ID: 11123

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Victoria

Comment: The proposed site to the north east of Lechlade is next to two tightly packed and congested traffic junctions where there are daily queues of 6+ vehicles at (Hambidge Lane onto Station Road plus Manor Farm into Station Road). Adding more traffic to this junction by building on the field beyond would lead to a dangerous series of junctions there. Significant road infrastructure changes would be needed to open the space- which would involve removing historic walls or several houses- this seems ridiculous.

The field potentially being developed (south of Ferrers park) is also a huge soak of water for the northern part of the town. Without the field there significant flood protection could be needed as many of the surrounding houses sit lower than the field, so run off water would be a likely issue- needing sewage infrastructure updates.

Comment ID: 11126

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Victoria

Comment: Within your infrastructure areas to explore I do not see 'maintenance of wild animal environmental habitats'. The infrastructure of our natural environment also needs considering here please.

Comment ID: 10908

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: Support Scenario 5 with caveats to protect Chipping Campden.

- Scenario 5 best evidences how the Council intends to meet the sharply increased housing target (18,650 homes / 1,036 per year) by combining current strategy with new settlements and/or strategic extensions; it delivers ~14,660 homes (79%) within the plan period - more than Scenarios 1 – 4 - while recognising CNL constraints.
- Major development in the CNL is not considered viable (Scenario 6) except in exceptional circumstances, so strategic growth should be outside the CNL; this is essential for Chipping Campden, whose parish lies entirely within the CNL.
- The consultation acknowledges delivery risks on large sites and infrastructure bottlenecks (e.g., water/wastewater and Thames Water's financial position); this underscores the need for robust phasing and infrastructure guarantees before allocations that could indirectly burden Chipping Campden.

Any growth selected in surrounding settlements must be planned holistically to avoid un-joined-up cumulative impacts on Campden's highways (incl. A44/B4081 junction), parking, flood risk, water/sewage capacity, schools and health services, and dark skies.

Comment ID: 10909

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: No.

Locating development in unsustainable areas undermines the plan's soundness and conflicts with national policy's requirement to prioritise sustainable locations. The Council's own preferred approach emphasises transport connectivity, services, facilities and employment - and accepts that CNL constraints may justify lower requirements or redistribution (including unmet need discussions with neighbours) rather than forcing growth into unsuitable places.

For Chipping Campden, the CNL designation, valley/flood context, constrained access and infrastructure limits make it particularly unsuitable for major growth, so using Campden to "make up numbers" would be unsound.

Comment ID: 10912

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: Limited support, context sensitive only; not appropriate for Chipping Campden's townscape.

- The consultation explains that achieving the target via density would require urban scale densities (91–267 dwellings/ha) on eligible sites - out of character in most rural locations and challenging where conservation areas, heritage settings and landscape constrain height and layout.
- In Chipping Campden, higher densities or taller buildings would harm historic character and erosion of burgage plot pattern; design should respect traditional forms and provide accessible downsizing options for older residents, rather than high rise or overly compact schemes.

Pragmatic stance: Support modest, design led density improvements outside the CNL and in transport rich strategic sites - if infrastructure and housing mix (including affordability and accessibility) are demonstrably deliverable and compatible with local character.

Comment ID: 10934

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: Limited support, context sensitive only; not appropriate for Chipping Campden's townscape.

- The consultation explains that achieving the target via density would require urban scale densities (91–267 dwellings/ha) on eligible sites - out of character in most rural locations and challenging where conservation areas, heritage settings and landscape constrain height and layout.
- In Chipping Campden, higher densities or taller buildings would harm historic character and erosion of burgage plot pattern; design should respect traditional forms and provide accessible downsizing options for older residents, rather than high rise or overly compact schemes.

Pragmatic stance: Support modest, design led density improvements outside the CNL and in transport rich strategic sites - if infrastructure and housing mix (including affordability and accessibility) are demonstrably deliverable and compatible with local character.

Comment ID: 10918

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: Percentage growth in Campden may be acceptable in isolation, but cumulative growth proposed for Moreton in Marsh, Mickleton, Willersey, and other nearby settlements will shift burdens onto Campden unless infrastructure is planned and funded up front. Key constraints and asks:

- Water supply & sewage: Current networks already under pressure; local plants at/near capacity; growth (including the Aston Road proposal in Campden) requires significant upgrades before additional allocations.
- Flood risk & drainage: Campden's 2007 flooding and recent near misses reflect the volatile Cam catchment, restricted culverts, and surface water run off from northern slopes; maintenance of drains/watercourses and avoiding development on north slopes are essential.
- Electricity: While Campden's supply has improved, nearby settlements report more outages; strategic growth must include grid reinforcement and battery storage siting guidance.
- Education: Chipping Campden School (~1,475 students) with potential expansion to ~2,000 still may not meet catchment demand with area wide growth; traffic at peak school times causes severe delays (30 - 45 min) affecting emergency response. Growth must fund capacity, access, and transport management.
- Highways & parking: Campden is at capacity for traffic/parking; the A44/B4081 junction has a poor accident record; require signals/roundabout, new car parks (both ends of town), and HGV routing management to mitigate increased flows from surrounding development.
- Public transport/rail: Support Honeybourne connectivity, potential light rail/tram options, and long term Stratford to Honeybourne line reinstatement to relieve road pressure - paired with active travel improvements that are realistic for rural topography.
- Healthcare & social services: Primary care already stretched; a potential new surgery will serve Chipping Campden and the wider area (Mickleton, Willersey, Paxford, Ebrington); growth must fund capacity and accessible transport for an ageing population reliant on volunteer drivers.

Plan wide alignment: These asks are consistent with the consultation's commitment to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) covering education, health, transport, utilities, flood management, digital infrastructure, and renewables, and its acknowledgement that Thames Water issues may delay housing delivery without upfront investment.

Comment ID: 10927

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: We request explicit policy coverage on:

- Battery storage in rural locations: A unified siting/scale/hazard framework to manage safety, landscape, and cumulative impacts near heritage towns like Campden.
- Nature recovery & BNG at scale: Clear mapping of ecological networks and green/blue infrastructure that residents can understand, linked to wellbeing and climate resilience.
- Education & skills pathways: Improve post 16 technical/apprenticeship access (currently car dependent), and align growth with local training/employment - particularly given Campden's tourism/hospitality, agricultural economy, Campden BRI, and nearby industrial estates.

The consultation confirms these will be covered via county wide Housing & Employment Needs Assessment, Town Centres Study, Gypsy & Traveller Assessment, and the IDP - we support and ask that Campden's context be specifically addressed.

Comment ID: 10930

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Victoria Bates

Comment: Broadly support the revised Vision and Objectives (“Green to the Core”), with the following additions for soundness and deliverability:

1. Explicit reference to education and skills in support of the local economy (apprenticeships, technical education, lifelong learning).
2. Community hubs integrating health, education, culture, housing, leisure, arts/crafts, and local shops to reduce car dependency for Campden’s ageing population.
3. Landscape led design codes for CNL settlements (like Campden), protecting dark skies, heritage townscapes, and views while enabling appropriate downsizing and accessible homes.

These refinements align with the consultation’s emphasis on climate, heritage, design quality, sustainable transport, and infrastructure delivery.

Comment ID: 722

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Valerie Pinnell

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

Comment ID: 549

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Vicente Rodriguez

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

Comment ID: 237

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Victoria Clarkson

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