

Comment ID: 10871

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: B Langton

Comment: The Cotswolds are undergoing a form of social cleansing with wealthy people moving to the area, especially since the covid pandemic. Many older people too. Younger people cant afford to stay.

The public transport is terrible with no night time service and poor connections to local hospitals, employment and cultural offerings at Cheltenham and Gloucester. Kemble station is frightening at night when you are stranded.

Cycling around Cirencester is already a dangerous afterthought in the road system and a few drop kerbs from the steadings is not going to help. Walking from the Steadings is more than the claimed 20 minutes and if Council planners cannot challenge this type of claim it is bad for all of us.

The traffic in and around Cirencester is always going to be problematic due to only half a bypass and the lack of planning as the Lidl, Greggs area has been developed. Active and green transport should be a top priority. It feels that all the focus in Cirencester is on electric car infrastructure which many of us cant afford and no focus on public transport, walking and cycling. Why not have a regular bus to meet trains at Kemble?

I would like to see a halt to all new housing except for social housing to meet the needs of local people. If we must have new housing it should be a completely new settlement with its own infrastructure and services. New housing should be to improve our communities and with our input and not imposed on us by government targets and speculating land owners. I would like to know how many holiday rentals and second homes exist in Cotswold District which i suspect is putting far more pressure on housing needs.

The southern area of the district is at risk of flooding.

Comment ID: 10852

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: B Langton

Comment: I do not think any new housing should be allocated to existing settlement until the local SOCIAL housing needs are met. Holiday homes and second homes should be barred.

Comment ID: 10800

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Barbara Chamberlain

Comment: I haven't found any mention of the criteria including the nature of the land to be used for housing development. I prefer the development of what is sometimes referred to as 'brownfield land', ie, land which may have had some kind of development in the past, rather than land which has been used only for agricultural use, recreation, or has scenic qualities. I am aware that developers prefer to use previously undeveloped land which does not require the cost of cleaning up. However, I consider Developers should be encouraged/forced to use such land as much as possible. Food security is a growing concern and our region includes much land suitable for agricultural use. In my view, food security is as an important a factor as the provision of housing. Our growing population needs both. Also, change of use of existing buildings should be a significant consideration to provide housing.

Comment ID: 10811

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Barbara Chamberlain

Comment: Increasing density may be acceptable in the provision of housing for older people (thereby enabling downsizing).

As I age, I see the benefits of smaller houses & gardens, potentially flats, as long as there is some outside space, the area is quiet and there is easy access to shops, services and facilities. As an example, friends live in the centre of the historic city of York, in a development called Bedern, which has fairly high density, a mixture of houses & apartments, shared green space, parking spaces, just a few minutes walk to all the facilities within the city walls of York.

Comment ID: 10816

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Barbara Chamberlain

Comment: I could not find any mention of the proportion of houses used as second homes or holiday lets. I understand that Tourism is a crucial part of the economy of the Cotswolds and, therefore, the provision of suitable accommodation is necessary to sustain this. However, if there is a need to break into undeveloped land to provide more housing, there should also be serious consideration of how many houses are not main homes and encouraging/forcing the restoring of these to be main homes. Certainly, there should be stringent enforcement of new development being only for main homes. Potentially there is conflict between retaining the features of the Cotswolds which make it attractive to Tourists and unattractive over development which might deter Tourists. Also, some hotels & pubs which provide accommodation for Tourists are closing as AirBnB properties increase. As I walk around attractive Cotswold towns & villages, I see many well situated potential homes which are not in use as main homes.

Comment ID: 9174

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Belinda Embear

Comment: Myself and my husband were born in Siddington and we are appalled to hear of the plan to build 1100 houses in our village. The main concerns are of infrastructure and the sewage plant, the green belt area that will no longer be there. we are a village and want to remain a village not be lumped together and lose our identity. Flooding is also a concern, how also can the school, shop, hospital that is also being reduced in service and surgeries cope. Also the 2500 houses that are supposed to be built for the steadings are still not finished. We strongly object to this proposal as well as the majority of the villagers. We know that houses have to be built. but not in Siddington on such a huge scale.

Comment ID: 9573

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Not sure what this actually means - what is beyond conventional housing?
Anything that is built needs to conform to the local vernacular and aesthetics of the Cotswolds and not repeat the awful housing styles and quality of the 60's, 70's, 80's and 90's

Comment ID: 9566

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: As per previous comments MIM could not cope with this level of building - you are proposing to more than double the existing town without any detail on how you will develop the infrastructure to cope with this level of increase. It would drown the town - literally - and also cause secondary impacts to towns and roads around other settlements - e.g. Stow On the Wold where the A44 can not cope today.

Comment ID: 9575

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Need to consider where the tradespeople will come from to build this level of housing - there is already a shortage of good quality tradesmen - most will likely live outside the area contributing to increased levels of traffic and pollution.

Having lived in a new development this year - the level of craftsmanship is poor - the developer clearly cutting corners and using tradespeople not qualified to do the jobs - will result in a load of badly built houses and likely extortionate prices

Comment ID: 9576

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: I do not see why any Council needs to provide sites for these people - they do not contribute in anyway to the local areas - quite the opposite

Comment ID: 9565

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Thames Waters ability to build and maintain the infrastructure to cope with this level of building is seriously in question. In MIM it has already said it can't cope with more building, the current system is at and beyond capacity and any planned improvements must be in doubt due to their financial difficulty.

Comment ID: 9577

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: 2. The Plan Is Not “Effective” Due to Severe Infrastructure Constraints

The NPPF requires development to be supported by necessary infrastructure and for plans to be deliverable over the plan period. Moreton-in-Marsh currently lacks the infrastructure capacity to support such extensive expansion.

Transport (A44, A429, Local Road Network)

The A44 and A429 already operate at or near capacity.

Congestion is routine, with no committed funding for major upgrades.

Many proposed sites rely on narrow rural lanes that are unsuitable for high-volume traffic or emergency access.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs requiring safe and suitable access for all users and reducing reliance on private car travel.

Rail Capacity

The North Cotswold Line includes single-track sections, limiting service frequency and resilience.

Trains are already heavily loaded at peak times.

No confirmed investment exists to expand capacity.

The plan does not demonstrate how rail infrastructure will support thousands of additional residents.

Education Provision

Moreton-in-Marsh has no secondary school.

Surrounding schools are already oversubscribed.

There is no funded or deliverable plan for a new secondary school.

This fails the NPPF requirement for sufficient choice of school places and undermines deliverability.

Health & Public Services

GP and community health services are at capacity.

Waste management systems are already stretched.

No infrastructure delivery plan demonstrates how these deficits will be addressed.

Retail & Community Facilities

The town lacks a full-service supermarket, forcing residents to travel to Stow-on-the-Wold via the A44.

This increases car dependency and worsens congestion in an already constrained area.

Sporting and leisure facilities are limited, with no gyms or adequate recreation spaces to support a doubled population.

Without a credible infrastructure strategy, the plan is not effective.

Comment ID: 9559

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Appreciating the need for more housing in an area constrained by other national policies none of the options are great and need to be more spread out - if Option 5 is the least of the worse solutions the proposed MIM increase needs seriously looking at - the town could simply not cope with that level of increased traffic - unless you are going to by pass the town or significantly improve the main 2 routes through the town and divert traffic away from the town.

Comment ID: 9562

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: The council should now start to consider discouraging 2nd home ownership and holiday home ownership across the Cotswolds - this would release significant housing stock - e.g. I understand 1 person owns over 16 holiday lets in MIM - this is just ludicrous.

The council also needs to really explore and ensure all brownfield sites are been reviewed and included for development before any more green belt is destroyed.

Comment ID: 9561

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: 100% not you can not and should not put housing in unsustainable areas - it would be foolish.

Comment ID: 9563

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: need to be very careful on this - small, cramped in housing development is a disaster leading to people feeling confined, subjective to inconsiderate noisy behaviour.

Flats at height only on brownfield sites - area just not suitable for higher rise blocks of flat would ruin the natural, rural environment

Comment ID: 9570

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Comments for Moreton In Marsh - its not sustainable. You would need:

Roads - by pass the town or increase the width of the roads - some suggestions are down a single country lane - 1 areas has a single crossing point in Evenlode Road - cars would also need to be banned from parking on Evenlode Road near the A44 - and therefore other parking would be needed.

Education - new schools, including a secondary school would be built.

Retail - a new major super market - Aldi does not provide the range of day to day needs people require - CoOp is horrendously expensive and out of reach of most people. Pressure on the roads to Stow and Tesco would become a bigger nightmare than they are today. Retail in the town is poor - outdated, old fashioned shops not selling what people need - no butchers, grocer, flower shops, household items - increasingly just Turkish Barbers and Kebab Shops.

Sports - no proper gym, only small ones, and the Fire Service College which is in a poor state or repair, has miserable staff and so difficult to join and would likely become a casualty of the planned development.

Water / Waste - make comments elsewhere about the infrastructure strain.

Environment - need to maintain open green spaces for people to get out and about and also ensure the wildlife flourishes and not driven out further.

Comment ID: 9578

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Seems sensible

Comment ID: 9557

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Response to Cotswold District Council Local Plan Consultation –
Moreton-in-Marsh (Policy Soundness & NPPF Compliance)

I am submitting this representation in relation to the scale of development proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh in the emerging Local Plan. The level of growth suggested — effectively doubling the size of the town — raises significant concerns regarding soundness, deliverability, and compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1. The Proposed Scale of Growth Is Not “Justified” (NPPF Soundness Test)

Under the NPPF, plans must be justified, meaning they should be based on proportionate evidence and represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

The evidence base does not demonstrate:

Why Moreton-in-Marsh should accommodate one of the highest proportional increases in the district

How this aligns with settlement hierarchy principles

Why alternative settlements with stronger infrastructure baselines have not been prioritised

Without a clear rationale, the proposed scale of growth fails the “justified” test.

2. The Plan Is Not “Effective” Due to Severe Infrastructure Constraints

The NPPF requires development to be supported by necessary infrastructure and for plans to be deliverable over the plan period. Moreton-in-Marsh currently lacks the infrastructure capacity to support such extensive expansion.

Transport (A44, A429, Local Road Network)

The A44 and A429 already operate at or near capacity.

Congestion is routine, with no committed funding for major upgrades.

Many proposed sites rely on narrow rural lanes that are unsuitable for high-volume traffic or emergency access.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs requiring safe and suitable access for all users and reducing reliance on private car travel.

Rail Capacity

The North Cotswold Line includes single-track sections, limiting service frequency and resilience.

Trains are already heavily loaded at peak times.

No confirmed investment exists to expand capacity.

The plan does not demonstrate how rail infrastructure will support thousands of additional residents.

Education Provision

Moreton-in-Marsh has no secondary school.

Surrounding schools are already oversubscribed.

There is no funded or deliverable plan for a new secondary school.

This fails the NPPF requirement for sufficient choice of school places and undermines deliverability.

Health & Public Services

GP and community health services are at capacity.

Waste management systems are already stretched.

No infrastructure delivery plan demonstrates how these deficits will be addressed.

Retail & Community Facilities

The town lacks a full-service supermarket, forcing residents to travel to Stow-on-the-Wold via the A44.

This increases car dependency and worsens congestion in an already constrained area.

Sporting and leisure facilities are limited, with no gyms or adequate recreation spaces to support a doubled population.

Without a credible infrastructure strategy, the plan is not effective.

3. The Plan Is Not “Consistent with National Policy” (NPPF)

Sustainable Development (NPPF Chapter 2)

The NPPF requires development to be sustainable, balancing economic, social, and environmental objectives.

The proposed scale of growth in Moreton-in-Marsh fails this test:

It increases car dependency due to limited local services.

It places development pressure on sensitive landscapes and deep green belt areas.

It risks harming biodiversity and local wildlife habitats.

It does not align with the NPPF's requirement to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

Design & Heritage (NPPF Chapter 12 & 16)

Moreton-in-Marsh has a distinctive historic character. The NPPF requires new development to:

Be sympathetic to local character

Use local materials

Maintain historic street patterns

Conserve heritage assets

Any large-scale, generic housing estates would conflict with these principles unless strict vernacular design codes are applied.

4. Deliverability Concerns: Workforce & Construction Capacity

The NPPF requires plans to be deliverable. The construction sector is already experiencing national shortages of skilled labour. The plan does not explain:

Where the workforce will come from

How build-out rates will be achieved

How infrastructure will be delivered in parallel with housing

This raises serious questions about deliverability within the plan period.

5. Environmental Constraints & Landscape Impact

Several proposed sites lie within or adjacent to sensitive landscapes. The NPPF requires councils to:

Minimise pollution

Protect biodiversity

Avoid development in areas with poor access

Prioritise brownfield land

The proposed expansion areas do not meet these criteria.

6. Overall Soundness Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed scale of development in Moreton-in-Marsh does not meet the NPPF tests of soundness:

Not justified

Not effective

Not consistent with national policy

Not demonstrably deliverable

A more balanced, infrastructure-led approach is required, with growth distributed proportionately across settlements with the capacity to support it.

Comment ID: 9558

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Ben Hunter Woollard

Comment: Response to Cotswold District Council Local Plan Consultation –
Moreton-in-Marsh (Policy Soundness & NPPF Compliance)

I am submitting this representation in relation to the scale of development proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh in the emerging Local Plan. The level of growth suggested — effectively doubling the size of the town — raises significant concerns regarding soundness, deliverability, and compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1. The Proposed Scale of Growth Is Not “Justified” (NPPF Soundness Test)

Under the NPPF, plans must be justified, meaning they should be based on proportionate evidence and represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

The evidence base does not demonstrate:

Why Moreton-in-Marsh should accommodate one of the highest proportional increases in the district

How this aligns with settlement hierarchy principles

Why alternative settlements with stronger infrastructure baselines have not been prioritised

Without a clear rationale, the proposed scale of growth fails the “justified” test.

2. The Plan Is Not “Effective” Due to Severe Infrastructure Constraints

The NPPF requires development to be supported by necessary infrastructure and for plans to be deliverable over the plan period. Moreton-in-Marsh currently lacks the infrastructure capacity to support such extensive expansion.

Transport (A44, A429, Local Road Network)

The A44 and A429 already operate at or near capacity.

Congestion is routine, with no committed funding for major upgrades.

Many proposed sites rely on narrow rural lanes that are unsuitable for high-volume traffic or emergency access.

This conflicts with NPPF paragraphs requiring safe and suitable access for all users and reducing reliance on private car travel.

Rail Capacity

The North Cotswold Line includes single-track sections, limiting service frequency and resilience.

Trains are already heavily loaded at peak times.

No confirmed investment exists to expand capacity.

The plan does not demonstrate how rail infrastructure will support thousands of additional residents.

Education Provision

Moreton-in-Marsh has no secondary school.

Surrounding schools are already oversubscribed.

There is no funded or deliverable plan for a new secondary school.

This fails the NPPF requirement for sufficient choice of school places and undermines deliverability.

Health & Public Services

GP and community health services are at capacity.

Waste management systems are already stretched.

No infrastructure delivery plan demonstrates how these deficits will be addressed.

Retail & Community Facilities

The town lacks a full-service supermarket, forcing residents to travel to Stow-on-the-Wold via the A44.

This increases car dependency and worsens congestion in an already constrained area.

Sporting and leisure facilities are limited, with no gyms or adequate recreation spaces to support a doubled population.

Without a credible infrastructure strategy, the plan is not effective.

3. The Plan Is Not “Consistent with National Policy” (NPPF)

Sustainable Development (NPPF Chapter 2)

The NPPF requires development to be sustainable, balancing economic, social, and environmental objectives.

The proposed scale of growth in Moreton-in-Marsh fails this test:

It increases car dependency due to limited local services.

It places development pressure on sensitive landscapes and deep green belt areas.

It risks harming biodiversity and local wildlife habitats.

It does not align with the NPPF's requirement to protect and enhance valued landscapes.

Design & Heritage (NPPF Chapter 12 & 16)

Moreton-in-Marsh has a distinctive historic character. The NPPF requires new development to:

Be sympathetic to local character

Use local materials

Maintain historic street patterns

Conserve heritage assets

Any large-scale, generic housing estates would conflict with these principles unless strict vernacular design codes are applied.

4. Deliverability Concerns: Workforce & Construction Capacity

The NPPF requires plans to be deliverable. The construction sector is already experiencing national shortages of skilled labour. The plan does not explain:

Where the workforce will come from

How build-out rates will be achieved

How infrastructure will be delivered in parallel with housing

This raises serious questions about deliverability within the plan period.

5. Environmental Constraints & Landscape Impact

Several proposed sites lie within or adjacent to sensitive landscapes. The NPPF requires councils to:

Minimise pollution

Protect biodiversity

Avoid development in areas with poor access

Prioritise brownfield land

The proposed expansion areas do not meet these criteria.

6. Overall Soundness Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed scale of development in Moreton-in-Marsh does not meet the NPPF tests of soundness:

Not justified

Not effective

Not consistent with national policy

Not demonstrably deliverable

A more balanced, infrastructure-led approach is required, with growth distributed proportionately across settlements with the capacity to support it.

Comment ID: 9858

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Ben Maxwell

Comment: I am appalled at the suggestion that so many houses are built at Driffield, and particularly at Ampney Crucis. The local roads struggle already with the quantity of traffic, and other local infrastructure is also insufficient. The area north of Ampney Crucis in particular is beautiful unspoilt country.

Comment ID: 9860

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Ben Maxwell

Comment: The massive expansion of settlements east of Cirencester (and in Ciren itself) seems totally inappropriate. It will spoil the special character of the area, and overwhelm the roads. The A417 is already very busy.

Comment ID: 8688

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Ben Owen

Comment: absolutely crazy to suggest Down Ampney can almost double in size in less than 20 years! Other areas that have been less developed or ignored over recent times should be priority, it shouldn't be all about the south of the county

Comment ID: 8905

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Benjamin

Comment: yes. The provision of wildlife corridors (woodland, hedgerows, ponds, marshes, meadows etc.) should be included here.

Comment ID: 8906

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Benjamin

Comment: I agree with all that is stated. There should be a point added in objective b. about biodiversity, i.e. increasing wildlife abundance and richness of species. There should be a point added in objective c. detailing how the council will ensure that housing is used for primary residence and not as second homes or short-term lets. If these houses need to be built to account for a national shortage of places to live, it's vital that we ensure that they're used by people to live in. This can be partially achieved by refusing planning on all future short-term lets in the district.

Comment ID: 8914

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

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: Adding large scale housing developments to a rural village like Blockley will spoil its well documented approach for walkers. Blockley has 12 public footpaths in and out of the village and among them we are blessed to have lovely pictures routes such as the Heart of England Way and Monarchs Way.

Comment ID: 8910

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: Building hundred and thousands of houses in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty seems ludicrous. The Greenland and farmland areas provide hardly enough sustainable space for wildlife to continue to flourish. Being a resident in Blockley we are riddled with natural springs and excess construction and overdevelopment would make existing drainage and waste water treatment issues worse.

Comment ID: 8912

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: I believe the government should consider looking at land reclamation at coastal level similar to Holland and Hong Kong rather than concerting over farm and green spaces adding to the notorious adding to the annual flooding in areas and rivers bursting their banks and flooding large areas. Natural drainage of excess rain is crucial to the environment.

Comment ID: 8911

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: I cannot support any large scale housing projects as the roads in rural areas are riddled with potholes as it stands and we have a large number of narrow roads and single file roads surrounding our area which simply cannot cope safely with any additional road traffic.

Comment ID: 8908

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: 2.6.3 I would like to question the classification of Blockley as a principal settlement, as we do not have access to a doctor surgery or pharmacist within the village.

Comment ID: 8909

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: Out of 616 houses in Blockley over 70 are 2nd homes or holiday lets. Adding 21% of houses on top seems unsustainable. Being a resident on upper Greenway Road we have problems with the existing infrastructure within the village and surrounding areas. A number of properties haven't got sufficient water pressure and fresh water supply. The Road drainage is insufficient and on a wet days Greenway Road becomes a water shoot with excess rain water spilling out of the often blocked up drains- and manhole covers. Waste water frequently enters brooks and rivers untreated as the Severn Trent plant can't cope with the existing housing stock. Tarmacking and concreting over existing green and farmland seems completely irresponsible given the existing water supply and drainage issues in place. Also Greenway Road has on the upper section no safe public footpath in place. With the shortage of public transportation adding more car traffic to a little village seems ludicrous and access via car onto the main A roads is challenging during rush hours and school run traffic times as there are no traffic lights or roundabout in place outside Blockley.

Comment ID: 8913

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Bernhard Russ

Comment: How does the math work on bellow table. Looking at Blockley adding 21 percent of housing stock on top seems out of proportion when you suggest to only add about 12 percent to the housing stock in Stow on the Wold or approx 8.4 percent to South Cerney. These later towns have a much better infrastructure in place with doctors, pharmacists and larger supermarkets and better transport links. All of these facilities are currently missing in Blockley.

Comment ID: 9600

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: By using the "standard method" the housing targets for the Cotswold district Council are drastically imbalanced and affect a small proportion of the land available as 80% of the land area in the Cotswold District is designated AONB and not suitable for development. The standard method therefore results in an unfair burden being placed on the remaining 20% of land and communities within the Cotswold District. There is a high likelihood of social and environmental polarisation between areas inside and outside the AONB.

Comment ID: 9603

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: Addressing item 2.4 - There are insufficient sites within the available 20% of Cotswold District to meet the target set by the standard method. The Duty to Co-operate by neighbouring authorities should be implemented at the earliest stage.

Comment ID: 9615

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: All scenarios negatively impact Preston village and surrounding countryside. The parish of Preston is mainly countryside with scattered dwellings and small businesses. Part of Preston village is designated Conservation Area - partly defined by it's rural setting and separation from Cirencester. This is a small village community that values its rural buffer from Cirencester. All the scenarios swamp Preston and will irrevocably change its rural character forever. They all raise concerns about the impact on traffic, road congestion and safety with further pressure on already congested sites such as Kingshill Lane, Tesco roundabout and Preston Toll bar. Huge infrastructure investment will be needed to support the proposed scale of growth.

Comment ID: 9613

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: Absolutely not. Houses built in sites that are unsuitable physically (e.g. flood risk) or because of separation from infrastructure (schools, accessible transport, medical facilities) should not be built.

Comment ID: 9619

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: While higher density development is might be appropriate for urban settings it is unsuitable for Preston and also the other smaller villages in the Cotswold District. It's essential to ensure the rural and historic character and beauty of the Preston as it borders the Cotswold AONB. Any development in Preston should be of low density with plenty of open space and trees with a substantial green buffer to preserve the identity of the village and clearly separate it from new development (this is supported by the Design in Preston statement adopted by CDC in 2017 and Preston's Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013 - 2031)

Comment ID: 9621

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: The expansion of Preston from a small village community of around 88 houses to over 2,400 houses will impact highway safety, traffic and the natural countryside surrounding this village.

Comment ID: 9624

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: Expansion of Preston by over 2500 homes would destroy it's rural identity. Any development must preserve it's green buffer and rural identity. Safe, continuous walking and cycling routes between Preston and Cirencester linking to schools and other facilities must be included in any plan. Preston must be protected from becoming a convenient through route for the inevitable high volume of traffic which would have a detrimental environmental effect and also negatively impact the safety of the local roads. The local roads would require significant development to accommodate the inevitable heavy traffic. Flooding of the A419 at Preston Till Bar must be addressed as should pedestrian safety measures. Provision for emergency services access has to be considered as demonstrated by recent fatal road accidents at the Preston Toll Bar roundabout. Improved provision of schooling , medical and dental facilities would be required.

This expansion seems unsafe and detrimental to the rural character of Preston and the safety of it's residents.

Comment ID: 9606

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: All the scenarios proposed will result in significant increase in the traffic, noise, highway safety and available parking in Cirencester (which already suffers with problems regarding these issues) as well as neighbouring Preston with the latter completely losing its identity as a small village and community. The speed and rate of proposed housing development is also likely to result in poor quality design and materials used that will not be coherent with the local architecture

Comment ID: 9611

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Bidemi Alli

Comment: All the scenarios have the same issue, which is rooted in the relatively small area available for development. The skewed impact means that if main service hubs are developed then population density increases to an unappealing level and if smaller villages and towns are developed then the impact on their character and communities is devastating. All scenarios suffer from a negative environmental impact with worsening traffic as well as lack of infrastructure, obvious local job opportunities and an already stretched road infrastructure and poor local public transport options.

Comment ID: 9449

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: We support CDC's preferred option 5, for the reasons they set out.

Comment ID: 9450

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: No, we do not agree with this: unsustainable = unsustainable all the schemes must be sustainable!

Comment ID: 9451

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: We agreeing with concept of higher densities but not at he expense of smaller room sizes/houses.

Flats/maisonettes should be considered.

Comment ID: 9452

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: Realistically unless local authorities are enabled to build housing like in the post war years, the housing numbers will always be theoretical. It is not in the house builders interests to meet targets as they can keep their profits high.

With regard to the question are they sustainable in theory yes.

Comment ID: 9453

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: We believe you have covered the main elements here. We assume crematories, Crematorium and associated facilities are included in communities and culture

Comment ID: 9454

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Bob Sharples

Comment: We agree the vision as it is set out.

Comment ID: 9742

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: I prefer scenario 1.

I do support higher density. My priority is that as little of paradise gets paved over or built on as possible. Presumably, higher density housing reduces the 'footprint' of building, thus minimising the loss of paradise land.

Comment ID: 9743

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Of course the Council would be silly to consider unsustainable development. Don't let get built what isn't wanted and/or cannot last.

Comment ID: 9744

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Yes, I would support higher density developments in preference to suburban sprawl.

Comment ID: 9748

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: The Council apparently dislikes the idea of creating a whole new town. That seems to me a mistake. A new town will spoil one area; but adding a lot of houses to a number of different towns will spoil all of them, and multiply existing infrastructure nightmares.

Comment ID: 9753

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: In Gloucestershire, the distinction between National Landscape and other seems artificial and indefensible nowadays. There are places in the National Landscape that would be good places for a new town. In contrast, the idea that Moreton and Stow can be significantly enlarged without trashing them is absurd.

Comment ID: 9759

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Scenario 5 is deeply misguided. Without fixing Moreton's road problems, flood problems, and sewage problems before any more development is started, Moreton will become a place no one wants to visit, much less live!

Comment ID: 9763

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Scenario 1 or 6. I am in favour of as little spoiling of paradise as possible, hence my preference for 1. What appeals to me about 6 is the idea of a new town in some remote big field, which doesn't already have too much traffic.

Comment ID: 9764

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Unsustainable development would be a terrible waste of effort, money, etc.

Comment ID: 9765

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Yes, higher density if this means you pave over less grass.

Comment ID: 9769

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Brad Hooker

Comment: Infrastructure around Moreton-in-Marsh needs improvement ALREADY -- roads, flood mitigation, and sewage capacity. Any further development in this area intensifies the problems. Already visiting Moreton and Stow are avoided by locals if possible. I recently had to buy a bike for going a couple of miles to Moreton Train Station and back, since the car park now is always full by 8am on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. This is indicative (not of the popularity of the train but) of the paucity of parking in Moreton.

Comment ID: 8712

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Brendan Jackson

Comment: I am in support of these proposals. Housing needs to be built across the country, and this is a reasonable proportion for the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 10500

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Brian

Comment: None of the scenarios are preferable but the immediate dismissal of option 6 (and therefore option 7) on the basis that it is 'contrary to national planning policy' is premature. With the huge increase of housing numbers now proposed, the council seems willing to over-ride its own policies and local area plans so should consider strategic development within the Cotswolds National Landscape. As it is the council seems willing (or keen) to concentrate only on development outside of the Cotswold National Landscape, with this being clearly visible from the indicative maps in section 3.

Comment ID: 10504

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Brian

Comment: No, the Council should not consider locating development in locations it considers unsustainable. However, it appears that the Council is already doing this in at least one case - that of Siddington - by designating the village as a Principal Settlement when it clearly is not. How can the proposal to add circa 900 dwellings to a village with only 339 dwellings at present possibly be sustainable when current road capacity and infrastructure (sewerage, water supplies etc) are already struggling to cope, and where there are certainly not the facilities, services, employment opportunities (or access or infrastructure) for such a huge development, possibly be considered as sustainable. It would appear that the Council has decided to develop Preston and Siddington as suburbs of Cirencester contrary to previous plans to maintain them as villages.

Comment ID: 10505

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Brian

Comment: Some increase in housing density in urban areas could be considered but high density development in rural areas would be out of keeping and inappropriate.

Comment ID: 10510

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Brian

Comment: No, I don't think it is sustainable.

As proposed the huge development of Siddington (and Preston) would effectively make it a suburb of Cirencester so it would completely lose its identity as a separate village. Siddington lacks the necessary infrastructure (roads, sewerage, drainage), services, employment opportunities and facilities and all of these would have to be developed prior to increasing the housing numbers considerably. The current (wrong) designation of Siddington as a 'Principal Settlement' suggests an adequacy within the existing that does not exist.

Comment ID: 10513

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Brian

Comment: The Development Strategy needs to consider in more detail and accuracy the current adequacy of local assets to accommodate increased housing numbers, flooding (current and increased risks), preservation of existing communities and rural identities.

Comment ID: 11093

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Brian

Comment: The latest mandatory changes to the NPPL by the Government has meant that the previous and current Local Plans passed in 2021 and 2024 have been complete wastes of valuable professional and administration time incurring huge costs on the CDC which have been borne by its council tax payers.

Comment ID: 11140

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Brian

Comment: The fact that this preferred options review has taken place before any consideration of the items in paras 4.1 and 4.2 is a fundamental flaw - similarly this comment applies to 4.3 to 4.5. It is to be hoped that these crucial aspects will be incorporated in the draft Local Plan.

Comment ID: 11112

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Brian

Comment: Para 2.1 - 2.3: I think we ought to have an explanation of what the Government's standard method calculation is based on and its relevance to the CDC district. For example does it cover the whole of the CDC area or is it just the area that is not within the Cotswold National Landscape boundary? If it is the former, then it is based on a false calculation as the Government calculation must exclude the CNL if that is not to be built on. This would reduce the number of homes demanded which must be crammed into the remaining small area outside the CNL. Either the standard method calculation should be challenged by the CDC, or the CDC must accept that the CNL should be included in the fair distribution of the number of homes demanded.

Para. 2.4: Has any approach been made yet to neighbouring authorities to get guidance on the likelihood of whether they can make good the shortfall?

Comment ID: 11138

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Brian

Comment: This is a major concern as the proposed concentrated locations of new homes will inevitably lead to a lowering of specifications, deviations from the character of the Cotswold natural building materials. Also the cuts in number of garages and car parking spaces will lead to problems of parking on congested streets that are already visible of on large high-density housing developments. More people will still buy cars despite attempts to prevent car ownership.

Comment ID: 11141

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Brian

Comment: See comment against items 4.1 to 4.5

Comment ID: 11120

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Brian

Comment: I am particularly concerned that not only in regard to this Scenario but a theme that is running through the document is that Kemble is treated as a major transport hub because of the railway station. It is an accident of history going back to the Beeching era that the lines to Tetbury and Cirencester were ripped up leaving the village of Kemble high and dry as a commuter station of little value to the immediate village. The Local Plan should at least include a provision for the reestablishment of Cirencester as a rail terminal as it is the most major settlement in the southern part of the CDC.

Comment ID: 11121

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Brian

Comment: I am particularly concerned that not only in regard to this Scenario but a theme that is running through the document is that Kemble is treated as a major transport hub because of the railway station. It is an accident of history going back to the Beeching era that the lines to Tetbury and Cirencester were ripped up leaving the village of Kemble high and dry as a commuter station of little value to the immediate village. The Local Plan should at least include a provision for the reestablishment of Cirencester as a rail terminal as it is the most major settlement in the southern part of the CDC.

Comment ID: 11135

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Brian

Comment: I disagree that the CNL designated area should be excluded from the distribution of homes. This has resulted in the demanded number of homes being concentrated in a quite small area of the CDC. Surely this cannot be the intention of national planning policy when considered in conjunction with the new housing targets imposed on the CDC. The requirements of the local communities within the CNL must be considered fully despite possible opposition by the vested interests that only think of maintaining exclusivity resulting in high property prices and the departure of local workers - a slow decline.

More affordable housing is required even within the CNL.

Outside the CNL and with particular reference to Kemble, the scale of the proposed addition of c600 homes to the existing 388 is wholly out of proportion. Indeed this scale of development was rejected in the current Local Plan. There would be major problems of infrastructure including education needs, highways, parking at the station etc. Also the proximity of Cotswold Airport is a major factor in the poor indicated location of new development.

Comment ID: 11139

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Brian

Comment: Option 5 is a poorly developed scenario even though it may be preferable to the CDC than the other six options. In my opinion it needs a fundamental rethink as in its current form it will not be acceptable in examination of the draft Local plan during the next stage of this process.

Comment ID: 11119

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Brian

Comment: All scenarios need to be reconsidered to allow for development within the CNL as this cannot be dismissed from the fair distribution of the number of homes demanded within the CDC district.

Comment ID: 10669

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Bridget

Comment: How do you propose to investigate and check if proposed developments sit on possible historic sites. we know Cirencester is surrounded by Roman villas. Will you legally oblige developers to investigate sites thoroughly first?

Comment ID: 10656

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Bridget

Comment: I read that you are considering housing densities in our village akin to those seen in London. I was shocked. This is not an acceptable rural development plan. Not for the people who already live here and certainly not for those who will live here.

Comment ID: 10661

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Bridget

Comment: We should be building in the whole of the Cotswold, spreading the pressure on our resources. Building viable good mixed communities. It is unwise to concentrate the development in the south, and blight small villages by over trebling their size without guaranteed government funding.

Comment ID: 10662

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Bridget

Comment: Therefore I favour option 6.

Comment ID: 10659

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Bridget

Comment: I totally disagree

Comment ID: 10668

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Bridget

Comment: Of course this level of development is not sustainable through private developers, when government does not have a parallel investment plan for infrastructure. Where are the plans for new primary and secondary schools. Building a new school hall at Siddington primary school to cope with the Steadings proposed development is evidence of the woefully inadequate funding and planning.

It was earlier suggested that any development should be "green at its core". How is planning to quadruple the size of a flood prone village "green" in any shape or form? Significant remedial flood work is needed and more with four times the housing. How is filling our rural landscape with more concrete pipes and the associated work "green" ?

Comment ID: 10670

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Bridget

Comment: Yes, how will you ensure development does not take place on undiscovered sites of historical interest, like Roman sites around Siddington and Cirencester?

Will you legally oblige developers to provide reports and employ professional investigators?

Comment ID: 10671

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Bridget

Comment: Why when you say your objective is to develop away from flood prone areas, are you developing in Siddington?

Comment ID: 10651

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Bridget

Comment: I do not believe this is the best scenario.

Putting large developments in small villages, several times larger than the existing housing stock will overload infrastructure and facilities.

Siddington already floods extensively at every entry road, and houses already flood and recently raw sewage was evident. Why would you subject villagers to more and worse of the same. It is a health and safety risk. Most plans to develop are on higher ground and will cause current villagers to suffer.

In addition I am interested if development will damage historic sites, there are thought to be old Roman villas in the vicinity of Siddington, so will the council be following the correct procedures to investigate these sites prior to development?

Comment ID: 10638

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Bridget

Comment: Given that we have a housing crisis in this country I suggest the government reviews its approach to Areas of outstanding natural beauty in the Cotswold. A new housing estate on the edge of any village is not a blight, it will maintain and encourage a cross section of community. And ensure we have a balanced civilised society. Where all levels of the community help each other be better people.

Comment ID: 10657

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Bridget

Comment: I entirely object to scenario 5 being the best option

Comment ID: 9496

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Bridget Ashley

Comment: Poulton does not have many of the necessary infrastructure requirements outlined in para 4.9, being:

- Water Supply and waste water
- Flood management
- Education
- Healthcare
- Public transport
- Digital infrastructure

I note this is only a proposal, so the actual number of houses proposed for Poulton may be far greater. Para 3.17 of the Plan states ‘...the government requires us to plan at least 30 years ahead for these sites to make sure they are well-designed and have the right infrastructure from the start’. How does this apply to unsustainable settlements like Poulton which do not even have the right infrastructure now?

Comment ID: 9497

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Bridget Ashley

Comment: Poulton does not have many of the necessary infrastructure requirements outlined in para 4.9, being:

- Water Supply and waste water
- Flood management
- Education
- Healthcare
- Public transport
- Digital infrastructure

I note this is only a proposal, so the actual number of houses proposed for Poulton may be far greater. Para 3.17 of the Plan states ‘...the government requires us to plan at least 30 years ahead for these sites to make sure they are well-designed and have the right infrastructure from the start’. How does this apply to unsustainable settlements like Poulton which do not even have the right infrastructure now?

Comment ID: 11031

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Bruce

Comment: The council should not exclude the Cotswold National Landscape from consideration in the plan; it is wholly unreasonable and disproportionate to try and fit the quantity of houses into the remaining area outside the NL.

Comment ID: 11045

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Bruce Hulatt

Comment: The figures for Ampney Crucis show a tripling in size of the village. As a material consideration this goes against any settlement strategy and sense of proportionality of growth. The village character would be destroyed and there is no way a 300% increase in growth would fit within village hall events and school facilities.

Comment ID: 11051

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Bruce Hulatt

Comment: There are several material considerations that mean the proposed Ampney Crucis expansion is unsustainable and impractical:

Material Consideration: Sewage and Drainage

- Thames Water's own data shows the local sewage treatment farm at Ampney St Peter outflowed raw sewage for 35% of 2024. Their own plans for fully meeting government targets are not expected to be in place until 2045-2050

(<https://www.thameswater.co.uk/about-us/performance/river-health/frequently-asked-questions/information-about-specific-sites#SP08360077>)

Material considerations: Traffic and highways

This proposal will bring unsustainable levels of additional traffic to the village, which already struggles with traffic volumes at busy times, especially with emergency vehicles and larger traffic being unable to negotiate roads around the school during pick-up time. The parish council attempted to help this by adding a large no-parking sign at the top of School Lane but this has had negligible effect.

- The cross-roads at the bottom of the village at London Road and Waterton Lane is busy, dangerous and the site of numerous serious accidents. Tripling the size of the village will bring unsustainable traffic volumes to this area with all traffic heading towards Swindon and the M4 and significantly increase risk and danger.
- Access roads to the north of the proposed development area are small and unsuitable.

Material Consideration: Groundwater and Surface Run-off:

- Large sections of the land behind the village give cause for concern for development; the fields in the central part of R583 have springs to the north and a piped culvert that already does not have capacity in periods of heavy rain, leading to flooding in the village road at the Pleydells junction.

- Additional development will only worsen this situation as the ground under houses and roads will be unable to absorb water and so there will be increased run-off into the village, exacerbating these problems.
- Water run-off is already a problem for the whole length of School Lane, leading to significant road damage and flooding risks along Ampney Brook and the A417.

Material Consideration: Water supply constraints

We already suffer water supply problems, especially along London Road. Our pressure is significantly lower than even 12 years ago when we had refurbishment work including mains-pressure showers etc. which were perfectly good at the time but now is significantly worse. Plumbers have said the performance is due to water pressure. Any increase in housing will have an even worse effect on this problem.

Comment ID: 254

Email/Letter Representation

Name: B Davis

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

Comment ID: 205

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Badminton Estate

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

Comment ID: 834

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Barbara Thompson

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

Comment ID: 330

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Barnsley Parish Village Committee

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

Comment ID: 783

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Barry Andersen

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

Comment ID: 556

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bathurst

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

Comment ID: 555

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bathurst Development Limited

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

Comment ID: 558

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bathurst Development Limited

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

Comment ID: 357

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ben House

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

Comment ID: 309

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ben Owen

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

Comment ID: 627

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Benjamin Hird

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

Comment ID: 387

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Beverley Wright

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

Comment ID: 870

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Black Box Planning

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

Comment ID: 364

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bledington Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 203

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bloor Homes Western

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

Comment ID: 204

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bloor Homes Western

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

Comment ID: 775

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bloor Homes Western

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

Comment ID: 655

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bourton-on-the-Hill Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 645

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Brian and Jude McKenna

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

Comment ID: 310

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Brian D'Arcy Clark

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

Comment ID: 604

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Brian Herbert

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

Comment ID: 590

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bridget Griffiths

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

Comment ID: 418

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bridget Lazenby

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

Comment ID: 642

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Broadwell PC

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

Comment ID: 574

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Bruce Hulatt

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