

Comment ID: 10860

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: G Ambler

Comment: My major concern is the issue of flooding in Drifffield. I have lived there for over 30 years and the issue has got worse. Outside my cottage in late December '25 the water did not clear for 5 days, excessive water is an increasing problem.

The area around Ampney Brook is bursting its banks causing much flooding to fields bordering it that do not fully drain. Surely building to such an extent would greatly exacerbate the problem and cause grief to home owners established and potential ones?

Is there a plan for social houses and infer structure to support them?

Comment ID: 10483

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: G Wall

Comment: Building housing where greener transportation options are viable is vital. The provision of new housing should also provide realistic and practical transport options too for the residents including walking, cycle and public transport

Comment ID: 10684

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Gavin Burtonwood

Comment: Scenario 3 is my preferred option. This is the most sustainable solution being proposed. It does not preclude development at all other sites but places more housing in the locations where there is greatest need and services exist

Comment ID: 10686

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Gavin Burtonwood

Comment: No. If this is truly a forward looking plan then proposing unsustainable solutions is not tenable.

Comment ID: 10689

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Gavin Burtonwood

Comment: This is a possible solution in certain urban environments but I do not think it is necessarily the solution in the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10674

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Gavin Burtonwood

Comment: Defining Broadwell as a non-principal settlement or 'village cluster' is inaccurate and based on misinformation. Broadwell is a small village of 150 houses. It has little infrastructure to support any significant expansion. Unlike other communities defined in the plan as non-principal settlements or village clusters, Broadwell does not have a primary school; the previous school closed in the 1980s due to a lack of demand and falling attendance numbers. Broadwell does not have a shop or post office; these are situated in neighbouring towns and require the use of vehicles to utilise them. Broadwell does not offer employment opportunities to residents beyond that provided by the pub. The pub itself only continues to exist as a pub as its customer base extends well beyond the village. Most importantly, Broadwell has poor transportation links. It is served by a once daily bus from the centre of the village which goes to a different destination each day and this combined with the times of travel is not compatible with regular commuting. Whilst there is an hourly bus service between Chipping Norton and Cheltenham which picks up from the Broadwell turning off the Fosse Way, this pick up location is not in the village but is three quarters of a mile from the village green and inaccessible to many elderly/disabled/younger members of the community. Access to most of the residents needs requires car transportation to neighbouring towns. Lack of transportation links makes development of Broadwell at any scale contrary to the Government's sustainability objectives.

Whilst most residents of Broadwell would have little objection to a natural level of housing development through conversion of existing agricultural buildings and small scale development, the provision of a development quota on the basis of past planning approvals is in no way appropriate. Broadwell has grown organically to the needs of the community. At least a quarter of the village's homes have been built or converted from agricultural buildings in the past century. It has been misdefined in the Local Plan as something it is not. It is not a village cluster or part of a village cluster. And it should not be defined as a non-principal settlement for the purposes of development due to the size and character of the place within the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Comment ID: 8890

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Gemma Hegarty

Comment: Objection to Proposed Development – Siddington Road / Ashton Road, Cirencester

I wish to object to the proposed housing development at Siddington Road / Ashton Road for the following reasons:

1. Unsuitable Location & Loss of Village Identity

Siddington is a small village with a distinct community character. This development would physically close the gap between Cirencester and Siddington, effectively erasing the village boundary and its separate identity. The sense of community that residents value would be diminished.

2. Traffic & Road Safety Concerns

Siddington Road is already busy and increasingly used as a through-route. Adding significant numbers of houses will increase congestion and raise safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, schoolchildren and residents.

3. Flooding Risk (Existing & Future)

Flooding already affects Siddington Road, particularly opposite the proposed site and in the areas near Cherry Tree Drive—an issue which has worsened since previous developments such as Spire View. Additional building, hard surfacing and water run-off will increase flooding risk for existing homes and road users.

4. Impact on Wildlife & Countryside Access

The proposed land supports wildlife and offers direct access to countryside. As a neurodiverse family, being able to cross the road straight into nature is essential to wellbeing and daily quality of life. Removing this green space harms both local biodiversity and residents' mental health and lifestyle.

5. Unsustainable Scale of Growth

Siddington has just over 300 houses. This proposal represents a disproportionate increase in housing numbers without corresponding infrastructure. The village has a small school, small shop and a single pub, services already at capacity. There is no justification for increasing population this significantly when support systems are limited.

6. More Suitable Locations Exist

Cirencester already has areas better suited for expansion, such as the Steadings / Love Lane side with stronger infrastructure, existing drainage systems, more amenities, transport connections and capacity to support growth. Development should be located where it is sustainable, not where it causes harm.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I strongly believe this location is not suitable for development. The proposal would intensify flooding, damage village identity, reduce access to nature, compromise road safety, and place pressure on inadequate local services. I urge the Council to refuse this application and prioritise development in areas with better infrastructure and environmental resilience.

Comment ID: 9435

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Geoff

Comment: Scenario 6. Scenario 6 also gives a small amount of development in the AONB villages. This is not in contradiction with the NPPF. This will reduce the strain on the remaining areas. Down Ampney is lacking upgrades to infrastructure with surface and foul water lacking sufficient capacity to fulfil the requirements we have now.

Comment ID: 9436

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Geoff

Comment: Of course not. Infrastructure must go in first. We have capacity problems in surface water and foul water. There is no bus. Parking on most sites is totally inadequate. Roads are in a terrible state with continual potholes. There must be a water supply problem and have noticed a drop in water pressure since new housing has been added. Stop and think before just ploughing on regardless. I cannot see any document that supports or justifies the government numbers in the CDC areas.

Comment ID: 8954

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Geoff Tappern

Comment: I would have expected to have seen some reference that a Neighbourhood Plan works alongside the Local Plan.

Comment ID: 9782

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Geoff Tappern

Comment: This document I've never seen let allowed to make a comment. W

Comment ID: 9783

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Geoff Tappern

Comment: Unfortunately the proposals completely ignore the fact that in most of the Cotswolds the infrastructure is just not there. Roads are poor, Foul and surface water infrastructure inadequate for what we have let alone the proposals. Not enough doctors. There is a wish to change density. We have rural villages and not trying to be a great big town. What decisions are made now could well ruin the villages and area for ever. THINK

Comment ID: 9787

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Geoff Tappern

Comment: There is of course Scenario 0 which is throw back the proposed numbers to government and tell them to rethink. After all even the government has to work to the NPPF. This alone protects from mass developments.

Comment ID: 10850

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Geoff York

Comment: Given the numbers of dwellings required vs. the amount of land available, it is time to consider strategic development in previously restricted areas (the National Landscape) to free up essential space. This is important to prevent the complete destruction of a number of small communities as currently envisaged in the plan e.g Preston, Siddington, Kemble.

Desperate times ... desperate measures?

Comment ID: 10414

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Geoffrey Barrett

Comment: Density is important as it is a major factor in creating a sense of place. Traditional village patterns sometime have areas of quite high density, and can have more variety and character than the pattern of much post war estate development leading to characterless uniformity across the built environment. Some of the highest density development has occurred in such prime locations as Kensington, Chelsea and Belgravia, which also has the highest value properties, so high density does not necessarily provide unpopular or unattractive living environments. (Designers should read books like Serge Chermayeff's Community & Privacy published in 1967).

Comment ID: 10429

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Geoffrey Barrett

Comment: Sustainability can be achieved by imaginative and ambitious design and by ensuring that all development is infrastructure led - in a meaningful way. That means that real investment in all forms of infrastructure, from water supply through to health and educational facilities, are fully funded and in-situ ahead of housing completions. The method of funding infrastructure through developer contributions is firstly not water-tight, and secondly is not provided in advance. There has to be up-front investment to ensure that development advances in a truly balanced way. Local Authorities should insist that national capital funding streams are created to support all major residential expansion.

Comment ID: 10439

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Geoffrey Barrett

Comment: There are some important existing elements of infrastructure located away from proposed locations for housing provision. One example is Chipping Campden School, which already has a catchment of some 9 miles across, and is serviced by 16 buses twice daily as well as numerous taxi and other transport provisions.

Gloucestershire County Council currently spends £20m/annum on school transport.

One criterion for justifying development might be to bring residential development nearer to the established infrastructure so that the catchment shrinks, more children can walk to school and the savings on transport can be reinvested in the facilities.

Comment ID: 10655

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Geoffrey Barrett

Comment: The infrastructure study should carefully consider the existing and well established secondary schools in Chipping Campden and Bourton-on-the -Water. Both of these outstanding institutions serve very wide catchment areas, causing considerable transport expense. Part of the overall planning exercise should give weight to considerations of locating more residential development closer to these facilities to reduce the extent of the catchment and the reliance on heavy transport.

At present the proposed housing supply will bring a total of 3264 houses into the catchment of Chipping Campden School yielding an additional estimated 424 secondary school pupils. The existing facilities at Chipping Campden School are based on buildings built 100 years ago for a much smaller school population, and include a block of seven 'temporary" classrooms now already 51 years old. These old buildings put increasing pressure on the School finances, already constrained by recent pay awards and increases in employment costs which were NOT fully funded in spite of Government claims that they were. It would be unacceptable to the Trustees of the School if any proposal is put forward to add capacity by incremental small additions. Only major capital expenditure and significant redevelopment will be accepted. In addition the School is already short of open space for its current pupil roll of almost 1500 and additional land will need to be provided to meet the requirements of an enlarged pupil roll. There is a current plan to provide the School with a new access and car park to reduce traffic congestion in the town, caused daily by the transport of pupils and the increasing number of 6th formers who wish to drive themselves to School as free transport is not available to them. However there has been no consideration of future proofing the School in the County Council's proposals to take back control of adjacent farmland.

The School also provides important sports and leisure facilities for the area and it should be noted that Table 7 of the Cotswold District Settlement Role & Function Study omits to schedule the swimming pool within the School's sports facilities. As with the other parts of the School premises, these facilities are quite old and outmoded, are poorly located within the School campus, and the opportunity should be taken to plan for and invest in a new sports centre on an enlarged School site to serve the wider district and expanding population. Such a development should also address the lack of national standard facilities in the District, and thus this proposal should be designed to form a centre of excellence in sport, including facilities for elite sports development.

The School has shown that it can successfully create and manage facilities which serve the community at large, as well as driving forward its educational ambitions, and the creation of the Performing Arts Centre and Cidermill Theatre, without recourse to public funds, is broadening the cultural offer to all sections of the community.

Comment ID: 10715

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Geoffrey Barrett

Comment: The existing well established secondary schools in Chipping Campden and Bourton-on-the-Water provide outstanding education and broader facilities to the communities of the north Cotswold area. Both have very wide catchments and rely on extensive transport facilities, at considerable cost to the Education Authority. Considerable weight should be given to the role of these Schools in balancing the constraints of where housing should be located. Every opportunity should be taken to bring housing closer to the Schools. It would reduce the transport costs and improve the experience of students and their accessibility to the wider experiences of school life, expanding the opportunities to participate in after-school activities, especially team sports.

The proposals for new housing within the existing catchment of Chipping Campden School (currently 9 miles across) will bring 3264 additional dwellings yielding 424 additional school pupils. The current pupil roll is almost 1500 so expansion to 2000 is foreseeable, but this will perpetuate and increase the reliance on bussing students to school. The Education Authority currently spends £20m/annum on these services, which of course exclude sixth form students.

The existing facilities at Chipping Campden School are based on a range of buildings now 100 years old, designed for a much small population, and include a block of 7 "temporary" classrooms now 51 years old. The maintenance and repairs necessary to keep these building functioning weigh heavily on the already constrained School finances. It will be unacceptable to the Trustees of Chipping Campden School if proposals are put forward to increase capacity by incremental extensions. Only significant capital investment and redevelopment will be acceptable. Furthermore, the School will need additional land as the site is already below the national standard of green open space for its current pupil roll. An additional 500 pupils will require an additional 1.62 hectares (4 acres) plus an allowance for a larger built footprint..

The School also provides another important element of local infrastructure, namely its sports and leisure facilities. These are used by the public out of School hours and are currently operated by Cotswold District Council. These facilities, like the rest of the school estate, are old and outmoded, and will be too small to serve both an expanded school and a larger residential community. It should be noted that Table 7 of Cotswold District Settlement Role and Function Study omits to schedule the swimming pool at the School.

The sports and leisure facilities are also poorly located within the School complex and really require relocating into a new up-graded sports centre, and designed as a centre of excellence meeting national standards for sports development including competition standards and accommodating elite sports facilities.

Cotswold District Council is aware of current proposals to provide Chipping Camden School with a new access, car park and bus-turnaround to alleviate the daily traffic problems in the town centre arising from the School transport services. However the proposals by Gloucestershire County Council to accommodate this development have not given any consideration to future proofing the School site and its expanding role within the Local Plan development proposals. Immediate action should be taken by CDC as Planning Authority to ensure that proper consideration is given to these wider issues. Failure to do so will risk the implementation of a flawed scheme that will require serious amendment a few years hence, when the two authorities will become a unitary authority. Joined up thinking should already be taking place between the existing authorities!

Comment ID: 10799

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: We do not support Scenario 5, which paragraphs 2.6.16–2.6.20 frame to place strategic sites outside the Cotswolds National Landscape ("CNL" or "AONB"), with paragraph 2.6.19 expressly steering new settlements and strategic extensions away from the AONB because housebuilding within the CNL is only possible in "exceptional circumstances" – "any new settlement or strategic site would need to be located outside of [the CNL]" and paragraph 3.11 stating that non-AONB settlements will "normally" receive more development.

Scenario 5 therefore arbitrarily distinguishes between nature and national heritage that deserves conserving (within the CNL) and that which does not (outside the CNL). It unfairly loads the relatively small area outside the CNL, despite housing targets being based on the area of the whole county. This approach drives development densities outside the AONB which paragraph 2.17 acknowledges are out of character reflecting a "highly urbanised form of development", which would lead to an irreversible degradation in desirable, historic areas of the British countryside without sufficient infrastructure planning. It would overload under-resourced transport, education and other public services and potentially cause further issues, such as increasing the risk of flooding downstream through increased run-off.

It is our view that the county is now facing an exceptional circumstance and therefore sharing new housebuilding throughout the county should be permitted, which would be more sustainable and fairer.

An updated version of Scenario 4 would be preferable. The current plan focuses growth around existing transport nodes, which better reflects paragraph 2.6.13's recognition of limited, "non-existent" rural public transport and is more consistent with section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requiring plan-making to contribute to sustainable development.

Scenario 4 currently enables a fairer balance between AONB and non-AONB settlements and respects the historic environment highlighted in paragraph 2.11. In short, a transport-led distribution is more deliverable within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan ("IDP") framework referenced at paragraphs 4.8 - 4.10 and reduces avoidable

pressure on roads such as the A417 which are already unsuitable in parts (e.g. through Fairford where it is so narrow). It might also reduce flooding risk to communities along the A417 corridor downstream in the watershed of the proposed development at Ampney Crucis.

Comment ID: 10801

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: This depends on what the council considers to mean "unsustainable". The Scenario 5 proposal suggests development which will cause irreversible harm to parts of Gloucestershire which form an essential part of the British countryside. Instead, the council should seek to promote development more evenly throughout the district.

Paragraphs 2.6.13 and 2.6.14 confirm limited bus and rail access in many rural areas, and paragraph 3.13 records binding pressures on water and wastewater that may delay upgrades, so forcing growth into low-access, infrastructure-deficient locations would undermine section 19(1A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 on climate mitigation and adaptation and risk failing section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 on soundness.

Scenario 4's emphasis on existing transport nodes is a more sustainable response to those constraints. Paragraph 6.6 rightly steers allocations away from Flood Zone 3, but where downstream receptors like Poulton face cumulative risk from upstream allocations, catchment-wide measures are also required to satisfy sections 9 and 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Without this, upstream development is wholly inappropriate and harmful, giving rise to legal rights of property owners downstream. The Duty to Co-operate and carefully limited, non-major, landscape-sensitive growth within AONB settlements, where justified, are preferable to allocations in patently unsustainable locations.

Comment ID: 10802

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: I do not support the very high density uplifts implied by paragraph 2.17, which the consultation likens to inner-city forms and which paragraph 2.11 accepts are out of character and problematic for delivering the required housing mix. Imposing such densities on non-AONB settlements would also prejudice the historic environment protected by section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Scenario 4's transport-led strategy, combined with a greater number of small and medium sites and modest, non-major additions within AONB settlements where justified, will deliver more sustainably without resorting to inner-city densities. This approach better aligns with paragraph 2.6.4 on Rural Exception Sites and with paragraph 3.13's recognition that infrastructure capacity is a hard constraint that density alone cannot solve.

Comment ID: 10803

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: No. The “strategic extension north of Ampney Crucis” on page 24 is not sustainable without greater local infrastructure investment, particularly focusing on binding, data-supported, catchment-wide flood alleviation. As is, this development will increase impermeable area and accelerate runoff to Poulton, where unmanaged bottlenecks at culverts and channel constrictions already constrain conveyance and are causing ever more frequent flooding.

Paragraph 4.9 includes "Flood Management" as an IDP category and paragraph 4.10 notes the IDP is at an early stage; policy must therefore condition occupation of the Ampney Crucis extension on upstream attenuation, conveyance upgrades through Poulton and formalised exceedance routes, secured by obligations and timed triggers, consistent with sections 9 and 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Paragraph 6.6's steer away from allocating high fluvial risk land is necessary but insufficient here because the principal mechanism is cumulative catchment response; addressing that pathway is essential to satisfy sections 19(1A) and 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This is the primary issue in this consultation.

At Down Ampney, Table 2 shows 231 current dwellings and 416 additional dwellings to 2043, an exact uplift of 180.09%. Given paragraph 2.6.13's public transport constraints and paragraph 3.13's water and wastewater pressures, Down Ampney must be phased behind verified capacity under sections 37 and 94 of the Water Industry Act 1991 and supported by defined junction, walking and cycling, and bus enhancements secured through the IDP to enable compliance with section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 and section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. For clarity, we do not attribute flooding in Poulton to the Down Ampney allocations; the principal risk arises from the Ampney Crucis extension acting through existing Poulton bottlenecks.

Comment ID: 10809

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: The Strategic Extension north of Ampney Crucis (page 24), which requires upstream attenuation and conveyance upgrades through Poulton before occupation to comply with sections 9 and 19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and to satisfy section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Scenario 4's transport-led distribution should be preferred over Scenario 5 to reduce car dependency and share impacts more evenly. This should be pursued alongside greater balance of housebuilding throughout the county, rather than focusing only on areas outside of the CNL given that the housing crisis is a national emergency and in an exceptional circumstance: limited, non-major, landscape-sensitive growth within AONB settlements can be justified in exceptional circumstances under the National Planning Policy Framework when it serves the public interest and avoids disproportionate harm elsewhere.

Down Ampney's 180 per cent uplift is unsustainable, particularly without verified water, wastewater and transport capacity under the Water Industry Act 1991, the Highways Act 1980 and the Traffic Management Act 2004.

I think that central government may be acting unreasonably expecting Gloucestershire to build so many homes when 80% of the County is AONB. However even if the County has to build this many houses, land outside the AONB also possesses heritage and environmental value and its rural character should not be sacrificed as a default growth zone to preserve the AONB untouched, especially if roads, drains and other infrastructure are inadequate.

Comment ID: 10805

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: Two matters should be explicit. First, land outside the AONB is not “open season” for housebuilding outside of this area; the non-CNL area in the county contains conservation areas, listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets protected by section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as valued landscapes and habitats referenced implicitly in paragraph 2.11 – this area requires protection in the same way that CNL does, and arbitrary AONB boundaries should not drive irreversible damage to non-CNL areas.

Secondly, paragraph 2.6.19’s emphasis on exceptional circumstances in the AONB must be applied realistically. The materially increased District requirement set out at paragraphs 1.5–1.6 can constitute an exceptional circumstance under the National Planning Policy Framework where and historic alternatives would cause disproportionate harm outside the AONB, provided design is landscape-sensitive. The housing target applies to the whole District, not only the c.20 per cent outside the AONB, and the AONB boundary does not track communities, hydrology or ecology, so rigidly offloading growth beyond it yields arbitrary, perverse outcomes.

Comment ID: 10807

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: I support the intent in paragraphs 5.2–5.3 to conserve the CNL, deliver sustainable communities and align growth with timely infrastructure, but the preferred distribution in paragraphs 2.6.16–2.6.20 and 3.11 would undermine those aims unless amended.

Aligning with Scenario 4's transport-led focus, greater balance of housebuilding throughout the county (including within the CNL – recognising that current housebuilding targets are themselves an "exceptional circumstance", conditioning the Ampney Crucis extension on greater investment in local infrastructure and flood alleviation work downstream at Poulton, and phasing Down Ampney behind verified utilities and transport capacity will bring the strategy into conformity with section 39 and section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and with the National Planning Policy Framework's climate-resilient plan-making principles.

Comment ID: 10817

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: George Maxwell

Comment: Has the council considered or explored the fact that the current housing target attributed to Gloucestershire is an "exceptional circumstance" for the purpose of planning regulations (ref para 2.6.19)?

Further, has the council considered that the county's allotment for house building targets (i) does not take into account the CLN/AONB area in the county; and (ii) that the target is therefore inappropriate/disproportionate for the area available for housebuilding?

Further, wouldn't the stress on local infrastructure be lessened and development be more sustainable if development was more evenly spread throughout the district, rather than unnaturally and disproportionately shoehorned in areas arbitrarily not deemed CLN/AONB?

Comment ID: 10406

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Georgina

Comment: I sincerely hope that by including potential future development that the necessary infrastructure - schools, GPs, transport, roads, sewage, water supplies, flood defences, etc - will be provided before or at least these new developments are built.

Comment ID: 10431

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Georgina

Comment: This is a serious concern of mine and I know many residents. We need to attract and provide facilities for a wide range of employment possibilities so that the people living in these new homes have access to local work opportunities.

We have some brilliant business and industrial parks in the North Cotswolds but we will need many more to absorb this increase in population if we want a vibrant and economically active Cotswolds.

We are fortunate to attract a large number of visitors who help support independent shops and hostelrys but there is no doubt that many do much of their shopping online now and it is likely that this trend will continue for groceries and many other essentials. High Streets will have to be supported to change to adapt to what is required.

Comment ID: 10434

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Georgina

Comment: Without doubt there seems to be an increasing need to accommodate both gypsies and travellers as their numbers grow. As I understand it statistically these groups generally buy some land and then quickly provide the services so they can live there and although some subsequently are not given the necessary planning position it can be difficult to get them to move away. So it would be preferable to identify where the community would prefer them to situate themselves and make all the arrangements accordingly but there is often fierce local opposition to this. It is not an easy issue.

Comment ID: 10441

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Georgina

Comment: Infrastructure is key to building good communities and all the bullet points are important ingredients to achieving this outcome. It will be a big and expensive task over such a broad area and with the constraints of the Cotswold National Landscape alongside many of these proposed new developments.

I would also add that many of the people in these new developments do not always integrate into their new communities partly due to the layout of the new estates which rarely link through to other parts of the settlement by road and rely on a few bicycle or footpaths which somehow do not join communities.

Comment ID: 10374

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Georgina

Comment: Whilst I wish that Cotswold District Council was not faced with this choice I back Option 5 as it most nearly achieves the housing target as set by the government.

Comment ID: 10379

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Georgina

Comment: As with all planning applications it is vital to look at the sustainability element. I have particular concerns around the lack of employment and opportunities especially for those relying on public transport.

Comment ID: 10381

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Georgina

Comment: I would be happy for much denser housing than has been outlined with more terraced housing built over three floors, small low rise blocks of flats for both the elderly and young people looking for affordable housing. We need a mix of housing but not so many of the four or five bedroom executive homes which are often only attract middle aged 'downsizers'

Comment ID: 10422

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Georgina

Comment: Well first of all I would say what does 'sustainable' actually mean in this context?

People want to live in the Cotswolds as it is perceived to be a very desirable area particularly for those people taking early retirement, wanting a holiday home, running a small business from home.

The people we need to provide this additional housing for are those people born in the District or with strong connections to it and those with lower paid jobs who work in the area. So we need more truly affordable housing for these people to be able to buy as well as rent at an affordable price.

The issue is that the affordable element mirrors current rents and to some extent prices of housing so unless the rents come down or the area is seen as less desirable these so called 'affordable' rents will still be out of reach of many. There will be some social housing which should help but for whatever reason it is not always taken up when offered to local people on the housing list as being unsuitable or not in the right area for them.

My comments are particularly aimed at Moreton-in-Marsh which is currently suffering regularly huge traffic jams, a severely inadequate sewage service and a high street which has become a shopping destination to avoid due to the difficulties in accessing the town and parking. The current set up for the station access is too restricted and even with the British Legion hall and its area included this will not be solved - look at Kingham, Charlbury or Honeybourne stations. A proper assessment of Moreton station would move it to a green field site as a Parkway station to the south of the town.

For both Willersey and Mickleton my concerns are the same - these small villages have virtually no shops, primary schools filled to capacity, tricky main roads for the existing traffic, sporadic public transport and neither offers much in the way of local employment. I have a particular concern that some of the people offered housing in either the social or affordable housing association run element will not have access to

the resources they need to manage their lives to best effect unless they can afford to run a car and in the case of families probably two cars. This is not sustainable.

Willersey also has a severe sewage issues with it rising up through the manholes and even into people's houses through their loos

Comment ID: 10448

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Georgina

Comment: Whilst we would all welcome that the new housing is built to the most efficient energy standards to enable their residents to keep their carbon footprint low there is no doubt that building houses in this way is more costly and this will be reflected in their rents or value. Affordable rents are up to 80% of market rent. In an area where private property rents are high affordable rents will follow.

I also have a serious concern about the costs of managing the common parts of a housing estate once the developer passes this over to a property management company. The housing association's properties also have to pay their fair share of these costs which are added to the rents.

As not only are the local Highways and water authorities reluctant to adopt the roads or SuDS but also town and parish councils refuse for cost reasons to take on cutting grass and managing children's play areas etc. This is an increasing problem.

Comment ID: 10400

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Georgina

Comment: Whilst I understand the reasoning behind the illustrative numbers of houses in each of the proposed principal settlements and in non-principal settlements there is no doubt that they will change the character of some of these places beyond recognition with a doubling in some cases of the numbers of dwellings.

There are currently deeply deficient infrastructure and services in these places and the railway services cannot cope with a greatly increased number of passengers who will not only be joining the train at either Kemble or Moreton-in-Marsh but will also be encouraged to do so from all the other stations on the route. The result will be more people taking to the roads in their cars as bus services are not adequate for most journeys particularly for work, education and health services.

Comment ID: 10407

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Georgina

Comment: All these locations will need significant infrastructure to allow them to accommodate so many more households including more local job opportunities

Comment ID: 10152

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: I would like to understand on what basis Broadwell has been selected as a Non-principal settlement or village cluster given that it has few services or facilities (including little useful public transport, no medical, dental, or school services) and provides very few employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 10153

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: As previously noted, Broadwell has "very limited or no services, facilities or employment provision". And yet it has been identified in Scenario 1 as a target Non-Principle Settlement or Village Cluster.

Comment ID: 10154

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: This would seem the most logical scenario. Particularly given HM Government's commitment to embed transport decarbonisation principles in spatial planning. We should be building denser, transit-oriented developments that reduce car dependency. The only way to do this is to develop existing service centres in a way that locates new homes near amenities/services to encourage walking/cycling and use of electrified public transport.

Spreading new homes across the countryside in small towns and tiny villages with few opportunities and little useful public transport would completely undermine this goal. Instead it would contribute to the existing congestion problems that plague Moreton in Marsh and Stow on the Wold.

Comment ID: 10155

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: This seems to be the only option that acknowledges that the area is part of the Cotswolds National Landscape. As such, the scale of development allocated by HM Government is inappropriate. Has the government taken into account that 80% of CDC's are in an AONB in imposing these targets?

Comment ID: 10156

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: I would favour Scenario 3. This would be the best way to create sustainable developments and encourage decarbonisation of our transport system. It would also preserve the feel of the AONB, which is characterised by small, historic towns and villages. This is crucial to the local economy, which relies heavily on tourism.

Comment ID: 10157

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: Absolutely not. Building housing in unsustainable locations is short-sighted and will ultimately undermine the local economy.

Comment ID: 10158

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: I would support increasing housing density through carefully designed, medium-rise apartment buildings with balconies, as seen across most European cities. These should be focused in existing service centres where more modern, higher rise buildings would be more in-keeping with the local vernacular. They are unlikely to be appropriate in historic towns, such as Moreton in Marsh, that rely on the historic architecture to attract the tourists that support the local economy.

Comment ID: 10161

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: Moreton in Marsh (and the surrounding villages) should not be developed any further without considerable investment in infrastructure. This includes:

- Education - any expansion would require an additional secondary school, given that both Cotswold School and Chipping Campden schools are at (or over) capacity.
- Healthcare - both doctors' surgeries are at capacity, with increasing wait times for appointments in recent years.
- Public transport is - at best - infrequent.
- Areas of Moreton in Marsh and Broadwell are susceptible to flooding. They should not be developed without a comprehensive review of flood management.
- Thames Water routinely discharges sewage into the River Evenlode as the combined sewer system, local pumping stations, and local treatment works all need upgrading to cope with increased rainfall and increasing volumes of wastewater as Moreton has already expanded. This work needs to take place before Moreton expands any further.

Comment ID: 10163

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Georgina Thorley

Comment: Transport (highways) is a key consideration in the proposed expansion of Moreton-in-Marsh and the surrounding villages. The area is already mired by congestion, particularly along the Fosseway with key pinch points at Moreton-in Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold. Without a concrete plan for a ring-road/bypass - which would need to circumvent the AONB - the area simply cannot sustain further development.

Comment ID: 8889

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: This table seems to suggest that Fairford will almost double in size. How can this be possible given the wholly inadequate sewerage supply, roads (which narrow to single vehicles in the town centre and do not have enough pedestrian crossings) and GP services? In addition it seems that yet again Lechlade has minimum growth when there already seems to be land and a partially built relief road available to the west of the town?

Comment ID: 10593

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: Fairford is in the Cotswolds Water Park (an SSRI) with an abundance of wildlife. In particular the River Coln supports a rare habitat for water voles which needs to be protected. The proposed doubling of housing in this small town puts this wildlife at risk and appears to go against any Green to the Core strategy

Comment ID: 10594

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: Better roads and public transport will be required to ensure people that live in the new housing can access employment hubs in larger local towns. Currently these are inadequate and require upgrading

Comment ID: 10586

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: I welcome the content in section 3.13. It is imperative that the sewerage works in Fairford is upgraded before any further development is permitted as it is already over capacity. Thames Water did not support the recent planning permissions already granted for this reason. To allow additional housing, especially at the scale indicated by this proposal would likely have catastrophic consequences for existing residents and wildlife in a SSRI

Comment ID: 10596

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: Already provide at length in other comments but significant planning and investment (public and private) is required in the short to medium term to make it viable for Fairford to expand as per this proposal and likely the housing development would need to be postponed to ensure sufficient provision for existing and new residents in particular around transport/ roads, sewerage, GP services, leisure facilities and access to supermarkets etc. going ahead with the proposals without making this investment up front could be catastrophic for existing residents and wildlife alike (my biggest concern is the sewerage works which is already over capacity and Thames Water are not in a good position to spend the money required to upgrade it) there is a real risk of contaminated waste entering existing properties (and this already happens to the River Coln)

Comment ID: 10590

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: The suggestion for Fairford is not sustainable based on current infrastructure. Significant investment is required (both public and private) in the short to medium term to upgrade the sewerage works, roads (although an A road runs through the town this reduces to one lane near the Market Place and this cannot be expanded due to historic buildings - a relief road of some sort would be required to cope with increased traffic), public transport (very poor bus service to Cirencester and Lechlade only - no direct route to Swindon where I assume is a key employment hub for new residents), road routes are rural and poorly maintained, cars are essential as nearest supermarkets are on the whole not accessible by public transport, no public leisure facilities available, limited access to GP appointments etc

Comment ID: 10597

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Georgina Walpole

Comment: I admire the vision but cannot see how this has been used to steer decision making as the proposed doubling in size of Fairford doesn't seem to be in line with the strategy

Comment ID: 8746

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: This is far too detailed even for someone interested and able to comment. Reduce to general questions with links to more detail on local areas. Circulate more widely to get a better response. Yes build more affordable houses with sufficient infrastructure-we have space and need in Tetbury but no employment, transport or even safe pavements in some areas. Schools need funding. Contractors in short supply

Comment ID: 8749

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: Yes more smaller dwellings that are affordable. Tax 2nd homers and holiday lets

Comment ID: 8751

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: This is far too detailed even for someone interested and able to comment yet not specific enough locally. Reduce to general questions with links to more detail on local areas. Circulate more widely to get a better response. Yes build more affordable houses with sufficient infrastructure-we have space and need in Tetbury but no employment, transport or even safe pavements in some areas. Schools need funding. Contractors in short supply

Comment ID: 8748

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: Expand transport-provide funding for under 19s who need to travel out of area for education

And funding for anyone needing work outside Tetbury with no private transport

Comment ID: 8750

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: Listen to the local experts

Comment ID: 8747

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Gill Bevan

Comment: Option 5 if that's what the experts recommend. Ask local contractors who know

Comment ID: 10875

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: 4.1 If CDC are serious about looking at each proposed site re employment and infrastructure need etc, then in this case Moreton in Marsh would not have any further development attributed to it. There has been no additional employment growth in the town in the last 15 years , with only 2 small business parks sited here. Neither the north/south main road artery (Fosseway) or the east/west (Oxford/Worcester) roads can cope with the existing level of road traffic, as can't its neighbours Chipping Norton and Stow on the Wold who get a knock on effect from the traffic levels experienced here. The train service is only hourly and not reliable with frequent train cancellations. The bus services are being cut.

Comment ID: 10901

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: a) Affordable housing ... we have seen this in Moreton in Marsh where affordable housing is still beyond the reach of the general public - £500k plus homes are not affordable for young people with or without families and who are the knub of this housing crisis. And where is the employment for them even if they could afford the prices? There are none in Moreton in Marsh.

b) Flooding has been an issue in this town for years. Why propose to continue to build on a flood plain with land that is boggy and marshy? Getting house insurance for a property in the centre of Moreton has not been possible for me because we were flooded back in 2007 - building more housing will exacerbate the problem with a lack of storm and run off drainage.

Comment ID: 10879

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: As noted, there are currently inadequate employment opportunities in Moreton in Marsh and none identified in this plan to alleviate the current problem as well as planning for any future residential development. The High Street is dying as people are forced go out of the town for employment, education, shopping and for leisure facilities.

Comment ID: 10851

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: 3.16 - Moreton in Marsh has already been identified for 'over development'! It is a shame CDC did not listen to the concerns of the local residents and that external consults are now able to 'have their say/make recommendations' which will no doubt be made without listening to the concerns of the residents who live daily with the issues of AIR POLLUTION, TRAFFIC CHAOS (on a good day as the town is gridlocked by traffic), WATER and SEWAGE SYSTEMS that are unfit for purpose, a dying High Street because people who live here travel out of town to access EMPLOYMENT and LEISURE FACILITIES.

It is also important to acknowledge and FACTOR IN that to the east of Moreton in Marsh where development is proposed, is a registered SLA. and is important not only to the areas BIODIVERSITY but also to the WELLBEING of the residents of the town who enjoy this area to the east.

Comment ID: 10890

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: 4.9 Any Infrastructure requirements plan and its delivery will require funding and to be put into place before or alongside any additional residential development.

Whilst it is plauded the council will instigate this review, it will be worthless unless it is enacted, and Moreton in Marsh get a ring road (although this won't relieve the additional vehicle congestion for places like Stow on the Wold and Chipping Norton etc), an appropriate upgrade in sewage and water infrastructure, employment and health facilities and education etc..

Comment ID: 10865

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: Moreton in Marsh is ALREADY under provided for and therefore under immense pressure re the following:

- a) lack of local employment opportunities
- b) inadequate transport infrastructure
- c) inadequate/not fit for purpose sewage and water facilities
- d) inadequate storm drainage
- e) health facilities at breaking point
- f) inadequate public transport
- g) inadequate leisure facilities/dying High Street with inadequate parking
- h) schools and nursery places at breaking point
- i) a train service that is unreliable and which often the train is at overcapacity (out of London)

These are just a few issues that Moreton has CURRENTLY, and which have been exacerbated by the recent developments of BackHouse and Spitfire as NO IMPROVEMENTS to any of the above has been made before or since their construction..

Comment ID: 10867

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: CDC are proposing to increase the size of Moreton in Marsh to reflect that of a 'New Town', but without providing any of the infrastructure needed to support it.

The impact of a development of this kind and size on neighbouring communities must also be recognised. For example, any increase in traffic levels will have a knock on effect on all the surrounding area and in particular Stow on the Wold and Bourton on the Water to the south of Moreton.

Comment ID: 10898

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: a) Retaining the BIODIVERSITY of the area with any upswing being used in and around the proposed developments who otherwise will be giving this up

b) AIR POLLUTION given the current high levels eg Moreton in Marsh High Street, from the continuous and heavy traffic passing through the town centre and having an adverse impact on the health of both the residents and wildlife.

c) Where are the open spaces mentioned that will be needed to compensate for the removal of the SLA are to the east of Moreton in Marsh? Wellbeing both from an aesthetic perspective and from being able to access the countryside easily on foot as we can now.

d) Impact on the wildlife in the area eg the frogs on Toddtenham Road which are already under threat from the current level of vehicular activity on this road due to new development in this area.

Comment ID: 10900

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: The vision and aims and objectives of CDC should be applauded, except that these are great in theory only. If the housing development as proposed is instigated then very few of these will be achieved. The increase in vehicle usage alone (assuming an average of 2 cars per household for each new dwelling), will blow out of the water the majority of these aims. That, coupled with the impact on wildlife, biodiversity, continued strain on power, water, educational, health, employment and drainage they are nothing but pipedreams.

Comment ID: 10843

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Gina Stephens

Comment: This strategy is not a fair spread of the huge number of properties required up to 2043. If every village/down/development - irrespective of where in the District/AONB they are located - had some small scale development then the impact on the district will

a) be fairer

b) spread and thus have less overall impact on the Districts overstretched transport, utilities and other infrastructure

c) have the housing where it is needed and not concentrated in areas with little or no extra employment opportunities

d) put affordable housing in the villages where people have been brought up and want to stay

e) stop piling all the new development (as seen over the last 15 years), concentrated in the extremities of the District which are already at breaking point re facilities and appropriate infrastructure.

Comment ID: 11013

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: The Local plan claims sustainability as its key value. All of these plans go against this critical value. Scenario five is to me actually the worst of these options. Not only does it go against green goals and sustainability, it destroys the character of small villages like Siddington

Comment ID: 11017

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: No it should not. Why should the council trade away one critical value (sustainability) it has been fighting and very vocal for for another value - one which central government has decided would supersede sustainability

Comment ID: 11023

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: It depends where and to what extent. It would not be acceptable to do do to a level which sacrifices the character of these communities. - which is what any of the plans will do , especially option five. It was also affect the quality of live of the current residences in each of these locales. Villages should be so dense so as to do this - which is what this plan would do for areas like Siddington. Plenty of available is great. If no one - including those new residents to the area (their quality of life needs to be considered as well) has a decent quality of life, due to lack of transport or access to services all will suffer.

Comment ID: 11032

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: The proposed level of development in Siddington is not sustainable. Siddington is currently reliant on Cirencester for services, that would only grow, pressuring Cirencester as well as Siddington

A vast enlargement to Siddington would overwhelm rural infrastructure, increase flood risk, and destroy the village's identity.

I note that Siddington has been misclassified as as a Principal Settlement. The Love Lane industrial estate should not be included therein.

Comment ID: 11036

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: The following need to be considered:

- the need for village identity and cohesion
- Flood resilience
- Rural infrastructure limits

Classing some areas like Siddington as Principal Settlement in the first place is wrong - based on an incorrect assesement. that should be reconsidered.

Comment ID: 11049

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: GM Tordoff

Comment: I agree with the goals of having a wider availability of housing and I agree with the goal of growing communities in a sustainable number.

The plan falls short. It isn't possible to increase housing in a manner which actually creates affordable housing for a community on the basis of numbers mandated by a central government planning exercise. It provides little understanding of the local economic dynamic - what and how much would actually be able to be built and at what price it can be sold. A central figure from far away won't actually be able to predict this.

It however runs the risk of leading to unintended negative consequences. It may not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing communities such as Siddington

It will involve development that does not prioritise environmental stewardship, social equity or economic vitality.

Furthermore it would not respect villages like Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.

Will not result in villages Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community.

Will not offer employment opportunities

Will not offer additional essential facilities to communities

Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks.

Will reduce the green space available to communities.

Comment ID: 9305

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Gordon Lee

Comment: In response to Question 2: NO, CDC should not consider development it deems to be unsuitable or unsustainable simply to meet the Government's target. The CDC exists to maintain the beauty and balance of the Cotswolds, not to simply bow down to present Government "requirements" or "targets".

Comment ID: 9306

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Gordon Lee

Comment: I would not support it at all except in situations where very small homes (eg: small cottages or bungalows) would make sense in some locations a large number of very small (1 or 2 bed) properties could be built without spoiling the attractiveness of the area (might even improve it) and thus make a good contribution towards the Government targets. I would NOT support development of higher-rise or higher-density development in the Cotswolds other than in large towns that already exist.

Comment ID: 9310

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Gordon Lee

Comment: No, I do not agree with the Vision or Objectives. Please note these comments:

1.. Zero-carbon development is NOT more important than many other matters which are far more urgent and also more likely to be obtainable.

2.. "Green-to-the-core" is NOT an important objective whilst so many other matters remain unresolved,

3.. The "Vision" states several areas in which it says CDC have been successful. I do not agree it has been in those areas.

4.. Infrastructure - the IDP - now that IS important and has to come first, ahead of those issues listed above which can only be given due attention once the community is successfully being catered for via the IDP.

Comment ID: 10966

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Graeme

Comment: Scenario 3 - Main Service Centre focus - is the only practical solution as it is the only way to build urban-dense housing.

Comment ID: 10968

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Graeme

Comment: Any council that promotes this option would never be re-elected!

Comment ID: 10972

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Graeme

Comment: This is only viable in truly urban settings, and only if the quality of the developments avoid the creation of “sink” estates in 50 years time.

Comment ID: 10947

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Graeme Ferrero

Comment: This is a most unattractive option. The Cotswold landscape must be preserved and not overdeveloped. There is very little infrastructure or supporting services in these predominantly rural areas and the environmental impact would be high.

Comment ID: 10958

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Graeme Ferrero

Comment: Although this aims to preserve the Cotswold National Landscape, it is essential that considerations such as transport infrastructure are fully assessed. The expansion of a settlement can result in unacceptable pollution and congestion in an extended area as commuters seek new rat runs through rural villages and rivers and streams become polluted by inadequate sewerage provision.

Comment ID: 10975

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Graeme Ferrero

Comment: Moreton-in-Marsh is a good example of poor development, with some areas almost on the flood plain and others more and more remote from shops and services without any transport infrastructure being planned.

Comment ID: 9471

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Graham

Comment: I am Chair of Daglingworth Parish Council and we spent quite a lot of money to object to a truck stop on a site near our parish which went to appeal. It is important that the Council make provision elsewhere in the plan to discourage another application.

Comment ID: 11046

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Graham Bondi

Comment: I reluctantly agree that scenario 5 is the best in a situation forced on the council by the government. If I understand correctly the figures and maps apply to this option and show that a significant majority of the new housing allocation is outside of the AONB as it should be.

Comment ID: 11048

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Graham Bondi

Comment: No. The Cotswolds is a precious natural environment that must be protected. Often suggested as a National Park its continued erosion by development must be halted as far as possible.

Comment ID: 11052

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Graham Bondi

Comment: No support in the AONB. It would also be unwelcome outside of it. The only possibility that I might support would be if a site outside the AONB could be found that did not impact adversely on existing dwellings, would not degrade the natural environment, had good employment opportunities and had good transport links. Unlikely I fear. I would like to say more about the inappropriate housing target, but suppose you have no control over this.

Comment ID: 778

Email/Letter Representation

Name: G Curtis

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

Comment ID: 751

Email/Letter Representation

Name: G R Bates

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

Comment ID: 261

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gallagher Developments

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

Comment ID: 355

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gemma Hegarty

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

Comment ID: 583

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gene Jeffrey

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

Comment ID: 515

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 516

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 517

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 518

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 519

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 520

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 521

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Geoff Tappern

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

Comment ID: 669

Email/Letter Representation

Name: George Maxwell

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

Comment ID: 505

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Georgia Kirk

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

Comment ID: 718

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Georgia Kirk

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

Comment ID: 743

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Georgie Hayward

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

Comment ID: 220

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gerry Westmacott

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

Comment ID: 618

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gill Barge

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

Comment ID: 105

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gillian Barge

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

Comment ID: 213

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gillie McCollum

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

Comment ID: 189

Email/Letter Representation

Name: GL and CM Woodhouse

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

Comment ID: 656

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gladman Developments Ltd

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

Comment ID: 295

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gleeson Land

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

Comment ID: 320

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gloucestershire County Council

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

Comment ID: 383

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gordon Lee

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

Comment ID: 522

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Gracie Napier

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

Comment ID: 443

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Graeme and Ceri Mitchell

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

Comment ID: 384

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Graham O'Connor

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

Comment ID: 106

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Graham Trethewey

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

Comment ID: 626

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Great Western Railway

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

Comment ID: 130

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Greg Jones

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