

Comment ID: 10859

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: T Buxton

Comment: Table 2 of the preferred options consultation shows an allocation of housing to Cirencester in addition to that provided by The Steadings. The Steadings already meets the housing need for Cirencester up to 2044 and there can be no justification for further allocation in the amended local plan until the Steadings development is complete. The rationale for this is:

1. The developer has a commercial incentive to build and sell housing as soon as practical. The delay to Steadings development (compared the original timeline) shows the demand for housing on the Steadings development is slower than forecast.
2. A forecast number of cumulative occupations prepared by The Steadings in May 2025 and published in November 2025 shows the Steadings development is complete in 2044. This assumes that the average monthly occupation rate from 2026/28 is six times that in 2025/26. This seems an overly optimistic assumption and the completion of the Steading is likely to be delayed further.

This should be taken into account and the additional allocation of housing to Cirencester removed until the next local plan.

Comment ID: 10864

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: T Buxton

Comment: I attended the exhibition in Cirencester. It was disappointing to hear that no consideration had been given to the CNP ('Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan') when considering the preferred options. Will you please take account of the CNP and how its policies can be delivered when considering options.

Comment ID: 11028

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Tara

Comment: The assumption that 18,650 home are required is a not a local assumption of need but a top down central government allocation of numbers to the Cotswolds. This need should be challenged. is it proven that there is the growth in employment and population that requires this number or is it to provide housing to "export" workers to nearby cities. If the latter then this is not beneficial to the Cotswolds, it cannot cope and it would be questionable whether there was an economic, environmental or social benefit.

Comment ID: 11035

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tara

Comment: While realising a scenario will need to be taken forward, none are good news. The scenarios which take the village clusters and force an allocation on them will be damaging to the villages. The main issue is the infrastructure - particularly the mains and sewage. Unless these are forcibly upgrading to take into account additional capacity there will be serious challenges. At the moment I understand that development permits of less than 100 homes do not require an enforcement on utilities to upgrade infrastructure to support. In addition our roads are already suffering from the increase in traffic from tourism and keeping up with the maintenance if roads will be an increasing problem, especially if the new residents are being exported to work in the nearby cities. I would urge the council to think about what the concept of a village is before doubling it in size. Likewise market towns. The doubling of Fairford and Moreton-in-Marsh will have significant impacts on the towns themselves and the local surroundings.

Comment ID: 11043

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

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: It looks as though the council has selected those areas immediately outside the AONB (except Moreton-in-Marsh). The village clusters such as Bibury and Hatherop/Coln and Quenington are immediately "penalised". The proposal to increase the housing in Birbury is "bonkers". How will it cope? Have any councillors been to Bibury recently? !

Comment ID: 11062

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: Previous comments have noted the utilities infrastructure is of serious concern.

Comment ID: 11039

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: I am not sure what this question is. Is it suggestin the council proposes development in places that it will never be able to achieve? I am not sure this is wise as the way the current government is going there may be an central overruling of local concern and the council will lose control of the plan.

Comment ID: 11040

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: Possibly but it would need to be taken on a case by case basis,

Comment ID: 11055

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: The protection of the Cotswolds as the place it is should be of utmost priority for the council. It should resist the imposed plan as much as it can. It should be bold and strong. The proposed plans will fundamentally change the beautiful special place this is.

Comment ID: 11047

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Tara Douglas-Home

Comment: Increasing the cluster of Quenington/Coln and Hatherop by 30% is not currently feasible. as perviously mentioned the utilities infrastructure cannot cope. I have recently been dealing with Thames Water who have been looking to increase the mains infrastructure across some fields for the additional building in Fairford and it has been a challenge. But there is no sign of sewage infratructure and without this the already creaking system will only result in a continuting polution of the River Coln.

Comment ID: 9149

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: Option 5 - the consultation document and supportive documentation was thorough, and whilst this option only provides 79% of the governments over ambitious target of 18,650, this is the option that best fits with the current district council local plan, and it recognises the need for potentially increased density of housing in the right locations.

Comment ID: 9150

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: Where are all the builders going to come from?

Comment ID: 9152

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: No - the Council should not locate development in unsustainable locations simply to meet government-imposed housing targets. Doing so would undermine the principles of the Local Plan and the long-term vision for the Cotswolds as a protected rural district.

Why not?

1. Infrastructure first!
2. Environmental Impact: Over 80% of the district is designated as Cotswolds National Landscape. Building in unsustainable areas would harm biodiversity, landscape, character and tourism. This must be protected.
3. Infrastructure Deficit: Unsustainable sites often lack essential infrastructure - roads, schools, healthcare (including health provision) and public transport - leading to car dependency, congestion and lack of parking.
4. Community Cohesion: Isolated developments risk creating dormitory estates with limited access to services, weakening social fabric and local identity.
5. Climate Commitments: Locating housing away from transport hubs contradicts carbon reduction goals and Gloucestershire's climate strategy.
6. Empty homes in disrepair with no other owner - whilst limited in number, could the Council look to take these homes on to provide accommodation?

Comment ID: 9154

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: We would support a carefully managed increase in housing density in appropriate locations within the Cotswolds, particularly:

- Market towns and larger settlements such as Cirencester, Moreton-in-Marsh, and Bourton-on-the-Water, where services and transport links already exist.
- Brownfield sites and infill plots to avoid unnecessary loss of countryside.
- Mixed-use developments that combine housing with local amenities.

This could include:

- Smaller homes and gardens for affordability.
- More flats and maisonettes in town centres.
- Limited use of taller buildings (e.g., 3–4 storeys) where they fit the historic character and landscape.

Why This Approach Works for the Cotswolds

1. **Protecting the National Landscape:** Over 80% of the district is designated as a protected landscape. Increasing density in existing settlements reduces pressure on greenfield sites and preserves the rural character.
2. **Sustainability:** Concentrating development near public transport and services reduces car dependency and supports climate goals.
3. **Affordability & Local Need:** Smaller homes and flats help younger people and key workers stay in the area, addressing the affordability crisis.
4. **Infrastructure Efficiency:** Higher density in the right places makes it easier to deliver schools, healthcare, and transport improvements without fragmenting resources.

Important Caveats

- **Design Quality:** Developments must respect the Cotswolds' distinctive architecture and heritage.

- **Green Space:** Even higher-density schemes should include communal green areas and biodiversity features. Attention must be given to who will manage these open spaces
- **Type of Housing:** Any housing development in the district would need to be appropriate housing, sustainable and carbon friendly. The cost of owning a property in the district is unattainable for most local people and so a shift towards social rented housing is required to allow people to live and work in our district.
- **Community Engagement:** Residents must be involved early to ensure developments meet local needs and maintain trust.
- **Adherence to Neighbourhood Plans in force,** particularly in Tetbury whose NP highlights the need for bungalows. Some provision of these would be helpful alongside smaller houses with less gardens and, where the landscape allows, higher buildings.

Comment ID: 9156

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: At present, the proposed level of development for the District and Tetbury raises concerns about sustainability.

In view of the fact that, after flood risk areas, and 80% of the district being in the Cotswold National Landscape (previously Area of Outstanding National Beauty), less than 20% of the district is available for development, the number of houses is over ambitious and inappropriate, it will be challenging to shoe horn into such a small area such a large number of properties. Infrastructure before development is essential if these properties are to be built

While Tetbury is a principal settlement with existing services, its capacity to absorb significant growth is constrained by:

- Social Rented/Truly Affordable homes for local people.
- Limited road infrastructure – The A433 and local routes already experience congestion, particularly during peak times.
- Healthcare provision – The current GP surgery is under pressure; plans for a new healthcare facility are welcome but must be delivered early in the development cycle.
- Industrial sites which will provide employment for light industry and office space – maybe flexible for homeworkers. Encourage small businesses and the employment of local people. Tetbury is in danger of becoming a dormitory town with limited employment opportunities.
- School capacity – a review of primary and secondary school capacities in the District and Tetbury, any expansion plans need to be confirmed.
- Public transport – Bus services are limited and infrequent, making car dependency high, both for local journeys within the town, as it grows and longer ones to centres such as Stroud and Cirencester. It is difficult to find a bus to take you to work in the morning and back again in the evening at appropriate times.
- Car Parking – limited car parking in an around the town centre is problematic and issues deteriorate during peak holiday times.
- Supermarket – whilst there is Tesco and a high street Co-op, a low-cost supermarket would be welcomed for residents who currently travel to Malmesbury or

Cirencester by car to shop weekly and save money. Waitrose would also appeal to some residents.

- Burial Ground – this is an issue across the district and in Tetbury, St Saviour's is now almost at capacity.
- Lack of builders to build out at this scale

What provisions would need to be added to make the District and Tetbury sustainable for the proposed level of development?

To ensure sustainability an Infrastructure First

approach to any development site should be adopted and the following provisions are essential – not in order of priority:

1. Healthcare Services

1. Deliver the proposed new primary healthcare facility (as outlined in recent planning applications) before major housing phases are occupied.
2. Include space for future expansion and integrated community health services - working in partnership with NHS and Tetbury Hospital Trust

2. Education

1. Secure funding and land for school expansion or a new primary school to accommodate additional families.
2. Collaborate with Gloucestershire County Council on secondary school capacity planning.

3. Transport & Connectivity

1. Improve road junctions and pedestrian safety along Cirencester Road and London Road.
2. Introduce enhanced bus services connecting Tetbury to Cirencester, Stroud, and Kemble Station.
3. Provide safe cycling and walking routes, including links to employment areas and schools.

4. Utilities & Digital Infrastructure

1. Upgrade water, drainage, and electricity networks to handle increased demand.

2. Ensure full-fibre broadband for all new developments to support home working and reduce commuting.
5. Green Infrastructure
 1. Maintain and enhance public open spaces and biodiversity corridors.
 2. Incorporate sustainable drainage systems and tree planting to mitigate flood risk and climate impacts.
 3. Infrastructure for nature should also be taken into account to include, on houses, birds and bat boxes and along byways, hedgehog corridors.
6. Affordable Housing & Mixed Use
 1. Ensure a balanced housing mix, including smaller homes and flats, to meet local needs and reduce pressure on greenfield sites.
 2. Consider mixed-use developments with local shops and community facilities to reduce car trips.

Summary

Tetbury and the District can accommodate growth only if infrastructure and services are upgraded in parallel with housing delivery. Without these measures, development risks increasing congestion, straining public services, and undermining the town's character.

Finally – Kemble Airfield – we would not agree with any suggested use of Kemble/Cotswold airfield for houses. The airfield is a valuable tourist attraction as well as being the country's largest private airport. In addition, it houses several innovative businesses and technologies on their site.

Comment ID: 9157

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: With an ageing population we need to ensure that we have affordable, appropriate housing for our older residents – not unaffordable private retirement villages. Residents throughout the district need single floor living – flats with reliable lifts or bungalows, as outlined in the Tetbury and Tetbury with Upton Neighbourhood Plan.

Burial space, memorial woodlands or crematorium.

All developers/builders should be required to work on site with carbon friendly materials and access site using electric vehicles. These developments are going to cause a huge amount of disruption to wildlife, and every effort must be taken to protect them and eventually, enhance their habitats.

All industrial buildings in the district should be housing solar panels on their rooftops rather than the use of green space/farmland

Comment ID: 9159

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tara Niblett - Tetbury Town Council

Comment: We agree that, whilst the objectives will be challenging, the vision and plan have been produced in a professional and conscientious manner. However, the imposition of blanket housing targets by central government fails to account for the unique characteristics and constraints of the Cotswolds, making them both unrealistic and potentially damaging. Here's why:

1. Protected Landscape and Environmental Sensitivity

- Over 80% of the Cotswold District is designated as National Landscape (formerly AONB). Large-scale development risks irreversible harm to biodiversity, heritage, and scenic beauty, which are the foundation of the local economy and tourism.
- National policy prioritizes protecting these landscapes, yet housing targets often ignore these constraints.
- Protection for farming community who are facing significant challenges e.g. use of land for solar farms. There should be an expectation that all houses will have solar panels, thus reducing demand for solar farms.
- This area does not have the water supply to manage the new data storage units that are now being talked about.

2. Infrastructure Limitations

- Rural road networks, healthcare facilities, and schools are already under pressure. Imposing high housing numbers without commensurate investment in infrastructure leads to congestion, overstretched services, and reduced quality of life.
- Government targets rarely come with guaranteed funding for these upgrades.

3. Local Need vs. Imposed Numbers

- Targets are based on national formulas rather than local demographic and economic realities. The Cotswolds faces a need for affordable homes for local families and key workers, not thousands of executive homes that fail to address the real housing crisis.
- Imposed targets often encourage speculative development rather than community-led planning.

4. Climate and Sustainability Goals

- Forcing growth in rural areas increases car dependency, undermining climate commitments. Sustainable development should focus on brownfield sites and transport hubs, not Greenfield sprawl.

5. Democratic Accountability

- Local plans are meant to reflect community priorities, yet government targets override local decision-making. This erodes trust and reduces the ability of councils to plan responsibly for their areas.

Comment ID: 8778

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Terry Morgan

Comment: Consultation response by Terry Morgan in relation to

Cotswold District Council Local Plan Update ~ Development Strategy Options~
Technical Report and I.I.A.~ November 2025

Observations and comments

1) It is stated that 18,650 additional new homes are needed in for the new local plan period based on the current government's new 'standard methodology' calculation of the number of homes needed. The report sets out that 6,150 homes already have planning permission, are remaining site allocations from the adopted Local Plan or are expected to be delivered as windfalls (i.e. sites not specifically identified in the Local Plan), which can contribute towards delivering the housing target. Consequently sites capable of delivering $18,650 - 6,150 = 12,500$ homes are judged to be needed to fully deliver this current Government's calculated housing target in the Cotswold area.

2) Of the 7 Development strategy options considered to best enable all or some of the assessed need for new dwellings in the Cotswold Local Plan area over the 18 year Plan period, Scenario 5 is identified as the "preferred option". This is judged as the only scenario that

"maximises housing supply whilst also delivering sustainable and inclusive development."

3) The report goes on to point out that

"scenario 5 relies on the delivery of eight strategic sites of 500 or more homes, with these types of sites normally being complex and often delayed. There are also other high risks, such as the delivery of the development being contingent on infrastructure delivery from external organisations, which may delay development".

4) It is surely more of a certainty and a fact, rather than just a "high risk", that the provision of the necessary physical infrastructure for this scale of development would be extensive, complex, expensive, time-consuming (and hence disruptive); factors which realistically mean undeliverable within the timeframe and unachievable given the lack of funding that would need to come from the already decimated "public purse".

5) The report acknowledges that the complexity of infrastructure provision in an area where there are statutory and local constraints and, as such, that it is unrealistic to believe the house building target would be achieved within the Plan period

6) Sensibly the report also points out that there is little or no chance of increasing residential densities in an attempt to compensate for the shortfall in achieving this frankly over-ambitious and politically misguided over-development of predominantly non-urban and environmentally sensitive areas.

7) What the report does not seek to identify (disappointingly but perhaps understandably) is the scale, and therefore order of potential costs of the required infrastructure provision for the preferred development scenario. Indeed an idea of the relative financial costs of each of the considered scenarios is normally an important factor in a comparative assessment process. To establish a “ball park” figure of required financial outlay is invariably a fundamental consideration in feasibility appraisals since such knowledge can have a significant effect on deliverability thereby adding or removing “weight” in the balance in the practical assessment of options.

8) The point here (and which I assume is deliberately absent in the report available for consultation) relates to quantifying economic viability and vitality of the existing and expanded settlements, and the costs involved in trying to achieve the housing uplift targets (formulated by an inept and misguided Government that, ironically and fortunately, won't be in power for the vast majority of the Local Plan period anyway).

9) In simple terms, part of the justification of the proposed development has to be the value given to the affected settlements and communities. Effectively, a profit and loss balance sheet whereby the relationship between the perceived economic uplift in the affected locations is quantified against the costs of implementation. So, as well as part of balancing “risk” (aka adverse impact) there is surely a need to undertake a cost/benefit analysis.

10) This clearly requires an economic appraisal of the effects of the changes to development locations, and a realistic first stage construction appraisal of all physical infrastructure that would need to be implemented for water (drainage and supply), power, communication and transport networks and facilities to mitigate, accommodate and ideally enhance, these essential services for, and within, these affected , and relatively fragile, settlements and communities.

11) An economic appraisal dealing with the “worth” of the additional development in an area obviously must consider the commercial viability (such as retail and hospitality provision and demand), as well as health services and educational provision, together with employment generation. Similarly the appraisal of infrastructure must sensibly consider workable accessibility through the use of and proximity to competent (and essentially enhanced) public transport connections, car parking facilities and emergency and delivery access provisions that are realistically commensurate with the nature, location and scale of the effected settlements.

12) The report makes scant reference to these factors related to infrastructure provision. In the I.I.A. there are various references and commentary on the hurdles to be overcome in progressing the new housing targets. An example of such commentary is found, inter alia, at Page 26.

13) The report makes the rather obvious point that bringing forward these development scenarios

“...has the potential to put pressures on the capacity of existing services and facilities which would serve additional housing growth. Notably, some infrastructure is already lacking in these areas (e.g. sewage treatment works and highway capacity), and as a result some parts of the district are already suffering from overdevelopment. Therefore, it will be essential for new development areas to be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure to meet needs (to support wellbeing).”

14) Another pertinent comment also on Page 26 of the I.I.A. is:

“Scenario 6 is the only scenario which exceeds the local housing need figure and will likely support opportunities to deliver significant new community infrastructure due to the inclusion of new strategic extensions, the level of growth proposed through this scenario is considered likely to adversely impact the sense of place of some settlements.”

15) Surely therefore if there is recognition of adverse impacts, the need to implement significant infrastructure and to include strategic extensions, then any development of this scale has to be coupled with up front programmed financial commitment by the responsible authorities.

16) Whilst it is appreciated that this document is “only” an assessment, it must be appropriate for any formal consideration about advancing these developments should come with stated (enforceable?) commitment to advance (and essentially fund) the required improvements. In the absence of commitment there is no guarantee that impacts will be mitigated or that the settlements and communities will suffer degradation through lack of investment.

17) Specifically, but not exclusively, in relation to transport networks on page 31 & 32, the I.I.A. makes reference to

“bus services across most of the district, particularly in rural locations, are sporadic or non-existent”.

And

“It is recognised that the ability of smaller settlements to absorb additional growth in a sustainable manner is more limited because people tend to rely more on their cars to

access services and facilities and employment opportunities, and other travel options are typically more limited.”

18) There is also the point that for larger scale scenarios (including the preferred scenario) there are implications which surely necessitates commitment to essential funding.

“...by delivering new settlement(s) and strategic extensions, these scenarios have the greatest potential to deliver significant new transport infrastructure, including public transport and active travel infrastructure. Due to this, these scenarios are also ranked highly. However, mixed effects are noted as growth in the Non-Principal Settlements and Rural Settlements will inevitably lead to an increase in the number of cars on local roads.”

19) It cannot be disputed that there will be a commensurate increase in the need for residents and others to travel. Specifically car (and HGV) usage will increase with any expansion in settlement size and with the increase in the density of the development . Further, car usage and the corresponding erosion of available road network capacity will only be reduced if those new populations have access to sufficiently competent, convenient and available alternative modes of travel.

20) There is then reference (Inter alia Page 32 & 33) to the “pipe-dream” that locating substantial residential developments relatively close to public transport networks will significant change or even reduce car usage.

“Dispersing growth around the district through Scenarios 1 and 2 would potentially result in a higher percentage of new homes and employment land being delivered in less sustainable locations with respect to accessibility and connectivity to public transport networks. The ability of Non-Principal Settlements to absorb additional growth in a sustainable manner is more limited because people tend to rely more on their cars to access services and employment opportunities and other travel options are typically limited.”

21) This is of course in the context of historic planning policy aimed at “Modal Shift”. It is generally acknowledged, and even referred to in the I.L.A. that achieving statistically significant and impact-reducing car use is impractical and almost impossible in small rural and semi rural areas where, for example public transport services are sporadic or non-existent.

22) It is a fact that people (and even the new residents in these new developments) will assess the choice of travel alternatives pertinent to their reason for travel, the relative location of the origin and destination of the journey, the convenience (simplicity and timing) of achieving the desired journey and the cost implications. That is why the choice of using the private car (they have purchased, taxed, insured and maintained)

will always be the predominate choice as apposed to public transport facilities that are less convenient, infrequent, unreliable, impractical and costly. Let's face it, people will always choose the car for their weekly shop or visits to retail centres, educational establishments and healthcare facilities.

23) There is also reference in the assessment to the misguided requirement to work towards "net zero". Whilst this remains an obligation at this point in time, it's unworkable restrictions to sensible planning are unlikely to last the entire local plan period. The I.I.A. makes reference to the Council's stance on climate change on page 32

"In this context, scenarios which would help support the transition to net-zero and improve climate resilience perform more favourably with respect to this theme."

24) It seems questionable as to the amount of weight that is applied to this aspect of the assessments. Reducing transport emissions is frankly and statistically less important than providing practical solutions to the necessary enhancement of the means of travel that would continue to be used by people when undertaking their journeys to work, shopping, schools, healthcare and recreation. Despite historic planning policy guidance seeking to get people out of the private car, the continued increase in population and car ownership is a fact that needs to be catered for in the real world, especially in non-urban and small settlement rural areas with significant proportions of tourist visitors that help sustain these locations, and where, by dint of geography people's place of work is simply not "on their doorstep".

25) In large urban areas there is a need and justification for assessments such as P.T.A.L.'s (Public Transport Accessibility Levels) to help determine development scale and density and to accord with environmental constraints and statutory planning and economic policy.

26) A further consideration relating to the deliverability of "greener" energy ambitions relates to the "roll out" of Electric Vehicles (E.V.s) and charging networks competent enough to help promote their use and make them a realistic alternative to "I.C.E." cars. It remains debatable whether 2030 is too soon to expect that production of petrol and diesel cars will be able to be stopped before a viable electric driven network is sufficiently attractive to effect that aspect of modal shift. This is particularly pertinent in areas such as the Cotswolds where the installation and implementation of vehicle charging facilities would be extremely difficult or impractical. Siting charging networks and equipment adjacent to sensitive, historic, protected settlements and rural environments would certainly come with challenges and inherent high costs. The proportional cost of such infrastructure needs to be "factored in" to the cost-benefit equation.

27) Another aspect of new residential development that is "location specific" is demographics. Certain regions and districts lend themselves more readily to achieving

a housing mix commensurate to the population. Euphemistically “horses for courses”, there is surely a need for the new housing targets to have considered the type and density of housing that best fits with the perceived demand for housing adjacent to, for example, areas of high employment density. Conversely it must be recognised that sensitive and rural areas will not in fact generate such demand and so it would be impractical and uneconomic to have to create infrastructure upgrades to accommodate an insignificant demand.

28) The practical availability of land suitable for new development is obviously a determinant in how realistic it is to accord with planning policy. Developers are tasked with the need to introduce a range of dwelling types within the development scheme, ostensibly to cater for a mix of private and low cost (“affordable”) houses. Depending on the scale of the development and its proximity and capacity of neighbouring facilities and amenities, the development may also need to include non-residential construction and related infrastructure (retail, educational, leisure and health services etc). Given that a private developer would have to see a return on investment, it would be unlikely that nonprofit making components of development schemes would “get off the ground” in areas where demand is questionable or inviable to create, at least without the assurance of further public funding.

29) The economic viability of an area can be assisted (or even rescued) by new development. It remains imperative that, as well as seeking to satisfy perceived housing demand, all development must bring forward benefits that outweigh adverse impacts such as inadequate capacity on transport networks or drainage systems. This capacity needs to be provided (and paid for) which, at the very least, returns the available capacity to the “Status Quo” by mitigating adverse impacts. The report acknowledges that there is limited scope for such capacity enhancements. For “limited scope” maybe this should be modelled as “no realistic scope”.

30) With that in mind, the assessment of the various development scenarios should surely also have to “factor in” the affects and infrastructure provisions required for any programmed development proposals (including the 6,150 homes already enjoying planning permission that are offset from the assessed target). This is a “double-edged sword” in the debate as to the adequacy and viable extent of infrastructure that would be necessary to facilitate the chosen scenario for new development. It is feasible that such programmed or ongoing development has “got away” with eroding available capacity without compensatory provision (funding and implementation). The point is that the level, nature and complexity of the all the infrastructure required to accommodate the impact of the scale of the target level of housing provision is likely to be, at best expensive, and realistically very difficult to implement in a timely fashion making it effectively unviable. It also begs the question whether such infrastructure would ever provide economic benefits over and above just “enabling” the development

by mitigating its impact, It is unlikely that any agreed developer-led funding would be sufficient to do more than accommodate the impact of the development(s). Assuming the funding for infrastructure is to come from the developer(s) rather than the public purse, then there would be no “philanthropic” contribution that would reduce their profit margins.

31) In considering the consequences of a development it seems strange that an “Integrated Impact Assessment” is silent on the subject of comparative costings. It is not beyond the wit of man to think that getting a handle on anticipated costs of the required infrastructure, utility upgrades and other factors that would inform and help determine whether even the preferred development scenario is cost effective or even affordable.

32) It is worthy of comment that “cash-strapped” communities, authorities, businesses and even developers need help in an unstable and underfunded national and local economy. It remains concerning that these choices of development options may be advanced without secured funding and commitment.

33) It is also pertinent that there is the “cart before the horse” approach with development proposals fundamentally because infrastructure improvements are generally funded by the developer(s) who naturally are business driven to make money before spending it. Experience informs us that securing funding, especially for large scale and longer term projects requires often extensive calculation, negotiation and justification and securing by planning conditions and legal agreements.

34) What is invariably difficult to secure is the funding and implementation of infrastructure at the onset of any development so as to facilitate and “pump prime” the overall development. This is particularly necessary where there is already a need for new infrastructure even before the expansion of demands on systems and networks.

35) One fundamental issue that appears absent from the analysis relates to what happens to existing and programmed planning commitments and obligations. There are intentions and responsibilities enshrined in current and extant planning policy and it begs the question whether these are being overridden or “factored in” to the considerations for the new development scenarios. There are two aspects to this; firstly and as previously mentioned, individual extant planning permissions and ongoing permitted development in the designated settlement areas will include some agreed improvements to infrastructure. Secondly, the planning authority is bound to obligations to continue to maintain and enhance the economic vitality and viability of these settlement areas through the advancement of schemes for employment generation, commercial sustainability, facilities and accessibility for tourist and retail generation, environmental enhancements etc.

36) It is not apparent in the technical report and integrated impact assessment whether the assessment of schemes is geared solely to determine how to achieve the imposed house-building targets or whether existing and programmed commitments associated with extant permissions would be effectively lost or pushed back. Of course it would be prudent not to duplicate work, but this needs to be addressed so that there is no adverse consequences for the effected locations. Losing the benefits of programmed works would be contrary to proper planning and would be disruptive and damaging to the economic and environmental sustainability of the effected settlements.

37) It is concerning that when commenting on the “key strengths and opportunities of the preferred scenario, the technical report (see page 31) can only say “ can” or “may”, but not will :-

- Provides the opportunity to create a well-designed, ‘green to the core’, sustainable and self-sustaining communities with new homes, jobs and supporting services and facilities.
- Can support sustainable travel and community facilities from the outset.
- Provides the opportunity to create significant new infrastructure investment.
- Can improve existing transport connectivity within existing settlements (e.g. the provision of a new bus service).
- Can include employment land, support local jobs and reduce commuting.
- May attract investment and innovation, especially if linked to growth sectors.

38) Progressing these development scenarios in the interests of existing communities and settlements really needs to be based on commitments not just “opportunities”.

39) It is at least encouraging that the report doesn’t ignore some fundamental and potentially unresolvable practical problems (see example below from Page 32 of the Technical Report). But how can we be confident that these issues will be addressed over the life of the Plan without commitment from the principle authorities, interested parties (such as Utilities) and notably the Government?

Scenario 5: Key Weaknesses / Threats

- Provides a housing supply that is 79% of the 18,650 homes needed.
- Strategic sites often take years to plan, approve, and deliver – they are therefore not expected to contribute towards the five year housing land supply early in the plan period.

• High risk of delays due to infrastructure, land assembly, or viability issues. Cotswold District Development Strategy Options Topic Paper – November 2025 Page 32

- There are several strategic sites within close proximity of each other, which may potentially be delivering housing at the same time²⁰. Even in a high demand area like Cotswold District, there is a limit to the number of homes that can be delivered in relatively small area, which may constrain housing delivery rates.
- High infrastructure costs – requires upfront investment in roads, schools, utilities, and public transport.
- Funding gaps can affect delivery or quality of outcomes, including the percentage of affordable housing.
- Risk of isolation – if not well-connected or phased properly, new settlements can feel remote or lack community cohesion.
- May struggle to attract early residents or businesses.
- Scale of development likely to have a significant environmental, social and economic impact, irrespective of location (e.g. large-scale development can affect biodiversity, landscape, and agricultural land).
- Requires careful mitigation and design to minimise harm.
- Complex governance and delivery – often involve multiple stakeholders, landowners, and delivery partners.
- Requires strong leadership, coordination, and long-term stewardship.

40) “Scenario 0” is the unmentioned “do nothing” scenario, but even that has a cost. There are policy driven commitments to all these settlements to maintain and ideally enhance the economic viability and vitality of local economies. Commitments to mitigate the effects of inadequate or ineffective infrastructure through maintenance and upgrading are enshrined in existing policy frameworks. There needs to be clarification that these intended works will not be forgotten or in some way subsumed into projects over the longer term.

41) Investment in infrastructure, that is needed anyway, needs to be quantified and be “up front”. The increase in the scale of development (whether sensibly derived or not) is unlikely to “pay for itself” by rejuvenating local economies for some considerable time (if at all) and so there needs to be a strategy for assessing and quantifying upgrades that that would adequately cater for infrastructure requirement that are necessary now, even before any development scenarios add pressures and capacity issues on facilities, systems and networks.

42) It must be the case that to go anywhere near achieving the development targets there needs to be a commitment for substantial government funding because it is damaging and unviable for existing (and underfunded) settlements to be adversely affected by unsustainable growth.

43) It seems that the most realistic way forward would need to involve “Pump priming” from government contribution. It would seem sensible for the Local Plan to address the “elephant in the room” that ambitious and potentially unachievable targets imposed by Government need to be funded, at least initially or in part, by those who created the targets because private investment will only come from those who can achieve a return on investment.

Summary

44) The Report and associated Integrated Impact Assessment do not seem to “factor-in” any consideration of commitments to the funding of the infrastructure and other local enhancements that would be necessitated by the various development scenarios. Whilst the I.I.A. makes reference to potentially significant infrastructure requirements, the enabling works and upgrades to achieve workable accessibility and sufficient network capacity will all come at a not insignificant cost.

45) In areas where there is arguably no demand for new development, but there remains a need for maintaining and enhancing existing infrastructure it has to be more realistic and sustainable not to allocate funding to new development but instead to ensure the (continued) viability of valued settlements and areas. This must factor into the demand calculations to a greater degree because sensitive and protected areas are not a blank canvas. Land availability for new development (and its infrastructure) is scarcer in such areas than the Governments calculations driving this push for development would have us believe.

46) These works will also need to be progressed in a timely fashion and with least disruption to existing settlements. In view of this it is surely imperative that one of the fundamental impacts that should be included in the assessments is funding. Indeed it is common when assessing development that some form of cost benefit analysis is undertaken, even at the feasibility stage, because this could sway the balance of achievability and change the hierarchy of preferred options if a scenario is simply too expensive.

47) Inherent in the consideration of funding there is the aspect of phasing the preferred scheme, and commonly the need to secure a commitment to funding prior to the commencement of the development. Indeed, it is increasingly important to have funding available at the initial “pump-priming” stage.

48) Given the complexities of developer funded projects, where understandably and rightly, businesses need to get a return on their investment, it would seem imperative that there was reference to a commitment by the Government and responsible authorities that funding was secured and available “before a spade turned over the first sod.”

49) It is not unreasonable to believe that if there was some measure of the costs of delivering the infrastructure as part of the appraisal of the various development scenarios, then certain options might be judged as prohibitively expensive and unaffordable. Such scenarios even if they were assessed as having “good scores” in relation to other impacts and objectives, could simply fall at that hurdle. Of course if available funding was limitless then a cost benefit analysis would be irrelevant, but we all know that funding is finite.

50) The technical report and I.I.A. do not make it clear whether the assessment of schemes is geared solely to determine how to achieve the imposed house-building targets or whether it has taken into account existing and programmed commitments linked to extant permissions. Indeed there seems to be a sense that meeting these imposed targets will “ride roughshod” over them .

51) Measures to achieve realistic and workable modal shift in non-urban locations are difficult, expensive and often ineffective. The travel behaviours of residents of existing and new homes in these settlements will always be based on what is the most convenient and least expensive mode of travel befitting the reason for the journey. That is why very few people do their weekly shop by public transport. The I.I.A. needs to address the complexity of modal shift in rural areas and assess impacts based on realistic interpretations of travel demand rather than the aspirations of historical planning policy guidance.

52) In an area such as the Cotswolds with dispersed small centres of population coupled with sensitive environments, it will take more than small pockets of new residential development to bring forward cost effective public transport infrastructure that would have any meaningful influence on modal shift. The cost and complexity of building such networks would exceed any economic or environment benefit. The demand for non-car modes of travel would simply not be created and consequently new residential development could not be instrumental in cultivating or even sustaining viable economic growth or stability in a region already lacking in investment.

53) There is a feeling of “cart before the horse” in the process of attempting to deal with potentially unsustainable, possibly ill-conceived and unaffordable, house building targets in sensitive locations.

Comment ID: 9186

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

Name: The Wolfords Joint Parish Council

Comment: The Wolfords JPC are very concerned about the proposals on the basis that Moreton in Marsh lacks the infrastructure to meet the increased housing load proposed in relation to both essential services, schooling and transport. As a neighbouring rural parish in Warwickshire the villages are already being impacted by traffic diverting onto the small rural roads with consequent adverse impacts. Little or not consideration appears to have been given to these matters.

Comment ID: 9188

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: The Wolfords Joint Parish Council

Comment: The choice of Moreton in Marsh for overdevelopment and supporting report appears very weak. It is obvious that Moreton already has a serious problem with lack of services, schools, etc and that the road infrastructure is unable to meet the current demand. The pressure that increasing Moreton will put on the adjoining villages and particularly the impact on the AONB is considerable

Comment ID: 9191

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: The Wolfords Joint Parish Council

Comment: The selection of Moreton in Marsh for increased growth will be detrimental to the township and is patently unsustainable as the town lacks the infrastructure to cope, as has been evidenced by the impact of the current housing developments. The consequent impact on surrounding villages has already been noticeable with small rural roads being used as rat runs, etc.

Comment ID: 10018

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: The proposed development raises concerns regarding compliance with the European Convention on Human Rights, in particular Article 8, which protects the right to respect for private and family life and the home. Increased flood risk, heightened traffic danger, loss of safe access, and degradation of local amenity would materially interfere with the reasonable enjoyment of existing homes in Ampney Crucis. The scale of development relative to the constraints of local infrastructure risks creating unsafe living conditions and environmental harm that are neither proportionate nor necessary, and therefore may constitute an unjustified interference with residents' Article 8 rights

Comment ID: 10022

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: Ampney Crucis has very limited access, with approach roads that are predominantly single-track, lack pavements, and have no realistic scope for widening. The principal access is via an ancient single-track bridge with an existing weight restriction. Parking within the village is already severely constrained, with on-street parking frequently obstructing visibility and vehicle movement; residents are often unable to park outside their own homes. The presence of the village school and public house regularly exacerbates these issues, creating congestion and unsafe conditions, particularly at peak times, and restricting access for buses and emergency vehicles. The local road network is not capable of safely accommodating the traffic and parking demand associated with a development of this scale.

Comment ID: 10023

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: There have been multiple fatal accidents on the A417 London Road at the Ampney Crucis junction, largely due to restricted visibility and the constrained turning over the historic bridge. The addition of approximately 660 dwellings would significantly increase vehicle movements, likely exceeding 800 additional cars, and would further compromise an already unsafe junction.

Comment ID: 10025

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: The proposed development site is currently used extensively by local residents for walking, recreation, and dog exercise. Development would result in a significant loss of accessible open land and informal walking routes, reducing local opportunities for outdoor activity. The site also provides habitat for local wildlife, including protected species, and development would lead to the loss of valuable green space and natural corridors, impacting biodiversity in the area

Comment ID: 10026

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: Ampney Crucis is approximately a 20-minute drive from the nearest railway station at Kemble, requiring travel through Cirencester and several residential areas. This would increase traffic congestion and emissions. The location does not align with national policy objectives that prioritise new development in close proximity to public transport hubs.

Comment ID: 10030

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Thomas

Comment: Ampney Crucis is approximately a 20-minute drive from the nearest railway station at Kemble, requiring travel through Cirencester and several residential areas. This would increase traffic congestion and emissions. The location does not align with national policy objectives that prioritise new development in close proximity to public transport hubs.

Comment ID: 10019

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Thomas

Comment: I own 26 Ampney Crucis, which backs onto the proposed development site. The area is known to have significant drainage constraints, and previous development proposals at Ampney Park were refused on the grounds of inadequate drainage. Building on this land is likely to place additional pressure on existing natural drainage systems and increase flood risk in the wider area. Clarification is required on what mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure that existing homes and infrastructure are not adversely affected.

Comment ID: 10029

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Thomas

Comment: I own 26 Ampney Crucis, which backs onto the proposed development site. The area is known to have significant drainage constraints, and previous development proposals at Ampney Park were refused on the grounds of inadequate drainage. Building on this land is likely to place additional pressure on existing natural drainage systems and increase flood risk in the wider area. Clarification is required on what mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure that existing homes and infrastructure are not adversely affected.

Comment ID: 10568

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: I support the representations made by Kemble & Ewen Parish Council in relation to the Regulation 18 Consultation by Cotswold District Council.

Comment ID: 9813

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

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: The proposed allocation for Kemble as a Principal Settlement appears over development based upon the current size of the village. Any development needs to ensure the creation of a sustainable community. The value of Mixed Use through Stewardship needs to be considered. It is of note that beyond 2043, 1,100 homes are referred to. Better housing design, layout and landscape are key. What is the legacy here for future generations? When West Hay was constructed in the 1980s, mains sewerage was laid onto the village. What was the legacy from Top Farm, Kemble and the development by Bovis? Infrastructure in the village needs to be improved and updated for development of the scale proposed. The value of Mixed Use through Stewardship is key. Please also consider The duty to build beautiful (Policy Exchange 2019). The landowners and developers in conjunction with the Council have a duty to consider infrastructure, design and legacy.

Comment ID: 10570

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

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: The Council's preferred approach in Kemble results in a community, which has 388 dwellings, accommodating an additional 619 for the period to 2043. This is clearly overdevelopment in the context of the doubling in size of a community. The proposal at Kemble is overdevelopment and of a kind which would completely engulf the existing community. This proposed development is not consistent with government policy and the reference in paragraph 77 of the NPPF to the supply of new homes being best achieved through planning for significant "extensions to existing villages and towns". The proposed 619 new dwellings to a community of 388 cannot sensibly be described as an extension of an existing community. It is in effect a monstrous carbuncle.

Comment ID: 9812

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: The Council should consider Walkability and Mixed Use: Making Valuable and Healthy Communities. There needs to be place making that matters with construction of sustainable communities. Change the narrative from building houses at all cost. There needs to be better housing design, layout and landscape. Allow for non residential uses such as schools, shops, work places and social spaces. Also consider The duty to build beautiful (Policy Exchange 2019).

Comment ID: 9811

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: The requirement for more homes to be built in Cotswold District is noted and understood based on the revised NPPF. However a 100% increase in housing target in the District seems unrealistic based on the extent of the National Landscape (AONB). It places immense pressure on settlements outside the National Landscape. If the 18,650 homes are to be built this needs to be across the District and if necessary include over county boundaries.

Comment ID: 10566

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Thomas Barrow

Comment: I support the representations made by Kemble & Ewen Parish Council in relation to the Regulation 18 consultation.

Comment ID: 9627

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Thomas Crockett

Comment: I strongly disagree with the suggested objectives of this plan. I can't specifically on the town of fairford, where I live. No amount of infrastructure upgrades are going to be suitable for upgrading the extreme narrowness of the roads in the local area. Most particularly, London Street and Milton Street, not to mention at the bottom of the marketplace where the road is effectively one lane. Also have extreme concerns about the effect on local drainage, water, and flooding risk. The town has already highly congested with traffic particularly at school run or commuting times. An increase in the number of homes at anything like the extent that is being suggested would create complete gridlock. This will not only strongly diminish the amenity for the residents of fairford, but create complete chaos for any cars passing through the town, so many do each day.

Comment ID: 9630

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Thomas Crockett

Comment: Obviously not. There could be no point building houses to meet a capricious political target in circumstances where this. Would be unsustainable, not only for the existing communities but also for those people moving into the new houses

Comment ID: 9631

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Thomas Crockett

Comment: Scenario four. Any residents incoming to live in these houses would not be likely working in the local area. Therefore makes sense the site of the new housing in areas of good transportation. The suggestion of such extreme levels of new housing in the town of Fairford is particularly troubling given the nervousness and congestion of its arterial and internal roads.

Comment ID: 9628

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Thomas Crockett

Comment: This is not a sustainable suggestion. The biggest concern in the town of Fairford will be the narrowness of major arterial roads in and out of the town, as well as most acutely within the town itself. These roads simply cannot take the population growth that would come with such extensive house building, this is not something, absent a bypass, that any amount of infrastructure upgrades is likely to be able to appropriately mitigate

Comment ID: 8718

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Thomas Eccles

Comment: Why would Kemble take 550 houses when South Cerney takes no additional houses. Do the authors of the report have any understanding of locality and infrastructure?

Comment ID: 9492

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Tim

Comment: This section implies that high-density will lead to higher rise building but the constraint is often based on developers insisting that the mix of housing must include 4 and 5 bedroomed houses. What the economy of most settlements require is a bias towards 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties to fulfil employment opportunities and provide more affordable, preferably social rent, housing. Large houses have large footprints so can limit open spaces in an area. Homes England are providing some funding for part of the Steadings development so can presumably support much of the additional cost to developers having to build smaller and more affordable properties.

Comment ID: 9493

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Tim

Comment: This section implies that high-density will lead to higher rise building but the constraint is often based on developers insisting that the mix of housing must include 4 and 5 bedroomed houses. What the economy of most settlements require is a bias towards 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties to fulfil employment opportunities and provide more affordable, preferably social rent, housing. Large houses have large footprints so can limit open spaces in an area. Homes England are providing some funding for part of the Steadings development so can presumably support much of the additional cost to developers having to build smaller and more affordable properties.

Comment ID: 9494

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tim

Comment: Given the current government's stated intention that housebuilding should be aimed at using existing transport hubs, especially train stations, it seems illogical not to combine scenarios 4 with 5. Any strategic extensions to existing settlements must consider current or necessary future transport hubs. For the Cotswolds this means there should be in emphasis on proximity through public transport to Kemble and Morton-on-Marsh. I support Scenario 5 so long as it is combined with a stated consideration with Scenario 4.

Comment ID: 9523

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tim

Comment: Given the current Government's stated intention that housebuilding should be aimed at using existing transport hubs, especially train stations, it seems logical to combine Scenarios 4 with 5. Any strategic extensions to existing settlements must consider current or necessary future transport hubs. For the Cotswolds this means there should be in emphasis on proximity through public transport to Kemble and Morton-on-Marsh. There is nothing in the Council's housing targets that indicate Kemble is considered for a large housing quota. I support Scenario 5 so long as it is combined into Scenario 4.

Comment ID: 9524

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tim

Comment: Given the current Government's stated intention that housebuilding should be aimed at using existing transport hubs, especially train stations, it seems logical to combine Scenarios 4 with 5. Any strategic extensions to existing settlements must consider current or necessary future transport hubs. For the Cotswolds this means there should be in emphasis on proximity through public transport to Kemble and Morton-on-Marsh. There is nothing in the Council's housing targets that indicate Kemble is considered for a large housing quota. I support Scenario 5 so long as it is combined into Scenario 4.

Comment ID: 10427

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tim Gardner

Comment: Least undesirable option

Comment ID: 10432

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tim Gardner

Comment: There is clearly a demand for retirement housing in this District and, given the compact sizes often required for downsizing and possibilities of multi-storey single level living, there should be potential for density increase for this type of housing for which there is much unsatisfied need. I do, however, recognise that the finances may be challenging.

Comment ID: 10758

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tim Green

Comment: New developments already barely allow normal living. Bedrooms in new builds are so small that there is room for a bed and two bedside tables, and little else (less than 2' clearance on each side of the bed). ALL garages are too small for modern cars and so everyone parks on the narrow roads. if this is intended as a 'nudge' technique to discourage car ownership then it is both misguided and naive, since people need cars to travel in rural communities, and public transport can never offer the flexibility and immediacy required to meet people's needs.

I would urge Planning Officers and others involved in making decisions to undertake multiple site visits to the new build developments around Moreton in Marsh, inspect the rooms and garages and talk to as many householders as possible about these issues before making any decisions. It is important to do this in person, on days when people are at home, and not rely on surveys or third party feedback.

Building up is impossible without completely destroying the character of the area.

Housebuilding should reflect the known demand for homes from those people who have identified a need or desire to specifically live in this area. Given the paucity of employment this might include retirees, especially downsizing from larger homes, and people seeking to move into a retirement complex. The benefit of this is that density rates would be much higher since these people would typically seek one and two bedroom flats. If this option were pursued then a mix of styles and services could be developed, ranging from lower cost entry level to potentially premium priced units (within complexes).

The other issue with all such decisions is that it is profoundly at odds with the general character of the area. If you were to also visit Poundbury in Dorset you would see a rural community in which the look and feel of the place has been put first, with open spaces, boulevard roads and a priority on architectural design detail rather than utilitarianism. Such an approach is the exact opposite of the 'high-density' model here but would arguably make people feel far happier about the outcome. I would certainly feel a lot more comfortable living in a Cotswold / Poundbury aesthetic than a densely built off-the-shelf newbuild housing estate

Comment ID: 10752

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tim Green

Comment: My comments relate top Moreton in Marsh.

The plan effectively destroys any sense that the town will continue to have a distinctive character, as a small market town, and will instead become a large and anonymous conurbation, starting to feel more like Evesham. This matters because MiM sits at the intersection of two very busy main roads, which already become overcrowded with traffic at peak times. The east / west route actually breaks at MiM so that traffic has to join the north / south road briefly, creating additional congestion. On the route to the north over the railway line the road narrows creating further congestion at peak times. The addition of nearly 2,000 additional homes will impose substantial congestion on all roads leading in and out of the town, especially at peak drive-times. The idea that most people will either work in the town or use the train to get to work is absurd, and with so many parents dropping children off at the (presumably brand new) schools which will be required we can expect congestion for several hours each day.

Moreton does not support employment on any scale and therefore it must be assumed that the overwhelming majority of people moving there will have to commute to work (which begs the obvious question 'why not build the houses near to the places of work, primarily Oxford, Stratford, Evesham, Cirencester and Coventry'?).

If the assumption is that by building homes when there is no employment then we will need to create industrial and business parks, then once again the obvious answer is 'build them where there is already the infrastructure and demand for such jobs and houses!

Moreton sits on an area prone to flooding and in the past the town has suffered extensive damage from flood water. The subsequent flood alleviation measures have done an excellent job in mitigating this risk, but creating nearly two thousand new homes over the plan life will impose a massive risk of severe flooding due to the amount of land built over.

The electricity, gas, sewage and water supply is nowhere near enough to support the demand of so many new homes and the rural location will make provision of these services absurdly expensive to instal and maintain. Again, there is no demand for houses or businesses in this location and simply dumping them here when the provision of infrastructure to service them will be incredibly expensive makes no sense.

Assuming the mix of homes will reflect the age profile of the population then it will be necessary to build at least one large (and possibly two medium sized) primary schools and one new secondary school adjacent to the town. Otherwise the impact on schools in Chipping Campden and Chipping Norton, both in overcrowding terms and excessive traffic congestion, will be huge. If new schools are built around MiM this will place a further and excessive burden on the utilities as well as road traffic congestion.

The doctor's surgeries and dental practises in MiM are now barely able to cope with the existing demand. It would be necessary to build a new surgery and probably at least two new dental practises, imposing substantial capital costs on the NHS, or more likely, simply failing to provide an adequate service and leaving local residents experiencing sub-standard access to services.

Comment ID: 10761

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tim Green

Comment: Central Government has a very unsophisticated perspective on supply and demand, whereas the private sector operates in a market economy. This way of working could create a more appropriate compromise which actually meets demand while not entirely wrecking the lives and happiness of the people who live here.

For example, the Council could identify a number of key locations within a 30 minute drive time of the most negatively impacted locations and work with those authorities to identify a more integrated solution. For example, Oxford is a business (especially tech and biotech) and academic centre of excellence, which attracts younger people and family formation cohorts. It is also easily commutable to London and Reading. On the other hand, Moreton is a small and traditional rural community with limited infrastructure and very little for younger people to do, but is very attractive as a retirement / empty nester location. If the total target for houses (should this not be a population target rather than a homes target?) across all of the locations within the Cotswold footprint AND the adjacent authorities footprints is x homes (or x people) then a more sophisticated breakdown of the relative mix and target market profiles could be created, which would serve the priorities and needs of each area more productively. I would be happy to help with this at no charge as I have extensive experience of marketing planning

Comment ID: 10763

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tim Green

Comment: I support 'a' and 'f'.

a, c, d and e are simply idealistic and almost certainly lead to a serious failure to [provide the public with the level of service they expect and require (bearing in mind that the Council serves the public and the public, in effect, owns Moreton in Marsh, in the sense that more than 90% of the total land in use is privately owned.

In particular 'e' is misguided and a waste of tax payers' funding. It is not the role of our civic employees to make it more difficult for us to travel in whatever mode we wish, whenever we wish. The adoption of EVs, bicycles or roller skates is for the public to adopt, but not for the Council to promote using Council Taxes paid for by the people whom they serve. This may sound cantankerous but it goes to the heart of the role of local Government. If housing which we did not ask for is being imposed on us, and then we are being further insulted by having politically motivated behavioural preferences thrown in for good measure, it will inevitably give rise to a growing desire to reform the whole structure of local Government (the word 'reform' being particularly apposite).

So please do not make generic and politically motivated objectives part of the core plan.

Comment ID: 9655

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Tim Guest

Comment: I think this would be my preferred option, though the amount of detail in this paper and the short timeframe to consider it makes the decision difficult.

To me, the key point, which seems to arise time and again, is that infrastructure (such as schools, doctors surgeries etc.) should be designed as part of any significant scheme and built alongside the housing, not added as an afterthought.

Comment ID: 9118

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tim Jackson

Comment: I live in Kemble and am answering the question re the proposed development here. We have had a number of smaller developments in Kemble which have added to the character and village life of Kemble over the years, and I support development, of a mixed range of homes. I am concerned about the volume proposed for Kemble for the following reasons.

Firstly many of those living in Kemble chose to live in a village with its connections of friends, get togethers etc. I worry that the volume proposed which will nearly treble the population will significantly adversely affect the village feel and community. If we wanted to live in a town we would do so not live in Kemble.

Secondly, it would inevitably end up with more traffic entering onto on a very busy arterial road, the A429, which could create significant congestion, possibly back into the village including the A429 crossing used by parents going to the primary school. Related to this its not clear how a safe route from the new development to the station can be accommodated. There are therefore a number of safety and congestion issues relating to the fact that the development would lie on a busy route and and would be the wrong side of the busy route to access the station.

The primary school in Kemble is already full and is turning people away. If kids are accommodated in other schools again this will affect the community feel of Kemble where local kids go to their local school. The doctors surgery is tiny and it is not clear whether medical facilities would be sufficient.

Overall I can only see the village becoming more like a town but with village facilities, with significant congestion and traffic safety issues arising from such a significant increase in population

Comment ID: 9120

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tim Jackson

Comment: I support the vision but I don't think it fully captures how to maintain and build the existing community feel of the area, for me this is partly about not having people criss cross the district for schools etc (in kemble the school is full which would mean with new housing parents taking kids to school outside the village undermining the sense of local community). I think this is about understanding what makes the communities what they are (eg Monday morning coffee in Kemble village hall) which could be lost if inappropriate development takes place. The cotswolds are world renowned for beauty, heritage etc and this plan must build on this not destroy it.

Comment ID: 8707

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tim Lovegrove

Comment: Overall comment to planning is that a road traffic plan should take priority in planning matters. Towns , for example Moreton in Marsh, are urgently requiring by-pass road schemes. The high level of road traffic in the historic towns and villages is detrimental to the living and working environment and also the tourist industry.

Comment ID: 9415

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Timothy

Comment: The doubling by the present Government of the number of homes to be built has no national mandate nor Cotswold inhabitants agreement. The chief architect of this target, Angela Rayner has been found to be a tax cheat and lost her position . This Government has zero credibility and even fewer good ideas to make this country and its inhabitants more prosperous. My advice, play for time as they will be voted out of office and pray more sensible people replace them.

Comment ID: 9850

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Timothy

Comment: The reference to consultation is somewhat an exaggeration as the outline of what the council seek is put forward and highlighted as the route wanted. That is more directional than the aspirations of the public who live in an area. The use of the word consultation becomes diminished as especially when a proposal such as has been put forward clearly states a preferred route to take

Comment ID: 9992

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Timothy

Comment: Green to the core is not what appears in all of the scheme. Building by its very nature is resource intensive. Demand on the infrastructure during build and after, as well as sustaining the inhabitants makes a major impact environmentally and visually. Increased density of population is also a pressure. Normally society expands to meet local needs and there is very little opportunity to provide this as plans are boxed in by the refusal to consider looking at careful development within the National Landscape. There will be an unequal pressure on those outside the area creating higher priced residences within the NL and also difficult choices for those outside the NL competing for residences. Add in business areas that will eat into possible development land is potentially going to create areas without the normal buffer of space.

Comment ID: 9990

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Timothy

Comment: comparing the proposed size of Mickleton to that of Chipping Campden does not make sense. The volume of houses far exceeds that of Chipping Campden without the level of facilities currently available to it. The current Mickleton has one junior school at maximum capacity, a butcher, convenience store and deli as well as two pubs one Hotel. There is a garden centre which has some small units rented out with a small cafe included. If planning had been to visit they would have seen the lack of facilities for the proposed increase. The new housing will not produce sustainable living but more a commuter belt.

From other statistics seen it is shown that there are quite a number of houses in Chipping Campden either let out or owned as second homes since the population figures indicate this.

Comment ID: 9993

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Timothy

Comment: We are being asked to consider something not even researched and this is very poor. The cart is being put before the horse. Demand is really unknown so the types of housing and business is not defined. How can a call be made for land without an overall plan and infrastructure be made.

Comment ID: 9995

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Timothy

Comment: Another unknown being put into the mix. Once again how can decisions be made when part of the jigsaw is not there?

I would suggest that this needs to be completed before any decisions can be made and should be put aside until ready. Unfortunately it is very piecemeal

Comment ID: 9904

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

Name: Timothy

Comment: Sadly the call for sites appeals to greed not need. It does not ensure that the basics such as roads are cohesive and therefore leads to a mismatched and often unsatisfactory layout. There would have been and perhaps could be, a way to indicate a favoured use of land. It need the County Council to be involved to ensure capacity

Comment ID: 9845

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Timothy

Comment: these figures do not clearly identify the restraints that exist for all the sites. The basic infrastructure remains outside DC control. Sewers roads electricity that need attention are seemingly not high on the priority. There is no clear cut indication of actual visits to these areas

Comment ID: 9899

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Timothy

Comment: I do not support any increase in density. I support the building of more need required buildings. For example those for young couples, retired individuals who do not want 5 bedrooms but smaller houses or bungalows not rabbit hutches. Employed with families etc.

Comment ID: 10109

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Timothy

Comment: Scenario 5 whilst being promoted does not include the National Landscape which has been excluded by the paper. This is not what I would expect to see in a democratic division of the challenges. I believe that there should be inclusion of the Landscape as this will assist in helping those needing to be in the area.

Comment ID: 9895

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Timothy

Comment: Definitely a challenge. The variables may allow for small sites only if they could be supported. There is no point in building on a flood plain for example just to get the numbers up

Comment ID: 9887

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Timothy

Comment: I do not support increases in density just to achieve the government impositions. The character of an area and needs of its individuals leads to more of a developed society and reduces friction.

Comment ID: 9892

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Timothy

Comment: It also seems that the associated issues of high density ie crime, vandalism graffiti need to have increased police presence. This density requires the higher level of lighting and planning of spaces for those whose space is reduced to ensure there is somewhere safe and attractive to go to. Also there is a need to ensure that the basic facilities for shopping, travelling, water drainage electricity and roads are in place

Comment ID: 10104

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Timothy

Comment: I cannot say that the proposed developments are sustainable as no real hard evidence has been given of need within the District. The results appear to be a reaction to government without any facts and figures that individuals can use.

Comment ID: 10003

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Timothy

Comment: Yes the active consideration, not being passed over, that the National Landscape is considered more. It has become a place where houses have become very expensive creating issues for local people.

This is both divisive and elitist. At a time of need, created by the government it should be demonstrated how prepared the DC is to really help ALL sectors in the development and improvement of the area and not section off such a huge part of the land without giving some ability to build within it over and above windfalls.

Comment ID: 10005

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Timothy

Comment: The vision is just what it is a vision. Outside influences just as we are experiencing may push matters off course. There will need to be back up plans should directions change. There does not appear to be any reference to the fact that the area may be merged into Gloucestershire and what that may mean.

Comment ID: 9856

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Timothy

Comment: The allocated sites shows that Mickleton is a current main exporter of working people with little opportunity for employment. There is an add-on of a very high number of houses in relation to current facilities and other villages and towns. A good example is Chipping Campden whose number of residences are similar but with many more shops, hotels. Also dental practices, schools and Doctors surgery.

Comment ID: 10106

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Timothy

Comment: The exclusion of National Landscape is not the correct way to deal with the issue created by government and the failure of the Council to have plans in place. I do not accept there should be an exclusion

Comment ID: 9867

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Timothy

Comment: This scenario allows for ALL to take a share in the challenge presented. It does not mean that development cannot take place. The wording put in is emotive and not impartial. The Lake District have a Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It is split into requirements for developers for varying sizes of sites. This is what should be created and implemented to protect and enhance the area without destroying it. A balance could then be created alongside

Comment ID: 9885

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Timothy

Comment: The proposal is not democratic since it is not put clearly ahead of any changes. The effects of such changes need to be thoroughly researched and known outcomes obtained. Education, roads, water electricity communication, support via buses or trains, health services. In Mickleton this increase would be detrimental to the community which has grown as a village. The local primary school is at full capacity. Chipping Campden Secondary is reaching capacity and alternatives are a long way away both in distance and planning for more. These issues have also been identified in the supporting documentation.

Comment ID: 11056

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: I support Scenario 3 (Main Service Centre Focus). It directs growth to the locations with the best services, employment, and transport accessibility, avoids unsustainable dispersal into small villages, reduces car dependency, protects rural character, and is therefore the most realistic and sustainable option.

Comment ID: 11057

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: No. If areas are already recognised as having poor services, weak public transport, and limited employment, directing housing there would increase car dependency, undermine climate objectives, and create poorly serviced communities.

Comment ID: 11058

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: Only where it is genuinely appropriate. The Plan itself notes that higher densities are not suitable in most Cotswold rural settlements due to heritage, landscape, infrastructure, and character constraints. High-urban densities would be out of character and hard to deliver successfully here.

Comment ID: 11064

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: Yes. Stronger emphasis is needed on realistic infrastructure timing, rural transport realities, water infrastructure resilience, and ensuring rural communities are not harmed by disproportionate development pressure.

Comment ID: 11065

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: Broadly yes, particularly the emphasis on sustainability, landscape protection, climate response, and infrastructure-led growth. However, these objectives require consistency in practice: smaller villages such as Broadwell should not be categorised in a way that implies they can support growth they clearly cannot sustain.

Comment ID: 11053

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Timothy Tasker

Comment: I have read through the various information and it is quite clear that the Broadwell classification is an error and should be corrected asap. The Preferred Options document is factually incorrect in implying Broadwell has amenities appropriate to a Non-Principal Settlement. Broadwell has no meaningful services, facilities, employment provision or sustainable transport infrastructure. The Council's own consultation acknowledges that many rural settlements lack such provision and are therefore unsuitable to accommodate growth, yet Broadwell has been incorrectly elevated into a category intended for settlements that do perform a service role. This inconsistency undermines the credibility of the hierarchy and contradicts the Plan's sustainability, accessibility and climate objectives. Broadwell should be reclassified to reflect the reality that it has no amenities and cannot sustainably support planned growth.

Comment ID: 10224

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: New Housing needs to be linked to employment and transport hubs to reduce the reliance on car transport. New developments need to be joined up with rising demands for hospitals, schools, sewage farms etc. Plus it is critical to consider independent power supplies and data infrastructure that homes of the future will need. Rural locations are not well served now and care needs to be taken not to overload the basic infrastructure of these communities.

Comment ID: 10228

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: No, this will only cause significant problems in the future for Local Authorities & Governments to resolve. There are many examples of 'white elephant' developments & communities in the UK, eg the Welsh valleys or Blyth, where the loss of employment has devastated the areas for generations. The development of large housing estates in the cotswolds, with no increase in local employment, will just create dormitory towns with high numbers of people commuting.

Comment ID: 10232

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: The style and type of smaller house and flat currently being built in the cotswolds is already very basic and compact. So, there is little scope to reduce these units in size. This is something that has naturally happened over the past 40 years as house prices have increased. It could be achieved in a limited way by building more high rise developments in city locations or by the conversion of older industrial buildings.

Comment ID: 10238

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: No, the large developments will overwhelm the communities and change their character and nature in an unsustainable way.

Huge changes have recently impacted the way we live and work post covid, more changes are now following with big data and the need for new data centres and the necessary infrastructure changes this will bring to how we need to live. It is vital to consider the fast pace of change that is coming and predict this change rather than ignore it and deal with housing in isolation.

Our hospitals in the UK are now overwhelmed with patients needing end of life care, this is a future problem with an aging population. So, part of the solution should be to plan to keep residents living in their own homes for as long as possible.

Many of the new developments in the cotswolds are bringing in new residents who commute out of the district or retire here. This is fine but it is changing the cotswold demographics, bringing more affluent people to live here and possibly exacerbating the divide between rich and poor.

Will the UK population continue to grow? with an aging population it is likely the current demand for housing will not be sustained. If this is the case we could be left with empty houses in future and ghost towns. Over development is not sustainable and it will not be possible to reinstate the prime agricultural land once it has been developed.

Comment ID: 10283

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: No building on employment land. In Tetbury the large opportunities to bring employment have been lost with the sites being permitted to become housing.

No demolition of good quality older buildings. Many older buildings have a history and the community would support their development. Often they are demolished to save VAT. On sustainability grounds it is greener to convert than demolish and rebuild but this is permitted too often.

Positively encourage the reopening of railway branch lines. Managing transport hubs is very important and many of the branch lines have closed and been built upon. The lines were built on the best natural contours of the land and reinstating them in their former locations would be the most appropriate way to reopen them. They also link the established towns in the cotswolds.

No demolition of bungalows. We have an aging population and a crisis in hospital beds. Keeping the aging population at home in accommodation that suits their needs and in their community is the best way to manage this. Also, the same criteria applies to the disabled or those needing care in the community. There is now a shortage of bungalows and this type of specialist accommodation which will impact social services if it is not addressed now.

Insist solar panels be installed on every new house. At the moment prime agricultural land is being converted into solar farms all around the country. I understand Oxfordshire have a policy of insisting solar panels be installed on new properties, this could very easily be applied and would help address the coming energy supply problems that the UK currently faces.

Develop a policy on end of life solar farms. In 25-35 years time all the existing solar farms will be at end of life. There is a risk they become brown field sites of the future unless some planning guidance is considered. If they were built on prime agricultural land they should revert to this and not become future development sites instead.

Preserve Canals and their routes. Important for the transport of water and flood alleviation. The Cotswolds has an oversupply of water at certain times of the year but borders Oxfordshire which has a scarcity. The better use and preservation of water supply routes would be a sustainable initiative.

Planning conditions on water mills. There are many missed opportunities to install turbines on former water mills and river side properties. Make is a planning condition which would provide a sustainable power source for the future occupiers of the building.

24 hour society. This is something that is naturally happening in the UK. Parcel delivery and supermarkets are currently expanding in this area. Farmers now uses automated vehicles and farming contractors work 24 hours a day. Monitor the use of the facilities and services in the cotswold to see how this is being adopted and try to predict what demands this may bring in planning terms and to the basic infrastructure. Demands on data and power may be needed and how can this be rolled out to rural areas? Alongside railway tracks and canals is an option but only if it is planned in early.

Comment ID: 10292

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tina Martin

Comment: Carbon Capture - vital as part of our passage to a low carbon energy future. So far, it is not technically possible. The only perfect method is naturally via trees.

So, protect every tree in the cotswolds with a TPO and require consent for any to be cut down.

Also, require all new developments to plant a quota of new trees.

Comment ID: 10626

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Tom

Comment: Bungalows. Set a target of the proportion of bungalows to houses/flats. Bungalows will free up existing 3-4-5 bed houses as retirees down size. Bungalows also benefit disabled/incapacitated residents. Their placement within developments should aid easy access to local facilities.

Comment ID: 10623

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Tom

Comment: The plan almost doubles the size of Fairford with further expansion of neighbouring villages. This must come with a pre-requisite to complete infrastructure upgrades before any house building starts.

Roads, Schools, Healthcare, commercial all should be linked to the plan otherwise your plan is nothing more than chasing govt targets with no regard to the community that lives therein - who you serve.

Comment ID: 10627

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Tom

Comment: Fairford desperately needs commercial and light industry venues for SMEs. If this does not come as part of a regional strategy (not just a housing plan), CDC will just be enabling more dormitory towns placing greater stress on local roads. Two or three small industrial parks would invigorate the local business network and help fix young talent in the local area.

Comment ID: 10610

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Tom

Comment: You highlight increasing housing density. This could be an opportunity to bring an end to leasehold developments with shared land purporting to be freehold. Shared green spaces that seem to be obligatory should not be maintained by the residents under a property management company. Either they should be commonhold or adopted by the council.

An objective should be to end leasehold.

Garden size to house floor area could be a zonal target with bands of higher to lower density based on location.

The proportion of bungalows being built has dropped to an all-time low (10%). There should be a higher percentage as an objective. This would help retirees downsize and release larger 3-4-5 bedrooms houses to the local market.

Comment ID: 10628

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tom

Comment: Education. Investment in Farmor school is needed. Add an integrated sixth form college as a way of expanding to meet growing local needs.

More sports facilities needed on site.

Improve the access road to enable turn-around and bus drop-off. It is on a B road that becomes single track one leaving town.

Comment ID: 10629

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tom

Comment: A417.

The A417 through Fairford is single lane due to buildings and on-street parking. If the town doubles in size, a bypass of essential. This should also be viewed with changes to the A417-A360 interchange in Lechlade.

Comment ID: 10630

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tom

Comment: Open Space.

Housing estates should not be a means of providing unfunded open spaces. It is leasehold be stealth and millstone to the residents. Any open spaces shod be ceded to the council as a public facility. There should be no more leasehold tying residents to property management companies for ever.

Comment ID: 10632

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tom

Comment: Renewables.

Set a target of over 50% of all domestic roofs covered by solar panels. and 85% or commercial premises. There are now solar panels that look very like slate tiles. The local power infrastructure must be capable of exporting any excess power.

Comment ID: 10631

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tom

Comment: Demographics.

The plan should consider the age demographics of the local communities. There should be targets for assisted living, bungalows, low-cost accommodation, starter homes etc.

Comment ID: 10635

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tom

Comment: While I agree with the principle role of Cirencester, There should d be provision to balanced development in Fairford in terms of small business estates to aid and expand the local commercial network.

If Cirencester is the centre of the region, then save and improve the hospital.

Comment ID: 10600

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Tom

Comment: The CDC preferred option seems logical based on the central govt target's for housing. Such expansion must be dependent on the delivery of improved infrastructure before any large-scale house building. The A417 through Fairford and the A417/A360 crossover in Lechlade should be addressed with a bypass. The central pinch point at the centre of Fairford cannot be widened without demolishing old buildings and with on-street parking along London Road means that much of this A-road through town cannot flow in opposite directions at the same time.

Comment ID: 10617

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Tom

Comment: Education.

You have shown figures for Fairford and villages round about. Has CDC considered these in terms of school catchment areas? Farmor School is a success story but is suffering from investment. Adding ore family homes will bring more students.

Farmor needs expanding - maybe with an integral sixth-form college.

It certainly needs more sports grounds (not reliant on town sports grounds)

The access is via a small B-road and this should be improved as part of the wider infrastructure piece such that it is easier for parents to drop children off safely and for buses to turn around and return to main roads.

Comment ID: 9347

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Tom Howard

Comment: I have looked through the drafted plan, and as per the previous draft it does not make adequate allowance for Self and Custom Build housing. The only policy reference is as part of policy H1 - as a small % of larger sites. This flies directly in the face of the governments stated intent (behind the Self Build Act) for self building to be a key strand for diversifying housing supply. The reliance on a % policy both prevents diversification by inherently relying on the existing monopoly of big developers to deliver this housing type on their sites, and by not promoting smaller sites to come forward - promoting SME's generally. Best practice guidance from The Right to Build Taskforce and NacsBA recommends a multi-policy approach - for example also encouraging smaller self build windfall/ exception sites. Following a more creative and supportive route like this could greatly assist the council to deliver it housing targets on smaller gap sites with less environmental and infrastructure impact. Self build keeps roughly twice as much money in the local economy as standard development and has carbon reduction of approx 40% against standard development. I/ we would be delighted to assist the council in developing suitable policies. We have done this for other councils. We regularly present for the Right to Build Taskforce and have an in house policy planner who has worked in several LPAs on policy.

Comment ID: 9546

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tony

Comment: Increased demands on infrastructure appears not to receive due consideration. We lament the change in the character of CDC towns and villages, but also acknowledge more houses are needed. So, in our opinion, housing development is essential, if and only if, there is appropriate investment of resources in infrastructure: additional school places, GP provision, local public transport, traffic flow (e.g. 20mph limits; Fairford & Lechlade both have significant and impactful road bottlenecks), provision for cycling/pedestrians. The all too frequent absence of an improvement in these resources feeds resistance to new development and undermines the quality of life.

Comment ID: 10082

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Tony Pugh

Comment: The number of houses required of over 12,000 is unrealistic and requires more local input from CDC. This will be derived from replies from land owners/developers of land available for house building.

Comment ID: 10090

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Tony Pugh

Comment: The main drain beyond Siddington towards South Cerney is frequently flooded following either prolonged rainfall or sudden heavy downpours. When this happens manhole covers are forced up creating dangerous conditions at night or during poor driving conditions. Improvements are needed to cope with the additional water from buildings and surface water. Shorncote works and existing pipe capacity must be improved.

Comment ID: 10092

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Tony Pugh

Comment: I will not be alone in being apposed to any plans that would result in Siddington becoming part of Cirencester. The current gap ensures that Siddington retains its identity as a village.

Traffic from the development at Severalls in Upper Siddington has increased congestion at the junction of Ashton Road and Parkway and any additional traffic will only make it far worse.

Comment ID: 8975

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The government imposed targets for the Cotswold District are skewed from the outset by the non-recognition of the constraint created by the Area of Natural Beauty. To require a 50% increase in the number of dwellings for the whole of the 450 mi.² of the District concentrated in only some 15% of the total area means that none of the options as presented can adequately meet both the target and retain the character of the area for which the Cotswolds in total are renowned.

The best that can be said is that CDC should go forward with whatever option keeps undesirable and potentially disastrous development to a minimum without allowing for uncontrollable commercial interests.

Comment ID: 10321

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The government imposed targets for the Cotswold District are skewed from the outset by the non-recognition of the constraint created by the Area of Natural Beauty. To require a 50% increase in the number of dwellings for the whole of the 450 mi.² of the District concentrated in only some 15% of the total area means that none of the options as presented can adequately meet both the target and retain the character of the area for which the Cotswolds in total are renowned.

The best that can be said is that CDC should go forward with whatever option keeps undesirable and potentially disastrous development to a minimum without allowing for uncontrollable commercial interests.

Comment ID: 8976

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: See my comment in response to question one. Self-evidently it is entirely illogical to suggest proposing unsustainable development.

That only creates a longer term headache to find a way to fudge around the figures.

Comment ID: 10323

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: See my comment in response to question one. Self-evidently it is entirely illogical to suggest proposing unsustainable development.

That only creates a longer term headache to find a way to fudge around the figures.

Comment ID: 8977

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: This question is too general. Increased housing density might be applicable in some areas and not others. A sweeping generalisation doesn't really fit but on balance if such a thing is necessary, then I do not support the creation of higher density development in Cotswold District given its traditional rural and open environment.

Comment ID: 10324

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: This question is too general. Increased housing density might be applicable in some areas and not others. A sweeping generalisation doesn't really fit but on balance if such a thing is necessary, then I do not support the creation of higher density development in Cotswold District given its traditional rural and open environment.

Comment ID: 10326

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: This question is too general. Increased housing density might be applicable in some areas and not others. A sweeping generalisation doesn't really fit but on balance if such a thing is necessary, then I do not support the creation of higher density development in Cotswold District given its traditional rural and open environment.

Comment ID: 10327

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: As already stated the skewed nature of the government target is such that it creates totally inappropriate solutions. This is particularly the case in relation to the indicative numbers relating to Preston and Preston Driffield combined, where development is necessarily of a current rural and undeveloped site. As an open field, unconnected with any surrounding building, it has none of the basic services that will be required to accommodate building as put forward. Not only should the site be supported with a comprehensive infrastructure delivery plan, looking beyond the plan period to post 2043 but also it is imperative that all the necessary infrastructures are built and commissioned BEFORE any development is allowed to proceed. There should be no room for commercial profit to be advantaged in the short term over the long-term requirements of sensible living standards for the whole environment.

That applies to all of the following at the very least:-

Water Supply and Waste Water (sewage)

Utilities

Energy

Flood Management

Digital Infrastructure (telecoms)

Not only will the provision for all these essential services be needed on site, the effect of the incremental strain on the area's already stretched services must have thorough investigation to avoid potentially dangerous consequences in the wider local area including Cirencester itself.

Amenity social considerations

Walking and Cycling

Open Space

Sport and Recreation

Education

Disabled access

Whilst too early at this stage for specific concerns to arise, these are very important aspects that will have to be carefully considered if the plans ever crystallise.

More generally, there must be major disquiet as to the adequacy of provision for other essentials in the area such as healthcare (already poor in the area) – hospitals, GP practices, dentists, chemists, education - schools of all levels and abilities – public transport and less specifically but just as importantly, aspects like postal services, shopping and recreation.

It also implies an increase in excess of over 50,000 people into the District predominately in the south. Given the history of employment in that area, with redundancies such as store closures and St James' Place retrenchment being a recurring feature, the provision of a long term adequate supply of employment is also more than doubtful.

That implied number of people and vehicles means a major increase also in daily vehicle movements for work, school delivery and the general provision of goods and services on an area road network nearing saturation and already regularly suffering from congestion. What will be done about this major increase in vehicle movements in such concentrated area, given that they will measure in the tens of thousands?

Comment ID: 8978

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The Cotswold District is required to meet a Government target of an increase in the current number of homes by some 50% over the period. The effect of this target, given that only 16% of the total area is available, particularly in the south, is to run rampant over local society and culture and the very aspects that make the area so attractive. There is no mention anywhere of fitting into the cultural and historical context of the area – how centuries of history are being swamped and utterly over-run, and how green space is being lost irrevocably for today's perceived need. Cultural and historical destruction is being wrought without full and proper local consultation.

Comment ID: 10328

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The Cotswold District is required to meet a Government target of an increase in the current number of homes by some 50% over the period. The effect of this target, given that only 16% of the total area is available, particularly in the south, is to run rampant over local society and culture and the very aspects that make the area so attractive. There is no mention anywhere of fitting into the cultural and historical context of the area – how centuries of history are being swamped and utterly over-run, and how green space is being lost irrevocably for today's perceived need. Cultural and historical destruction is being wrought without full and proper local consultation.

Comment ID: 8979

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The rose tinted vision statements in Paragraph 5.0 second para mean little or nothing – “thriving communities”, “employment opportunities”, “proportional growth” “integrated infrastructure”, “maintenance of district identities” are all fine but not what this document is actually proposing for Preston and its environs.

“thriving communities”

Current estimates of registered requests social housing are for some 1000 affordable dwellings in Cirencester and surroundings. There are plans afoot, including Chesterton, for over 2500 properties at least in progress of some sort already. Given the number of additional dwellings proposed in this document – in the longer term 2,500 in Preston alone and over 4,000 including Driffield, for whom are they to be built and where will the new occupiers work? If there is not an immediate need for so much dwelling space in the area, why put them there?

“employment opportunities”

Are there to be new local industries to be created for them? If so where will they be put and is there space for them?

“Principal and Non-Principal Settlements will have grown proportionately”

Hardly! Community growth projections range from single figure percentages to more than 30 times for Preston and eighteen times for Driffield.

“maintenance of district identities”

Really? Preston’s green buffer has already been jettisoned to meet Government demand, meaning that there is only Kingshill Lane between the two parts of the parish which is now conjoined on both sides with Preston on one and Cirencester Town on the other. The new suburbs being created are the antithesis of “maintenance of district identities” in Preston’s case.

Comment ID: 10329

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tony Warren

Comment: The rose tinted vision statements in Paragraph 5.0 second para mean little or nothing – “thriving communities”, “employment opportunities”, “proportional growth” “integrated infrastructure”, “maintenance of district identities” are all fine but not what this document is actually proposing for Preston and its environs.

“thriving communities”

Current estimates of registered requests social housing are for some 1000 affordable dwellings in Cirencester and surroundings. There are plans afoot, including Chesterton, for over 2500 properties at least in progress of some sort already. Given the number of additional dwellings proposed in this document – in the longer term 2,500 in Preston alone and over 4,000 including Driffield, for whom are they to be built and where will the new occupiers work? If there is not an immediate need for so much dwelling space in the area, why put them there?

“employment opportunities”

Are there to be new local industries to be created for them? If so where will they be put and is there space for them?

“Principal and Non-Principal Settlements will have grown proportionately”

Hardly! Community growth projections range from single figure percentages to more than 30 times for Preston and eighteen times for Driffield.

“maintenance of district identities”

Really? Preston’s green buffer has already been jettisoned to meet Government demand, meaning that there is only Kingshill Lane between the two parts of the parish which is now conjoined on both sides with Preston on one and Cirencester Town on the other. The new suburbs being created are the antithesis of “maintenance of district identities” in Preston’s case.

Comment ID: 9205

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Agree with Scenario 5

Comment ID: 9206

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: No

Comment ID: 9207

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Increased density not supported

Comment ID: 9210

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Agree with Scenario 5

Comment ID: 9212

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Agree with scenario 5

Comment ID: 9211

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: No

Comment ID: 9213

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: No

Comment ID: 9214

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Increased density not supported

Comment ID: 9215

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Cotswold District Council – Local Plan Review

Preferred Option Consultation

Following briefings with CDC officers at Moreton-in-Marsh and Fairford , together with the published review documents , Lechlade Town Council considered the preferred options consultation at its meeting on 14th December.

These comments are mainly related to the local impact of the consultation and we have assumed that most of the policies in the current Local Plan and Lechlade-on-Thames made Neighbourhood Plan will continue to be material considerations when assessing new planning applications.

Although Lechlade-on-Thames is one of the 16 proposed Principal Settlements when assessed in the ‘Cotswold District Settlement Role and Function study ‘(November 2025), it is towards the bottom of the list in terms of the sustainability score of key infrastructure , services and facilities to enable future growth.

Lechlade Town Council contends that Lechlade is a Principal Settlement in name only and doesn’t have the infrastructure, services and facilities to support extensive new development.

As CDC officers state ‘Lechlade has less available land suitable for development than most other Principal Settlements. “ .

The Preferred Options Consultation proposes 220 new dwellings in Lechlade up to 2043 in addition to the 1241 existing dwellings.

This is an increase in numbers from the 114 dwellings allocated in the previous Local Plan and Lechlade's made Neighbourhood Plan, 113 of which have now all been delivered.

Despite no infrastructure improvements.

Lechlade Town Council would request that the following Local Plan policies be carried forward to the updated Local Plan

- Multi-Use path between Lechlade and Fairford as a key section of the National strategic cycling infrastructure
- Town car park allocation adjacent to Wharf Lane and the Faringdon Road (A417)

Whilst Lechlade Town Council note CDC's allocations and statement' that everyone must play their part – we think it is important that the review continues to recognise the significant issues that any building beyond Lechlade's Development Boundary will need to be resolved. These issues are highlighted in CDC's Local Plan review documents

- 98 listed buildings with significant heritage impacts
- Extensive Conservation area
- Nature improvement areas
- Scheduled monument areas
- SSSI's and landscape impacts
- Mostly flood zone 2 and 3
- Mineral safeguarding areas
- Severance of rural landscape continuity
- River Thames to the south
- Oxfordshire boundary to the east and north
- Sites of national ecological importance
- Loss of village character – social considerations
- Limited key infrastructure

- Lack of local employment – 125% net exporter of workers

The CDC 220 dwelling allocation for Lechlade mainly relies on 150 dwellings to be built on 10 Ha of high grade agricultural land adjacent to Burford Road/Old Railway Close which is listed as an 'indicative non-strategic site allocation'.

Lechlade Town Council recognise that development of this site, with many of the issues listed above, will continue to be vigorously challenged locally. The Town Council takes the view that if Lechlade has to accommodate new development to help meet the CDC targets then if the site specific issues can be resolved this is the least worst site for Lechlade to accommodate development on.

In summary Lechlade Town Council support the new Local Plan proposals as a key document for guiding future decisions on planning applications, including new housing, employment, shops and infrastructure.

However, the new Local Plan should take into account the exceptional circumstances and locational restrictions of Lechlade which may make the housing allocation in the Preferred Options Review significantly challenging to deliver.

Comment ID: 9216

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: see text in Q4 re Lechlade/updated Local Plan policies

Comment ID: 9217

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Town Clerk

Comment: Lechlade TC agrees with the vision and objectives

Comment ID: 10340

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Tracy

Comment: None of the scenarios are sustainable or 'green', which I thought was the aim of the Local Plan. They all undermine the ethos of the Cotswolds, but I thought that the preservation of the Cotswolds has been central to previous CDC Local Plans. The scenarios pay lip service to the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plans in the district.

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

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

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

Instead, why not consider these alternatives?:

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

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

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

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

Comment ID: 10343

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Tracy

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

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

No. Siddington is being targeted and sacrificed because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The CDC have to be seen to meet housing targets and have decided that the vast majority of new houses should be built in the 16% of the Cotswolds outside the National Landscape, instead of pushing back on the government as this being unreasonable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10345

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Tracy

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations (such as Siddington) is completely inappropriate and would destroy their rural nature. It would be imposing a completely urban identity on a rural location.

Comment ID: 10347

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Tracy

Comment: The proposed level of development in Siddington is in no way sustainable. Siddington is currently reliant on Cirencester and we expect that would continue.

A 300 – 400% expansion would merge Siddington with Cirencester and destroy the village's unique identity and community feel. The village is in a rural location and has been for 1,000 years – it should not be a suburb of the conurbation of Cirencester and the proposal would create urban sprawl. The already existing flood risk would increase manyfold, threatening homes and livelihoods. The fact that the village is erroneously classed as a Principal Settlement further strengthens the opposition to growth.

Comment ID: 10349

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Tracy

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

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

Comment ID: 10364

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Tracy

Comment: I agree with the vision but think that the proposals in the Consultation document will not deliver that vision. With regard to Siddington, the proposals:

- Do not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing community. In a busy and volatile world, cohesive communities are needed. An increase of 300 – 400% in the size of the village will not deliver sustainability or community cohesion – quite the opposite.
- Will involve development that does not allow for vital habitats and green spaces to be looked after or prioritise housing for those most in need.
- Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character. It has been a separate settlement for 1,000 years and was listed in the Domesday Book as such in 1086.
- Will not result in Siddington "maturing" into a thriving community, just an urban sprawl, like Swindon.
- Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington.
- Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington.
- Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks. The roads in and around the village are already congested and potholes appear as soon as they are mended. Just one new home being build could feasibly add 2 cars to the roads.
- Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately – 300 – 400%! The ONC figures for population growth for the period of the plan do not support that level of growth,
- Will reduce the green space available to the Siddington community. Many studies have shown green spaces as vital for physical and mental health. Concrete does not have the same effect!

Comment ID: 8907

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Tristram

Comment: I have just looked at the Thames Water discharge map
(<https://www.thameswater.co.uk/edm-map>)

As of this morning Fairford STW has been continually - and illegally - discharging untreated sewage into the River Coln for 214 hours.

Ampney St Peter the same, for 171 hours into Ampney Brook. Both tributaries of the Thames.

Under these circumstances 1,252 new properties in Fairford and 660 by Ampney Crucis should not and cannot be allowed to happen.

Similarly Down Ampney is now regularly flooded due to new development in the village. I have lived in the area more than 30 years and have never seen flooding there. 416 new house there would be the height of folly. What could possibly go wrong?

Comment ID: 345

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Terra

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

Comment ID: 621

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Terra

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

Comment ID: 704

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Terry Underwood

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

Comment ID: 339

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Thames Water

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

Comment ID: 633

Email/Letter Representation

Name: The Maintenance Trust of the Whittington Court Estate

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

Comment ID: 471

Email/Letter Representation

Name: The Trustees of Spring Hill Settlement

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

Comment ID: 164

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Thomas Haden

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

Comment ID: 448

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Arnold

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

Comment ID: 483

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Arnold

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

Comment ID: 629

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Charsley

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

Comment ID: 876

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Embley

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

Comment ID: 871

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Nichols

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

Comment ID: 252

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tim Nichols

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

Comment ID: 696

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tina Wall

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

Comment ID: 839

Email/Letter Representation

Name: TM Barlow

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

Comment ID: 496

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Toby Paddison

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

Comment ID: 868

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tom Bennett

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

Comment ID: 796

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tom Robinson

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

Comment ID: 595

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tony Leonard

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

Comment ID: 315

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tony Warren

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

Comment ID: 379

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tracey Barham

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

Comment ID: 434

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tracey Barron

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

Comment ID: 497

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Tracey Paddison

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