

Comment ID: 10897

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: J Ellis

Comment: I am not happy with increasing density. But I am also not happy with developers building large 'mansions' that end up as second homes. Small older cottages which might suit a growing family are used as holiday lets, i would like to see more penalties to discourage houses being left empty for much of the year.

Comment ID: 10869

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: J Ellis

Comment: It seems illogical to specify affordable housing in rural settlements which can offer the least facilities to help what are most likely to be young families. surely affordable housing should be part of the provision in the principal settlements as well.

Comment ID: 10872

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: J Ellis

Comment: It is important to maintain development boundaries for those principal settlements within the Cotswolds Natural Landscape., particularly as the landscape is vulnerable, and in the future even more so, to flooding from the surrounding hills.

Comment ID: 10887

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: J Ellis

Comment: Yes, it is of vital importance that strategic planning is undertaken to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place before houses are built. We are already suffering from overcrowded primary care services, as an example.

I agree that this option is the best one to pursue, but existing settlements also need to be bolstered with improved services.

Comment ID: 10891

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: J Ellis

Comment: Agreed, not viable option

Comment ID: 10196

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: James David Johnson

Comment: This is a loaded and biased question to support unsustainable development in rural areas. None of these plans deal with the matter in whole but selecting one of the options as a favourite will support justification for moving ahead with any of these scenarios.

Comment ID: 10244

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: James David Johnson

Comment: Answers for feedback on the local town plan

No the Council should not consider development in unsustainable areas and should reconsider many of the areas it has already deemed suitable.

Almost all of the labelled Principal settlements in the table share common factors that have dictated slow growth over the history of these towns and villages:

Accessibility

Roads - The current adopted highways through and around these settlements struggle already to cope with the current weight of traffic. Congestion around pinch points of narrow roads, junctions, bridges is already unsustainable leading to increased pollution and decreased accessibility. Maintenance of these roads is already a losing battle with roads needing to be resurfaced with the current traffic. The road surfaces are currently deteriorating faster than the highways agency can maintain them leading to serious risk to motorists. The utilities infrastructure beneath the roads are persistently and increasingly subjected to damage from the weight of traffic leading to consistent need for repairs and subsequent further damage and deterioration of the road surfaces as well as delays, reduction in accessibility and increased pollution. Increasing housing in and around these areas will add to the problem until sufficient investment to improve the highways is implemented, rather than struggling to maintain the existing infrastructure.

Public transport - Many of the towns and villages have little to no public transport connections and these services are already in decline. Without improvements to the public transport system to these locations, the cost of commuting and accessibility for those that rely on them make the proposal of affordable housing a fallacy. Simply adding more buses to the routes available to support increased populations will further add to the issues raised in the above comment on roads. Addition to rail network will be financially unrealistic to improve the accessibility to the smaller towns and hubs and would take years to implement even if it were financially viable. Cost of rail travel is ever rising to provide insufficient practicality or sustainability for those who require affordable housing and rely on train as a means to access employment.

Green transport – Pedestrians and cyclists are already at risk on the country roads with insufficient pavement and cycle routes. Adding further traffic to these areas without improvement to paths and cycle lanes poses increased risk to these groups and further exacerbates the issues outlined for accessibility, traffic and pollution already raised above.

Utilities

The utilities infrastructure in many of the mid-sized to smaller Principal settlements is currently insufficient to maintain the current demand. Regular issues with sewerage, water, electricity and telecoms supply and loss of service cannot be safeguarded while adding further demand without significant investment in improving the current infrastructure. If a hypothetical infrastructure has a demand of 105% of its capacity and you add an additional 5% population demand, this does not make the problem only 5% worse but doubles the excess demand issue.

Employment

The total unemployment rate in Cotswold District has increased from 1.37% in Jan-2020 to 2.07% in Mar-2025. Increasing the alleged “affordable housing” without an increase in employment opportunities leads to a further increase in the unemployment rate. Though increased housing could draw more commuters to the area, the issues surrounding accessibility have already been raised above.

Amenities

Dental care

Zero of the Principal Settlements have availability for NHS dentistry.

Schools

Only 8 of the 61 schools in the district show as having significant capacity space with most of the rest showing as at capacity or significantly oversubscribed.

Comment ID: 10247

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: James David Johnson

Comment: No

Accessibility

Roads - The current adopted highways through and around these settlements struggle already to cope with the current weight of traffic. Congestion around pinch points of narrow roads, junctions, bridges is already unsustainable leading to increased pollution and decreased accessibility. Maintenance of these roads is already a losing battle with roads needing to be resurfaced with the current traffic. The road surfaces are currently deteriorating faster than the highways agency can maintain them leading to serious risk to motorists. The utilities infrastructure beneath the roads are persistently and increasingly subjected to damage from the weight of traffic leading to consistent need for repairs and subsequent further damage and deterioration of the road surfaces as well as delays, reduction in accessibility and increased pollution. Increasing housing in and around these areas will add to the problem until sufficient investment to improve the highways is implemented, rather than struggling to maintain the existing infrastructure.

Public transport - Many of the towns and villages have little to no public transport connections and these services are already in decline. Without improvements to the public transport system to these locations, the cost of commuting and accessibility for those that rely on them make the proposal of affordable housing a fallacy. Simply adding more buses to the routes available to support increased populations will further add to the issues raised in the above comment on roads. Addition to rail network will be financially unrealistic to improve the accessibility to the smaller towns and hubs and would take years to implement even if it were financially viable. Cost of rail travel is ever rising to provide insufficient practicality or sustainability for those who require affordable housing and rely on train as a means to access employment.

Green transport – Pedestrians and cyclists are already at risk on the country roads with insufficient pavement and cycle routes. Adding further traffic to these areas without improvement to paths and cycle lanes poses increased risk to these groups and further exacerbates the issues outlined for accessibility, traffic and pollution already raised above.

Utilities

The utilities infrastructure in many of the mid-sized to smaller Principal settlements is currently insufficient to maintain the current demand. Regular issues with sewerage, water, electricity and telecoms supply and loss of service cannot be safeguarded while

adding further demand without significant investment in improving the current infrastructure. If a hypothetical infrastructure has a demand of 105% of its capacity and you add an additional 5% population demand, this does not make the problem only 5% worse but doubles the excess demand issue.

Employment

The total unemployment rate in Cotswold District has increased from 1.37% in Jan-2020 to 2.07% in Mar-2025. Increasing the alleged “affordable housing” without an increase in employment opportunities leads to a further increase in the unemployment rate. Though increased housing could draw more commuters to the area, the issues surrounding accessibility have already been raised above.

Amenities

Dental care

Zero of the Principal Settlements have availability for NHS dentistry.

Schools

Only 8 of the 61 schools in the district show as having significant capacity space with most of the rest showing as at capacity or significantly oversubscribed.

Comment ID: 10252

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: James David Johnson

Comment: Lechlade on Thames

Improvements to the road and highways for current traffic. Consideration of a bypass for the HGV traffic.

Improvements to the utilities sewerage, water, electricity and telecoms to support the current population prior to authorising new growth.

Significant improvement to flood management prior to authorising further development sites.

Significant improvement to accessibility for parking, pedestrians and safer cycling.

Reject all and any development proposals failing to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Comment ID: 9269

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: James Donovan

Comment: It is very clear from the maps that the development has been massively bottom loaded onto the southern end of the county- Cirencester and south of Cirencester. No doubt this is because much of the area further north is an area of outstanding beauty. None the less the council must find ways of spreading the load more evenly. I am sure if the will is there a solution that balances development across the whole area can be found if focus is placed on this issue.

Comment ID: 9271

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: James Donovan

Comment: I have comments relating to the proposed new houses for Down Ampney. The scale of new development is out of proportion to the existing village and wholly beyond the already stressed infrastructure capabilities of the village. Drainage is already a big issue as is surface water flooding. Significant improvements in resources in these areas would be required. Traffic volumes and speed is another big issue allied to the safety of pedestrians and residents. School places are also likely to be a problem.

Comment ID: 9312

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: James Griffin

Comment: Zesta Planning has been instructed by Cotswold Oak Ltd (CO) to submit representations to the current Regulation 18 consultation on the preferred options for the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan.

CO support spatial strategy Option 6 as this presents the best opportunity for accommodating the District's housing requirement. It is considered that major development will be necessary within the National Landscape (AONB) if the Council is to have any chance of meeting its housing requirement in full.

National Policy does not preclude this happening but requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated. Given the extensive coverage of National Landscape within the District it is considered that there is not sufficient scope for meeting the District's need entirely outside of the designated area in line with NPPF Paragraph 190.

It is considered to be essential that major development is accommodated in the National Landscape so to help address affordability and ensure that younger generations are not forced out of the area due to not being able to afford a home.

Nevertheless, it is understood that the Council's preferred spatial strategy option is Option 5 which involves allocating sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters, along with supporting Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements and creating new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s).

Whilst this falls short of meeting the housing requirement in full, it involves allocating sites in Principal Settlements which is considered to be a sound approach.

Comment ID: 8992

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 1 – Which of the above scenarios has your preference? Why do you prefer this option?

I support Scenario 5 as the preferred option. This scenario builds on the existing strategy while introducing new settlements and strategic extensions, which is essential to deliver housing in a sustainable and planned way. It provides the highest proportion of the housing target (around 79%) without compromising national policy or the character of the Cotswolds National Landscape. Scenario 5 allows for comprehensive infrastructure planning, including schools, healthcare, transport, and utilities, and creates opportunities for mixed-use development and employment land. It also offers flexibility for growth beyond 2043, aligning with national requirements for long-term planning.

Here is a summary of Positives and Negatives for Scenarios 1–8:

1 – Current Strategy (Principal Settlements + Village Clusters) • Builds on existing strategy, familiar approach.

- Concentrates growth in sustainable settlements with services.
- Supports affordable housing via Rural Exception Sites.
- Delivers only 42% of housing target (7,840 homes).
- Large shortfall → risk of speculative development.
- Limited infrastructure funding; cumulative strain.
- No provision for strategic sites/new settlements.
- Harder to plan beyond 2043.
- Higher density infill may harm heritage/landscape.

2 – Dispersed Growth (includes Rural Settlements)

- Spreads growth more evenly.
- Supports rural vitality.
- Similar benefits to Scenario 1 plus small villages included. • Still only 44% of target (8,230 homes).
- Rural settlements lack services → unsustainable.

- Infrastructure delivery harder and costlier.
- Increased car dependency.

3 – Main Service Centre Focus

- Concentrates growth in largest settlements with best services.
- Efficient infrastructure delivery.
- Supports public transport use.
- Delivers 51% of target (9,420 homes).
- Other settlements get little growth → imbalance.
- Pressure on main centres; risk of congestion.
- Limited flexibility for long-term growth.

4 – Transport Node Focus

- Aligns growth with rail/bus corridors.
- Encourages sustainable travel.
- Potential carbon benefits.
- Delivers 49% of target (9,190 homes).
- Few transport nodes in district → limited options.
- Risk of overloading Kemble/Moreton-in-Marsh.
- Still major shortfall.

5 – Principal Settlements + Strategic Extensions/New Settlements (Preferred Option)

- Delivers 79% of target (14,660 homes).
- Enables comprehensive infrastructure planning.
- Creates new communities with full services.
- Best chance of meeting sustainability objectives.
- Supports long-term growth beyond 2043.
- High upfront infrastructure cost.
- Long lead-in time for strategic sites.
- Delivery risk if large sites stall.
- Still short of full target → needs cooperation with neighbours.

6 – Same as 5 + Major Development in Cotswolds National Landscape

- Delivers 104% of target (19,320 homes).
- Tests upper growth limit.
- Contrary to national policy.
- High landscape/environmental harm.
- Not viable; would fail Examination in Public.

7 – Maximise Growth (includes unsuitable sites)

- Delivers 87% of target (16,200 homes).
- Pushes capacity to theoretical maximum.
- Includes sites assessed as unsuitable.
- Unsustainable; high environmental and infrastructure risk.
- Not viable per Council.

8 – Extreme Growth (beyond all constraints)

- Would theoretically meet/exceed target.
- Tests absolute capacity.
- Completely unsustainable.
- Severe environmental, infrastructure, and policy conflicts.
- Not considered a realistic option.

You have to consider the demographic e.g. in Scenario 1, Would 100% affordable housing in a remote location solve anything? One assumes that finances would be tight and stress high, so no access to public transport, places of work and facilities such as doctors and shops would create more issues than it solves.

Comment ID: 8993

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 2 – Should the Council consider locating development in locations it considers unsustainable to meet the government housing target? Please explain.

No, the Council should not plan development in locations it considers unsustainable simply to meet the government housing target. Doing so would conflict with national planning policy and undermine the objectives of the Local Plan.

Reasons:

1. Policy Compliance and Soundness

- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Local Plans to deliver housing in a sustainable manner, balancing environmental, social, and economic factors.

- o Allocating sites in unsustainable locations would likely fail the Examination in Public, rendering the plan unsound and delaying adoption.

2. Infrastructure and Service Constraints

- o Unsustainable sites often lack essential infrastructure such as schools, healthcare, transport, and utilities.

- o Delivering these in remote or constrained areas is costly and inefficient, and may still leave residents dependent on private cars, increasing emissions and congestion.

3. Environmental and Landscape Protection

- o Many unsustainable locations are within or adjacent to the Cotswolds National Landscape, flood zones, or ecologically sensitive areas.

- o Development in these areas would cause significant harm to protected landscapes and biodiversity, contrary to the Local Plan's vision of being "Green to the Core."

4. Long-Term Risks

- o Building in unsuitable areas creates future liabilities: poor connectivity, higher infrastructure maintenance costs, and vulnerability to climate impacts.

- o It undermines the plan's objectives for resilient, inclusive, and low-carbon communities.

Alternative Approach:

- Maximise sustainable options first, including higher densities in suitable settlements, strategic extensions, and new settlements with full infrastructure.
- Collaborate with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to address any residual unmet need.
- Explore innovative solutions such as brownfield regeneration and transport-oriented development to meet housing targets without compromising sustainability.

Comment ID: 8994

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 3 – To what extent would you support increasing housing density in developments (such as smaller houses and gardens, more flats, or higher buildings) to help meet the full housing target? Please also explain why.

I support a small and carefully managed increase in housing density in appropriate locations. Modest changes, such as slightly smaller gardens, more terraced homes, and a limited number of well-designed flats, can help meet housing needs without compromising the character of the Cotswolds. This approach allows for more efficient land use and supports affordability while maintaining the rural feel and high-quality design standards.

However, density increases should:

- Be focused in areas with good access to services and public transport.
- Retain green space and community facilities to ensure quality of life.
- Avoid multi-storey flats above two storeys, as these would be out of character for the Cotswolds, harm views, and conflict with conservation and heritage settings.
- Access roads should be wide, and enough parking (surplus for big families and visitors) should be incorporated into landscape designs. New estates with narrow roads and cars parked down one side are dangerous.

A balanced approach will help deliver homes sustainably while respecting the district's unique landscape and identity.

Comment ID: 8995

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 4

If infrastructure and provisions are not addressed in line with the housing plan, my family will leave Fairford as it will have lost its appeal as a rural town. We might as well live in a larger town or City which has the correct facilities, or more somewhere more rural to achieve the 'feel' that Fairford once had. This saddens me.

The proportion allocated to Fairford is unfair. As a percentage rise in stock (70%), it is comparable to Moreton-in-Marsh (80%), which has had specialist consultants and specific strategic development considerations. Fairford simply is not ready for that level of development. Why has Lechlade been 'left alone' in comparison with only a small amount of development perceived (18%)? It does not make sense. This will also effectively double the number of cars in the town, so traffic flow at the High St/London Road junction, parking and access will be a major issue.

"3.16 Moreton-in-Marsh was identified in the previous Local Plan consultation stage (also formally known as a Regulation 18 consultation) as a potential location for strategic development. The Council has commissioned specialist consultants to assess the feasibility of strategic development in the town and is currently awaiting this evidence."

Anything can be achieved, but it would have to be project managed appropriately. For any further development in Fairford the following needs to be in place beforehand, and some should be quick wins:

- Quick Win: Another Doctors Surgery – You have a purpose-built hospital already there that is hardly used! I would encourage another dentist surgery here too.
- Quick Win: Leisure Facilities – There is a leisure facility at the school that is hardly used, this could be repurposed and expanded.
- Quick Win: Traffic lights at the Mill cut through – these can be small and in keeping with the surrounding (e.g. small red and green). 2 cars cannot pass side by side and increased traffic will cause a big problem on this road.
- Traffic at London Road Bottleneck – we need a ring road, but not sure how that would be achieved.
- Waste water and sewerage – not fit for purpose with current housing stock
- School Places – reduce the catchment area for Farmors, otherwise where will local children go to school?

- Cycle/walking paths away from main roads to Lechlade, Whelford, Kempsford – when will this happen?
- Employment land to reduce commuting.
- Green infrastructure, flood management, and biodiversity enhancements.
- Without these provisions, large-scale growth could place unacceptable pressure on existing services and harm the environment.
- I am fed up with the Lakes development at lake 104 restricting access for walkers. This is not fair, and I can see this area being permanently closed off by stealth and i can foresee other developers doing the same in the future.

This is all common sense. I dropped the preferred options document into Co-Pilot and asked it 'what facilities does Fairford need to improve or add to support it's housing targets to 2045 and beyond? This is what AI produced:

"What Needs to Be Added or Improved

Education

2 additional primary schools (total of 3).

Secondary school capacity (either a new school or expansion).

Healthcare

New health centre with 4–5 GPs.

Expanded pharmacy and dental services.

Transport

Road network upgrades for strategic growth.

Regular bus routes.

Active travel links (cycle paths and pedestrian routes).

Utilities

Upgrades to water supply.

Wastewater treatment improvements.

Electricity grid reinforcement.

Community Facilities

Library or cultural space.

Spaces for youth and elderly activities.

Retail & Employment

New local retail hub.

Small supermarket.

Convenience stores and service businesses.

Employment land or mixed-use development to reduce commuting.

Open Space & Recreation

Sports pitches for football and cricket.

Multi-use games areas.

Additional recreational facilities.

Emergency Services

Satellite facilities for police and fire.

General improvements to emergency service coverage.

Planning assumptions used for sizing (industry-standard rules of thumb)

- Population: 3,200 homes × 2.4 persons/home ≈ 7,700 people.
- Primary schools: ~1 form of entry (FE) per ~210–250 homes (≈210 pupils).
- Secondary: typically, 7–8 FE per 6,000–8,000 residents within a wider catchment; often met via expansion unless local capacity is exhausted.

- Healthcare: 1 GP per ~1,800 patients; modern health centres commonly host 4–6 GPs with allied services.
- Open space: Local plan practice seeks play areas, formal pitches, parks, and allotments proportional to population

Detailed Version:

What Fairford Needs to Add or Improve

Education – Primary

+2 new primary schools (2–3 FE each) or 1 new 3FE school plus expansion of existing to 2–3FE.

Target: ~900–1,100 places across town.

Education – Secondary

Secure secondary capacity via expansion of nearest schools.

Reserve land for a future secondary (7–8 FE) if modelling shows deficits.

Early Years / Nurseries

3–4 nurseries (or expanded settings) distributed near primary schools and local centre.

Healthcare

New integrated health centre with:

5–6 GPs

Pharmacy

Dental suites

Community nursing rooms.

Community & Culture

1 new multipurpose community hub (sports hall, meeting rooms).

Enhanced library offer (dedicated space or shared hub).

Spaces for youth and older adults.

Retail & Local Centre

New local centre in the strategic extension:

Small supermarket (1,000–2,000 m²)

5–10 convenience/service units

Café

Coworking space.

Employment / Mixed Use

5–8 ha of flexible employment land (light industrial, workshops, offices).

Maker spaces and home-business support.

Transport – Highways

Junction upgrades.

Traffic calming.

New spine street through extension.

Safe crossings and school streets.

Public Transport

Bus frequency uplift (every 20–30 mins peak).

New stops and real-time info.

Subsidy via S106/BSIP.

School bus provision.

Walking & Cycling

Primary cycle spine linking town centre, schools, local centre, and new neighbourhoods.

3–4 greenways.

Widened footways and secure cycle parking.

Open Space – Parks

2 new neighbourhood parks (3–5 ha each).

Pocket parks in each neighbourhood.

SUDS-integrated green corridors.

Sport & Recreation

3–4 senior football pitches.

Cricket square.

Multi-use games areas (MUGAs).

Full-size sports hall.

3G pitch and changing pavilions.

Play Space

LEAPs/LAPs in every new neighbourhood.

1 NEAP at the local centre park.

Allotments

~1–2 ha new allotments (~150–250 plots) near green corridors.

Flood Management / SUDS

Attenuation basins, swales, rain gardens.

Blue-green networks designed for 1 in 100 + climate events.

Water Supply & Wastewater

Network reinforcement.

New trunk mains.

Wastewater treatment works capacity increases.

Phased occupancy controls until delivered.

Electricity / Energy

Primary substation upgrade.

Grid reinforcement.

Rooftop PV.

Heat network feasibility for higher-density areas.

Digital Infrastructure

FTTP (gigabit) to all plots.

5G small cells at centres/schools.

Emergency Services

Satellite police touchdown point.

Ambulance standby bay.

Fire appliance access and hydrants.

AI also gives indicative costs schedules:

Education – Primary

New 3FE primary school (site/build/fit out):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £12.0m (range £10m–£14m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Expand existing primary to +2FE:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £6.0m (range £5m–£8m)
- Timeline: 2027–2031

Education – Secondary

Regional secondary capacity uplift (expansion):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £20.0m (range £15m–£30m)
- Timeline: 2032–2038

Early Years

3 nursery settings:

- Quantity: 3
- Cost: £0.8m each (total £2.4m)
- Range: £0.6m–£1.2m
- Timeline: 2028–2035

Healthcare

Integrated health centre (5–6 GPs + pharmacy/dental):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £5.0m (range £4m–£7m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Community & Culture

Multi-purpose community hub (incl. library space):

- Quantity: 1

- Cost: £6.0m (range £4m–£8m)
- Timeline: 2030–2034

Retail & Local Centre

Public realm + small supermarket shell + 8 units:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.0m (range £2m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Healthcare

Integrated health centre (5–6 GPs + pharmacy/dental):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £5.0m (range £4m–£7m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Community & Culture

Multi-purpose community hub (incl. library space):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £6.0m (range £4m–£8m)
- Timeline: 2030–2034

Retail & Local Centre

Public realm + small supermarket shell + 8 units:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.0m (range £2m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Healthcare

Integrated health centre (5–6 GPs + pharmacy/dental):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £5.0m (range £4m–£7m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Community & Culture

Multi-purpose community hub (incl. library space):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £6.0m (range £4m–£8m)
- Timeline: 2030–2034

Retail & Local Centre

Public realm + small supermarket shell + 8 units:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.0m (range £2m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Healthcare

Integrated health centre (5–6 GPs + pharmacy/dental):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £5.0m (range £4m–£7m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Community & Culture

Multi-purpose community hub (incl. library space):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £6.0m (range £4m–£8m)

- Timeline: 2030–2034

Retail & Local Centre

Public realm + small supermarket shell + 8 units:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.0m (range £2m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2029–2033

Employment Land

Serviced plots (roads/utilities) ~6 ha:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.5m (range £2.5m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2030–2036

Highways

Junction upgrades, spine street, crossings:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £8.0m (range £6m–£12m)
- Timeline: 2027–2037

Public Transport

Bus stops/RTI + capex elements of service uplift:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £1.5m (range £1m–£2m)
- Timeline: 2028–2034

Active Travel

Cycle spine, greenways, footway widening:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £5.0m (range £3m–£7m)
- Timeline: 2027–2035

Parks & Open Space

Two neighbourhood parks:

- Quantity: 2
- Cost: £1.5m each (total £3.0m)
- Range: £1m–£2m per park
- Timeline: 2028–2036

Sport & Recreation

Sports hub (3 pitches, cricket, 3G, pavilion):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £4.0m (range £3m–£6m)
- Timeline: 2029–2035

Play Space

10 LEAP/LAP + 1 NEAP:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £0.6m (range £0.5m–£0.8m)
- Timeline: 2027–2035

Allotments

~1.5 ha (paths, fencing, water points):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £0.3m (range £0.2m–£0.5m)

- Timeline: 2030–2034

Flood / SUDS

Basins, swales, rain gardens (strategic network):

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £3.0m (range £2m–£5m)
- Timeline: 2027–2036

Water & Wastewater

Network reinforcement + WwTW capacity increase:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £15.0m (range £10m–£25m)
- Timeline: 2028–2040

Electricity / Energy

Primary substation + grid reinforcement:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £4.0m (range £3m–£6m)
- Timeline: 2028–2036

Digital Infrastructure

FTTP enablement, ducts/chambers:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £2.0m (range £1m–£3m)
- Timeline: 2027–2035

Emergency Services

Police touchdown + ambulance standby bay:

- Quantity: 1
- Cost: £1.0m (range £0.7m–£1.5m)
- Timeline: 2030–2035

Comment ID: 8996

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 5 – Are there any other matters beyond conventional housing that have not been listed here that you think should be considered in the Development Strategy for the updated Local Plan?

Yes. The Development Strategy should also consider:

- Climate resilience measures, including renewable energy generation, heat networks, and EV charging infrastructure.
- Digital connectivity, ensuring full fibre broadband and 5G coverage.
- Community health and wellbeing, with spaces for mental health support and social inclusion.
- Local food security, through allotments and community gardens.
- Sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) integrated with green spaces to manage flood risk. These measures will help deliver the Local Plan's vision for resilient, inclusive, and low-carbon communities.

Comment ID: 8997

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: James Haynes

Comment: Question 6 – Do you agree with the vision and objectives? Or is there anything else that should be covered in the vision and objectives? Please explain.

Yes, I agree with the vision and objectives. They reflect the need for sustainable growth, climate action, and community wellbeing. However, I suggest strengthening the commitment to:

- Delivering infrastructure in step with housing to avoid service shortfalls.
- Promoting local employment opportunities to reduce out-commuting.
- Embedding biodiversity net gain and nature recovery networks in all developments.
- These additions will ensure the vision is fully aligned with national policy and local priorities.

I think the existing road infrastructure needs updating.

- I live on Hatherop road, and this is treated like a rat run, people drive through way too fast. Added to that, cars are parked all down one side. This makes access tight, and I've seen individuals almost run over when stepping into the road between cars. Traffic calming and/or residents only access is needed to resolve this issue.
- There needs to be enforcement on parking. Turning off London Road Fairford onto Hatherop Lane, all the houses that should park their cars at Aldsworth, do so on Hatherop Lane, right up to the junction with Hatherop Road. It is dangerous as drivers are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road approaching a blind corner, where speeding drivers from Hatherop Road (point above, almost collide). This will cause issues when the building work commences on the field off Hatherop Lane due to heavy machinery, mud from the site etc.
- To summarise, all cars should be parked on driveways and this should be enforced. On Hatherop road, some homes do not have driveways but could have on their large front gardens. These are mainly council houses so the council could help with that.

It is important that young people are afforded the opportunity buy homes in the areas they grow up. Right now, it is unobtainable. Innovative ideas should be considered to ensure that new homes are purchased by genuine people and will be used as homes – not as a commodity or investment as this keeps pushing prices/rents up and

exacerbates the situation. I have some ideas, and I suspect there are many other great ideas out there.

- Idea 1 – I live in a 3 bed 1960's semi-detached in Fairford. I have lived in Fairford since 2011 with my wife and Children. I am in the RAF (26 years) and my wife works at Cirencester hospital. We love where we live and intend on settling here long term. However, I would like to purchase a 4-bed detached house with a large garden so I can host grandchildren etc one day. It is unachievable as I need another £200K - £300K to do this. My children will never be able to afford a 3-bed semi in Fairford as it stands which saddens me. My idea, offer a substantial discount (e.g. 20%) to people like my wife and I to allow us to buy a 4-bed in the same area. This would allow us (and others) to release the cheaper housing stock, so I could sell my 3-bed semi to my children or a young family trying to live somewhere nice.

- Idea 2 - As alluded, we should be talking about homes not commodities or investments. There is so much stock in Fairford that is Airbnb, holiday cottages etc. How much housing stock in Fairford (and wider Cotswolds) is not owner occupied permanently? I suspect it is a substantial amount. I feel that you could satisfy a substantial portion of your housing needs with current stock and this should be investigated. Personally, I would bring huge levies and taxes on vacant homes, holiday lets, and homes in the names of businesses rather than owner occupiers to detract from using homes as commodities. This just increases wealth for the few and disadvantages the majority – we are talking about the greater good here for our communities! I really would like to know the councils views on this.

- Idea 3 – Along with housing developments (so facilities are in place), consider selling small parcels of land to local residents only (long standing residents with links to the area like my family – no investors) for affordable self-build projects that must be in keeping with the local environment. For example, pre-fabricated houses to modern build standards can be stunning and blend into the landscape and can be quick to assemble. There are many companies that do this e.g. Link . These plots must be freehold and large enough to build nice family homes with large gardens so minimum plot sizes e.g. 800 Square Metres. Overages could be attached the land only if sold on (with exceptions such as selling to children that can prove they will live there), but not for too long, as this would discourage investment.

Comment ID: 9833

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: James Lockhart FRICS FCI Arb

Comment: My comments relate to the proposed new settlement west of Driffield. The magenta-coloured circle shown on Indicative Map 3: South Cotswolds, envelopes the village of Driffield, the hamlet of Harnhill and the land around Rats Castle. The land is defined as a strategic site capable of accommodating 840 homes by 2043 with a further 1,260 homes following on beyond 2043.

The agricultural land identified within the circle on the map was in the former ownership of the Royal Agricultural University. The recent new owner farms this land sustainably and for the growing of organic vegetables. I consider CDC should I have a dialogue with the present owner before progressing any further with the notion of developing his land.

Reasons for questioning the suitability of this proposed strategic site West of Driffield are:

- Major and hugely expensive road junction upgrades on the A419 (what3words:unsecured.goat.highways), widening the bridge over the A419 dual carriageway (what3words:website.rich.handyman) and altering the narrow and steep S bend near the Mole Valley store (what3words:dares.backers.mistaking) will be needed together with significant widening of the surrounding country lanes. This will materially affect the ambience of the area but as a plus might improve road safety. These road upgrades if they require non highway land might involve “ransom payments” by the developer to minority landowners who have no development land as such.
- The A419 dual carriageway is a major source of noise and air pollution. Placing new homes in areas less than 250m from this road is unnecessarily succumbing the occupants to an unhealthy environment.
- Village lanes serving Harnhill and Driffield are flooded on regular occasions as the surface water management and field drainage in the area is inadequate. Overcoming the high-water table and managing the surface water runoff from a development of the scale proposed will be an expensive exercise again potentially involving landowners who have no development land as such.
- The Driffield and Harnhill have only basic access to utilities and major upgrades to utilities will be needed to support such a volume of new homes.
- Viability of this strategic site looks extremely doubtful from a developer perspective in view of the high cost associated with access, utilities and surface water management combined with potential ransom payments.

Comment ID: 10839

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: James Richardson

Comment: I dispute the definition that Siddington is a Principal Settlement as based on its current dwellings numbers it is comparable, even smaller than some, to the Non-Principal Settlements; e.g. smaller than Avening and Willersey.

By not providing a %-increase data point this table is wilfully misleading, by for the majority of Principal Settlements (13 out 16) there are >100% increases, compared with Siddington (268%!) and the nearby (only 4-miles) Kemble (160%)

Siddington is a rural, close-knit village community that will be swamped and destroyed by over 900 new homes, tripling its size.

Comment ID: 10844

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

Name: James Richardson

Comment: What consultation, if any, was done with the local residents before accepting a "submitted site" into this plan?

This feels like a very one-sided approach whereby the opinions of the (many) existing residents are being ignored by those who serve us (as local government employees) in favour of individuals seeking to profit from the sale of land.

Comment ID: 10878

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: James Richardson

Comment: You need to consider all of the "services" that people need to live happily and not just those that are provided by the local and central government; e.g. supermarkets, dentists, cinemas, affordable taxis. All things we have limited numbers of with poor transport links.

Comment ID: 10882

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: James Richardson

Comment: Admirable, however public transport that takes 1 hour to drive to Cheltenham or runs on a frequency of twice a day and takes 3-4 times as long to drive means people will stick with their cars (or not bother at all!) on a road network that is rural and wholly ill prepared for such increases

Comment ID: 10960

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: James Richardson

Comment: I object to the selection of Siddington for a 268% increase in the housing stock of this single location and the equally significant increases to other close-by (and therefore cannot be ignored / treated separately locations to Siddington; e.g. additional homes on top of the already approved significant Steadings development, Kemble, Preston, Driffield, South Cerney, Down Ampney.

The grounds for my objection are as follows:

- Siddington is an independent community with its own identity that will be wholly swamped and lost by the new homes and cease to be recognised as an independent village when consumed into a sub-district of Cirencester
- Siddington is a historical and rural village and whilst not geographically located in the Cotswolds National Landscape, has many of the hallmarks, character, views and open spaces. No new development can ever replace or replicate the natural countryside. There are ancient buildings, historical ruins and nature trails and spaces accessible to all
- Planning decisions to date within the Siddington parish have been taken sympathetically and finding compromises to meet targets without losing the integrity of the village and in harmony with the local vernacular; e.g. the recent Orchard Field development occupies a limited portion of its space that has afforded the ability for it to be significantly setback and screened from the road, whilst having an architectural character aligned with that of the Cotswolds. This new plan is inconsistent with this policy, focusing on quantity over quality, which it should be noted that this past sympathetic planning wasn't without cost that was born by the owners, who will undoubtedly (at least) be negatively financially impacted by this plan
- As a rural village, the roads around Siddington and connecting it to other settlements are insufficient for significant increases in traffic; for example to access the rail station at Kemble there is a narrow (single vehicle width) road through Ewen, in Siddington itself Park Way has multiple (single vehicle width) pinch points plus significant on-street parking, the Coach Road to the school is single vehicle width (a problem for school traffic already), the road over the canal bridge, which whilst historical itself is blind, narrow and humped, is single vehicle width, Clark's Lane is single vehicle width. Many of these roads (e.g. Coach Road, Clark's Lane, Park Way) do not have public footpaths

- I acknowledge there is a bus link north to Cirencester or South to Swindon, however to go anywhere else (e.g. the train station at Kemble) requires connections for which there is no integrated timetable (e.g. eventually arriving at Kemble just as the train has left)
- Whilst the flood plain may not be part of the proposed development (and for the record, it is flooded often during the winter), surface water flooding throughout the village is an issue, which even the developers of the new Orchard Field development were unsuccessful in combating with drainage and balancing ponds
- The current freshwater and wastewater supplier for Siddington is Thames Water, a debt-ridden company who is incapable of consequently making its own capital investments, but has a widely publicised backlog of remedial work to rectify and / or upgrade its infrastructure before significant new homes can be built
- Creating new homes and successful communities will inevitably be the responsibility of private developers, however as the Planners and Councillor's approving this work, your existing residents hold you CDC accountable for the approach, implementation and outcomes, and based on past experience you have not demonstrated strong leadership in holding said developers to account; e.g. allowing developers to resubmit retrospective plans removing obligations on them.
- With the quantity of new homes this plan proposes, it will mandate district-wide if not cross-district (e.g. with Stroud or Wiltshire) leadership of an integrated delivery upgrade plan to all aspects of society (e.g. public services, commercial services, transport links), which will need to be implemented timely and with minimal disruption to the existing residents and businesses. I do not believe credible, competent and empowered leadership, nor the funding for the required works, will exist.
- 2,300 homes on the nearby (<1 kilometre away) Steadings development are already approved with building work underway, however the majority are yet to be completed and occupied and therefore the impact that this significant increase in population will bring is completely unknown. Therefore before additional homes are added to the vicinity this work should be completed and the impact properly understood, including taking any lessons learned for future developments to avoid them becoming a blight on the societies they seek to, as minimum, coexist with but aspire to enhance
- Given the Council's decision to abide by the UK Government-defined targets and the space chosen in the district to realise these targets (i.e. the 20% not within the Cotswolds National Landscape), the proposed plan has a high likelihood to create a "new-town" within the Cirencester sub-region as Kemble, Cirencester, Siddington, South Cerney, Preston, Driffild, Stratton and Ampney Crucis all merge unconsciously in one amorphous "blob", with no character, insufficient employment, ecological and

environment harm, falling tourist numbers, inadequate transport links, and insufficient services.

Comment ID: 10854

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: James Richardson

Comment: None of these scenarios is my preference as I don't believe the targets calculated via the new (Dec-24) Standard Method are appropriate for this district, and should be challenged.

The new UK Government standard method for calculating (as defined and revised on 12th Dec 2024) <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments>) demand is flawed when applied to the Cotswold District, specifically;

- o 80% of the district is occupied by the government-designated Cotswolds National Landscape, bringing significant restrictions on developments (be that commercial or residential) and therefore causes any whole-district targets to need to be fulfilled by the remaining 20% of the land (as shown in C-3-1-1 Preferred Options Consultation Document Nov-2025 by Indicative Map 1, Indicative Map 2 and Indicative Map 3).
- o There has been a skewing of the average district house price due to higher demand for medium-to-top-end priced homes by middle-to-high income and retirees seeking homes within close proximity to the Cotswolds National Landscape. This has not doubled(!) the district demand for more affordable, and therefore of greater quantity, housing
- o As a predominately rural district, with 80% of the territory being occupied by the Cotswolds National Landscape (with the commercial and residential development restrictions it brings) there is insufficient new employment demand for this additional housing demand; i.e. the rural economy isn't a growth industry and the nearest nearby towns (Cheltenham, Gloucester, Swindon) all have higher unemployment rates than the district
- o These targets and associated plan have been created based on arbitrary and soon-to-change district boundaries, as announced by the UK Government in July 2025 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-reorganisation-letter-to-areas-invited-to-submitted-final-proposals/summary-of-the-local-government-reorganisation-process>) and due for implementation in 2026; i.e. this is a sub-optimal plan as demonstrated by section 5.49 of C-3-2-1 Development Strategy Options Technical Report Nov-2025 which is unable to consider homes at Cotswold Airport due to part of the land supply being within a neighbouring district

The plan (reference C-3-2-1 Development Strategy Options Technical Report Nov-2025) presents seven scenarios but is inconsistent in the presentation of the information and details, which raises questions of bias in the selection of a recommended scenario; e.g. compare the data points in Section 5.42 Table 6 and Section 6.46 Table 7

The plan (as shown in C-3-1-1 Preferred Options Consultation Document Nov-2025 Indicative Map 3) defines multiple, very close proximity locations with high quantities of new homes without taking a holistic view of the implications on the (sub-)regional transport, public services, commercially-provided services, quality of living (both during and post build), loss of community and identity; i.e. within 7-miles of the local, largest and only market town of Cirencester there will be a 68% increase in the quantity of houses (and therefore in excess of 200% increase in population numbers), without commensurate initiatives to support this; e.g. the local roads are small country lanes, there is only one (affordably-priced) large supermarket.

A number of the scenarios reference asking neighbouring authorities to contribute to residual need or even, if that isn't successful, setting a lower housing target. Given these are valid scenario(s) they should be explored and proposed as such, with likelihood of success, for feedback. i.e. this report / plan isn't balanced.

If an option is required, then CDC should pursue scenarios 6 or 7 as test case for the UK Government defined restrictions as a consequence of the Cotswolds National Landscape, that require all of the housing targets to be met within 20% of the available land and which already has the majority of the dwellings; i.e. either the areas the Council believe are "unsustainable" are relaxed or the targets are reduced, but we can't maintain areas of outstanding national beauty for the benefit and national and international visitors to the detriment of the lives of local residents.

Comment ID: 10856

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: James Richardson

Comment: Pursue scenarios 6 or 7 as test case for the UK Government defined restrictions as a consequence of the Cotswolds National Landscape, that require all of the housing targets to be met within 20% of the available land and which already has the majority of the dwellings; i.e. either the areas the Council believe are "unsustainable" are relaxed or the targets are reduced, but we can't maintain areas of outstanding national beauty for the benefit and national and international visitors to the detriment of the lives of local residents.

Comment ID: 10861

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: James Richardson

Comment: As per my other comments, the new Standard Method for calculating future housing demand is focused on enabling more affordable housing; i.e. traditional supply and demand economies that drive prices down. However, in a rural district like Cotswolds, which is also dominated (80% of the land) by the Cotswolds National Landscape, there is not a comparable increase in employment demand and therefore who is going to be able to afford to live in all of these homes?

We will only be left with unsold homes, sold homes that the State though benefits are paying for, or individuals commuting to work places further and further away from their homes on a rural, and unfit for mass transit, transport network and plus the environment impacts.

If the objective is more affordably-priced new homes, then other strategies should be considered; e.g. the greater densification that this question is considering.

Comment ID: 10862

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: James Richardson

Comment: This scenario should not be discounted as it reflects a balanced approach (i.e. the target is spread across the available land rather than just 20% of it). If developing in the Cotswolds National Landscape isn't aligned to the UK Government defined restrictions, then they should review the new housing targets they defined and compatibility with the dynamics of this district.

Comment ID: 10863

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: James Richardson

Comment: This scenario should not be discounted as it reflects a balanced approach (i.e. the target is spread across the available land rather than just 20% of it). If developing in the Cotswolds National Landscape isn't aligned to the UK Government defined restrictions, then they should review the new housing targets they defined and compatibility with the dynamics of this district.

Comment ID: 10866

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: James Richardson

Comment: For this 200% increase (and <2 years since the previous targets and plan) in future homes demand, what challenge has been made to the UK Government on its validity for the Cotswolds District? The available land is clearly insufficient given only 20% available, there is insufficient employment demand, the public and commercial services are inadequately sized, transportation links (road and rail) are inadequately sized (the report make naive claims of existing rail links without considering the rural location of stations, the narrow lanes to them and the woeful public transport connections).

Comment ID: 10870

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: James Richardson

Comment: The new UK Government standard method for calculating (as defined and revised on 12th Dec 2024) <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments>) demand is flawed when applied to the Cotswold District, specifically;

- o 80% of the district is occupied by the government-designated Cotswolds National Landscape, bringing significant restrictions on developments (be that commercial or residential) and therefore causes any whole-district targets to need to be fulfilled by the remaining 20% of the land (as shown in C-3-1-1 Preferred Options Consultation Document Nov-2025 by Indicative Map 1, Indicative Map 2 and Indicative Map 3).
- o There has been a skewing of the average district house price due to higher demand for medium-to-top-end priced homes by middle-to-high income and retirees seeking homes within close proximity to the Cotswolds National Landscape. This has not doubled(!) the district demand for more affordable, and therefore of greater quantity, housing
- o As a predominately rural district, with 80% of the territory being occupied by the Cotswolds National Landscape (with the commercial and residential development restrictions it brings) there is insufficient new employment demand for this additional housing demand; i.e. the rural economy isn't a growth industry and the nearest nearby towns (Cheltenham, Gloucester, Swindon) all have higher unemployment rates than the district
- o These targets and associated plan have been created based on arbitrary and soon-to-change district boundaries, as announced by the UK Government in July 2025 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-reorganisation-letter-to-areas-invited-to-submitted-final-proposals/summary-of-the-local-government-reorganisation-process>) and due for implementation in 2026; i.e. this is a sub-optimal plan as demonstrated by section 5.49 of C-3-2-1 Development Strategy Options Technical Report Nov-2025 which is unable to consider homes at Cotswold Airport due to part of the land supply being within a neighbouring district

Comment ID: 10874

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: James Richardson

Comment: For the settlements in and around Cirencester; i.e. Siddington, the Steadings (both the currently approved and proposed additional homes), Preston and Driffield these are not sustainable.

An increase of the population in excess of 200% in what is a largely rural community without wholesale destruction to the existing community isn't possible and if considered is naive at best and wilful at worse. For example, as a rural community the majority of people use a car to go shopping for which the only full-sized supermarkets are within Cirencester which has limited parking, tight, narrow streets and is connected to those rural hamlets and villages by tight / narrow country lanes.

There is insufficient local employment for the people planned to occupy these new homes and there is unrealistic ex-district transport to other locations for employment other than the car. NB the nearest larger towns and cities have higher unemployment rates than this district.

Comment ID: 9659

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: A problem for CDC is the National landscape area which has forced more and more housing & development on to the so called Principal Settlements. Over the last 10 years these areas have taken the majority of new development. However some areas such as Moreton in Marsh have reached saturation point. There is known serious flood risk & known inadequate drainage and sewage infrastructure. Not only is the Principal Settlement of Moreton in Marsh effected but the flood and sewage problems have effected the nearby small villages. These plans for new housing driven by the government take no account of the effect on Moreton in Marsh or the small villages immediately surrounding them. Builders do not provide adequate infrastructure, they merely "try" to protect their development. If more growth is forced on Principal Settlements the government MUST own up to providing adequate infrastructure for growth and also recognise some areas like known Flood Plains cannot absorb more housing.

Comment ID: 9661

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: Surely this wider dispersing of development is the better way forward. The Principal settlements cannot absorb the new government housing alone. Some appropriate development outside these settlements should help share some of the requirements. Also if appropriately shared the infrastructure crisis hitting the Principal settlements is better shared.

Comment ID: 9665

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: There is a false belief that the train station in Moreton in Marsh is a 'transport hub'. The Victorian train station is single track line at Moreton and is at full capacity. There is already a problem of not enough parking for all who currently use the train. There are no bus connections to & from it. The season fares to London are in excess of £11k & as such it is not feasible to suggest it will be widely used by all income brackets to commute to London. It does not offer workable connections to other main employment areas. It is a rural station that would require a major line upgrade and extensive infrastructure expansion to take on further capacity.

Comment ID: 9667

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: Much as I hate the idea of tampering with the beauty that is the Cotswolds, if the Government will not listen to CDC regarding numbers pushed upon them for development, I fear the only way forward is to start nibbling away at towns and villages currently protected by National Landscape designation. Continuing to develop Principal Settlements is unsustainable and also has a knock on effect of passing problems such as flooding and traffic problems back to these villages as well.

Comment ID: 9670

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

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: I can not stress highly enough the need for CDC to remember that Moreton in Marsh is a flood plain. In the Anglo Saxon chronicles it is referred to as the Henmarsh. Ecologically the area cannot sustain much more development. The limited flood abatement that Developers have put into their new developments has merely caused flooding to be pushed further along adding to problems in sections of Moreton as well as surrounding villages. The extensive new development over the last 10 years has also caused significant increased ground water flooding and sewage overflow. The river Evenlode runs through Moreton in Marsh very near the trainline embankment. These Developer flood mitigation pools run right up to the train embankment. When they overflow there is no where for the water to disperse.

Comment ID: 9676

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: The chart below shows Moreton in Marsh being allocated one of the largest new housing targets in all of the Cotswolds. I have already commented on the ecological imperative of not over extending further development on a known Flood plain, a flood plain that has been known for centuries. Before 2010 Moreton in Marsh was approx 1600 households. In five years it has grown to 2,663 households. Infrastructure and traffic is currently at breaking point. Flooding has increased significantly and continues to push water into smaller surrounding villages as well. Thinking it is possible to add an additional 2,135, which nearly doubles Moreton in Marsh in size, is beyond unsustainable. Even if Thames water were to immediately upgrade the known under capacity of its sewage plants to handle current volume in Moreton, and suddenly miraculously new employment opportunities were to emerge, along with new schools and new doctors surgeries and hospital care added, there would still be no escape from the fact that the road network is seriously congested and often at gridlock from Stow on the Wold to beyond Moreton in Marsh near Portobello crossroads toward Shipston on Stour. The so called Transport Hub of Moreton in Marsh station is in reality a Victorian single track line with currently not enough parking for existing residents and the surrounding area. CDC acknowledges that settlements outside the National Landscape, ie: Moreton in Marsh will receive a disproportionate share of development but nowhere does it offer the equivalent in investment to support jobs, infrastructure or services.

Comment ID: 9690

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: I do not believe that the number of homes proposed for Moreton in Marsh is sustainable. The geography of the area which is a floodplain cannot sustain the growth suggested. Flooding continues and climate change has already shown that we are suffering from wetter weather. The area to the east of the town centre has the Evenlode River running through it and known tributaries and springs that arise and feed into it. Past Developments, despite Developers so called flood mitigation exercises, have contributed to increased flooding in the area and have also pushed flood issues into surrounding smaller villages unable to cope with them. The local economy is driven by tourism and agriculture. Driving up the number of houses in Moreton in Marsh risks destroying the employment opportunities that exist locally. Overdevelopment will mean the town is no longer considered a tourist destination and the farms gobbled up to development will end agricultural employment opportunities. All this new housing with no employment will cause social issues as well & create more problems on the currently overstretched road network as those who can commute to find work will add to traffic congestion. Ah I hear you say 'but they will use the train'. With the cost of a season ticket to London in excess of £11k not many will be able to afford such a commute, which in any case is 1 hour & 20 minutes.

And finally, where is the infrastructure to support all the extra development flowing toward Moreton in Marsh. Are there new Doctor's surgeries? Is there an hospital less than a 40/50 minute emergency commute (on a good day without excessive traffic?). Are there new schools proposed? When will Thames Water upgrade the existing sewage and foul water system to deal with the significant growth Moreton in Marsh as seen on the last 7 years?

So to conclude it is impossible to foresee a good outcome for CDC or Moreton in Marsh if such a huge number of new development is allowed in this town particularly. The better path must be to recognise the issues that confront Moreton in Marsh and try to share out more proportionately the housing numbers imposed by central government. Sharing out proportionally may mean nibbling into the National Landscape areas. Certainly Moreton in Marsh is a SLA and a known Flood risk area by the EA and yet this Local Plan is looking at developing; if it can overlook these Planning prohibitions surely it can find a way to see some development occurring in the National Landscape areas too. Sharing the burden must be the better way forward.

Comment ID: 9837

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: Scenario 1 potentially overloads Principal Settlements with more than they can absorb. These principal Settlements have taken the lions share of the CDC development to date because they are the few areas of CDC Land that is not National Landscape. However often they are SLAs.

A case in point is Moreton in Marsh. Not only is it a SLA it is an historic floodplain; known as such in the Anglo Saxon chronicles named as such as: Henmarsh. So Moreton in Marsh has 3 important Planning considerations that need to be acknowledged before the majority of new Development is pushed its way. First it is a known Floodplain, second an SLA and third between 2010 it has already grown from 1800 dwellings to 2663 dwellings. That is a 48% growth rate - so half again in size, pushed upon it in the last 15 years.

Scenario 1 would plan to add another 2135 houses in Moreton growing it by over 80%.

This level of growth is unsustainable in a town already struggling with infrastructure issues. Primary is inadequate sewage treatment for the growth spurt between 2010-2025. This plan does not offer any new Plans and Infrastructure development from Thames Water who (not the Developers) must build what is required. This is a major issue that cannot be overlooked.

Secondary, flooding continues to occur more regularly in Moreton in Marsh and in the smaller villages surrounding it. Flood abatement schemes do not work in a known floodplain when it is OverDeveloped. It merely pushes the flooding onward. Often roads leading from Moreton are unpassable and under water when a heavy downpour occurs. With wetter more storm prone winters this issue is only exacerbated.

Third, the growth to date has led to another key infrastructure problem which is the road network. There is daily gridlock on the A429 often from Stow on the Wold to the Portobello Crossroads nr. Shipston on Stour. The A429 runs through the centre of Moreton in Marsh and connects to the A44. There is no plan on how to alleviate this major traffic problem today, so planning to grow Moreton in Marsh by 80% without a well thought out plan that sees the road network re-routed through either floodplain land that now floods or through the National Landscape on the other side of Moreton in Marsh appears as a major issue that cannot be overlooked. The cost of this infrastructure and the actual feasibility of achieving it with both a river crossing (the Evenlode) and a GWR railway crossing it, would require the resources of central government not just CDC. We are repeatedly told there are insufficient funds to accommodate a road upgrade.

Fourth, great store is set on Moreton In Marsh's Victorian train line. It is a single track line, with a station carpark that cannot accommodate current parking levels. To grow it to a more modern efficiency level will require GWR to build better infrastructure to have trains pass one another on dual lines, and find capacity for more and more parking. And while there are plans to call Moreton train station a Transport Hub, all this means in reality is more space allocated for turning of buses and in total approx 10 more parking spaces! Oh yes and some additional trees and landscaping.

Fifth, local employment opportunities in Moreton in Marsh are mainly tourist related or agricultural based jobs. The proposed 80% + level of growth in Moreton in Marsh will not grow these opportunities. In fact if Moreton becomes a 'suburban' style populated town, the tourist opportunities will not be there and the agricultural jobs will disappear. All that will happen is further pressure on the lack of road infrastructure because more and more people will get in their cars to drive.

I have highlighted Moreton in Marsh to state why I believe loading the majority of new Development on Principal Settlements in Scenario 1 is unfair and also because many of the Principal Settlements cannot absorb more.

Much as I regret it, if the Government continues to insist on development perhaps it is time to nibble away at some areas of the National Landscape which might help to share out the numbers required. It cannot all be dumped on to the very few CDC areas that are outside the National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10178

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: Assuming Moreton in Marsh can accept an increasing in housing of over 80% is an impossibility. The underlying geography of floodplain (sites 05 & 06 in Figure 3 "potentially Developable Land Sub divided in Broad Zones, un Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations Nov 2025) can no longer be disregarded & ignored. Growth in Moreton in Marsh in the last 10 years has pushed the infrastructure to breaking point. Housing has gone from approx 1800 in 2011 to 2663 in 2025. As it stands the sewage treatment plant for Moreton regularly overflows and spills noxious material into roads and the Evenlode River. As the housing continues to be added in Moreton on floodplain land, the Flood abatement schemes Developers but in place for their specific Development merely push the flood waters onward. After heavy rain the Evenlode Road is regularly impassable at Heath End Farm and also just beyond Pebbly Brook Farm.

Comment ID: 10180

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: An increase in housing numbers needs to be allocated more fairly. Moreton in Marsh is assumed to be able to take an over 80% increase in housing numbers. There are many problems with this. Currently traffic and road infrastructure is often at a stand still. There is no plan to alleviate this. Building a bypass that would have to tunnel under, or bridge over the railway line and also build it to withstand regularly flooding by the Evenlode river is beyond financial reach of any builder or CDC. So no new road infrastructure is planned. This coupled with very limited parking in Moreton in Marsh, mean more and more businesses struggle to attract clients. The Victorian, single track trainline that runs through Moreton in Marsh, and its even more limited parking capacity, is hardly a solution either.

Certainly Moreton needs to take some of the housing Central Government is imposing however it cannot shoulder the lion's share for the North Cotswolds. The distribution of housing numbers needs to be spread more widely. And even edges of National Landscape must be considered for development too if the government continues to impose unworkable numbers to be pushed entirely on to the tiny portion of Non-National Landscape land within CDC.

Comment ID: 9693

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jamie Ball

Comment: Yes, the underlying geography of the areas being considered for development must be reviewed as well.

A known Flood Plain will not endure overdevelopment despite an modern flood mitigation technology. There is only so many places flood water can go. Mitigation merely ships it elsewhere. Please review the notes and comments from small villages neighbouring Moreton in Marsh (even if they are WODC) and take note of their problems which arise from Flooding which the overdevelopment in Moreton in Marsh causes.

Comment ID: 10883

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jan Sparrow

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

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

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

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

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

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

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

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

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

Comment ID: 10886

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jan Sparrow

Comment: Question 2 – Should the Council consider locating development in locations it considers unsustainable to meet the government housing target? Please explain.

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

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

No. Siddington is being targeted because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10888

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jan Sparrow

Comment: Question 3 – To what extent would you support increasing housing density in developments (such as smaller houses and gardens, more flats or higher buildings) to help meet the full housing target? Please also explain why.

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

Comment ID: 10893

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jan Sparrow

Comment: Question 4 – Do you think the proposed level of development up to 2043 – the end of the Local Plan period – and beyond 2043 is sustainable? If not, what provisions would need to be added to the settlement(s) to make them a sustainable location for the proposed level of development? These could be new services, facilities or the provision of infrastructure. Please clearly state which settlement(s) your comment relates to.

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

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

Comment ID: 10894

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jan Sparrow

Comment: Question 5 – Are there any other matters beyond conventional housing that have not been listed here that you think should be considered in the Development Strategy for the updated Local Plan?

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

Question 6 – Do you agree with the vision and objectives? Or is there anything else that should be covered in the vision and objectives? Please explain.

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

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

Comment ID: 10896

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jan Sparrow

Comment: Question 6 – Do you agree with the vision and objectives? Or is there anything else that should be covered in the vision and objectives? Please explain.

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

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

Comment ID: 9337

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Jane Collison

Comment: Agree with CDC preferred strategy

Comment ID: 9340

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jane Collison

Comment: Other considerations should be schools, shops, doctors surgery, dentists etc and improvement of existing housing

Comment ID: 9341

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jane Collison

Comment: Agree with CDCs vision

Comment ID: 9343

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Jane Collison

Comment: This needs to be advertised to a great extent and smaller sites accepted

Comment ID: 8741

Location in consultation document: Introduction

Name: Jane Hennell

Comment: Thank you for your consultation on the above document.

We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals & rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a statutory consultee in the Development Management process, and as such we welcome the opportunity to input into planning policy related matters to ensure that our waterways are protected, safeguarded and enhanced within an appropriate policy framework.

The Trust have no waterways, assets or land interests within the area covered by the document and as such we have no comment to make.

Comment ID: 9131

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jane Mackridge

Comment: Sustainability needs to be looked at within the context of Flood Risk. The flood risk assessment on land offered for development, particularly in the area to the South West of Kemble needs to be reviewed and updated in the light of Storm Bert (Nov 24) and Strom Claudia (Nov 25) - what used to be termed '1 in 100 year events' are now becoming more regular. The environment agency has raised the risk of surface water flooding for Kemble Wick (Windrush Cottage GL7 6EQ) to high in the last year citing more than a 3.3% chance of flood each year. Lessons need to be learned from the construction of the solar farm behind Kemble Wick. Whilst a drainage plan was signed off by a hydrologist for the completed site - no attention was paid to the construction phase where surface water run off, in a zone already prone to flooding, was ignored - causing increased surface water running off the construction site and through Kemble Wick. Building in an area already prone to flooding with a track record of the surface water causing extensive damage (in excess of £150k) to private residences in my opinion is not sustainable and offering this land for development is misguided and needs to be reviewed

Comment ID: 9133

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Jane Mackridge

Comment: You state that one of the objectives is to

"Locate development away from flood-prone areas" - this needs to be reviewed on a very regular basis as the environment agency are updating their flood risk ratings all the time and particularly after Storm Bert (Nov 24) and Storm Claudia (Nov 25). I write these comments with particular focus on the development proposed to the South West of Kemble near the new Solar Farm where the village of Kemble Wick is exposed surface water flooding on a regular basis

Comment ID: 10307

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I am afraid similar arguments as I have provided elsewhere prevail: more jobs provision etc equates to more infrastructure, more road accessibility, and so on.

Calling this 'Green to the core' would appear on the surface to be a meaningless slogan. It may be that substantial wildlife provision is being made, I have not encountered this. It is a cause of great anxiety to me that we are damaging the balance of nature and ultimately ourselves.

There is an argument that we must not easily get rid of our farmland, we made need to be self sufficient in the relatively near future given the current world situation.

Comment ID: 10311

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: Healthcare is vital, but I have no idea what the council is thinking of: surgeries...a new hospital etc?

Highways are critical - I cannot see anyway that humans are going to stop using the car. Public transport is important but only really buses can travel virtually anywhere.

You talk about open space - we all need that - children adults and wildlife. We live in area which has a poor record as regards water services there is much to do there.

There is much land prone to flooding.

Comment ID: 9881

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I would say that it is impossible to fulfil the quotas expected of Gloucestershire given that a large part of the area is designated especially beautiful. If South is 'built' up it is in serious danger of becoming a giant suburb, (in the country?!). Already the roads are full of traffic with attendant queues at rush hour.

You would also be encouraging more and more cars on the road . The reality is that people rarely use public transport except for long journeys. This does nothing for our carbon footprint. Building at high density is friendly neither to green issues and certainly not to wildlife.

Comment ID: 9897

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: To reiterate, it sounds as if the council/ government wants the whole of south Gloucestershire to become some kind giant suburb. This would not be countryside. There has been much development in Fairford and Lechlade - they are close to forming a large town. Tetbury has also had it fair share of development - leading to large queues between Cirencester and Tetbury.

Whilst I do want young people and those who work in this area to have access to affordable housing there would appear to be no way to guarantee this.

Comment ID: 9905

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: If so much land is going to be used it appears there will be little consideration to wildlife.

Comment ID: 9873

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: scenario 5

Comment ID: 9874

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: It would be a waste of time and money to build where it is deemed unsuitable

Comment ID: 9876

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: Q. 3 Unless you want to lose the character of this area of outstanding beauty it would be detrimental to the whole area and country to wilfully spoil it.

Comment ID: 10297

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: It is difficult to respond to this question because on the face of it it is asking an impossible question. The Council must know that what is being suggested will harm this COUNTRY area. So minimising all impact must try to be avoided.

Comment ID: 9900

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I find it very difficult to see how appropriate infrastructure could be put in without prohibitive expense. The roads are somewhat narrow and the traffic rips up the tarmac in record time. It is hard to see how building many more houses out of the centres could be anything but harmful. The cost of putting drainage, road widening schemes etc would be indeed daunting.

Comment ID: 9902

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: See above - referring to Kemble Fairford and Lechlade.

Comment ID: 10304

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I do not see that this level is sustainable without massive changes to infrastructure. This involves essentially turning a country area into an urban or semi-urban development.

Q Has anyone from the government actually come out here and seen the traffic problems in Stow on the Wold, the massive development of Fairford, Tetbury and Lechlade, the build of traffic on the A 429 and A 433, particularly at rush hour? It is just about manageable now but I cannot see how it will be with the level of development envisaged.

Comment ID: 9910

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: Please ensure that sufficient attention is paid to wildlife and habitat.
Without that you cannot claim to be 'green'

Comment ID: 9913

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: Kemble has a significant flooding problem (not where housing is proposed), however I do not know how much this could be adversely affected by mass property building at the top.

Comment ID: 9919

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I do not agree with the vision. It seems to me that this vision involves changing the countryside into a semi-urban future. This would lose so much of what is important in this area. I do recognise the need for more more housing and some development - on the scale proposed I have grave concerns.

Comment ID: 9868

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: If too many small sites are built on there will not be hamlets etc any more.

Comment ID: 10295

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: I think I have changed my mind and that additional housing should be around main centres. This would enable in some cases at least to build a little higher (3 levels) and hopefully minimise travelling so current country roads will not be overwhelmed as at least a proportion of jobs would be available locally.

Comment ID: 9931

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: It would seem that if development were concentrated here we would run into same problems of access and over crowding that we will run into elsewhere

Comment ID: 9890

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: How do you expect small towns and villages to retain any character if the housing is to double or in some cases quadruple...and that is before any business is put in? How do you equate this level of development with your statement 'green to the core'. If you are using so much land with attendant lighting and tarmac etc. How can this possibly be 'green'? What is going to happen to wildlife habitat?

Comment ID: 9872

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Janie (Janice)

Comment: Totally inappropriate to build too high or too densely in this area. Would lose all character of the Cotswolds. Inner city density should be in inner city.

Comment ID: 9285

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: If yet more houses are to be built in Moreton, can estates have at least two entrances/exits, so if there is any problem on the main road residents have more chance of access. I live in Fosseway Avenue, with several cul-de-sacs off a long road and there is only one exit, making it difficult with turnings opposite. Bad planning years ago!

Comment ID: 9282

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: Moreton not sustainable. The town will be so unattractive that people will not want to live here, prices will fall (supply and demand) so, if wanting to move away, residents will only receive reduced amounts on sale to provide for property elsewhere. The falling birth rate should be considered so there might not be such a requirement for speculative building.

Comment ID: 9283

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: The narrow bridge over the railway in the north of Moreton towards Stratford is dangerously narrow, particularly with all the HGV's. Certainly not suitable for pedestrians. Anyone in Todenham Road has to walk through Blenheim Estate to cross the station footbridge to reach the High Street. Ridiculous and you propose building houses on the north side of Todenham Road?!!! The railway bridge is owned by the railway, soon to be Great British Railways and they do not want to make any improvements.

Comment ID: 9284

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: All these suggestions for cycle routes in Moreton will not be possible on our roads and footpaths which are too narrow. I cannot see any other off-road routes being available. It currently shows by the number of cycles at the station that people are not interested in cycling, probably because of danger on the roads or they prefer to use their car.

Comment ID: 9286

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: No, I do not agree with your vision! It's impractical.

Comment ID: 9279

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: Too many coming to Moreton station by car.

Campden station could be reopened to ease congestion.

Comment ID: 9280

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: Inadequate infrastructure to support more homes in Moreton. It is already at breaking point, particularly the sewage system which was at full capacity many years ago. Thousands of houses have been built since then without any improvement. The Spitfire site on Dunstall Farm is still being developed with Phase three already completed. Most of Moreton's roads are too narrow, especially for the HGV's, inadequate doctors and dentists for the increased population, poor shopping facilities and very few local job opportunities. All needed now, before any more new homes, not afterwards.

Comment ID: 9281

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Janis Clements

Comment: Cirencester is a very large town compared to Moreton. Why should Moreton have 2/3rds of their housing allocation?

Comment ID: 9263

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Jasper Biddulph

Comment: The Government is suggesting too high a number of new homes for our district. Housing density should be limited to 20 to 30 dwellings per hectare

Comment ID: 9901

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jean Bacon

Comment: Scenario 5 would be preferred for the reasons stated in the text. It would seem to be the least CDC would be allowed to adopt.

Comment ID: 9907

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jean Bacon

Comment: No. There will be enough problems dealing with existing buildings etc that have been built unsustainably without adding to the difficulties. In particular pressure to build on land liable to flooding must be resisted since flooding levels will only increase in the future.

Comment ID: 9921

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jean Bacon

Comment: If effective soundproofing was used, more use of terraced houses could help increase the density. All gardens should have some sun on them from March - November.

Comment ID: 9924

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jean Bacon

Comment: Will all these new homes have some form of local occupancy restriction to prevent them being used as second homes?

Comment ID: 9889

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jean Bacon

Comment: Major developments within the Cotswold Natural Landscape would negate the whole point of the the landscape designation - which was more clearly stated in its previous title 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'. This would be detrimental to all 'Natural Landscapes', not just the Cotswold, so should not be included in the plan options.

Comment ID: 10433

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Jean Cleary

Comment: I've lived in Siddington for approx 20 years and have witnessed some of the changes that have already taken place and which seem to have had an adverse affect on the village. We have already seen the outcome of the housing development by Spire View on our village. It has increased the size of our village and as a result the commuter traffic has increased as has the drain on our local resources. Living in Cherry Tree Drive I/we have experienced all too often the strain these extra homes have placed on our sewer system with constant overflow of raw sewage onto our road and pavements every time we have heavy rainfall. Despite reporting these concerns to Thames Water on a regular basis they either don't seem interested in putting the matter right or are unable too. It is a huge health hazard to us and needs to be addressed not added to . With these additional homes we have faced greater and more frequent occurrences of flooding in the village. There is also an extra strain on our water supply. In addition to this the extra homes in Spire View placed a bigger strain on our access to GP and hospital appointments. The commuter traffic has also increased and can cause huge tail backs.

If this is the outcome of the development in Spire View then the proposal to add another 1,100 new homes in Siddington would be catastrophic. The current infrastructure does not support what we have already so it won't be able support any further homes. Adding more homes to the village will simply swamp it and the community as we know it now will sadly fail to exist. We don't want to become part of a larger urban development we want to retain the rural character of our village and live in a safe community not one that is threatened because of what the new proposals may bring.

Comment ID: 8929

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jennifer

Comment: High density housing does not meet the needs of people, families with children, the elderly or the disabled. For strong mental health people need their own outside space, and families purchasing houses want gardens. If new builds do not provide this it creates added demand and increased house prices on existing stock making it less affordable for local people to buy

Comment ID: 8930

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jennifer

Comment: In the plan Cirencester is set to grow by 50%, where is the provision for 50% more doctors, dentists, car parking facilities, school provision? Already waits for doctors appointments is the highest I have known in 20 years, NHS dentists are virtually impossible, the hospital is to be downgraded again, no 24hr A&E, theatre to be closed, huge waits in Glos, Cheltenham A&E also downgraded.

Also roads around Cirencester, from Tetbury in rush hour tails back, is this going to be worse when Steadings is built, also Love Lane despite the changes can be gridlocked back round to Austins. The infrastructure is severely lacking, and if the ring road is closed there is chaos and also any closures on the A419/A417, our roads are often not fit for current usage let alone 50% more housing.

Comment ID: 8932

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jennifer

Comment: Re Q 5 which has no link, it appears that there is a dominance of proposed sites near Cirencester which will therefore further increase the pressure on the roads and services in the town over and above the already proposed 50% increase in housing in the town?

Comment ID: 8931

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jennifer

Comment: There needs to be a balanced approach. This is being driven by the needs for housing, but the housing doesn't work if the infrastructure, transport, both public and private ie parking provision in the towns and at the housing, health, education quality of life etc isn't paramount. It appears that the focus is where can we find the land to build NOT where is the best place to build to meet the quality of life for those residents and those already here.

Comment ID: 9683

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jennifer Boyse

Comment: Your presentations have banners showing idyllic community developments-building communities. This takes time and effort

and adequate community facilities. The most recent developments in Mickleton have considerable problems with anti social behaviour and I include the massive development down the road at Meon Vale. This causes ongoing stress to the other

residents. This is the result of pushing too many people together too quickly ie proposing to increase the size of our village by circa 60%. Mickleton has a large sports field which cannot be fully utilised as the Pavillion is in an advanced state of disrepair with inadequate changing facilities and toilets.

My point being that better facilities and reduced housing numbers would encourage community activity and integration and reduce anti social behaviour.

Others have commented on the lack of medical and educational facilities and transport for such a large proposed development .

Comment ID: 8933

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Jennifer Lawrence

Comment: Driffield is a small village with less than thirty houses. The proposed allocation of 840 dwellings is totally out of proportion to the area. Such an expansion contradicts sustainable patterns of growth, Driffield will lose its distinct identity as a small rural village.

Comment ID: 8934

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

Name: Jennifer Lawrence

Comment: Driffield has no local services or amenities. No school, playground or bus service. There is no gas, and limited access to the sewage system. The roads that service this area are narrow and often single track. This proposed development would mean a huge upgrade of the road network system to service 840 dwellings.

Comment ID: 8935

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

Name: Jennifer Lawrence

Comment: I request that Cotswold District Council deletes the proposed allocation of 840 dwellings at Driffield from the local draft plan. Instead explore a distribution of settlements with an already existing infrastructure, with public transport, wider more resilient road systems nearer the A419.

Comment ID: 9259

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Jennifer Skillen

Comment: It is really important to have more affordable housing, however, I don't think it is even worth making a comment about that because the council won't stand up to developers and most housing is unaffordable. The only spot in our rural village that could have taken housing has been built on with four very unaffordable houses, all costing over £1million. It is laudable that Scenario 1 talks about 100% affordable housing in rural settlements but it is too late now for most rural areas.

Comment ID: 8961

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jenny Owen

Comment: i have a very strong objection to a back door arrangement to extend nasty inappropriate housing adjacent to worwell rise tetbury

Comment ID: 8962

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jenny Owen

Comment: do not want any bog standard building crammed onto the edges of

Comment ID: 8866

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: This policy concerns me. Does the country not need the food that is being produced in all these fields which are disappearing under concrete.

Comment ID: 8861

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Jeremy Arnull

Comment: Higher density building brings more problems in communities.

Comment ID: 8863

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: Proposal three. It is the most sensible solution for the Cotswolds. The belief that we need these homes is erroneous. Yes there is a demand, but that demand is for 'affordable housing'. If houses are built at current prices, the people who need homes here will not be able to afford them. That really has to be closely considered, and is surely an argument back to the Government. We can build but not actually the homes that are needed, because there will be no profit in it for the builders.

Comment ID: 8864

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jeremy Arnull

Comment: Simple answer is no.

Comment ID: 8865

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: Not an easy one to answer. There is a fear that closer buildings with less space are more likely to provoke tensions. The theory behind this is wrong headed. There are already enough Planning Applications granted but not built on to satisfy the Government's quest, but why would builders build on brownfield when they can have nice green fields instead,

Comment ID: 8857

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: It would appear that Scenario 3 would be the most sensible way to go forward. I realise that this does not hit the Government Target, but if we are to preserve the Cotswolds and the environment we live in, filling the non-National Landscape areas of the District with houses is not the way forward without substantial infrastructure in place,

Comment ID: 8858

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Jeremy Arnull

Comment: To regard Mickleton in any sense as a Principal Settlement is a total misunderstanding of the facilities that Mickleton has. By imposing 590 houses on this village you seem to be totally ignoring the 10000 houses being built in Warwickshire only a few miles away which will use the road system that drives through our village to access the Cotswolds, the M5, Evesham and Chipping. You are therefore going to cause gridlock in Mickleton itself which already suffers one car, van, lorry or bus through the village from 6 am to 7 pm. We do not have the facilities which you claim, and which can sustain the 62% increase in the number of houses, let alone the 1500 extra cars that will be added to our roads. We have no bus service worth consideration, nor is rail travel an option without using a car to get there. Our primary school is full and has no room to expand. We have no doctor surgery or pharmacy. These houses can only add to the huge pressure already on such services in Meon or Chipping which are already under huge pressure.

Comment ID: 8859

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: We cannot accept that this development should only happen on non National Landscape land, as this will create a them and us scenario. Those who can afford it will be basking in the beauty of the wonderful countryside, whilst the rest of the Cotswolds will have to put up with a scenario of bricks and mortar, or worse, waiting for Builders to decide when it will be profitable to build such houses. The thought that increased housing will reduce prices simply does not stack up. Even 'affordable housing' will be beyond the reach of people who we rely on to make our rea work.

Comment ID: 8860

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jeremy Arnull

Comment: I do love this concept which sounds so easy BUT/ Where is the infrastructure to come to allow these to be built. Where is the water, the electricity, the doctors, the dentists, the hospitals, emergency services going to come from. No doubt there will be plans to put much of the cost of this onto builders. However a quick glance at recent press stories will tell you that builders are stepping out of providing promised infrastructure or 'affordable housing' because they cannot afford to do it, even though it was part of their Planning Application.

Comment ID: 8862

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Jeremy Arnall

Comment: This is the logical option if this is simply a mathematical problem. How can we supply enough houses. Well we keep adding them until we reach a figure that is near enough our target, without actually considering what these houses will mean to the villages and towns who will have to put up with an ill thought out policy.

Comment ID: 9363

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Jerry Arnall

Comment: The document has selected sites in Mickleton which have already been discounted in the past. Indeed from the original Housing Plan we have supplied more houses than we were asked for. Those houses were built on the premise that there would be infrastructure in the village to allow us to comfortably subsume this building. This has not happened. Now you want a Village without many basic services to add a further 500 plus houses without any indication of how water, sewage, and electricity are available for these buildings without destroying the services of the entire village. You have also selected Mickleton as one of the top areas for new houses totally ignoring the 10,000 houses being built little more than one mile down the road in Warwickshire. All the developments there will have to come through an already stretched road system in Mickleton to reach the Cotswoldss and all areas to the south of the village.

Comment ID: 9204

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jessica

Comment: Scenario 5 is the preferred option, as it is CDC's preferred option, due to their consideration that the other scenarios are unlikely to be accepted by an Independent Inspector at the Examination in Public. Although the density increase is substantial and only appropriate in an inner city environment according to the report, it is the second lowest density option. It is mindful of the AONB.

Comment ID: 9208

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jessica

Comment: Brownfield sites should always be prioritised for housing development, as there are ample empty offices/factories and retail units in the settlements which could provide housing, subject to change of use. Much of the infrastructure is in place here. The majority of the proposed sites in this local plan extend beyond the current boundaries into agricultural land, where little of the infrastructure is in place.

Comment ID: 9209

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jessica

Comment: According to this plan, the current density in Cotswold District is 21 dwellings per hectare and the proposed density in Scenario 5 is 106 dwellings per hectare, which is appropriate in an inner city environment and would conflict with the area's character as well as the practical limits of infrastructure and services. However, large houses are not required and more modest and affordable housing would allow a small increase in the current density levels.

Comment ID: 9218

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jessica

Comment: For the Quenington/Coln/Hatherop cluster and the Fairford settlements, planning permissions should be withheld until the following issues have been rectified, including;

Sewage issues must be resolved with a significant increase in capacity.

Water abstraction locally must be reduced to preserve the water volume and quality in the River Coln and to ensure that fresh water supplies will not be impacted by any proposed development.

Electricity supply must be increased prior to any future development, including the upgrading of existing properties to green technologies.

Housing type should focus on affordable/social housing so that local people can afford to live in the area.

Essential services, primarily medical, need substantial investment.

Ensure the local schools have sufficient capacity and sports facilities and other facilities are enhanced or provided to maintain the social fabric of the community.

Transport links need to be strengthened.

Comment ID: 9657

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jim

Comment: This is a very lazy document and way of planning. No thought has been given to local people and the impact this will have on their environment and their lives. In particular, I refer to Down Ampney. 420 new homes to a village of 200+. The village already has regular flooding, its roads and footpaths are full of potholes and there are no footpaths(pavements) at all east of the village, with the council refusing to install any. The heavy vehicles and workers needed to build new houses will only worsen these roads and footpaths. The waste and drainage systems are already overloaded after recent developments and to add 420 additional properties will max them out completely. Traffic in the village regularly exceeds 30mph and to add 600+ more cars will result in the worsening of the roads, more speeding drivers and inevitably serious accidents. This village does not have a doctors, it does not have a dentist, does not have a large shop, does not have a junior or senior school and does not have a pub. This means all residents must use cars to get to these facilities. Homes should be built in villages and towns that already have these facilities and not dumped on a village like Down Ampney simply because there may be land available. 420 new homes will have a negative impact on this village and residents would be living on a building site for the next 15 years during building. Kindly reconsider this proposal and come up with a realistic and achievable figure given my comments. Thank you

Comment ID: 9079

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: What consideration has been given to repurposing existing buildings as in Coln House School being converted to flats? What % of the additional homes will be provided this way and where across the Coltswold Area?

Comment ID: 9080

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: Higher density living is contra to everything the Cotswolds is about. Higher rise buildings are also against everything that people want to live in the Cotswolds for. This is a rural community and landscape. Filling it with high density housing and blocks of flats will ruin everything we love about the area.

Comment ID: 9081

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: Whilst you prefer Scenario 5, you will ruin parts of the Cotswolds by doubling the number of houses - ie Fairford.

We may have a range of facilities but we do not have capacity within those facilities to accommodate the residents we already have and it is hard to find anyone who has confidence in the Government and Council providing those. We also don't want to live in a conurbation - we love our Market Town and do not want to see it destroyed by becoming an urban sprawl.

Comment ID: 9082

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: How is the position of Lechlade affected given that it is at the point of 3 counties and much of the surrounding land is in Oxfordshire and Wiltshire and presumably outside of the remit of CDC?

Comment ID: 9083

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: What consideration has been given to the unusable space that is occupied by RAF Fairford? Although the land is included in CDC, it is not available for building and therefore has this been considered? Also what consideration has been given to flooding which is a serious concern and permanent threat.

Comment ID: 9084

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: Environmental implications of commuting / visiting supermarkets / hospitals
- more people with fewer facilities (jobs, medical, shopping, entertainment etc) = more travel = greater environmental impact.

Keeping local medical facilities open

Comment ID: 9187

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: Infrastructure and Traffic Management Concerns

Additional Infrastructure and Services

The provision of additional infrastructure and services is a pressing concern given the current state of the A147. This road, at its narrowest point between Town Bridge and Hyperion House, effectively functions as a single lane. The limited width means that only one vehicle can pass at a time, with drivers frequently having to give way to one another. The lack of space has resulted in lorries mounting the pavement, causing damage to adjacent properties and creating hazardous conditions for pedestrians.

Road and Pavement Limitations

There is no feasible option to widen the A147 without the demolition of listed buildings, which is not permissible. The pavements themselves are already too narrow and pose significant risks to pedestrians, with one side of the road lacking any pavement access to the High Street. This further exacerbates the safety issues for those on foot, as well as the general accessibility of the area.

Traffic Flow and Diversion Routes

The narrowest section of the A147 does not permit two cars to pass simultaneously, resulting in frequent bottlenecks and requiring drivers to cooperate by giving way. There is no obvious alternative diversion route available, making traffic management particularly challenging during periods of increased vehicle flow.

Impact of Maintenance and Increased Housing

Routine maintenance work on properties such as the Post Office and the Medieval White Hart House necessitates the closure of the A147, even for relatively minor tasks such as painting. With the anticipated increase in traffic brought about by additional housing, effective management strategies will be vital to ensure safety and accessibility for both residents and road users. The current infrastructure does not appear capable of accommodating the expected rise in traffic volume without significant disruption.

Comment ID: 9189

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: Where will new work opportunities be created? And what will the environmental impact of commuting be? Is the surrounding infrastructure robust enough to manage additional commuting to Swindon, Oxford, Cheltenham etc.

Comment ID: 9190

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jo Mainwaring

Comment: What provision is there for increased health facilities/schools?

What is the plan for improving sewage and flooding resilience which is currently not fit for purpose?

What is the plan for stopping the raw sewage discharging into the River Coln?

Comment ID: 8952

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Joanna Shellard

Comment: I understand the need for additional housing but it should not be allowed unless the infrastructure of the proposed area (I am in Fairford) is upgraded to meet the additional need. In Fairford the sewage system, medical facilities, education and road system do not support even more housing. Unless all these can be approved no additional housing should be considered. A lot of new houses have been build recently but we have seen NO improvement in the infrastructure - where has this money gone to? The main road running through Fairford is totally inadequate for more traffic, the doctors surgery is inadequate, the sewage treatment system is dreadful and the school is full to bursting. All this must be improved before any additional houses are built.

Comment ID: 10518

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: I do not understand how/why Mickleton has been identified as a Principal Settlement. This should be based on not only population but also facilities, infrastructure and employment. There are no public facilities other than one primary school. There are no medical facilities nor a village hall that is owned/operated by the Parish Council. There are very limited bus services, certainly not suitable for anyone wishing to commute to a place of employment.

Comment ID: 10519

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: With ref to 2.15 please explain with respect to the proposed increase in Mickleton's housing (an increase of 62%) how the preferred option can be deemed sustainable ie best services, facilities, employment etc. There appears to be no transparency in how the housing figures for each location are calculated. This options study appears to be an arbitrary numbers game without the rationale and due consideration required by planning policy.

Comment ID: 10522

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: Option 4 is the only sustainable option which centres population growth at transport hubs. All other options would increase vehicular travel to unacceptable levels and have too high a proportion on new homes in areas without sufficient employment opportunities or infrastructure

Comment ID: 10524

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: Absolutely not. All options apart from Option 4 are unsustainable and not sufficiently different (particularly in respect to growth at Principal Settlements).

Mickleton is an extreme outlier in all but one option (Option 4). The median growth figure within the Principal Settlement category is 12%, whereas Mickleton is 5 times this at 62%. it appears to be a completely arbitrary and unacceptable figure.

Comment ID: 10526

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: Higher density housing would not retain the character of the Cotswold District which is an important consideration. This would also attract second home owners/holiday lets. Good quality family homes are needed. Flats are suitable only where land availability is severely restricted - ie in highly urbanised areas.

Comment ID: 10527

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: What is the solution to the severe water shortage in the Thames Catchment area. I live in Mickleton and we were one of the few areas locally which had a hosepipe ban for most of this year, as water is from an aquifer which is severely depleted. Yet the proposed housing increase in our village is 62%. Whilst there is mention of water scarcity in this document there is no solution identified.

Comment ID: 10529

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: Yes, additional matters should include (i) Biodiversity and Habitat Creation
(II) Safety, Security & Crime Prevention (III) Community Cohesion

Comment ID: 10533

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Joanne Chell

Comment: I do not have an objection to the words, just a very low confidence that it is deliverable. The currently described scenarios in this document are at odds with this and do not go anywhere near far enough in providing evidence that this vision and objectives can be met.

Comment ID: 10450

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: None of the proposed scenarios reflect the Local Plan's stated ambition to be sustainable and "green to the core" when considered from the perspective of local communities. They risk undermining the character, landscape, and way of life that define the Cotswolds and which previous Local Plans have sought to protect. The scenarios also pay insufficient regard to the Neighbourhood Plans prepared by local communities, which express how residents wish their areas to evolve.

Scenario 5 is of particular concern because it would fundamentally change the nature of a number of small villages. By directing large-scale growth to places that are not equipped to absorb it, the scenario risks turning rural villages into extensions of nearby towns. This would erode their identity, sense of place, and community cohesion.

I do not support any scenario that relies on Siddington being treated as a Principal Settlement. This designation does not reflect the reality of daily life in the village, including the limited services, facilities, and infrastructure available to residents.

Scenario 5 can only work if major development is directed to locations with established infrastructure and services that communities can realistically access. Siddington does not meet this test. Allocating around 1,100 homes to a village with only 339 existing dwellings would overwhelm the existing community, permanently alter its character, and is not consistent with development that supports strong, healthy, and sustainable communities.

Comment ID: 10459

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: No. The Council should not locate development in locations it considers to be unsustainable in order to meet government housing targets.

Adopting a plan that allocates development to locations acknowledged to be unsustainable would be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and contrary to the approach promoted in previous Cotswold District Council Local Plans. Meeting housing targets should not come at the expense of sound planning principles.

Siddington appears to be targeted primarily because it lies outside the Cotswolds National Landscape, rather than because it is a sustainable location for growth. The classification of Siddington as a Principal Settlement further obscures the reality that the village lacks the services, public transport, employment opportunities, and infrastructure required to support large-scale development.

If the Council chooses to allocate development to locations it considers unsustainable, it should be transparent about the implications of doing so and acknowledge that this represents a departure from established good planning practice. Unsustainable locations should not be used as a means of meeting housing numbers, as this would place unacceptable pressure on communities and undermine the long-term objectives of sustainable development.

Comment ID: 10462

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations (such as Siddington) is inappropriate and would threaten their rural character as well as compounding problems associated with pressure on infrastructure.

Comment ID: 10474

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: Lack of Infrastructure Capacity for Siddington

Siddington lacks the infrastructure necessary to support large-scale growth, including:

- The Narrow roads through Siddington are already congested and dangerous. They are inadequate to support further traffic volumes from large scale housing developments. There have been 4 road traffic accidents on Siddington in the past few weeks.

- There is no GP and healthcare provision
- Insufficient Local employment opportunities
- Insufficient Leisure facilities
- Resilient utilities and services

In addition, the wider district is already experiencing water supply and wastewater treatment constraints. These factors collectively demonstrate that Siddington is not a suitable location for development on the scale proposed.

Comment ID: 10476

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: Flood Risk in Siddington

Parts of Siddington already experience flooding. The Common, Cherry Tree Drive, Ashton Road and Park Way regularly suffer from flooding and issues with surface water drainage. Large-scale development would significantly increase surface water runoff and place further pressure on drainage systems. This is contrary to the Local Plan's objectives to avoid areas at risk of flooding and to ensure development does not exacerbate existing problems.

Land to the east of Ashton Road is poorly served with in adequate drainage and further pressure from addition run off water would lead to significant problems in Ashton Road.

Comment ID: 10475

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Johanna Tordoff

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: 10478

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Johanna Tordoff

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

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

Comment ID: 10470

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Johanna Tordoff

Comment: Disproportionate Scale of Growth for Siddington

The Local Plan proposes:

- 881 strategic allocation dwellings by 2043
- Approximately 900 dwellings by 2043 in total
- Approximately 1,100 dwellings including post-2043 delivery
- Compared with just 339 existing dwellings

This represents growth of over 260% by 2043 and more than 325% overall. No other settlement of comparable size is being required to accommodate such extreme proportional growth. This approach directly conflicts with the Local Plan Vision and objectives, which emphasise proportionate development and the maintenance of distinct settlement identities.

Comment ID: 9784

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: John

Comment: Scenario 1 is the only one I could reluctantly give any support to whatsoever. The others are clearly not viable as they impose either an imbalanced (e.g. Moreton and doubling it's size with no chance of even a fraction of service upgrades to accommodate) or simply not feasible due to infrasture limitations which cannot be scaled up in this genrational timeframe.

Comment ID: 10391

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John

Comment: No, I don't think this level of growth is remotely sustainable.

I have lived in Broadwell for 30 years, 3 miles from Moreton-in-Marsh, and in 1996 the Fosse way (A429) between here and Stow was stationary during busy times, and always during the summer.

No significant improvements in infrastructure have been made since then and it is now beyond breaking point and the potholes and constant breaking up of the road surface bear this out, as does the DfT data from 2017.

Moreton's aging railway station cannot cope today as it is at full capacity. Parking is just not possible unless you arrive a day in advance so it is not conceivable to ask more people to use this facility and the lines have been upgraded to their maximum capacity already.

Public transport via bus is already severely limited due to traffic congestion and journey times grow every year for the same distance, so the costs keep rising, forcing people not to travel and interact socially because it is too expensive and takes too long.

All developments will need huge levels of HGV traffic which will further crucify the broken state of local roads and they simply never get repaired. I know of 2 road traffic accidents locally that were caused by drivers swerving to avoid potholes.

Health services were stretched in 1996 and despite the addition of the North Cotswold Surgery / Hospital in Moreton-in-Marsh, appointments are at 8 weeks and there is no capacity to expand this facility. Staff are leaving already and recruitment is at zero because health care professionals don't want the hassle of travelling in such a congested area and the abuse that comes with understaffed medical practices.

In Moreton, new houses have already been built on flood plains. In 2007, we had one of the Country's worst floods and the whole town was underwater. Many businesses never came back. Hundreds of houses now sit on this once flooded land and nothing has been done to prevent this from happening again. All of these new houses will flood again one day. That is certain.

But we are now planning more houses on land even more likely to flood, just to meet a made up housing target. Who is thinking of the people whose lives will be wrecked by this mindless strategy? Not the Council if you back these plans.

I could continue but I feel my efforts are wasted on a feeble attempt to challenge this incompetent bunch of clueless career politicians who could not care less about others and will not be around if this ever comes to pass.

Comment ID: 10394

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: John

Comment: Other matters that need considering are pretty much everything else other than the unrealistic target for new build homes.

It seems inconceivable to me that any Government could impose such a scale of house building without first considering targets for the things these new people coming into the area, well over 50,000 if the 18,650 was ever reached, will need to live.

Where are the targets for;

- School places, senior, junior, primary and infant
- Childcare facilities for pre school
- Nursing homes; state funded
- Employment; they can't all work in Aldi
- Traffic congestion; Moreton High St. & Stow can't cope currently and are at standstill daily and villages have become rat runs as a result with cars avoiding the jams. These villages are now dangerous to walk in because cars speed through them and have knocked over many pedestrians recently. This can only get worse without a major bypass which is not what the area wants. Therefore, increased traffic flow has to be avoided another in other ways, and 18,500 plus new houses is not one of them
- Parking; there is nowhere to park as it is for High Street businesses and no target or location for more parking
- Noise & air pollution; we are already breaking laws in Moreton and Stow because of stationary lorries running diesel engines and going nowhere
- Damage to the wildlife by removing huge parts of their habitat and poisoning the environment with construction fumes
- Irreversible impact on the natural landscape of ugly urban style townships built where they cannot sustain their inhabitants
- Crime; with the mass unemployment that would result in thousands of houses and no jobs for people, crime will certainly increase and local people would end up afraid to go out as they once did
- Healthcare; how many new Doctors & nurses are targeted to be employed in each area?

- Where will these Doctors & nurses work? There are no new hospitals or surgeries mentioned anywhere in this Plan
- Dentists; How many new NHS dentists will be targeted to cope with the influx of people who won't have jobs so cannot pay to go to a private dentist
- Community Centres; How many new community centre facilities will be built to create recreation for the influx of new younger people
- Sports Facilities; How many new playing fields, football/rugby pitches, gyms, sports centres will be built under this Plan and where is the target?
- Thames Water; how is going to help Thames Water double the size of it's water supply and drainage capability when it fails on a monthly basis already and is effectively a bankrupt business as it is, despite trebling the average water bill in the Cotswolds
- Sewage; How many new sewage plants will be built under this Plan? The Cotswold district sewage system is currently not fit for purpose and blockages are a regular occurrence
- National Grid; where is the target for new power stations to be built to power all these homes? We have monthly power cuts in Moreton & Stow, from 10 minutes to 3 days. They are a regular feature because the infrastructure carrying electricity is decaying and overloaded - it is always going down. Where are the numbers to show where 18,500 plus new homes will get their power from?
- Food; where will all these new homes go to buy weekly shopping? What is the target for new supermarkets with parking that is not always full as it currently is with the few we have

These are some of the matters that spring to mind, the detail of which is noticeably lacking in this Local Plan.

Whilst I understand all of the detail on numbers, facilities, amenities and employment cannot be determined at this stage, setting a specific number of 18,650 new homes in a largely ANOB seems perfectly fine to target, but without a single consideration of any numbers or even ideas around how these people will live, work, get healthcare, childcare, shop or engage in any social activity to keep fit. Not a mention of any of this.

Why is that?

Is no one responsible for joined up thinking when it comes to new housing developments under a Labour Government?

This whole project is fundamentally flawed and doomed from the start if more basic homework and planning is not done before any final decisions are made.

Comment ID: 10395

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John

Comment: Whilst I agree that a Vision and Objectives are important and these words tick some boxes in this regard, they are rather too high level and therefore somewhat meaningless, given that the Government has demanded that you as a Council somehow accommodate 18,650 new homes without and consideration of the basic infrastructure that would be required to even begin a planning process.

Talk of Biodiversity, renewables, housing mix, zero carbon, sustainable transport and sustainable communities are laudable and what we ultimately want and need, you are faced with crude number as your sole target and no financial roadmap as to how these desirable elements of the Vision & Objectives could possibly form part of our future.

My concern is that this is not achievable without joined up thinking, then joined up planning and resourcing before numbers of new homes can possibly be committed to.

These are the reasons I think that, as I set out in my answer to Question 5;

Other matters that need considering are pretty much everything else other than the unrealistic target for new build homes.

It seems inconceivable to me that any Government could impose such a scale of house building without first considering targets for the things these new people coming into the area, well over 50,000 if the 18,650 was ever reached, will need to live.

Where are the targets for;

- School places, senior, junior, primary and infant
- Childcare facilities for pre school
- Nursing homes; state funded
- Employment; they can't all work in Aldi
- Traffic congestion; Moreton High St. & Stow can't cope currently and are at standstill daily and villages have become rat runs as a result with cars avoiding the jams. These villages are now dangerous to walk in because cars speed through them and have knocked over many pedestrians recently. This can only get worse without a major bypass which is not what the area wants. Therefore, increased traffic flow has to be avoided another in other ways, and 18,500 plus new houses is not one of them

- Parking; there is nowhere to park as it is for High Street businesses and no target or location for more parking
- Noise & air pollution; we are already breaking laws in Moreton and Stow because of stationary lorries running diesel engines and going nowhere
- Damage to the wildlife by removing huge parts of their habitat and poisoning the environment with construction fumes
- Irreversible impact on the natural landscape of ugly urban style townships built where they cannot sustain their inhabitants
- Crime; with the mass unemployment that would result in thousands of houses and no jobs for people, crime will certainly increase and local people would end up afraid to go out as they once did
- Healthcare; how many new Doctors & nurses are targeted to be employed in each area?
- Where will these Doctors & nurses work? There are no new hospitals or surgeries mentioned anywhere in this Plan
- Dentists; How many new NHS dentists will be targeted to cope with the influx of people who won't have jobs so cannot pay to go to a private dentist
- Community Centres; How many new community centre facilities will be built to create recreation for the influx of new younger people
- Sports Facilities; How many new playing fields, football/rugby pitches, gyms, sports centres will be built under this Plan and where is the target?
- Thames Water; how is going to help Thames Water double the size of it's water supply and drainage capability when it fails on a monthly basis already and is effectively a bankrupt business as it is, despite trebling the average water bill in the Cotswolds
- Sewage; How many new sewage plants will be built under this Plan? The Cotswold district sewage system is currently not fit for purpose and blockages are a regular occurrence
- National Grid; where is the target for new power stations to be built to power all these homes? We have monthly power cuts in Moreton & Stow, from 10 minutes to 3 days. They are a regular feature because the infrastructure carrying electricity is decaying and overloaded - it is always going down. Where are the numbers to show where 18,500 plus new homes will get their power from?
- Food; where will all these new homes go to buy weekly shopping? What is the target for new supermarkets with parking that is not always full as it currently is with the few we have

These are some of the matters that spring to mind, the detail of which is noticeably lacking in this Local Plan.

Whilst I understand all of the detail on numbers, facilities, amenities and employment cannot be determined at this stage, setting a specific number of 18,650 new homes in a largely ANOB seems perfectly fine to target, but without a single consideration of any numbers or even ideas around how these people will live, work, get healthcare, childcare, shop or engage in any social activity to keep fit. Not a mention of any of this.

Why is that?

Is no one responsible for joined up thinking when it comes to new housing developments under a Labour Government?

This whole project is fundamentally flawed and doomed from the start if more basic homework and planning is not done before any final decisions are made.

Comment ID: 9790

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: John

Comment: Absolutely not. This Government have proved consistently that they have no grasp of reality, business or the communities they are elected to serve so why should the Council sit there and accept some hypothetical figure dreamed up to please backbenchers with no understanding of how it could possibly work in practice.

Unsustainable means that it CANNOT be sustained - not feasible. What part of this are we not understanding?

Comment ID: 9793

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: John

Comment: To a very small extent. If a plot of land that could accommodate one property comfortably in a Principle Settlement could be designed to fit 3 or 4 apartments or similar that would still be in keeping with the Cotswold landscape and was no more than 2 (max 3) floors high, then this could contribute more towards the total for a given acreage.

Comment ID: 9807

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John

Comment: No, I don't think this level of growth is remotely sustainable.

I have lived in Broadwell for 30 years, 3 miles from Moreton-in-Marsh, and in 1996 the Fosseway (A429) between here and Stow was stationary during busy times, and always during the summer.

No significant improvements in infrastructure have been made since then and it is now beyond breaking point and the potholes and constant breaking up of the road surface bear this out, as does the DfT data from 2017.

Moreton's aging railway station can not cope today as it is at full capacity. Parking is just not possible unless you arrive a day in advance so it is not conceivable to ask more people to use this facility and the lines have been upgraded to their maximum capacity already.

Public transport via bus is already severely limited due to traffic congestion and journey times grow every year for the same distance, so the costs keep rising, forcing people not to travel and interact socially because it is too expensive and takes too long.

All developments will need huge levels of HGV traffic which will further crucify the broken state of local roads and they simply never get repaired. I know of 2 road traffic accidents locally that were caused by drivers swerving to avoid potholes.

Health services were stretched in 1996 and despite the addition of the North Cotswold Surgery / Hospital in Moreton-in-Marsh, appointments are at 8 weeks and there is no capacity to expand this facility. Staff are leaving already and recruitment is at zero because health care professionals don't want the hassle of travelling in such a congested area and the abuse that comes with understaffed medical practices.

In Moreton, new houses have already been on flood plains. In 2007, we had one of the Country's worst floods and the whole town was underwater. Many businesses never came back. Hundreds of houses now sit on this once flooded land and nothing has been done to prevent this from happening again. All of these new houses will flood again one day. That is certain.

But we are now planning more houses on land even more likely to flood, just to meet a made up housing target. Who is thinking of the people whose lives will be wrecked by this mindless strategy? Not the Council if you back these plans.

I could continue but I feel my efforts are wasted on a feeble attempt to challenge this incompetent bunch of clueless career politicians who could not care less about others and will not be around if this ever comes to pass.

It will not, but they don't care either way.

Comment ID: 9949

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: John

Comment: Other matters that need considering are pretty much everything else other than the unrealistic target for new build homes.

It seems inconceivable to me that any Government could impose such a scale of house building without first considering targets for the things these new people coming into the area, well over 50,000 if the 18,650 was ever reached, will need to live.

Where are the targets for;

- School places, senior, junior, primary and infant
- Childcare facilities for pre school
- Nursing homes; state funded
- Employment; they can't all work in Aldi
- Traffic congestion; Moreton High St. & Stow can't cope currently and are at standstill daily and villages have become ratruns as a result with cars avoiding the jams. These villages are now dangerous to walk in because cars speed through them and have knocked over many pedestrians recently. This can only get worse without a major bypass which is not what the area wants. Therefore, increased traffic flow has to be avoided another in other ways, and 18,500 plus new houses is not one of them
- Parking; there is nowhere to park as it is for High Street businesses and no target or location for more parking
- Noise & air pollution; we are already breaking laws in Moreton and Stow because of stationary lorries running diesel engines and going nowhere
- Damage to the wildlife by removing huge parts of their habitat and poisoning the environment with construction fumes
- Irreversible impact on the natural landscape of ugly urban style townships built where they cannot sustain their inhabitants
- Crime; with the mass unemployment that would result in thousands of houses and no jobs for people, crime will certainly increase and local people would end up afraid to go out as they once did
- Healthcare; how many new Doctors & nurses are targeted to be employed in each area?

- Where will these Doctors & nurses work? There are no new hospitals or surgeries mentioned anywhere in this Plan
- Dentists; How many new NHS dentists will be targeted to cope with the influx of people who won't have jobs so cannot pay to go to a private dentist
- Community Centres; How many new community centre facilities will be built to create recreation for the influx of new younger people
- Sports Facilities; How many new playing fields, football/rugby pitches, gyms, sports centres will be built under this Plan and where is the target?
- Thames Water; how is going to help Thames Water double the size of it's water supply and drainage capability when it fails on a monthly basis already and is effectively a bankrupt business as it is, despite trebling the average water bill in the Cotswolds
- Sewage; How many new sewage plants will be built under this Plan? The Cotswold district sewage system is currently not fit for purpose and blockages are a regular occurrence
- National Grid; where is the target for new power stations to be built to power all these homes? We have monthly power cuts in Moreton & Stow, from 10 minutes to 3 days. They are a regular feature because the infrastructure carrying electricity is decaying and overloaded - it is always going down. Where are the numbers to show where 18,500 plus new homes will get their power from?
- Food; where will all these new homes go to buy weekly shopping? What is the target for new supermarkets with parking that is not always full as it currently is with the few we have

These are some of the matters that spring to mind, the detail of which is noticeably lacking in this Local Plan.

Whilst I understand all of the detail on numbers, facilities, amenities and employment cannot be determined at this stage, setting a specific number of 18,650 new homes in a largely ANOB seems perfectly fine to target, but without a single consideration of any numbers or even ideas around how these people will live, work, get healthcare, childcare, shop or engage in any social activity to keep fit. Not a mention of any of this.

Why is that?

Is no one responsible for joined up thinking when it comes to new housing developments under a Labour Government?

This whole project is fundamentally flawed and doomed from the start if more basic homework and planning is not done before any final decisions are made.

Comment ID: 9951

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John

Comment: Whilst I agree that a Vision and Objectives are important and these words tick some boxes in this regard, they are rather too high level and therefore somewhat meaningless, given that the Government has demanded that you as a Council somehow accommodate 18,650 new homes without and consideration of the basic infrastructure that would be required to even begin a planning process.

Talk of Biodiversity, renewables, housing mix, zero carbon, sustainable transport and sustainable communities are laudable and what we ultimately want and need, you are faced with crude number as your sole target and no financial roadmap as to how these desirable elements of the Vision & Objectives could possibly form part of our future.

My concern is that this is not achievable without joined up thinking, then joined up planning and resourcing before numbers of new homes can possibly be committed to.

These are the reasons I think that, as I set out in my answer to Question 5;

It seems inconceivable to me that any Government could impose such a scale of house building without first considering targets for the things these new people coming into the area, well over 50,000 if the 18,650 was ever reached, will need to live.

Where are the targets for;

- School places, senior, junior, primary and infant
- Childcare facilities for pre school
- Nursing homes; state funded
- Employment; they can't all work in Aldi
- Traffic congestion; Moreton High St. & Stow can't cope currently and are at standstill daily and villages have become ratruns as a result with cars avoiding the jams. These villages are now dangerous to walk in because cars speed through them and have knocked over many pedestrians recently. This can only get worse without a major bypass which is not what the area wants. Therefore, increased traffic flow has to be avoided another in other ways, and 18,500 plus new houses is not one of them

- Parking; there is nowhere to park as it is for High Street businesses and no target or location for more parking
- Noise & air pollution; we are already breaking laws in Moreton and Stow because of stationary lorries running diesel engines and going nowhere
- Damage to the wildlife by removing huge parts of their habitat and poisoning the environment with construction fumes
- Irreversible impact on the natural landscape of ugly urban style townships built where they cannot sustain their inhabitants
- Crime; with the mass unemployment that would result in thousands of houses and no jobs for people, crime will certainly increase and local people would end up afraid to go out as they once did
- Healthcare; how many new Doctors & nurses are targeted to be employed in each area?
- Where will these Doctors & nurses work? There are no new hospitals or surgeries mentioned anywhere in this Plan
- Dentists; How many new NHS dentists will be targeted to cope with the influx of people who won't have jobs so cannot pay to go to a private dentist
- Community Centres; How many new community centre facilities will be built to create recreation for the influx of new younger people
- Sports Facilities; How many new playing fields, football/rugby pitches, gyms, sports centres will be built under this Plan and where is the target?
- Thames Water; how is going to help Thames Water double the size of it's water supply and drainage capability when it fails on a monthly basis already and is effectively a bankrupt business as it is, despite trebling the average water bill in the Cotswolds
- Sewage; How many new sewage plants will be built under this Plan? The Cotswold district sewage system is currently not fit for purpose and blockages are a regular occurrence
- National Grid; where is the target for new power stations to be built to power all these homes? We have monthly power cuts in Moreton & Stow, from 10 minutes to 3 days. They are a regular feature because the infrastructure carrying electricity is decaying and overloaded - it is always going down. Where are the numbers to show where 18,500 plus new homes will get their power from?
- Food; where will all these new homes go to buy weekly shopping? What is the target for new supermarkets with parking that is not always full as it currently is with the few we have

These are some of the matters that spring to mind, the detail of which is noticeably lacking in this Local Plan.

Whilst I understand all of the detail on numbers, facilities, amenities and employment cannot be determined at this stage, setting a specific number of 18,650 new homes in a largely ANOB seems perfectly fine to target, but without a single consideration of any numbers or even ideas around how these people will live, work, get healthcare, childcare, shop or engage in any social activity to keep fit. Not a mention of any of this.

Why is that?

Is no one responsible for joined up thinking when it comes to new housing developments under a Labour Government?

This whole project is fundamentally flawed and doomed from the start if more basic homework and planning is not done before any final decisions are made.

Comment ID: 10386

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: John

Comment: Reluctantly only Scenario 1. The others are imbalanced or simply not feasible in this generation and certainly not by 2043. Moreton cannot double in size with no chance of the infrastructure being more than double to cope. It already can't cope. Ask Thames Water or the NHS or the Education Dept. if they can more than double their capacity in 20 years. Ask the Highways agency where the traffic will be routed and park when it needs to visit an under resourced service centre or high street business.

Comment ID: 10388

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: John

Comment: Absolutely not. This Government has proven that it doesn't understand local issues (e.g. Farmers) or peoples concerns (e.g. Winter fuel allowance) and not even business (e.g. raising of taxes and NI leading to less employment) so why should the Council agree to an unsustainable target? Clue is there = Unsustainable – therefore not feasible.

Comment ID: 10390

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: John

Comment: To a very small extent. If a plot of land that could accommodate one property comfortably in a Principle Settlement could be designed to fit 3 or 4 apartments or similar that would still be in keeping with the Cotswold landscape and was no more than 2 (max 3) floors high, then this could contribute more towards the total for a given acreage.

Comment ID: 8740

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: John Albury

Comment: The percentage increase in housing is ridiculous. Some of this proposed housing is in areas that have flooded in the past resulting in damage to existing properties & problems with sewage overflows. The areas proposed for development will require extensive infrastructure improvement to cope with the huge increase in population in those areas. We are already struggling to find doctors surgeries, dentists, access to NHS facilities and coping with pot holed roads & parking etc. Roads will need to be built to cope with the increased access required & conservation areas will be compromised, indeed the whole proposed areas will be overtaken by so called affordable housing that will swamp the associated countryside. Government, both national and local, needs to wake up to the fact that many areas in this Country are full up & overcrowded with a strained infrastructure that already cannot cope with the current situation. The Cotswolds is one of these areas.

Comment ID: 10371

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: John Allan

Comment: I support CDC selecting option 5, but per my answer to Q2 below, would ask the council to also look at small, sympathetically designed additions of say 5-10 homes in the Rural developments to "spread the load" across the district. As currently presented later in the Review, the burden of proposed development falls predominantly across the SE corner from Siddington to Lechlade, forming a "rural conurbation" which will soon become "Swindon North East" .

Comment ID: 10361

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: John Allan

Comment: I am concerned that too rigorous definition of "unsustainable" might be being applied. In many cases I'd surmise that in settlements defined in the "Role and Function" review as being Rural, sustainability might not be entirely relevant where for example new housing provided accommodation for a home worker who only needs personal transport for shopping trips, and the children might get a local school bus etc. As such, I think CDC should consider putting some housing in such locations. There are probably 140 plus listed in the "Role & Function" review, and if each had 5-10 new dwellings, that could be almost 10% of the district's target.

Comment ID: 10384

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: John Allan

Comment: I do not support this other than in exceptional circumstances. 1) I am concerned about the impact of this on the amenity value of the resultant properties - ie tiny back gardens without decent space for children to play, or heavily shaded by closely adjacent properties.

2) I am concerned about the impact on parking spaces for home owners and visitors - I note 3 examples. The new development on the west side of Fairford on the north side of the A417 is a warren of small roads with cars parked on pavements and verges. In the Cerney on the Water development off Broadway Lane in S Cerney, there are instances where the front drives are so small that parked cars overhang the pavement. In the centre of Down Ampney, a small plot at the end of Duke's Field has recently had 10 new dwellings put on a plot really only suited for 6-8 dwellings, with pavement parking already a frequent occurrence.

Comment ID: 10442

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John Allan

Comment: Simple answer, NO !

I am deeply concerned that the targets imposed on the District by the NPPF unfairly penalises an area which as stated, is 80% CNL and inaccessible to development. As I have already said, the proposals put a massive burden on the Siddington to Lechlade corridor with proposals to 2043 (4401 homes) being intolerable and the estimate beyond 2043 (9060 homes) being totally unreasonable. This entire area will become a continuous ribbon of development with a total loss of rural character.

Comment ID: 10455

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John Allan

Comment: The vision and objectives form a great set of principles which should be used for guiding future strategy and decision making, but please be flexible and pragmatic in their application.

It is all very well seeking to make transport solutions as green as possible, but don't do this by making it a nightmare to own, park and operate a person car. The availability of public transport is always variable despite best intentions, and most people in a semi rural environment will need personal transport options for decades to come.

Regarding infrastructure, clearly number one must be flood water and sewage management. It is no good having a strategy to do something about this, but not implementing it until after all the homes have been built. For example, in Down Ampney the number of homes to 2026 has increased by 31% since 2001 with no consequential improvements to sewage system capacity. Whenever there is heavy rain, pump out lorries are deployed at the end of the village to stop the system from overflowing. Thames Water make promises, and all we see is untreated sewage in Ampney Brook after heavy rain.

Comment ID: 10342

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: John Allan

Comment: Para 2.6.19 is one of probably many locations in the Review, which highlights the key issue of the new NPPF which puts targets on the District which take no account of 80% being within the CNL and hence inaccessible for new housing. I'd ask that CDC pushes back in the strongest terms to seek targets that reflect these constraints.

I'm sure this comment applies elsewhere in the Review, but I state it now to get it logged.

Comment ID: 10207

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: John Barratt

Comment: Cricklade Court Leet Charity Comment <https://crickladecourtleet.org.uk/>

Cricklade Court Leet own part of North Meadow SAC and work in partnership with Natural England to manage the site.

Scenario 5 will have the greatest recreational pressure impact on North Meadow SAC. The North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC interim recreation mitigation strategy (NMIMS) needs urgent review. It is both technically flawed and this scale of development far exceeds what was anticipated in the current mitigation strategy.

The NMIMS strategy was based on a total of 486 houses within the 9.4km ZOI of North Meadow SAC in the Cotswold Local Plan area by 2028. The proposed development for the preferred Scenario 5 now proposes 527 houses in the inner 4.2km zone (Down Ampney (416) South Cerney (111)) and a further c 6300 houses within the outer 9.4km zone.

The NMIMS has allowed a 140 house development by Newland Homes 280m from North Meadow SAC to be progressed. If this development is built it will use up any available capacity North Meadow has to absorb additional recreational pressure. Based on Footprint Ecology research its impact will be equivalent to 8000 houses on the edge of the 9.4km ZOI. It is likely that North Meadow SAC will be pushed into unfavourable condition making favourable Appropriate Assessments for Scenario 5 developments extremely challenging.

North Meadow SAC is unlikely to survive both the Newland Homes development and the proposed Scenario 5 development and will be lost forever after a period of terminal decline. The NMIMS needs to be urgently revised to include a 500m development exclusion zone and planning for Newland Homes development next to North Meadow must be refused.

Cricklade Court Leet requested an urgent review of the NMIMS in a letter to Wiltshire Council dated 29th August 2025. See https://www.crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/115/2025/09/12b-Court-Leet_NMIMS_Letter_to_Wiltshire_Council_Aug25.pdf

Cricklade Town Council have also requested an urgent review of the NMIMS in a letter dated 8th December 2025 See <https://www.crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/115/2025/12/17.-Letter-to-WC-ref-NMIMS.pdf>

These letters were copied to Cllr Juliet Layton - Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning.

Comment ID: 10213

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: John Barratt

Comment: Cricklade Court Leet Charity Comment <https://crickladecourtleet.org.uk/>

Cricklade Court Leet own part of North Meadow SAC and work in partnership with Natural England to manage the site.

The Integrated Impact Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment both rely on the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC interim recreation mitigation strategy (NMIMS) <https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/hmvfdoos/north-meadow-sac-mitigation-strategy-final-2023.pdf> .

The NMIMS is fundamentally flawed and is failing to protect North Meadow SAC from recreational pressure. Cricklade Court Leet requested an urgent review of this strategy in a letter to Wiltshire Council dated 29th August 2025.
https://www.crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/115/2025/09/12b-Court-Leet_NMIMS_Letter_to_Wiltshire_Council_Aug25.pdf

Cricklade Town Council have also requested an urgent review of the NMIMS in a letter dated 8th December 2025. See <https://www.crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/115/2025/12/17.-Letter-to-WC-ref-NMIMS.pdf>

These letters were copied to Cllr Juliet Layton - Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning.

The Cotswold District Council Local Plan must be based on an effective recreational pressure mitigation strategy for North Meadow SAC which is supported by the available evidence and is consistent with established policy on SAC mitigation strategies.

Comment ID: 10103

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: John Bate-Williams

Comment: Why is it not possible to see the comments made to date?

Why is there an apparent lengthy delay before any comments can be seen?

Why is there no acknowledgement of receipt of a comment?

Why can no previous comments be seen on 30 and 31 December?

Comment ID: 10606

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: John Bate-Williams

Comment: test

Comment ID: 10614

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: John Bate-Williams

Comment: While I live half an hour away from Driffield, I have several friends in and near the village and I regularly visit them. The proposal to allow and encourage substantial development for housing in the vicinity of this classic Cotswold village seems wholly inappropriate and risks the despoliation of the village, and surrounding agricultural and amenity land, changing its character for all time. The area proposed for development would be close to the A419 road, and therefore subject to noise and traffic emission pollution, and precious countryside would be lost. There is regular flooding in the area (as recently as last week the road near the church was under about a foot of water) and the narrow lanes are simply not suitable for potential access routes. I urge the CDC to remove the suggested area in the vicinity of Driffield from consideration. Others have suggested that the Council's apparent legal responsibility to identify areas for substantial housing development could simply be met by removing the restriction on permanent residence placed on the hundreds of homes in the Cotswold Water Park. I appreciate that the restriction was originally necessary due to the additional infrastructure which would be required for the occupants of permanent homes, but surely the provision of adequate access, sewage treatment and schools would be a drop in the ocean compared with the cost of providing development land so close to such a lovely part of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 10073

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: John Dooley

Comment: I, John Dooley, am Town Clerk to Chipping Campden Town Council. I have submitted responses to Q1-Q6 on behalf of the Town Council. I have not submitted any comments that are my personal views. I have also emailed the full response document directly to the Local Plan email provided.

Chipping Campden Town Council

Response to Cotswold District Council Local Plan Consultation (Preferred Options, Nov 2025)

Context and summary of our position.

Chipping Campden is a small historic market town wholly within the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL). We support a development strategy that concentrates larger growth outside the CNL and that masterplans strategic sites with infrastructure secured up front, while allowing proportionate growth in Principal and Non Principal Settlements. We highlight the cumulative impacts of substantial growth at nearby settlements - particularly Moreton in Marsh, Mickleton and Willersey - on Chipping Campden's roads, services, water and wastewater capacity, education and historic character.

Comment ID: 10065

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: John Dooley

Comment: Chipping Campden Town Council accepts Scenario 5 (Principal / Non Principal Settlements + Village Clusters plus new settlement(s) / strategic extensions outside the CNL) as CDC's preferred option, subject to robust master planning, infrastructure commitments and environmental safeguards. We do not support Scenarios 6 or 7.

Reasoning

- CDC identifies Scenario 5 as its preferred, sustainable strategy, providing the highest credible housing land supply among viable options ($\approx 14,660$ homes; 79% of the 18,650 target), while locating major growth away from the CNL. This aligns with national policy and the district's landscape constraints
- Scenario 6 relies on major development in the CNL and is explicitly deemed not viable and contrary to national policy by CDC. Scenario 7 "maximises growth" in locations assessed as unsuitable and is also deemed not viable
- Scenario 5 better enables comprehensive master planning for strategic sites (≥ 500 homes), securing transport, schools, healthcare, utilities, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain from the outset and over a 30 year horizon
- For Chipping Campden, proportionate growth is acceptable in principle, but the cumulative effects of substantial allocations nearby (e.g., Moreton in Marsh strategic extensions; significant uplift at Mickleton and Willersey) must be assessed and mitigated holistically for the North Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 10066

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: John Dooley

Comment: No. Development should not be steered to locations CDC deems unsustainable merely to meet the headline target. Where the district cannot meet the full need because of protected landscapes or infrastructure constraints, CDC should engage neighbours on unmet need under the duty to cooperate / cross boundary planning, as the consultation explicitly contemplates.

Chipping Campden Town Council notes that NPPF does permit a reduction in numbers rather than overdevelop within a protected landscape.

Comment ID: 10067

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: John Dooley

Comment: Chipping Campden Town Council does not support density increases that would materially harm Chipping Campden's historic character, landscape setting or residential quality.

- CDC's own analysis shows that to bridge the gap to 18,650 homes, average densities on eligible sites would need to rise to ~91 - 267 dwellings per hectare depending on the scenario; Scenario 5 would imply ~106 dph on average - a level CDC associates with highly urban contexts (inner London / inner city Bristol), not with Cotswold towns and villages
- CDC concludes such densities are generally unrealistic and would likely conflict with local character and practical infrastructure limits
- Chipping Campden has already experienced loss of historic burgage plots and has an older demographic; we need accessible downsizing options and modest, design led infill rather than flattened or overly compact schemes that jar with the conservation area and CNL
- It is important in a protected landscape to retain traditional garden space.

Comment ID: 10068

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John Dooley

Comment: Chipping Campden (Principal Settlement) – proportionate growth with strong caveats

CDC's indicative total for Chipping Campden in 2025 - 2043 is ~228 homes (18 extant permissions + 36 remaining LP allocations + 64 windfalls + 110 additional non strategic; no strategic allocations). We consider this quantum broadly proportionate, subject to demonstrable capacity for water, wastewater, flood risk, education, highways / parking and health services.

- Critical dependencies & asks for Chipping Campden and the North Cotswolds
 - o Water supply / wastewater: CDC acknowledges district wide supply pressure, treatment capacity constraints and Thames Water's financial difficulties, which risk delaying needed upgrades
 - o Housing delivery may be held back without timely investment - reinforcing our concern that infrastructure must be committed and phased with growth
 - o Require an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that sequences Campden area growth with assured water / wastewater schemes and catchment wide flood management (including maintenance of watercourses and culverts.
- Flood Risk Management – Critical Priority

Chipping Campden's basin topography and the restricted outflow capacity of the River Cam (between Park Road and Haydn's Mill) make the town highly vulnerable to flooding. Severe flooding occurred in 2007, and near misses have happened recently despite upstream interventions

- o Chipping Campden Town Council insists that flood risk mitigation must be treated as a strategic infrastructure requirement in the IDP, not a site specific afterthought. This includes:

- ☐ Comprehensive catchment wide modelling for the Cam valley and its northern slopes before any allocations are confirmed
- ☐ Upstream natural flood management and investment in culvert upgrades and watercourse maintenance to prevent blockages

❓ Development exclusion zones on the northern slopes above Chipping Campden to avoid increasing runoff into the basin

❓ Integration of climate resilience measures to address the rising frequency of extreme rainfall events

❓ Without these measures, additional housing - even at proportionate levels - will significantly increase flood risk, jeopardising safety and property and undermining the sustainability of the Local Plan.

- Education

- o Chipping Campden School is oversubscribed, with sixth form car dependence worsening congestion. Strategic growth nearby (e.g., Moreton in Marsh) will intensify demand

- o The IDP should set out post 16 and FE access solutions, not only primary / secondary places - e.g., enhanced public transport links to FE / technical colleges (both inside or outside the County boundary) and safe active travel corridors where realistic

- Highways, Safety and Parking

- o A44 / B4081 Junction (Four Shire Cross / 'X Hands') - this junction is already a serious accident blackspot, with GCC's own evidence noting 39+ accidents on that section of road in the last three years. With the proposed growth at Moreton in Marsh (~2,135 homes to 2043) and cumulative traffic from Mickleton, Willersey and Chipping Campden, the risk will escalate significantly

- o Chipping Campden Town Council strongly urges CDC / GCC to prioritise a funded, deliverable scheme for this junction in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) - either a roundabout or signalised junction - as a critical precondition for strategic growth in the North Cotswolds

- o This improvement must be treated as essential strategic infrastructure, not an optional mitigation, and should be sequenced early in the plan period to prevent further casualties and congestion

- o The B4081 is inadequate to take increased traffic from Mickleton, the road is incapable of being widened and there should be an alteration to the rail bridge on the B4081 to enable HGV safe passage

- o We also recommend that CDC liaise with neighbouring authorities to safeguard land for future rail connectivity (Honeybourne / Stratford corridor) and exploring light rail or shuttle links to reduce pressure on the A46 corridor long term

- o Chipping Campden already operates near capacity for traffic and parking; we need additional off street parking at both ends of town and town centre management

- o Growth in Mickleton (indic. ~589 homes) and Willersey will exacerbate flows through constrained lanes; HGV routing and quarry / digester traffic also need addressing
- o Support public transport measures and explore rail connectivity options (e.g., safeguarding for Honeybourne / Stratford corridor and local shuttle solutions)
- o We recommend that CDC / GCC proactively examine the viability of additional cycle routes.
- Health & social care
 - o GP access is already stretched; a potential new surgery intended to serve Mickleton, Willersey, Paxford, Ebrington and Chipping Campden must be capacity tested against cumulative growth and supported by transport to reduce car dependency.
- Economy & skills
 - o Chipping Campden relies on tourism / hospitality, Campden BRI, and the school; securing local employment land (e.g., Business Park extension) and skills pathways (apprenticeships / technical) is essential to keep younger residents and reduce out commuting
 - o Library and growth hub - whilst limited in scope, this centrally located service is essential both to the future economic strength of the high street and health and wellbeing of residents.
- Neighbouring growth with direct impacts on Chipping Campden
 - o Moreton in Marsh (strategic extensions) – ≈2,135 homes to 2043 (incl. ≈1,712 strategic), with indicative total 3,970 when looking beyond 2043; Mickleton ≈589; Willersey ≈184. These figures, while outside Chipping Campden parish, will materially affect our roads, schools and services; cumulative transport and utilities impacts must be modelled and mitigated through a North Cotswolds sub area masterplan and the IDP
 - o Chipping Campden Town Council recommends that CDC liaise with neighbouring authorities to assess the impact of the proposed new garden village in South Warwickshire on transport to and from Chipping Campden.

Comment ID: 10069

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: John Dooley

Comment: • Battery storage siting & grid safety - introduce district wide criteria for rural battery energy storage systems (BESS): separation distances, ecology / fire risk, landscape mitigation, access for emergency services, decommissioning and cumulative impact mapping across the North Cotswolds

- Nature recovery at scale - use strategic allocations to secure joined up green infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain corridors that link settlements and watercourses, with long term stewardship secured through planning obligations
- Education & skills as core infrastructure - make education and skills an explicit Development Strategy theme (including FE, apprenticeships and adult upskilling) to underpin a low carbon local economy and reduce out commuting
- Transport hubs and demand management - commit to public transport hubs, shared / electric mobility, and targeted parking solutions in historic centres like Chipping Campden to protect viability, accessibility and air quality
- Business and Local Economy – incorporate a plan and incentive scheme (e.g. reduced Business Rates / BR Holiday) to attract new businesses, protect existing Businesses (e.g. through stringent enforcement of Change of Use) and increase local employment opportunities. Include specific provision for locating new businesses (e.g. expanding existing Business Park / provide for new Business Development areas and proactive measures to grow the visitor economy e.g. increasing visitor parking

Comment ID: 10071

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: John Dooley

Comment: • Battery storage siting & grid safety - introduce district wide criteria for rural battery energy storage systems (BESS): separation distances, ecology / fire risk, landscape mitigation, access for emergency services, decommissioning and cumulative impact mapping across the North Cotswolds

- Nature recovery at scale - use strategic allocations to secure joined up green infrastructure and Biodiversity Net Gain corridors that link settlements and watercourses, with long term stewardship secured through planning obligations
- Education & skills as core infrastructure - make education and skills an explicit Development Strategy theme (including FE, apprenticeships and adult upskilling) to underpin a low carbon local economy and reduce out commuting
- Transport hubs and demand management - commit to public transport hubs, shared / electric mobility, and targeted parking solutions in historic centres like Chipping Campden to protect viability, accessibility and air quality
- Business and Local Economy – incorporate a plan and incentive scheme (e.g. reduced Business Rates / BR Holiday) to attract new businesses, protect existing Businesses (e.g. through stringent enforcement of Change of Use) and increase local employment opportunities. Include specific provision for locating new businesses (e.g. expanding existing Business Park / provide for new Business Development areas and proactive measures to grow the visitor economy e.g. increasing visitor parking
- Leisure and sports facilities – ensure adequate leisure and sports facilities to support the increase in population

Comment ID: 10072

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John Dooley

Comment: Partly. Chipping Campden Town Council support the direction - climate action, landscape protection, sustainable transport, affordable housing, and zero carbon development - but ask for the following clarifications / additions to make the vision operational and testable

1. Education and skills – add an explicit objective to raise educational attainment, skills and apprenticeships linked to the economic strategy, recognising rural accessibility barriers to post 16 / FE provision
2. Sub area master planning – commit to a North Cotswolds masterplan to manage cumulative impacts (transport, water / wastewater, flood risk, health) from strategic growth at Moreton in Marsh and neighbouring settlements on Chipping Campden and the CNL
3. Infrastructure sequencing – state that allocations will be phased with deliverable IDP schemes (esp. water / wastewater and A44 corridor safety), recognising the delivery risks CDC itself highlights
4. Density policy guardrails – embed a place sensitive density framework that protects conservation areas / CNL character, while enabling gentle densification where appropriate; reaffirm CDC's conclusion that inner city style densities are not generally appropriate.

Comment ID: 9073

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Majority of employment associated with new development is likely to be outside the local area - e.g. Swindon, Bristol, Reading , Gloucester etc. Whilst there will be some local employment generated significant increases in traffic will be seen as a result of the need to travel.

Comment ID: 9072

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Comments made within this section show that the proposed developments are not sustainable. Specifically any large development west of Driffield would need to not increase any of the following for the existing Villages:-

Water run off - flooding

Vehicle movements in local lanes

Sewerage disposal

Comment ID: 9074

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: There is already significant numbers of holiday homes in the area, this will no doubt increase around the water parks however there need to be a plan for how much development is allowed for the tourist economy verses allocating land to permanent housing, given the government pressure on housing numbers

Comment ID: 9075

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Housing focus on low cost ownership as well as socially rented homes - encourage development of low cost homes within planning applications

Comment ID: 9069

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Potential development near Drifffield is impractical due to lack of land availability. Additionally any development there or in the local villages will significantly exacerbate the current issues of flooding and sewerage affecting the villages of Drifffield and Harnhill. (Further explanation will be added in response to Area 19, and see also the submission from Drifffield & Harnhill Parish Council)

And "village" would need to have its own dedicated access to the A419 to prevent additional traffic on the single track lane network south of Preston and between the A419 and A417

Comment ID: 9070

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Extension of new settlement west of Driffield at these figure would (disregarding the CDC definitions) effectively make this a town which would require sufficient area that it would subsume the adjacent villages and remove all of their character and history, as has been the case with some of the old villages to the North and West of Swindon.

Additionally this settlement would need to "stand alone" from the surrounding villages as the level of traffic and infrastructure required is incompatible with the rural location

Comment ID: 9071

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: John Forshaw

Comment: Given the proposed expansion of Preston, Siddington and West of Driffield these numbers are likely to coalesce into one large conurbation to the south of Cirencester. Adding to this the proposed increases in Cirencester, the town is likely to be swamped with people, traffic and the need for shops, amenities and services which will totally change the character of this ancient town with significant impacts on the tourist economy.

Comment ID: 9062

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: John Milner

Comment: The Council's analysis makes sense and so Scenario 5 seems to be the "least worst" option and is the one to go for. It should be possible to negotiate the targets in due course

Comment ID: 9063

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: John Milner

Comment: Absolutely not, there are already sustainability issues in existing developments, notably on water supply and waste management, flood management as well as NHS and school capacity management. So using known unsustainable areas is frankly nuts

Comment ID: 9064

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: John Milner

Comment: Density is already too high with most developments reminiscent of "Little boxes made of ticky tacky" they also have too narrow streets and limited parking. Flats with utilities and parking at the bottom might be possible in urban areas

Comment ID: 9065

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: John Milner

Comment: It is highly unlikely that the scale of development proposed for Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, Kemble and Preston would be susytainable without major investment in infrastructure and services. Traffic, power, water, waste and sewage as well as NHS and potentially education would all need attention BEFORE any development was occupied.

Comment ID: 9066

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: John Milner

Comment: It all makes sense but requires a radical approach not currently consistent with neoliberal government policy. How would joined up infrastructure be achieved?? Busses, trains need to be coordinated, building regs will need enforce sustainable energy efficient housing etc.etc.

Comment ID: 10331

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: John Sleggs

Comment: FAILURE TO UTILISE NORTH OF CIRENCESTER: I notice there is no mention or putting additional housing along the northward extension of Gloucester Road up to the Daglingworth Quarry intersection with the A417.. Not all commuting is to Swindon or London. Many people would be happy to live on the north fringe of Cirencester and commute to Cheltenham, Stroud or Cirencester for work. It is higher ground so no flood risk. Traffic is currently light, so no need for additional roads. Why is this not being utilised? Expanding Siddington 3x seems problematic.

Comment ID: 10525

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: John Williams

Comment: While I live half an hour away from Driffield, I have several friends in and near the village and I regularly visit them. The proposal to allow and encourage substantial development for housing in the vicinity of this classic Cotswold village seems wholly inappropriate and risks the despoliation of the village, and surrounding agricultural land, changing its character for all time. The area proposed for development would be close to the A419 road, and therefore subject to noise and traffic emission pollution, and precious countryside would be lost. There is regular flooding in the area (as recently as last week the road near the church was under about a foot of water) and the narrow lanes are simply not suitable for potential access routes. I urge the CDC to remove the suggested area in the vicinity of Driffield from consideration. Others have suggested that the Council's apparent legal responsibility to identify areas for substantial housing development could simply be met by removing the restriction on permanent residence placed on the hundreds of homes in the Cotswold Water Park. I appreciate that the restriction was originally necessary due to the additional infrastructure which would be required for the occupants of permanent homes, but surely the provision of adequate access, sewage treatment and schools would be a drop in the ocean compared with the cost of providing development land so close to such a lovely part of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 9196

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jolyon Bennett

Comment: WEST OF DRIFFIELD

i farm in the area under consideration and have a number of concerns

1. HIGHWAYS the roads are in terrible condition currently and not at all big enough to cope (the majority are single track roads) with the increase number of cars this development would bring, they cant cope currently with the volume of traffic. Trying to work around this area with a tractor is a nightmare
2. DRAINAGE. there is a real issue with water running off the land and and ditches where culverts down tank lane have not been maintained and the roads now flood regularly
3. PUBLIC TRANSPORT, quite simply in Driffield and Harnhill there is none.

Comment ID: 8991

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Jon

Comment: I don't envy your predicament. Please don't blink in haste to meet what might be a transitory target. There are other population issues at stake in U.K. other than build, build, build.

Comment ID: 8985

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jon

Comment: Here is an invitation to rapacious opportunism. I fear the council will be overwhelmed by the detail and demands of such opportunists, with no stake in the community's they are fortunate enough to own a piece of.

For example the real (not assumed) blight of seasonal flooding, being conveniently swept aside

Comment ID: 8987

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Jon

Comment: Gypsy and travelling community diaspora need to be located as far away from contented, stable settlements as possible. It's as simple as that.

Comment ID: 8988

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jon

Comment: To what degree of confidence do residents have that this study is both objective and independent (not in any way funded by developers)? When we no nothing about this study.

Comment ID: 8982

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jon

Comment: I support any option that optimises existing infrastructure especially principal road nodes. Requiring less commuting and thus less noise and material pollution. Preferably where it minimises increased loading on existing settlements with stretched infrastructure and legacy road and communication links. And no meaningful employment.

Comment ID: 8983

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jon

Comment: Yes the AONB must be on the table and take its turn for development. It has not been immune to date.

Comment ID: 8984

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jon

Comment: Full support especially where the impact on existing settlements is reduced to the absolute minimum. New developments adjacent to road and rail nodes is ideal.

Comment ID: 8986

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jon

Comment: An arbitrary putative target set by central government has all the hallmarks of baking in unsolvable problems down line. For example flooding; for which I believe has scant mitigation. building close to watercourses that are 'supposed to flood' on a seasonal basis will only exacerbate a worsening trend for existing communities and those down stream.

Comment ID: 8989

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jon

Comment: It is blinding obvious that raw housing development must come with all associated and fully funded (including downline) support. This includes medical provision and all other provisions paid for by U.K. taxpayers.

Comment ID: 8990

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jon

Comment: I concur fully with the objectives and their relative ranking. These are balanced, reasonable and challenging. The issue is Council, are you able to meet this commitment?

Comment ID: 8980

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Jon

Comment: I agree such a challenging housing target requires consideration of potential new developments with all associated infrastructure and service (health etc). Nodes built in the vicinity of major road junctions seem to offer this benefit. Yet only one (W of Driffield) seems to be considered. Why have other suitable sites, such as major linear route from Spine road roundabout on A417 all the way down to Latton, via Manor Farm (old Ermine Way), not been considered?

Comment ID: 8981

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jon

Comment: I would think that not the whole of the Cotswold AONB can be ruled out. Development has always continued in this area. It is not all uniformly AONB; and must be thoroughly scrutinised to take development in its turn, with necessary restrictions in mind. But not a blanket ban. It should not be regarded as a 'royal yacht'; untouchable under any circumstances.

Comment ID: 9272

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Jonathan

Comment: All scenarios are incoherent due to the constraints of the national landscape. It will create a sprawl south of Cirencester From Kemble - Siddington - Preston - Ampney Crucis, swallowing up and destroying these historic villages. As an example, Preston has grown from c. 40 dwellings in AD1,000 to c. 80 dwellings in 2025. It took 1,000 years to double in size, however this plan proposes growing from 80 dwellings to 1,950 in 18 years.

Comment ID: 9691

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Jonathan

Comment: The target numbers must take into account the Cotswold National Landscape. If development cannot take place within the national landscape, the target numbers should be reduced in a pro-rata way, recognizing the land available and suitable for development.

Comment ID: 9629

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jonathan

Comment: None of the proposed options offer a coherent and sustainable plan. Either the number of housing needs to be reduced or the assumption not to build in the Cotswold National Landscape should be challenged.

Comment ID: 9632

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jonathan

Comment: Building at this scale in a concentrated area, in rural communities should only be done in conjunction with a robust plan to boost employment opportunities in the area. Otherwise these will be commuter settlements with the majority needing to travel to towns/ cities such as Swindon, Bristol or Cheltenham.

As most of the proposed development is in rural areas, public transport links are poor, so there would be a significant increase in road traffic (including through the National Landscape).

Comment ID: 9684

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Jonathan

Comment: The proposed addition of dense housing in areas that are currently open farm land is incoherent. The infrastructure is unsuitable with few public transport options and poor foot and cycle access routes. There will be very limited employment options locally so all it will create is sleeper commuting settlements with no identity. This will have a significant negative impact on the existing communities in these areas, and will totally destroy the character of Kemble, Siddington, Preston and the Ampneys.

Comment ID: 9687

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jonathan

Comment: Scenario 6 is the only option which will allow the numbers to be met in a coherent way - i.e. grow all settlements in the district in a proportionate way regardless of the national landscape boundaries.

Comment ID: 9688

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jonathan

Comment: Limited employment options locally

Comment ID: 9689

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jonathan

Comment: Yes, as this maintains the integrity of existing settlements and reduces the requirement to build on productive agricultural land

Comment ID: 9634

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Jonathan

Comment: This is the least worst option as it appears to take the impact of rapid development on existing communities into account.

Comment ID: 9635

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jonathan

Comment: For development at this scale the national landscape must be included.

Comment ID: 9637

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Jonathan

Comment: Arguably the government impost targets represents 'exceptional circumstances'

Comment ID: 9681

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Jonathan

Comment: This is the worst of all scenarios proposed that will the most significant impact on existing villages. It will totally destroy the character of numerous historic settlements and have a negative impact on these strong communities with unique identities.

Comment ID: 9685

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Jonathan

Comment: How will existing communities be protected under this option?

Comment ID: 9686

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Jonathan

Comment: How does the district council plan to add 18,000 additional jobs to provide employment locally for people living in these developments?

Comment ID: 9633

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Jonathan

Comment: All these options will have a significant detrimental impact on existing communities. The district and national landscape boundaries create artificial lines on the map, principally constricting the majority of development to a small wedge of land south of Cirencester. The plans do not propose a coherent and proportional expansion of existing settlements, but appears to be based on building over virgin agricultural land.

Comment ID: 8685

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Jonathan Collins

Comment: Employment and infrastructure needs cannot be separated from housing numbers. CDC appears to be using the Gov. changes as an excuse and should have published them together with the employment and infrastructure needs. These should not only cover the towns but large villages like Mickleton which has few facilities, virtually no employment and poor public and private transport links.

Comment ID: 8686

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Jonathan Collins

Comment: CDC should NOT have divorced acceptance of development plans in any area without an infrastructure assessment. In some cases the cost of developing appropriate infrastructure may limit the housing numbers or may even suggest that no development should take place in a location, irrespective of local landowners' freeing of land for this purpose. = Cart before the horse and is totally illogical.

Comment ID: 8687

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jonathan Collins

Comment: No definition of 'conventional housing' is given but current proposals from developers do NOT address local needs since they come before request for local views! There is little provision for appropriate housing for more elderly, fit people e.g. bangalowed areas fronting greenery with appropriate amenities within walking and cycling distance and provision.

Comment ID: 9946

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Jonathan Elvin

Comment: The number of potential new houses in the 'new settlement west of Driffield' is completely out of synch to the surrounding area. This is a rural backwater where the roads are very narrow and in places one car wide. The influx of more traffic is unsustainable.

There is regular flooding along the road from Harnhill to Driffield due to the runoff of water from the fields leading from Ampney Crucis which are at a higher level than the local roads. There is a complete lack of amenities - the sewage works at Ampney St Peter already struggles with the levels of use.

Comment ID: 9947

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Jonathan Elvin

Comment: New Settlement west of Driffield - the number of new homes before 2043 is an enormous number for this rural back water. The plans to increase the number from 2043 to 2100 homes would mean that this would become a small town and would need all the amenities; education, transport, sewage to be installed from the start. This is not a suitable location for what will be a large development.

Comment ID: 10687

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Jonathan Stebbing

Comment: 1 There are 143 parishes in the cdc area and all should contribute to housing where possible including in the AONB rather than loading larger settlements in the cdc area .

There are numerous sites in the villages of cdc for 3-6 houses

2 This will enable small villages to continue to thrive as communities

3 no account is taken of water/sewage/ capacity in the larger settlements

4 similarly transport capacity of the A417/419 if a large percentage of the development is in between Cirencester/Lechlade area or the A429 in Cirencester to Moreton

Comment ID: 9130

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Jonathan Stockwell

Comment: To be mandated to go from around 500 dwellings per year in current Local Plan to 1000 per year in following Plan period must be based on some rationale which is not spelt out in this Consultation. What is the new basis? Has it been defined? Can it be publicised here please.

Comment ID: 9175

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Jonathan Stockwell

Comment: All of the options apart from 6 require city high rise housing densities above 90 dwellings per hectare which the consultation states 'are generally out of character with the District'. This begs the question what on earth is the point of developing and exploring options that are by definition non starters.

I cannot support any of the options since they are all inappropriate according to CDC's planning criteria on dwelling densities.

Why can't it be simply stated that without allocating National Landscape land 1,036 houses per year or 18,650 houses in the Local Plan period 2027 - 2041 cannot be achieved.

Increasing the dwellings for Preston from 89 to 1,131 would turn this distinctive small cotswold village into quite a large urban sprawl. This would wreck the peaceful quality and character of a small cotswold village.

Comment ID: 9185

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jonathan Stockwell

Comment: Qn. 1. Not in favour of any of the scenarios since all are non starters but if forced to choose it would be scenario 2 since it has the lowest house density and maintains more greenfields land.

Qn. 2. I consider it preferable to expand the larger towns and villages to prevent ribbon and urban sprawl that would arise from building new conurbations on basically greenfields. If this means building on unsuitable land then this should be pursued. I don't know but suspect the proportion of extra land needed in unsuitable areas will be a small fraction of their total areas.

Qn. 3. I would support flats, smaller houses and higher buildings particularly for affordable dwellings. The country does not need all identikit boxy small houses. New housing must reflect style, individualness and not all 'sameness'.

It seems a complete non starter to try and squeeze 19,000 odd houses into the available land defined as suitable with a house density of 90 - 100 dwellings per hectare. This is around 40 houses per acre in old money! Can't be done unless all new dwelling are high rise which would sit oddly in the cotswold countryside.

The choice comes down reducing the new housing allocation for the Local Plan or building in the National Landscape or building high rise dwellings. Or a combination of all three.

Comment ID: 9177

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Jonathan Stockwell

Comment: The following docs are included:

Development Options Strategy Technical Report.

Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Integrated Impact Assessment .

But I could not find any reference to them in the Consultn. doc. Do they draw any meaningful conclusions that may favour or disfavour any one or more scenarios?

It seems seriously money wasteful and irrelevant to undertake these detailed assessments on scenarios that CDC admit are non starters.

Comment ID: 8847

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: I strongly object to the scale of development proposed for Siddington. The Local Plan states that settlements outside the Cotswolds National Landscape will “normally be expected to receive more development” and may receive “disproportionately more development than others.” This is exactly what is happening to Siddington, which is being chosen not because it is suitable but because it is not protected landscape.

Siddington’s designation as a Principal Settlement is also misleading. It appears to be based solely on the village’s proximity to Cirencester rather than on Siddington’s actual level of services, employment, transport, infrastructure or community facilities. Siddington does not function as a Principal Settlement in any meaningful sense. Using this incorrect classification to justify allocating 907 homes to 2043 (and 1,100 overall) is unsound.

This level of growth—more than tripling the size of a village of 339 homes—would eliminate the green buffer with Cirencester, undermine the Local Plan's Vision to maintain distinct settlement identities, and destroy the rural character of Siddington.

As Chair of the Village Fête, a member of the Siddington Show Committee, former Village Hall Trustee, editor of the village newsletter, founder of the Covid Support Group and flood-response volunteer, I know first-hand how dependent Siddington’s cohesion is on its small scale. Such growth would irreversibly damage the social fabric of the village.

Comment ID: 8851

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: The proposed 907 homes for Siddington by 2043 (and 1,100 total) are neither proportionate nor sustainable. Siddington has only 339 existing dwellings and does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase.

The Local Plan identifies serious constraints in water supply, wastewater treatment, and infrastructure delivery. These issues are especially critical around Siddington, where parts of the village already experience flooding. As a flood-response volunteer, I have seen the strain this places on residents.

Furthermore, the allocation assumes Siddington is a Principal Settlement, but the village does not fulfil that functional role. It has very limited services and is dependent on Cirencester for almost everything. Using this misclassification to justify extreme growth produces an unsound distribution of housing.

The proposed scale of development would also remove the essential green buffer between Cirencester and Siddington, causing the two to merge and destroying the village's distinct identity.

Comment ID: 8848

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: I do not support any scenario that allocates growth based on Siddington being treated as a Principal Settlement, because this classification is incorrect. Siddington does not have the infrastructure, transport, employment or service capacity associated with a Principal Settlement and relies heavily on Cirencester for basic needs.

Scenario 5 is only acceptable in principle if strategic sites are located where genuine services exist — not in small rural villages such as Siddington. Allocating 881 strategic homes (907 total to 2043, and 1,100 overall) to a village of 339 homes is entirely disproportionate and contradicts the Local Plan's own Vision and sustainability principles.

Comment ID: 8849

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: No. Sustainable development principles must guide site selection. Siddington is being targeted simply because it lies outside the Cotswolds National Landscape, not because it is a sustainable location. This is not a sound planning basis.

Siddington's incorrect classification as a Principal Settlement masks the fact that it lacks services, facilities, public transport, employment and infrastructure. Adding more than 1,000 homes here would increase car dependency, worsen congestion, heighten flood risk, and force the village to merge with Cirencester.

Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet national housing numbers.

Comment ID: 8850

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: I do not support density increases that conflict with rural character or exceed infrastructure capacity. The Local Plan states that densities of 91–267 dwellings per hectare would be required to meet the full target — densities typical of inner-city environments.

Siddington is a rural-edge settlement and such density increases would be wholly inappropriate, especially where they risk eliminating the green buffer between Siddington and Cirencester. Higher densities should only be considered in genuinely serviced areas such as Cirencester or rail-accessible towns.

Comment ID: 8852

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: No. The proposed level of development is not sustainable for Siddington.

A three- to four-fold expansion would:

- Remove the green buffer with Cirencester
- Overwhelm roads, utilities, and drainage
- Increase flood risk
- Erode rural character
- Destroy community cohesion
- Force car-dependency
- Contradict the Local Plan Vision

Siddington does not have the services, facilities, or infrastructure to support such growth. The misclassification of Siddington as a Principal Settlement exaggerates its supposed capacity but does not reflect reality.

Surrounding areas would need additional schooling, GP surgeries, hospital and road infrastructure, public services and transport, as well as employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 8853

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: Yes. The Local Plan should consider:

- The misclassification of Siddington as a Principal Settlement
- The protection of village identity and social cohesion
- The safeguarding of critical green buffers
- Existing flood risk and water infrastructure constraints
- Rural infrastructure limitations (transport, utilities, services)

These are essential to determining whether a location is sustainable — particularly for rural villages whose identity and cohesion depend on scale.

Comment ID: 8854

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Jude Grayson

Comment: The Vision and Objectives are well-intentioned, but the allocation for Siddington directly contradicts them. The Plan promises to maintain distinct settlement identities, direct growth to sustainable locations, protect landscape character, and ensure proportional development.

Yet Siddington — a rural village with limited services — is being asked to absorb 1,100 homes due to an overstated Principal Settlement classification and offered land. This would eliminate the separation with Cirencester and destroy the village's identity. The proposals cannot be reconciled with the Vision.

Comment ID: 10193

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Judith Ellis

Comment: Basing the scenario on transport routes is unproductive. Routes should be adapted and increased to meet needs.

Comment ID: 10841

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Judith leggatt

Comment: The NPPG at para 2a 005 is questioned.

The constraint of the NL is significant.

Scenario 3 is probably the least worst option.

With train services to Birmingham being extended we are sleep walking into increasing problems with the Government's support for more development close to stations.

The recently announced ideas of more ancillary housing must be helpful to reduce use of greenfield sites.

Not helpful to this consultation but a national rethink on housing need is required. Just how much results from migrant influx?

Comment ID: 9586

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: The preferred option 5 fails to meet the current housing target by a significant margin whilst also proposing inner city levels of housing density. Many of the proposed development locations already have inadequate transport and infrastructure and relying on developers to fund substantial upgrades will only be possible if major settlements are proposed. Given that the new plan needs to work in conjunction with the neighbouring Gloucestershire authorities - however the unitary arrangement turns out, it would be far better to actually have joint working arrangements to come up with comprehensive development and infrastructure solutions rather than continuing to work in isolation, and have an out of date plan when the new unitary arrangement comes in. In addition it is hard to see an Inspector supporting such an shortfall in delivery, you need to look again at the options for expanding settlements with good infrastructure or where it can easily be provided - which is important for sustainability.

Comment ID: 9587

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: See response to question 1. It is suggested that development where existing infrastructure and services can easily be upgraded will ultimately be more sustainable than proposing development where developers and landowners prefer. Good design is essential as is protection of the natural environment not just land within the National landscape area. This may mean new development in areas currently considered to be unsustainable if it provides a long term less damaging solution if combined with good design and infrastructure delivery.

Comment ID: 9588

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: Development should not provide lowest common denominator housing of a ubiquitous nationwide major house builder style. Recognising the special character of The Cotswolds does not mean adding a few dormers or using artificial stone it means carefully considered layouts, landscaping and housing styles appropriate to the area, combined with varied housing densities appropriate to the character of the settlement. This may well mean lower not higher housing densities but pockets of high density housing can work if very carefully designed. A revised Cotswold Design guide aimed at new development of all types should be considered as a supporting document to the emerging plan. The current housing developments across the district show how much scope there is for higher quality landscape design led approach.

Comment ID: 9590

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: Development on the south side of Cirencester has developed in an ad hoc manner without adequate supporting infrastructure, services or facilities. Links to Cirencester centre are generally poor or inadequate for those without cars, and much of the area is prone to flooding. The existing road network is inadequate and does not serve these communities well being subordinated to the ring road serving longer distance traffic skirting the town.

This particularly affects the proposed new settlements of The Steadings phase 3 (or whatever it will be called) Siddington overspill and potentially the new settlements at Preston and west of Driffield. Individually the developers will all claim that they cannot afford to provide the necessary infrastructure particularly where it serves a requirement beyond their own development, however this will be essential if adequate infrastructure is to be provided that properly serves these new settlements and the existing communities.

Comment ID: 9591

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: The importance of landscape -its recognition retention and enhancement is conspicuous by its absence. Landscape does not stop at the national landscape boundary but affects all settlements and their settings. It is not just there but should be considered as part of the background to any settlement proposal and indeed its value is most important where development threatens its surviving character. The landscape setting of settlements may be important because of its historic value or its ecological and arboricultural value and it can be lost through ignorance and neglect as well as through poor planning.

Comment ID: 9592

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: historically, ecologically and arboriculturally important landscapes extend beyond the National Landscape boundary and this should be recognized and celebrated. In addition should not the development of cultural opportunities be included. Where are the policies supporting the provision of wider cultural activities, music drama art and the like to enrich the lives of the many thousands of new residents being proposed here.

Comment ID: 9610

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Judy Enticknap

Comment: Can I add to my previous response to this question, that there are other non planning-related issues which are related to sustainability. These include the adequacy of medical service provision; and this becomes particularly relevant in the light of the current proposals to downgrade Cirencester Hospital when the local population is anticipated to increase significantly during the anticipated lifetime of the Local Plan.

Comment ID: 10581

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: You have added the village I live in, Avening, as a non-principal settlement or village cluster but separately have added that rural exception sites have no facilities - WE have NO facilities as well. There is no shop, a couple of buses a day at inconvenient times, no employment opportunities and no space to built without taking away farm land. Why is it assumed that Avening can take more housing? There is an ongoing large construction in the middle of the village. Earlier in the year the social housing was built. Hasn't Avening had enough building? The roads are busy and in many cases single track. If 'everyone has to do their bit' then look at local building records and share out the requirements across all settlements - we don't see 73 additional houses planned for the pretty tourist villages!

Comment ID: 10582

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: You do need to increase the density within towns where there are employment opportunities. The wrong type of housing continues to be built - suburban style executive detached homes and off-plan designs that fail to complement the local vernacular or meet local need. We need more flats in towns, both social housing and first-time buyer properties, more properties suitable for the elderly who will then be able to live closer to facilities and facilitate the release of larger properties to young families.

Comment ID: 10583

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: It is difficult using this platform to refer back to individual scenarios however I would support the option that increases density in towns for the reasons already given
- more flats are required for younger people where employment opportunities exist and
for elderly people - not every one needs or wants to live in a house with a garden.

Comment ID: 10584

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: No - I believe the Council should continue pushing back on the ridiculous housing target

Comment ID: 10585

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: Absolutely in towns - for reasons already given in question 1

Comment ID: 10587

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: No - of course it is not sustainable. The Cotswolds landscape, villages and towns are being destroyed. The level of infrastructure is low (GP provision, schools, local shops), there is limited parking in the towns, roads are already too busy/dangerous in places.

Comment ID: 10588

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: Not sure I understand the Avening map - there is no pink segment yet the tables above mention 73 new homes which is surely large enough for a segment. Whatever, it is too many.

Comment ID: 10589

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Julia Tu

Comment: South Cotswolds and particularly the villages around Cirencester seem to be taking the largest hit when it comes to the provision of new homes.

Comment ID: 10990

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: I agree it is extremely important to have up to date policy guidance to manage forward development in a sustainable manner and to provide certainty to developers

Comment ID: 10997

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The recent government housing requirements anticipates an increase from 493 to 1,036 dwellings completions a year, an increase of 210%. This seems an unrealistic expectation. Is CDC challenging the government expectation with historic facts and figures? Eg historic annual completion numbers; types and sizes of houses the private sector has built; profile of who has moved into the houses; the latent demand profile within CDC ; where those people work?

Comment ID: 11068

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Turn this round and ask whether or not the sustainability criteria have been adequately assessed. Yes Moreton has a great railway station but how many local, people use the trains to commute? Yes it has a great Minor Injury Unit - but residents need to travel nearly an hour to Gloucester, Warwick, Oxford or Worcester for a specialist consultation or A&E. And the GPs find it hard to meet the numbers of existing residents.

Leisure/ swimming facilities are not regularly available because the hours are very limited, classes are limited, sessions are cancelled, it's a very long walk to the facilities.

The assessment of the detailed boundaries of the National Landscape Area - if there are extenuating circumstances requiring a 200+% increase in the housing requirement then surely those boundaries need reexamining.

Comment ID: 11069

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: It's arithmetically obvious but sites will need greater design input.

Comment ID: 11073

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: When will the Moreton feasibility study be ready ? Will there be consultation on its methodology or its findings? Will it be ready In time for the next iteration of the Plan?

Comment ID: 11079

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The amount of development proposed for Moreton is disproportionate, impractical and is unlikely to meet the local housing needs.

Moreton would need a Masterplan to properly plan for the amount of development proposed to ensure that every aspect is coordinated unlike the recent developments.

The numbers of people generated by the amount of development proposed in Moreton would require additional health, schooling and leisure facilities. These would need to have committed delivery programmes.

Utilities would need to be committed - notably drainage.

A significantly better road network would be required to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed - there is already a regular grid lock in Moreton town centre. All roads currently require a central journey leading to poor air quality and a traffic-dominated town centre.

Comment ID: 11088

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The proposed direction of growth for Moreton is not sustainable. Moreton would no longer be a town with a centre that met settlement needs. People just won't walk that far! Not everyone cycles - the huge cycle park at the station is hardly used for bicycles by either commuters not shoppers.

The "hospital" is too far especially if you are ill.

Placing all the growth eastwards will simply encourage more car journeys.

It's all based on the false premise of there being land that has been previously developed (as an airfield) and being of lesser Landscape value. It's an easy option!

Comment ID: 11090

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: A more sustainable option would be to allocate land on the eastern edge of Moreton for employment uses. Then an increased population would be more self contained.

Comment ID: 11096

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Moreton town centre needs strategic help. The number of shops has declined despite an increase in population in the last 10 years. Traffic and parking are dominant and yet parking is sometimes difficult.

Comment ID: 11099

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Delivery is key here. In Moreton existing new developments have roads, drainage systems and landscaping schemes that are not yet adopted 5+ years after completion. Developers are keen to build but not so keen to conclude the conditions of their planning permissions. CIL monitoring should include all these “invisible” obligations, not just payments.

Comment ID: 11000

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Does CDC know how many dwellings are unoccupied; let out as holiday lets/airbnb; second homes? These dwellings have been lost to the housing supply but need to be recognised in some way in the housing supply calculations. Also how many dwellings could be provided through conversions?

Comment ID: 11006

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Clearly landowners have a vested interest in putting their sites forward for development. It is inherent within the planning system of 2025. Planning Authorities should be mindful of their need to formulate policy on the basis of providing the best possible outcome to the common good of all their constituents.

Comment ID: 11008

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

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The change in housing requirement is so significant a change for this plan that it seems unacceptable to reconsider some of the other previous assumptions such as the principal of “no” development in the National Landscape areas and their detailed boundaries. National Planning Guidance does indeed provide for justified exceptions to be made allowing development in those areas. Has CDC given recent rigorous consideration of the boundaries of the areas included within the Landscape Areas?

Comment ID: 11010

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: In terms of the Moreton in Marsh feasibility study when is this expected to have been undertaken? Will there be consultation on the methodology ? Will the study be completed before the next stage of this Plan is presented?

Comment ID: 11033

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The Settlement Role and Function Study sets Moreton as a Category 4 settlement. I would question some of the conclusions made from the data on which this status is based:

Distance to work - from the data people from MiM travel on average further than CDC residents ie the town is not meeting the employment needs of its existing residents. It needs more jobs if more houses are to be built.

Hospital - our Walk in Centre is fantastic but it does NOT have the same status as eg Cirencester as set out in the table. In fact residents have to choose between Gloucester, Oxford, Warwick to Worcester for specialist consultation appointments or A&E.

GP surgery - yes there are 2 practices within the one building but getting an appointment can take weeks. If more people are to arrive there needs to be an identified budget to increase the service currently available.

Leisure/ swimming - these are not publically available services. The hours open are extremely limited and not generally convenient compared to eg Bourton. The sessions are often cancelled. The facilities are far from the town and there is no public transport. Did the data collected consider how many local people use these facilities? A better more accessible leisure centre would be needed meet the exercise needs of an increased population.

Comment ID: 11038

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: Part of the justification for placing the majority of the required CDC growth is based on its public transport accessibility. The station is a great asset to the town but has CDC surveyed the numbers using the train for commuting? Unless you work in Oxford or towards London the options seem limited - by destination and by timetable.

Comment ID: 11054

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: The outcome of all the considerations and justifications seems to be that MIM gets the vast majority of the growth in dwellings and hence population. The percentage increase in dwellings anticipated in Moreton is 80% which compared to other larger settlements in CDC is eg Cirencester 33%, Tetbury 10%. Moreton is at the far northern edge of CDC, remote from services and District connections.

Comment ID: 11060

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: If the priority is to meet local housing needs then there needs to be a more dispersed distribution of new affordable housing. The vast majority of housing need is not going to be met in one concentrated expanded settlement.

Comment ID: 10988

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Julie Dunn

Comment: I welcome the preparation of a Local Plan for Cotswold District

Comment ID: 8838

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Julie Tomblin

Comment: With 80% of Cotswold within the National landscape how can the numbers be fair? Can you realistically expect the remaining 20% to deliver the target set by central Government?

Have CDC looked carefully at all options available to them?

I can't begin to imagine the impact this number of houses would have on Preston.

Comment ID: 8839

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Julie Tomblin

Comment: Every scenario would have a huge impact on both Preston and the surrounding area.

Preston is a small village, in a rural setting, separate from Cirencester. It would literally be consumed by the proposed level of development and lose the green buffer much valued by its residents and noted in the NDP.

Should any development go ahead, close attention must be paid to the NDP.

A robust green buffer between the village and any form of development is an absolute must.

Safe walking and cycling routes, particularly at Preston Toll Bar.

There are issues with flooding on the pedestrian route to Tesco as well as the main road.

Look carefully at schools and doctor surgeries.

Rat running has the potential to be a huge problem for the village, measures must be taken to prevent it.

Comment ID: 8840

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Julie Tomblin

Comment: Every scenario would have a huge impact on both Preston and the surrounding area.

Preston is a small village, in a rural setting, separate from Cirencester. It would literally be consumed by the proposed level of development and lose the green buffer much valued by its residents and noted in the NDP.

Should any development go ahead, close attention must be paid to the NDP.

A robust green buffer between the village and any form of development is an absolute must.

Safe walking and cycling routes, particularly at Preston Toll Bar.

There are issues with flooding on the pedestrian route to Tesco as well as the main road.

Look carefully at schools and doctor surgeries.

Rat running has the potential to be a huge problem for the village, measures must be taken to prevent it.

Comment ID: 8841

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Julie Tomblin

Comment: Any development in Preston should be lower density and include a robust green buffer in order for the village to maintain its rural character and keep it completely separate from new development.

Notice should be taken of the Design in Preston statement adopted by CDC and the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Comment ID: 8842

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Julie Tomblin

Comment: Any development in Preston should be lower density and include a robust green buffer in order for the village to maintain its rural character and keep it completely separate from new development.

Notice should be taken of the Design in Preston statement adopted by CDC and the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Comment ID: 9789

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Juliette Jago

Comment: Access to countryside and leisure facilities.

Improved public transport and safer cycling and walking routes, particularly for children to get to and from schools and colleges.

Local employment.

Comment ID: 9785

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Juliette Jago

Comment: Kemble is identified as a principal site because it has a station, a school, surgery, and a post office, which make it a potential site for expansion.

The proposed construction of 590 homes would stretch existing facilities so that they would be unable to support the increased population and would lead to increased road use and demand for parking.

There are currently poor public transport links to nearby towns for schools and other amenities, such as medical services and shops, which would increase the already high level of traffic and decrease the safety for pedestrians within the village and when crossing the A429.

The expansion of Kemble would also have a negative impact on Cirencester and its roads, which at times are overloaded, particularly at the junctions, where there have been a number of accidents.

The village has a thriving community centred around the school, church, pub and community gardens, all of which are relatively close together. The proposed expansion site is away from the centre and these hubs, making it harder for people to engage with the community, particularly if they have to access them by car.

The village has had a number of developments, which have mainly consisted of larger properties (styled as executive, exquisite etc) and which do not meet the needs of existing residents and their children, who are unable to afford to live in the village. Furthermore, a number of smaller properties have been developed and/or expanded to become holiday properties, which also reduces the availability of housing to village residents.

Comment ID: 9788

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Juliette Jago

Comment: Kemble is identified as a principal site because it has a station, a school, surgery, and a post office, which make it a potential site for expansion.

The proposed construction of 590 homes would stretch existing facilities so that they would be unable to support the increased population and would lead to increased road use and demand for parking.

There are currently poor public transport links to nearby towns for schools and other amenities, such as medical services and shops, which would increase the already high level of traffic and decrease the safety for pedestrians within the village and when crossing the A429.

The expansion of Kemble would also have a negative impact on Cirencester and its roads, which at times are overloaded, particularly at the junctions, where there have been a number of accidents.

The village has a thriving community centred around the school, church, pub and community gardens, all of which are relatively close together. The proposed expansion site is away from the centre and these hubs, making it harder for people to engage with the community, particularly if they have to access them by car.

The village has had a number of developments, which have mainly consisted of larger properties (styled as executive, exquisite etc) and which do not meet the needs of existing residents and their children, who are unable to afford to live in the village. Furthermore, a number of smaller properties have been developed and/or expanded to become holiday properties, which also reduces the availability of housing to village residents.

Comment ID: 10034

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Justin

Comment: I have a number of deep concerns regarding scenario 5.

1. We now experience flooding to a greater of lesser degree every year. Building this many houses will only make this worse. I see no proposals to alleviate this, currently we are seeing raw sewage from many manhole covers in the area and that is before the Steadings site has even started building its main site of 2300 homes.

2- 15000 Homes will mean 28000 additional cars using the rural average of 1.9. I suspect our area will be higher than that as public transport is really not good enough to rely on for work journeys. How will this plan upgrade the road infrastructure to cope with this increase. In Siddington more specifically (1100 Homes), means 2100 Cars to add to the 4400 that the steadings will add to the area. The roads surrounding Siddington and other villages in the area will not be able to cope from a capacity or structurally without significant investment and expansion.

3- Employment- where are these new residents going to work? Most will have to travel and while working from home is more common now many companies including my own only allow that 2 days a week as productivity is badly hit above this level. Without a massive investment in Roads both upgrading and new to cope with this. This is compounded by many of the proposed homes being concentrated in the Siddington and surrounding villages.

3- Water and waste is a big concern. We see the capacity being stretched every year during the winter months. I see no proposals to address this.

4- If the proposal goes forward. Siddington effectively becomes part of Cirencester. Villages will be consumed.

5-Cirencester itself has not the infrastructure to cope with such a massive increase of people. Secondary schools are nearly full, Cirencester College is full. Doctors, Dentists, Parking etc has to be properly addressed and planned for upfront and then enforced to ensure it is actually delivered.

Comment ID: 10038

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Justin

Comment: Scenario 1- The current Government targets in my opinion are not based upon and local demand. In fact we see larger developments being delayed due to the previous phase not selling quickly. This will get worse as this scales up and facilities already stretched move towards breaking point. This scenario at least will allow better consideration of site

Comment ID: 10062

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Justin

Comment: Yes in general but what I have seen in this area and others is it is all about the housing and everything else gets deprioritised or forgotten. Sadly, it tends to be these things that make a difference to the quality of people lives. It is NOT just about the houses.

Comment ID: 10040

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Justin

Comment: No if it considered unsustainable then it clearly is not viable. We should not be tearing up the countryside just to tick boxes

Comment ID: 10044

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Justin

Comment: Part of the attraction of living in this area is that there are gardens. If we go this route we very quickly start recreating the City environment that people are trying to move away from in the first place

Comment ID: 10045

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Justin

Comment: Perhaps it would be better to consider a Poundbury style development. I am sure between that larger land owners in the area they have enough to dedicate to an entirely new development rather than overwhelming existing towns and villages.

Comment ID: 10050

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Justin

Comment: this plan suggested 5000 new houses in Cirencester and surrounding villages this is a huge percentage increase in size especially give the already approved developments

Comment ID: 10051

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Justin

Comment: As I understand it the whole of Europe's population is predicted to decline due to birth rate vs deathrate. If the numbers even now are looked out it of only net migration that is causing the UK to increase even now. Surely, controlling that and therefore managing the demand should be the long term strategy, otherwise there will be nothing left

Comment ID: 10054

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Justin

Comment: They are not sustainable.

In order to accommodate this level of development the following will need to happen

1- extensive road upgrades plus the addition of new trunk roads connecting large population centres to hub road networks

2- Train services connecting Cirencester to the main network

3- Managing the flood plains. If houses are built there and subsequently flood in later years. How will they be able to get insurance with is a mandatory mortgage requirement.

4- Local employment will need to be created. The small increase in the industrial estate which was due in 2023 and still not started will not provide this. We also notice that this is now included in the Parish of Siddington which it has never been in prior, presumably to make the proposed numbers look better. This at best will provide several hundred jobs if it ever is built

5- Significant additional primary, secondary places and Further Education places will need to be created

6- Additional Doctors dentist etc will be needed- even now in Cirencester just last week I was told the first appointment I could get was in 2 weeks

7- Our hospital has gone through years of downgrading, pushing service to Cheltenham and Gloucester. Service such as Maternity and A&E need to be re-established

I strongly suspect that the desire to invest at this level will not be desired but if this is to work and for this area to continue to be somewhere where people want to live it will be needed.

Comment ID: 10060

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Justin

Comment: Walking and Cycling requires a strategic approach. I grew up in Milton Keynes and as a 10 year old I could cycle to school, clubs and even the shopping centre without going on a road at all. Given that this area is a holiday destination, surely it would make sense to invest in a network of cycle ways to connect key locations.

My son tried to Cycle to Deerpark from Siddington for a term and after nearly being hit or blown off his bike on Somerford road a number of times he gave up we ended joining the school run. Bus was not an option from Siddington

Have made comments on the other aspects earlier

Comment ID: 10061

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Justin

Comment: I would like to see a plan for all of it before anything is approved. This includes public services, roads, schools, Cirencester facilities upgrades, Trains services, Cycle paths. If this is not done then it won't happen. Needs to be in plan plan and enforced as part of the delivery.

Comment ID: 229

Email/Letter Representation

Name: J A W and A F Wildsmith

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

Comment ID: 736

Email/Letter Representation

Name: J E Steeden

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

Comment ID: 731

Email/Letter Representation

Name: J R Steeden

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

Comment ID: 360

Email/Letter Representation

Name: J Robinson

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

Comment ID: 274

Email/Letter Representation

Name: J Robinson

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

Comment ID: 442

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jackie Douglas

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

Comment ID: 740

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jacky Leadbeater

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

Comment ID: 503

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jacqueline and Trevor Hancock

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

Comment ID: 162

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jacqueline Gluning

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

Comment ID: 715

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jacqueline Gunning

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

Comment ID: 587

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James and Joanna Wells

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

Comment ID: 856

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James Armitage

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

Comment ID: 877

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James Burden

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

Comment ID: 113

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James Haden

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

Comment ID: 143

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James Weaver

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

Comment ID: 569

Email/Letter Representation

Name: James Woodhall

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

Comment ID: 757

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jan Bayley

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

Comment ID: 148

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jan Mills

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

Comment ID: 842

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jane Bates

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

Comment ID: 822

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jane Hardy

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

Comment ID: 628

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jane Thompson

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

Comment ID: 738

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Janet and Laurence Bernascom

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

Comment ID: 728

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Janet Tremellen

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

Comment ID: 329

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jay Draper

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

Comment ID: 248

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jayne Parnell

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

Comment ID: 454

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jayne Tovey

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

Comment ID: 742

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jayne Tovey

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

Comment ID: 858

Email/Letter Representation

Name: JE Franklin

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

Comment ID: 165

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jennie Haden

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

Comment ID: 224

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jennifer Evans

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

Comment ID: 586

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jennifer Gaden

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

Comment ID: 720

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jennifer Wood

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

Comment ID: 137

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jeremy Clarke

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

Comment ID: 830

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jeremy Clarke

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

Comment ID: 707

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jill Underwood

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

Comment ID: 540

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jim Hubbard

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

Comment ID: 654

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jo Hawkins

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

Comment ID: 823

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joan Steven

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

Comment ID: 752

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joanne, Matthew, Lily and Finley Mullan

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

Comment ID: 437

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jodie Horton

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

Comment ID: 312

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joe Gilder

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

Comment ID: 524

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joe Napier

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

Comment ID: 465

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John & Sarah Ash

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

Comment ID: 140

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John and Barbara Fullick

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

Comment ID: 141

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John and Barbara Fullick

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

Comment ID: 173

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John and Joanna Friedberger

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

Comment ID: 815

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Campbell

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

Comment ID: 850

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Evans

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

Comment ID: 867

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Fullick

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

Comment ID: 543

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Gloyn

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

Comment ID: 340

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Hackling Holdings Limited

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

Comment ID: 768

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Hancox

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

Comment ID: 741

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Hayward

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

Comment ID: 120

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Latham

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

Comment ID: 513

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John T Ducker

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

Comment ID: 690

Email/Letter Representation

Name: John Williams

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

Comment ID: 284

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Johnathon Ryder

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

Comment ID: 630

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jon Hall

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

Comment ID: 644

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jon Hughes

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

Comment ID: 214

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jonathan Clamp

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

Comment ID: 631

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jonathan Freegard and Angela Sacre

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

Comment ID: 632

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jonathan Freegard and Angela Sacre

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

Comment ID: 875

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jonathan Hall

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

Comment ID: 126

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jonathan Higgins

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

Comment ID: 530

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joseph Lam

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

Comment ID: 531

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joseph Lam

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

Comment ID: 532

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joseph Lam

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

Comment ID: 533

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joseph Lam

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

Comment ID: 234

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joshua Govier

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

Comment ID: 810

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Joshua Jones

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

Comment ID: 803

Email/Letter Representation

Name: JS McCauley

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

Comment ID: 404

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jude Grayson

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

Comment ID: 561

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Jude Grayson

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

Comment ID: 719

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Judith Cutler and Keith Miles

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

Comment ID: 826

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Judith Vening

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

Comment ID: 180

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Julia Govier

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

Comment ID: 819

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Julia Lewis

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

Comment ID: 363

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Julian Clarke

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

Comment ID: 594

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Julian Fagge

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

Comment ID: 641

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Julie Farguson

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

Comment ID: 712

Email/Letter Representation

Name: June Bradley

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