

Comment ID: 8951

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Daphne Barber

Comment: Infrastructure

Sound insulation for domestic machinery

Comment ID: 10502

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: David

Comment: I attended the consultation in Fairford. I could not get a meaningful or positive response regarding water supply or sewage treatment being upgraded before any new development starts, especially as Thames Water are continually dumping raw sewage into the river Coln.

The surgery is under pressure to cope with current patients, so where are the new doctors going to come from? Again, I didn't get a meaningful or positive response.

Comment ID: 9311

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David

Comment: I agree that Scenario 5 is the least bad option. I feel it is extremely important that the Cotswolds has an approved local plan and weighting should also be given to the likelihood of approval being granted.

Comment ID: 9313

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David

Comment: I do not believe that the council should consider developments in areas where sustainability cannot be demonstrated. To do so would store up significant challenges for the communities in which they are located as well as the individuals that buy those properties.

Comment ID: 9315

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David

Comment: I support increasing the density of developments to the extent that it doesn't significantly change the character of the location. Doing so would promote building affordable housing, which is the key driver for the change to the Local Plan. I would discourage the building of larger houses on sites that are viable for higher density housing.

Comment ID: 9455

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David

Comment: I agree with the vision and objectives

Comment ID: 9525

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: David

Comment: Whilst the overall spatial strategy appears logical given the scope and environmental limitations, the limited areas for development to the north and south of the area concerned in this consultation, plus the flawed assumption that everyone will jump on a train to commute to work, confine areas for growth to very limited areas. No consideration has been given to local infrastructure when all of these houses put 2 cars per household onto the surrounding roads and drive to work, supermarkets and schools. That must be addressed.

Comment ID: 9541

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: David

Comment: I do not believe you need to attract people to the Cotswolds with cheap "affordable" housing however you do need to have schemes for those brought up here. The people who move here recognise the Cotswolds is affluent and they pay the high price for a reason. Do not seek to water down that reason by making it a free-for-all thereby destroying what it is to live here in an AONB. A race to the bottom, mediocrity or the lowest common denominator benefits no one in the end! Hold standards high and when people are attracted here to live, give them the facilities they need to enjoy pollution-free, safe, outdoor life. A city is different.

Comment ID: 9540

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: David

Comment: Apart from my previous infrastructure comments, a cycle path along the Fosse Way between Moreton-in-Marsh and Stow-on-the-Wold would give the train station cycle hub a fighting chance of ever actually being used and it would dissuade tourists from walking along a dangerous road in favour of an e-bike. Now that's "sustainable"!

Comment ID: 9538

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David

Comment: The disproportionate weighting of housing growth supported by Moreton-in-Marsh is insane when the town is already becoming gridlocked at times with the Fosse Way and A44 intersecting the only major historic roads through the town (no planned bypass in line with this house building expansion). Even areas of supposedly small scale sustainable housing have not considered roads and logistics.

The water supply/drainage is constantly being dug up or is sprouting leaks and this is unsustainable even now! The sewage system and treatment facilities are at or near capacity.

There are some significant flood risks in this area particularly to the east and south - its not called "The Marsh" for nothing! (see environmental flood risk map).

There are no senior schools (all teenagers get bussed to Chipping Camden or Bourton-on-the-Water).

Retail in the High Street does not have the right mix or pedestrian layout/pavements to support the growing population and visitors safely.

The Police station was shut and sold off somewhat prematurely given the plan to double the population.

Just because Moreton has a train station and is not in the more rural mid-Cotswolds, does not mean it is capable of sustaining this level of growth. It may seem like the best option but it will destroy the town without significant infrastructure changes where the costs probably outweigh the benefit. "Sustainable" means it should blend in almost unnoticed, without adverse affects, not just to contain the damage and destruction of an AONB to one place!

Comment ID: 9539

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David

Comment: In the Mid-Cotswolds area, there seem to be some missed opportunities to expand most of the villages in a "sustainable" manner with small adjustments to facilities. 25-50 houses here and there makes far more sense if done in natural Cotswold stone and not ruined by low cost brick housing.

Comment ID: 9542

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David

Comment: See my last comment

Comment ID: 9626

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David

Comment: Infrastructure gets a mention but there is nothing substantive in here and nothing closely linked to the Scenarios. If there is a Phase II to this consultation, that's where the direction needs to be.

I am not sure what "socially rented housing" means and I think in the Cotswolds maybe the focus should be on young people aspiring to own their homes, not inviting people here on benefits or at the lower end of the socio-economic scale. One thing people in the Cotswolds do not want is low cost social housing destroying the character of the Cotswolds!

Comment ID: 9527

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: David

Comment: Scenario 4 is a non-starter as the assumption that everyone will use public transport is totally flawed and local highway infrastructure will not support the unforeseen consequences

Comment ID: 9529

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David

Comment: The number of houses proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh in table 2 is totally unsustainable without significant changes to infrastructure, including but not limited to, schools, highways and water treatment facilities. It is already showing signs of reaching peak capacity while retail facilities are limited and unsupportive of this level of growth. More joined up thinking is needed

Comment ID: 9532

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: David

Comment: The disproportionate weighting of housing growth supported by Moreton-in-Marsh is insane when the town is already becoming gridlocked at times with the Fosse Way and A44 intersecting the only major historic roads through the town (no planned bypass in line with this house building expansion), the water supply/drainage is constantly being dug up or is sprouting leaks, the sewage system is at or near capacity, there are some significant flood risks in this area - its not called "Marsh" for nothing! (see environmental flood risk map), there are no senior schools (all teenagers get bussed to Chipping Camden or Bourton-on-the-Water), retail in the High Street does not have the right mix or pedestrian layout/pavements to support the growing population and visitors, and the Police station was shut and sold off somewhat prematurely given the plan to double the population! More joined up thinking needed! I suggest a weight restriction of 20 tonnes and reinstate the medieval toll system for all trucks over that weight limit passing through Moreton-in-Marsh who have no need to be here and can use motorways between Swindon and Birmingham (local deliveries excluded) to help fund repair of the roads, limit traffic and pollution as a starter.

Comment ID: 9534

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: David

Comment: I think it is wrong that the biggest settlements are facing the greatest burden of expansion. Cirencester doesn't even have a train station and I assume the numbers in the table are wrong or reversed. Is it ~9k going up by ~4k to ~13k? It cannot be halving?

Comment ID: 9526

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: David

Comment: The limited areas for development to the north and south of the area concerned in this consultation, plus the flawed assumption that everyone will jump on a train to commute to work, confining areas for growth to very limited areas makes Scenario 4 a non-starter. No consideration has been given to local infrastructure when all of these houses put 2 cars per household onto the surrounding roads and drive to work, supermarkets and schools. That needs to be addressed in all Scenarios.

Comment ID: 10729

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: David

Comment: CDC is being obliged by Government to supply new housing development in only part of the district's area, and as a result those sites are expected to put up with more houses than are practical.

Comment ID: 10743

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: David

Comment: The large area of the district that will currently be untouched needs to bear some of the load of new development. The chosen sites so far will be irreparably damaged by the extra population and traffic especially. There are insufficient roads to accommodate the extra traffic and essential services.

Comment ID: 10777

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: David

Comment: Thank you for your consideration of the following:

The Government's late edition of the 'standard method' has obviously complicated the process by seemingly penalising Cotswold District for their beautiful location and their past careful planning.

The indicative Maps 1&2 indicate small villages like Condicote and Naunton but not others like Ablington, Coln Rogers, Withington and Shipton Oliffe.

My question is: Had the requirements of local people in every village been considered before the introduction of the 'standard method' and now especially after its onerous introduction have they been reviewed again?

There is social housing (or ex social housing) in Condicote for example. It set a precedent for local needs in common with many other Cotswold villages at the time as was the case for my own village and many others in South Warwickshire in 1950's. In other words a small number of houses for local people.

A small number of houses built to blend in I would have thought could have been accommodated in most villages thus helping to take off some of the pressure of, in my opinion, the completely unsustainable proposals for Mickleton.

The Government's idea seems to be to reduce house prices by increasing numbers. I would say that because of a combination of our natural beauty, built history, careful planning in the past and a number of villages that do not seem to have been included, that will not happen in the majority of cases. It is more likely that house prices in a village like Mickleton especially will suffer and householders take the brunt of the policies both financially and in quality of life.

Comment ID: 10794

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: David

Comment: I would say the policy of 21 dwelling per hectare is already dense enough and should not be compromised unless possibly for starter homes

Comment ID: 10790

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: David

Comment: Scenario 3

Conclusion. Having read the Local Plan Review and the Government's 'standard method'

I understand the Cotswold District Council recommendation of Scenario 5 for what is now a difficult situation, but bearing in mind the existing commitments to building in the different villages anyway I would favour option 3, near to Cirencester, the main centre with infrastructure and facilities. There are already many large development proposals indicated on Indicative Map 3. To this could be added a contribution from the other villages, albeit small, as I stated in my earlier comments on the Local Plan.

Comment ID: 10812

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David

Comment: I think the idea of a Scenario 3 near Cirencester is more likely to be sustainable into the future with the opportunity for new roads, schools, sports facilities before building the houses rather than, for example, the proposals for Mickleton which doesn't have a doctor's surgery or Post Office, local schools over subscribed, poor road connections unsuitable for cyclists and very difficult access over the bridge in Stratford-on-avon for work. I agree the infrastructure Delivery Plan update proposed under Clause 4.8 is essential before this question can be answered fully. Any Developers description of existing facilities and infrastructure in a village or town, including vehicle access to the site, attached to a Planning Application should be rigorously examined.

Comment ID: 10818

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David

Comment: I agree with your objectives particularly 5.3.e.{2}

Thank you for the excellent document and the opportunity to comment

Comment ID: 10744

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David and Anne Swain

Comment: Ideally none of them but the selected option 5 seems like a reasonable choice amongst a batch of evils. It does end up converting the area surrounding Cirencester into a large urban conurbation that absorbs the surrounding villages to the detriment of all but needs must I suppose.

Comment ID: 10746

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David and Anne Swain

Comment: To get the ridiculous number of houses we understand it is necessary to make smaller plots but the heights of new builds must be kept in line with existing dwellings. So for example one or two story buildings should be the norm, blocks of flats would be inappropriate, at least close to existing village dwellings. Possibly three or four storey at the very outskirts of the development but not close to the existing villages.

Comment ID: 10735

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David and Anne Swain

Comment: 1. Road access to the new houses should be from the main road only at the Siddington Park roundabout. The current Preston village road is not suitable for a main thoroughfare as the centre of the village is narrow and has cars parked on the road.

2. There is considerable movement of wildlife through the fields surrounding village, particularly those to the south. Roe and Munkjak deer and foxes particularly use this corridor. A forested access corridor must continue from the south of the village starting at Kingshill Lane to the copses to the south-east. This will reduce local noise levels and air pollution as well as providing a walking corridor.

Comment ID: 10741

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David and Anne Swain

Comment: Although we understand the need for increasing the housing density please keep the height of any new houses to one or two storeys in keeping with the rest of the village,

Comment ID: 10847

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

Name: David Ball

Comment: Previous site assessments should be considered when allocating sites for residential development. As an example, those sites assessed as unsuitable for development as part of creating the current Local Plan, should not be allocated now or at a minimum be reassessed using the same methodology and criteria.

Comment ID: 10849

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: David Ball

Comment: The Council has suggested that a Plan needs to be delivered and accepted showing land availability for the 18K+ houses indicated by the government. It is very unlikely that this number of houses will be built in the life of the Plan as economic pressures will dictate build rate. If the Council fails to secure a Plan and is at risk of speculative development, fewer houses could be built than the government's target as economics of supply and demand will influence the outcome. How essential is a Plan if it is to indicate an unsustainable level of development.

Comment ID: 10845

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Ball

Comment: I believe that excluding areas within the protected landscape denies these settlements the opportunity for vital development which would help secure thriving communities. Conversely, concentrating large developments in a small number of existing villages would put unsustainable pressure on local services and infrastructure. To meet government targets residential development should be spread throughout the District, avoiding overburdening communities.

Comment ID: 10853

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David Ball

Comment: Concentrating large developments in existing villages risks overwhelming the local services, amenities and infrastructure. The natural landscape and established character of many of the villages, especially those taking a heavy allocation to the south of Cirencester, will be irrevocably damaged. The open landscape nature of the countryside surrounding these villages adds to the Cotswold character and charm of the area which will be destroyed if the proposed level of development is concentrated in this way.

Comment ID: 10194

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: David Brown

Comment: It is difficult to see how to comment on this document. The video is useful but does not address the basic question of how you ensure that a comment has been submitted. "Post comment" is not a helpful term. Furthermore, in trying to find the route to comment clicking on "online consultation system" simply takes you round in a loop.

Comment ID: 10205

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: David Brown

Comment: You seem to be accepting of the Government targets but at the same time deciding to restrict development largely to the very small areas in your district that lie outside the National Landscape. The new housing numbers proposed for these small areas are massive. I fear the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be bordered with two areas of outstanding unnatural ugliness if you adopt this policy. Surely you should either spread development more evenly through your area or argue in the strongest terms with Government that it is unreasonable to squeeze their target numbers into the very small areas you have outside the National Landscape. To me, you seem to be rolling over to the Government's demands. I wonder if Government even realises that you're keeping development out (almost) of your main areas of jurisdiction.

The other thing you seem unreasonably determined on is the importance of a railway station in the areas identified for intensive development. In the case of Moreton-in-Marsh you should look at its use. Passenger numbers going north on this line are, I am sure, insignificant. And numbers going south are not great. Oxford and London are the only destinations of note for commuters. To use the train for a commute to Oxford only makes sense if you work in the centre of Oxford. Jobs in the University and in retail make up the majority. There are few major office blocks and conventional office jobs. And London - fares are high and few can afford to commute from as far away as Moreton. If you have any doubt of this, see the newly-constructed bicycle storage shed built at Moreton station. You're lucky if there are two bikes in it!

My particular concern is Moreton, where I live. I cannot believe that central Government would expect the sort of expansion you plan for Moreton to be imposed anywhere. As my councilors I think I can reasonably expect you to resist the sort of numbers for Moreton that appear in this plan.

Comment ID: 9331

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: David Clare

Comment: Expansion of Moreton in Marsh would require a solution to the already appalling traffic congestion affecting the A429 and A44. At the very least, a by-pass to the West of the town to improve through traffic on the Fosse Way, which would also alleviate through-town traffic on the A44. If a solution to the traffic can be delivered, there could be even higher numbers of houses than currently proposed.

Comment ID: 9332

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: David Clark

Comment: The Main Service Centre scenario seems to be the best way to build more housing. Proximity to services, i.e. shops, schools, health care and of course, public transport thus making it easier for families and people with disabilities. It encourages people to cycle and walk to work. It cuts down on carbon emissions and to live a greener lifestyle.

Comment ID: 9334

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: David Clark

Comment: Scenario 4 Will alleviate car dependency, locating housing near bus services train stations, etc seems to be the logical way forward.

As I understand it a good and efficient way of land use and can minimise Urban sprawl.

Comment ID: 9528

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David Clark

Comment: As a resident of Driffield and Harnhill , I feel I can only speak from experience about my own village." I'm concerned about the proposed development that could impact our village. The CDC's plans fail to acknowledge the existing settlement and its current size, which I believe exceeds 50 dwellings.

I'd like to highlight several obstacles to building 840 houses near our village. The development's scale is disproportionate to Driffield and Harnhill's size, and it will significantly harm the rural landscape. Furthermore, I've been told that several landowners are unwilling to sell, rendering the CDC's land availability information outdated. I would appreciate the CDC's clarification on this matter.

Our agricultural economy plays a vital role in feeding the nation during uncertain times. The village's narrow roads, hedgerows, and stone walls are integral to its historic character. However, we also face challenges like flooding, which the CDC seems to have overlooked. This issue is linked to our sewage system's limited capacity, and the CDC would need to fund upgrades.

Local employment opportunities are limited, with Saint James Place in Cirencester and Corin Orthopaedics being our largest employers. This raises questions about where the residents of these proposed houses would work. Prioritizing housing near existing industry and infrastructure would be more sensible, rather than expecting residents to commute. If new homes are necessary, they should be built near train stations in larger towns like Cheltenham and Gloucester, promoting more sustainable development.

As a resident, I'm deeply concerned about the proposed development of these houses in our rural landscape. This large-scale development would not only destroy the area's natural beauty but also threaten the local wildlife, including rare tawny owls and protected barn owls that call our farmland home. The mature trees and hedgerows that support these species are a vital part of our ecosystem, and it's crucial that we protect them.

I would like to know if the CDC has conducted a thorough investigation into the potential impact on local biodiversity. Have they considered the long-term consequences of building on this land? Our community's character and identity are rooted in the rural landscape, and this development would irreparably alter it.

Has the CDC properly questioned the idea of building in north Gloucestershire? I think not. It appears some councillors have a political bias, seemingly reluctant to upset our neighbours living in the AONB areas!

Instead of building 840 houses in a rural area, perhaps the CDC could consider alternative solutions, such as smaller-scale developments near existing infrastructure in towns like Stroud, Cheltenham, or Tewkesbury. This approach would minimise the impact on the environment but also support more community-focused development.

As a community, we value our rural heritage and the natural beauty of our surroundings. I urge the CDC to reconsider the proposed development and prioritise the protection of Driffield and Harnhill's character and wildlife.

Comment ID: 9996

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: I agree with the Council's decision

Comment ID: 9997

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: No - good planning should maintain standards and goals for sustainability to ensure long-term viability of development

Comment ID: 9998

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: To a limited extent. Increased density must be accompanied by enhanced infrastructure.

Comment ID: 10000

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: Although CDC will cease to exist long before this date, infrastructure, e.g roads - something this LPA does not fully control - will be crucial to ensure that large-scale development at sites such as Moreton can benefit not suffer from major increases in housing. Unless these requirements are 'baked in' to development approvals, these plans are flawed.

Comment ID: 10001

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: Yes - but while aspirations are laudable, they need to be backed with more than wishes. Hope is not a strategy.

Comment ID: 10002

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: David Cunningham

Comment: When will the new SHELAA be published?

Comment ID: 9365

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: I don't approve of the whole concept because government policy is forcing people to live in areas where there isn't necessary suitable work, there are insufficient amenities and they are isolated from friends etc. It would be far better to let the market decide where housing developments should be. But, on the basis that one of the options must be chosen, option 3 would be the most logical in order to enable new residents to partially remedy the above fundamental shortcomings.

Comment ID: 9367

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: It depends what the Council means by "unsustainable". If it addresses my answer to Question 1, unsustainable locations should be considered along with the steps necessary to make them sustainable.

Comment ID: 9368

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: I would consider higher density developments, but only if they are in appropriate locations, eg in an established urban or semi-unban location which already features higher density developments, and crucially if the demand for housing is present in the proposed locations.

Comment ID: 9369

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: There are two fundamental issues in addressing the sustainability of the proposed solutions:

1. The present demand is for 18,650 new homes in the Cotswold district. Do you really believe that this figure will endure, or will the unabated inrush of immigrants, by fair means and foul, dictate that this figure is uplifted in due course?
2. Are all the necessary amenities going to be put in place ahead of or in tandem with the housing developments? Here in Willersey we have a number of local issues, not least the overloaded sewerage system which overflows every time it rains hard, which have not been addressed despite promises in successive previous developments. These issues should render any future development plans unviable until AFTER the existing problems are addressed and sufficient capacity for future developments put in place.

Comment ID: 9370

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: Water supply

Sewerage

Rainwater drainage

Electricity supply

Gas supply

Landline telephone & broadband connections

Road capacities in area

Parking capacity

Proximity to transport hubs

Proximity to emergency services

GP and hospital capacities

School capacities

Local shops

Local leisure facilities

Employment potential in area

Compatibility of development with local ambience

Sympathy of housing design with existing properties

And a host of other things that haven't come to mind but which should be part of the planning assessment.

Comment ID: 9371

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: David Dunbar

Comment: As I have previously said in answers to previous questions, I believe the whole exercise is flawed because you are inevitably going to be chasing a moving target until the fundamental issue of population growth is addressed. Also, this process is forcing people to take up residence in locations which are unsuitable for them for a multitude of reasons already specified. Someone in authority needs to wind back and address these fundamental issues before embarking on any further guessing where people should be made to live.

Comment ID: 9038

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: David Hindle

Comment: b. add - Increase the prevailing residential density, primarily by design, and layout.

c. Provide units that match the number of bedrooms needed, rather than a disproportionate number of units with 4 or more bedrooms.

Comment ID: 9039

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Not being a land owner or developer, i can only reiterate that i consider that there are 3 sites in Tetbury (in addition to the 50 + 43 units), that if they come forward, i would support. Together they could provide around 500 units. The indicative 10% growth for Tetbury, is i believe too low.

As previously noted i would support part of site 2i1d (please note i wrongly quoted 20a earlier) to the north of Cirencester to be medium scale residential.

Comment ID: 9042

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Apologies again. For page 36 i wrongly stated 21d. I meant 21 a.

For the avoidance of doubt i consider most of that land, medium - high landscape value, and not all appropriate as a Special Landscape Area. I consider that it should be considered for inclusion as a medium scale extension to Cirencester. That sufficiently north of the road, to avoid unreasonable noise. the residential extending towards Burford Road, avoiding the Ancient monument, and stopping before the substantial trees to the north.

Comment ID: 9022

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Agree context.

Comment ID: 9030

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: David Hindle

Comment: As previously stated only 3 Strategic sites should be post 2043. They are the obvious ones that the Mayor would certainly allocate post 2043.

Morton - railway station, and proposed transport hub. The land would also not be within the NL, nor SLA. The finished scale should be sufficient to justify a Secondary School.

Kemble - Railway Station, but the Tetbury, Kemble, Cirencester public transport corridor would need to be significantly improved.

Driffield - Post 2043 growth needed to reach the critical size of a small Town.

Steadings should not be continued post 2043, as it would become even more like ribbon development, and be likely to start encroaching the SLA. The only exception would be if my proposed density for all of Steadings (43 dph), cannot be completed by 2043, and occupies the same land area as 400 residential units was intended to cover up to 2043.

The other 3 Strategic sites, where post 2043 residential was proposed should not continue post 2043. It appears far too much like cramming residential in, that would substantially affect character, and is not justified by good levels of sustainability, and in the case of Driffield, enabling that development to reach a critical scale of being a small Town.

As the Mayor will determine Strategic allocations, across a very large area, it is unnecessary to allocate post 2043, with the exception of obvious locations, and ensuring that a 5 year supply of residential is maintained, before the Mayor through a Spatial development Plan, establishes Strategic residential growth areas, and the Unitary Authority allocates specific sites, and also allocates non strategic residential, along with its development Strategy. I believe that CDC with its high level of constraints, will not have to take its 'fair share', and will not have to cram more residential in.

Kemble

Comment ID: 9320

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: David Hindle

Comment: I note the recent consultation regarding proposed changes to the NPPF. I consider that if adopted along those lines it vindicates my view that that except for the Strategic Development that i have indicated post 2043, no other Strategic sites should have a level of development that would continue beyond 2043.

The Mayoral Area will have to produce a Spatial Development Strategy, within a relatively short period. Then the LA that will include the CDC area, will have to commence its Unitary Local Plan. Previous decisions of the original constituent Authorities could either be built on, or a different approach taken, as a far larger area would be relevant by being part of ,that area; and a larger area would form the new Unitary Local Authority.

Comment ID: 9034

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Increased employment essential, as well as residential. Please also do not forget about the need for appropriately sized shops/supermarkets to serve the new residential.

Comment ID: 9035

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Please do not forget about pitches for those who are travelling, rather than wanting a permanent location to be.

Comment ID: 9023

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

Name: David Hindle

Comment: As a methodology for selecting the Strategic sites i agree that it is logical. I note that 21a was discounted. Whilst agreeing that the area would not be suitable for a Strategic level development , i have always considered that the part of the land from the A4145, up to close to Burford Road, should be developed, as a northern extension to Cirencester. At the Reg 19 stage please consider this. I would not personally consider all that area as a Special landscape Area. I would class it as Medium high.

Comment ID: 9015

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Strongly agree that density should be increased (using CDC net methodology), and that it should be in the Local Plan, rather than the SHELLA. Rather than a uniform density, there should be variation. My suggestions being (average where one number:

Ampney Crusis 35 dph

Steadings (including already permitted outline) 43 dph - adds about 350 units to existing outline.

Driffield 35 dph

Fairford 35 dph

Kemble 35 dph

Morton - Inner 43 dph; outer 35 dph

Preston 35 dph

Siddlington 35 dph

dph = dwellings per hectare

Cirencester Town Centre Area 50 - 75 dph (non family residential).

Cirencester elsewhere 35 -43 dph

Principal Settlements - 35 - 50 dph

Land adjacent to Principal Settlement - 30 - 35 dph, unless lower density is necessary for reasons of Natural Landscape, Listed Buildings, or Conservation Area. or substantial character reasons.

Density for 3 or less units, and for development elsewhere, to be considered on its own merits.

My key justifications, is that higher density is easily, and appropriately achieved by layout and design. Higher density does not mean bad design, and is compatible with the special area. It is also relevant that strategic development can create its own identity. In addition the Strategic Development, is not within the Natural Landscape.

The Cotswold Design Guide would need to be amended, in order to give place a higher emphasis on density. My suggestions being:

- Predominantly terraced properties for layout and design.
- For residential units, with 3 or more bedrooms, predominant use of the roof space, or inclusion of a third floor, where a third floor would be visually appropriate.
- There should be childrens play space guidelines for larger development
- No specific guide for POS, but appropriate for the scale of development.
- Variable, rather than uniform garden sizes, by number of bedrooms.
- One bedroom units, and 3 person units - no garden needed.
- End the presumption against flats, provided they are no more than a double and a single bedroom.
- Town Centres, no garden required.
- Parking for residential, to include on street parking, unless it would cause serious danger.

Residential overlooking distances to be reduced to 20 m - There is no rationale for the need to retain 22 m.

- New residential with 3 or more bedrooms, not to exceed 20% more than the Minimum Technical standards.
- Garages to be rarely permitted, as they use land, and are frequently used as storage, or changed into residential floorspace.

Comment ID: 9024

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: David Hindle

Comment: As, I would set variable densities, my figures will inevitably be higher. As I have previous stated, i also consider that there is potentially more scope for residential adjacent to Principal Settlements, assuming that the land is offered up for development. This would include Settlements in the Natural Landscape, where undue harm to the character will not always be present.

I would make it clear that when referring to Principal Settlements, that could grow further, i am excluding those where Strategic level growth is proposed, with the exception of Cirencester.

Comment ID: 9036

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Supermarkets, Town Centre fine; ensure that Key, and District Centres also need to have appropriately sized Supermarket. In addition new strategic residential where elsewhere also has appropriate retail. Kemble is lacking, with a tiny shop, not suitable for strategic level growth.

Accessible children's play space for significant residential.

Nursery premises, as part of substantial new residential development.

Comment ID: 9017

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Option 5. I have given my reasons already. It primarily relates to:

Sustainable

Highest numbers, leaving aside discounted options

Builds on the previous Local Plan.

Strategic developments in the least sensitive areas.

Protects the Natural Landscape.

Most likely to be supported by an Inspector.

Comment ID: 9018

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Definitely, if an increase in density is not included, the council would be excluding an obvious option, and without it an Inspector would not support the Plan.

Layout and design techniques can be used to have much higher density. I have outlined some previously.

Keeping to dwelling mix Policies (eg. only 20% units with 4 or more bedrooms), will be a means to higher density.

A higher proportion of affordable units will mean higher density, as affordable housing, has to keep to tight space standards, and has smaller gardens.

I do not consider an average of 37 dph, as high. For example there is a development taking place in Tetbury, that is about 50 dph. Cirencester Town Centre, can be developed at a higher average density.

Strategic Development, particularly where largest creates can create its own character.

The Strategic developments are also all not within the natural Landscape, so character is of less importance, so i would argue is density.

Comment ID: 9019

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Apologies, please take my answer to 2, as for 3, and note my previous suggestions related to 3.

Comment ID: 9020

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: This is the answer to 2.

Definitely do not consider residential in unsustainable locations.

Comment ID: 9021

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: This is the answer to 3.

Definitely yes. I answered most of this in a previous answer:

- Higher density is a lot about layout and design.
- I do not regard an average of 37 dph, as an unreasonable density, that can still preserve the character of the Natural Landscape.
- All the Strategic residential is not in the Natural Landscape.
- Particularly larger scale Strategic development can create its own character
- Keeping to dwelling mix (bedrooms/occupancy), aids density, as only 20% 4 or more bedroom units are required.
- There has been a tendency to permit a higher proportion of larger units than required.

With no maximum sizes, particularly for larger units, residential units are far larger than reasonably required.

- With a higher proportion of affordable housing, that will increase density, a affordable housing has tight standards, including the gardens.
- As noted earlier garden size guidelines should be provided, on a minimum and maximum basis, for each of 3, 4, 5 and above bedroom units. There should also be similar for 2 bedroom, 4 person units, but nothing required for a 2 bedroom, 3 person unit, or a one bedroom unit. For Cirencester Town Centre, and other Town Centres, no gardens required.
- As noted earlier, support for one, and 2 bedroom (primarily 3 persons).

Comment ID: 9033

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Up to 2043 i agree it is sustainable, with the right improvements in public transport. Taking a wider view on the definition, infrastructure, is essential. I also consider that with higher variable density, the level of residential development would still be sustainable. As noted i also believe that land adjacent to principal settlements (excluding where strategic residential is already proposed), can make a greater contribution to residential growth, if appropriate land is offered up for development.

I certainly do not consider that what is indicated post 2043, is sustainable. That is part of the reason why i strongly suggest that only the obvious sites should be post 2043. An advantage of strategic growth established at a Mayoral level, is that strategic growth is for a very large area, and can take account of constraints that the CDC area has, and recognise that the need is only so high, because of the very high price/earnings ratio within the CDC area. The area should on that basis take less than its theoretical share of residential, as the residential strategic growth will be directed over a very large area.

I do not consider that Infrastructure improvements would adequately solve the problem. More residential would also be crammed into the areas, which whilst not having Landscape Designations, do have character. The greater scale would of development would also be a variance with the scale of existing communities.

Comment ID: 9037

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: David Hindle

Comment: C2 uses. however not all older people want, or can afford such. Therefore, please consider the possibility on some sites having bungelows, and also flats, and include a lift in some. Consider by condition and section 106 agreement, to persons over 60, for say an initial period of 6 months, and retain that clause when a person leaves.

Also need to design an appropriate proportion of residential, as Wheelchair, and mobility housing. As much as possible have Lifetime Homes.

Comment ID: 9008

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Too little residential, but i welcome specific identification of the Settlements that are considered to be Non Principal Settlements, or clusters, rather than being determined on an individual basis.

Comment ID: 9009

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: I object to rural dispersal, as it is not sustainable. The exception would be for 100% affordable, but that would still require accessibility. For instance, that could be edge of a Principal Settlement, or a Strategic Settlement. Also insufficient residential.

Comment ID: 9010

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Insufficient residential. Does not make full use of the Principal and Non Principal Settlement Settlements. Potential over focus on sites in the Natural landscape. The one area that i consider that this scenario can have relevance, is when it comes to establishing appropriate density, for Town, Key and Regional centres.

Comment ID: 9011

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Insufficient residential. The only good transport links, are by train from Kemble, and Morton, where I do agree that there should be substantial growth there. The Bus Network is too poor currently to achieve a modal shift. Again, the two stations are obvious locations for higher density. Cirencester also has relative good internal public transport making that

An obvious location for very high density in the area covered by the Cirencester town Centre Plan, and also high density for the whole of the steadings site. I appreciate that it would be up to the land owners, covering the existing Steadings Outline Planning permission, to decide if they take up the offer of a higher density, than was originally permitted.

Comment ID: 9012

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David Hindle

Comment: I agree with this preferred option, which is the most sustainable. leaving aside 6 and 7 that are non starters, it achieves the highest number of residential units. Rather than village clusters being determined when an application is submitted, the clusters should preferably be identified in the Local Plan.

The Strategic growth locations, are in the least sensitive locations, so i agree with them, but only up to 2043. The only allocations that should carry on post 2043, are Morton, and Kemble having the 2 railway stations; and Driffield, as that needs to reach a critical mass, with a population the size of a small Town. With LGR in 2028, far earlier that 2043, strategic residential will be decided in the Mayoral Spatial Plan, covering a vast area, The area covered by CDC, with its Natural Landscape constraints, will undoubtedly not have to take its 'fair share' of residential. Less that Strategic residential will also be considered as part of either all Gloucestershire, or half of Gloucestershire. Again the area covered by the existing CDC would undoubtedly not have to take its 'fair share', given the Natural Landscape constraints. There is no justification for having land allocated post 2043, provided 3 - 5 years residential supply remains.

I have not referred to post 2043 residential for Steadings, as with the pre 2043 residential for Steadings, anything beyond that would appear even more like ribbon, not organic growth. It would also encroach into the Sensitive Landscape Area.

Comment ID: 9013

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Totally discount, as totally against Government Policy regarding major development in the Natural Landscape. Overall it would destroy what is special about the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 9014

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Totally discount. Bad planning. Would destroy character, of the Natural landscape, and further cram in strategic residential, into areas without specific protection.

Comment ID: 9016

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Whilst i appreciate that those with existing planning permissions cannot be forced, to apply for higher density development, the densities within the Local Plan, where stated, should be made universal. for residential greater than say 20 exiting units, land owners/developers, where the density is lower, and the development has not commenced, should be actively encouraged to reapply based on the new density standards, where that would 'work'. For example the existing Steadings outline should be increased to 43 dph, adding around 350 units. the opportunity should also be taken to have provided free land for the new total needs of Steadings, and the floorspace required by Cirencester Phoenix. There should also be a funding mechanism, for construction, in association with the ICB.

I consider that there is more, adjacent to settlement land, within in Settlements in the Natural Landscape, that could be developed under Scenerio 5, without undue harm to the Natural Settlement.

I do not know how the maths works for up to 2043, when it comes to the the numbers achievable in the strategic settlements, due to the long lead in times. However, if possible up to 2043, my (presumably higher) densities should be used, for the same land area.

Comment ID: 9354

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: David Hindle

Comment: note the consultation regarding the NPPF. I recognise that this is only a consultation at this stage. However, the results, are highly likely to be enacted prior to the CDC Local Plan reaching Examination stage. Therefore the contents cannot be ignored.

I note that it is consistent with having density within the Local Plan itself, as I have suggested. It also seems to follow my idea of having variable density dependent on circumstances. That particularly relates to railway stations and Towns. Whilst not all Principal Settlements are Towns, the principle behind the consultation is consistent, with having a higher density for the land within the Settlement Boundaries of Principal Settlements, and a lower density on land adjacent.

My 2 levels of density for Morton, are deliberate recommendations. It should provide a density of an average of about 40 dph, suggested for development where there is a railway station, but with limited accessibility. With regards to Kemble, I suggested lower than the Government's suggested 40dph, due to the location in the Countryside. My assumption is that the 40 dph is a guide, that can be adjusted by location, in this case its rural location, and the nearby Landscape value. It would be illogical for the Government to mandate a density figure for all of England, as Planning is about weighing up the balance to be given, to regularly conflicting criteria,

I have particularly separated out Cirencester, and its Centre, for high density, which is again consistent with the NPPF consultation, as Cirencester has the highest status of being designated as the highest level Town Centre within CDC, with its many services.

With regards to the Strategic level residential growth elsewhere, an average density in the Local Plan, is also consistent with the NPPF consultation. My proposals take account of characteristics/locations, and what seems perfectly reasonable taking into account the rural location of some of the proposed Strategic residential growth, whilst also taking account of the proximity to railway stations, and the highest level Town centre, with its many services, namely Cirencester.

As previously stated, the densities should be applied universally, irrespective of when there are already planning permissions, that have previously been permitted. It is up to the land owners if they wish to take up the higher densities in the new Local Plan, compared to the unspecified, but lower indicative density levels in the existing Local Plan.

Comment ID: 9029

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Due to higher density, my figures will be higher. That will primarily affect Principal Settlements, and Strategic Housing sites, although the influence on the latter will be dependent on the extent that the figures reflect the maximum achievable by 2043. If it represents the maximum, less land would be taken for strategic residential.

I consider that for the Principal Settlements, including those within the Natural landscape, there can be more residential, adjacent to the Settlement Boundaries. In the case of those in the NL, there are undoubtedly locations, where there would not be undue harm.

I appreciate that only land offered up for development can be developed. My comments cannot have regard to that, as i do not know land offered up.

As i am not aware of all locations, i will highlight only some:

Tetbury - 3 additional sites, maybe 500 units. I appreciate that 2 would be major development, in the NL, that would not normally be permitted. However, based that has to be balanced against the need for residential. With appropriate design, and layout i consider that there would not be undue harm to the NL. If allocated, i doubt that given the shortfall on need, an Inspector would wish to delete the 2 allocations. The third, appropriate designed, and laid out would also not cause undue harm to the NL. I also recognise the 50 new, and 43 unit site. this site is appropriate, but the density can be higher, potential providing up to 120 units, whilst protecting the NL.

Cirencester - as noted 20a should also include part allocation for residential, It is a logical extension of Cirencester, and i do not agree all is worthy of designation as a special Landscape Area. I would place it as medium - high at the most. As mentioned the outline permission for Steadings, has the capacity for a higher density, with around 350 more residential units.. My other surprise is that in view of the Town Centre Plan, that will be produced alongside the Local Plan, that there little attempt to provide an indicative number of residential units for the town centre, by 2043.

Comment ID: 9041

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David Hindle

Comment: When quoting land to the north of Cirencester, where there could be residential development (medium scale), i wrongly quoted 20 a. I meant 21 a.

Comment ID: 9031

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Up to 2043 i agree, but more will be possible, or less land taken, if my density figures are used. In addition up to 350 more residential units, on the same residential land area (minus a land for a substantial Health Centre).

For post 2043 note my answer to the previous question, only; Morton; Kemble; and Drifffield, all with more units due to higher density. Steadings, only to continue post 2043, if any extra units on the outline planning permission area, and the land intended for the extra 400 units (at a higher density 43 dph) cannot be completed by 2043.

Comment ID: 9032

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: David Hindle

Comment: See my answers to the previous 2 questions, and the one regarding my proposed densities, for the Strategic sites.

Comment ID: 9007

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Agree that only 1 -5 are potential options, for consideration.

Comment ID: 9520

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: David Hindle

Comment: In support of only having in the Local Plan, indicative residential post 2043 residential for 3 strategic sites, I would refer to the South Gloucestershire Local Plan, currently at examination.

If adopted that would include only one broad area, to continue as residential allocation post 2041. As a justification specific reference is made to the future existence, of Mayoral Area Spatial Development Strategy.

The Mayoral Area will be responsible for Strategic Growth identification of broad locations, in a Spatial Development Strategy.

It is unnecessary, illogical, and potentially prejudicial for CDC to allocate, anything other than the 3, 'obvious' post 2043 areas, namely Morton, Kemble, and the new large village/small Town near Drifffield.

Comment ID: 9521

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Reference to 2943 should have been 2043.

Comment ID: 9814

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: David Hindle

Comment: I note that a commonly used minimum new house garden size is 30 sym. It seems appropriate to use that as a minimum for CDC, except in Town Centres. The guidelines that I have indicated elsewhere, should also be maintained.

Where there are balconies, I note that 5 sqm, for flats for 1 or 2 persons is often used, with an additional 1 sqm per person. A deapth of 1.5 sqm also being used. That also seems appropriate for CDC .

For communal gardens, a minimum of 50 sqm is common The 20 SQM per unit should be retained

Comment ID: 9983

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: David Hindle

Comment: Regarding my post about overlooking distances. Where it is across a road, and there is no prevailing building line; I revise my comment, that the across a road overlooking distance should normally be a minimum of 16m.

Comment ID: 9984

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: David Hindle

Comment: With regards to garden sizes. I revise my comment, to make it clear that in Town Centres, or where residential is above other uses, no gardens should be required.

Comment ID: 9589

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: With regards to gardens, I suggest the guidelines should be variable.

1 and 2 bedroom units fo

Comment ID: 9595

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: More flats should be provided, particularly for 2 bedrooms 3 person, and 1 bedroom units. They can easily be designed to fit in with character.

Comment ID: 9597

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: More flats, particularly for 2 bedrooms, 3 person units. It is easy to design flats, that externally fit in with character.

Comment ID: 9618

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: With regards to gardens.

For Town Centres, no gardens should be required. Patios encouraged.

Elsewhere

2 bedrooms, 3 person residential, and 1 bedroom residential - no gardens required.

Communal gardens encouraged, and Patios.

2 bedrooms 4 person residential - gardens 40 - 50 sq m. If flats, and mixed with flats for less than 4 persons, the alternative to be communal garden 20 sym per unit.

3 bedrooms residential - variable gardens 50 - 60 sym.

4, and more residential, 60 - 75 sym.

As referred to earlier, habital room/habital room overlooking distance, to be a universal 20 m, with no increase for more than 2 storeys.

For across a road. greater flexibility, based on the building line. Where non exits, particularly where the residential is new, the overlooking distances can be reduced to 18 m.

Flank walls of more than one floor, should normally be a minimum of 12 m, from residential.

Comment ID: 9622

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Hindle

Comment: When I referred to Patios, in my previous comment about amenity space, I meant balconies.

Comment ID: 9183

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: David Hindle

Comment: I note that no reference is made to, how the future needs, for Town Centre parking are to be resolved.

The Local Plan needs to allocate land for relocated Cirencester Town Centre car parking.

That will most likely include fewer opportunities to park in the Town Centre.

The implication is that land will need to be allocated, either on the edge of Cirencester, on land a greater distance, providing park and ride.

Comment ID: 9184

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: David Hindle

Comment: The on, in reference to Cirencester should have been or.

Comment ID: 9950

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David Jago

Comment: I would like to question Kemble as a principal site for the suggested scale of development. Yes, it has a railway station, a shop/PO, a primary school and a doctor's surgery, but the existing facilities would be extremely stretched with a further 590 homes. Developments to date have been smaller and manageable, but the scale of the new proposed scenario is unrealistic for the village.

Kemble can accommodate some more housing, but the need is for affordable housing for local people rather than a large scale housing estate of 'executive homes'.

Additionally, the increased traffic would overwhelm the local roads, including all traffic into and out of Cirencester, the key hub for (more) local services, schools, shops, etc. and probably also a main area for local employment. This would have a serious impact on air quality, road safety and the safety of pedestrians. The situation would be exacerbated with expanded housing in Cirencester itself, as the town can barely cope with the scale of local development now, let alone if it serves as a hub for expanded housing eg in Kemble or other surrounding villages.

Public transport in the Kemble and Cirencester area is extremely limited (beyond the railway), so there are no viable alternatives to the much greater car usage that would come with more housing.

Comment ID: 9952

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David Jago

Comment: Given their dire financial situation and appalling track record on water quality, I question the ability of Thames Water to deliver to existing households in the area, let alone more homes. There has to be some serious consideration given to this vital piece of infrastructure.

Comment ID: 9829

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: David Keyte

Comment: The suggested 6,150 homes in the pipeline and subsequent 12,500 new homes needed should take in to account likely lapse rates over the plan period for existing/new permissions. Projections should also recognise the difficult financial times and increasing cost of land, labour and raw materials for new housing which will affect the market value of a completed property and hence its saleability. Obtaining planning permission is also becoming/has become very expensive and challenging to obtain. All of the above along with other externalities will adversely affect the number of planning permissions sought, granted and implemented. Consequently, the 6,150 and 12,500 figures quoted should be treated with caution and should be adjusted to take into account the inevitable lapse in permissions granted and the reduction in permissions granted for certain types of smaller developments.

Comment ID: 9830

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: David Keyte

Comment: The desire to protect the National Landscape is laudable. However, Scenario 6 with appropriate/justified development in the National Landscape (whether major or not) is the only scenario that provides a sufficient number of new homes to satisfy the government target of 18,650. Windfall housing and new allocations at/in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and appropriate Village Clusters within the National Landscape added to the development options advanced in Scenario 5 will provide a dispersed pattern of housing delivery that is sustainable whilst remaining recognisant of national designations.

Comment ID: 9419

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: David Lowbridge

Comment: The military fly very very low flying aircraft over the edge of Drifffield, and the proposed development site for the new village near Drifffield. They drop pallets from parachutes on to their South Cerney Airfield.

Noise will be a factor, as will safety.

* For developments near airfields, the Council will need to conduct an aviation noise analysis to assess the potential impact on future residents. You may also need to consult the RAF as to their use of the South Cerney Airfield as the development is on the flight path of their aircraft.

Comment ID: 9060

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: David Morecombe

Comment: I understand the requirement for new housing allocations and although I understand the need for Fairford to take it's share, I do think that an increase of over 60% in the housing stock before 2043 is a huge increase. If this building was spread over the next 18 years, this could be achieved, but provision of adequate GP surgery facilities, schools and utilities should be put in place before any large scale development is allowed. There is already a development in the town where Thames Water cannot provide a water supply until April 2026 where the developer has houses built and ready to sell but cannot complete due to the lack of a water supply. I also believe that a requirement should be placed on developers in the future for social housing, a 40% minimum should be one and two bedroomed houses and 10% should be bungalows. This would ensure that local young families would not be priced out of the town and have to move to Cirencester or Swindon which often happens now.

Comment ID: 9817

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Senario 6 would have my support as it offers a much fairer distribution of houses across the Cotswolds, including the CLA. A more widespread development plan makes far better use of existing infrastructure. Spreading the new housing requirement over all existing settlements with numbers relating to the size and existing facilities would make far more sense than forcing huge numbers on settlements with very limited infrastructure.

Comment ID: 9818

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Question 3

density should not be increased in non principal settlements like Down Ampney, which are rural villages and not extensions of towns like Swindon and Cirencester.

Comment ID: 9820

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Thames Water have failed to provide sufficient sewage capacity for Down Ampney and have promised a LIMITED upgrade at Ampney St Peter in Asset Management Plans going back for over a decade. Given that their latest commitment to upgrade this works has not been started and given that approaching 100 houses have been or are about to be connected to this heavily polluting works (see figures provided by WASP) how can the decision to build a further 416 homes be justified? Thames Water are also struggling to meet the household water requirements in the Cotswold area. How are they going to provide this facility to new housing on this scale?

Comment ID: 9823

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Table 2 Non-Principal Settlements. Down Ampney does not have the infrastructure to support the village effectively being trebled in size. Recent development in the village has seen considerable damage to road surfaces, increased surface water flooding. The primary school is at capacity. We have no public transport, which can be used to get people to work and there is no employment in the village.

Comment ID: 9825

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Question 4. to accommodate 416 new dwellings Down Ampney would require a new school, a doctors surgery/ chemist, a proper public transport link and major upgrading of the approach roads and waste water treatment plant at Ampney St Peter.

Comment ID: 9827

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: David Reinger

Comment: Section 4.9 sums up the major flaw in the whole plan in that it states that infrastructure will be looked at to determine infrastructure requirements. this back to front planning approach, where numbers are determined ahead of sustainable infrastructure being put in place is the problem. Down Ampney being a good example with 68 new dwellings occupied or under construction and not a single penny having been spent on upgrading our deteriorating roads, sewage works or public transport.

Comment ID: 8769

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: If this online system is the only way to provide comments to this important consultation I think that you are deigning older residents their say. Its complicated and requires access to technology that not everyone will have access to.

Comment ID: 8781

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: My (5 yr old) laptop has really struggled with this database. I hope that it is not only me as you will not get many responses if everyone is finding it so difficult. I am referring to my screen freezing and being thrown out of the system.

Comment ID: 8773

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: It seems to me that scenario 5 has already chosen so this question seems somewhat redundant to me. I do not agree that all the extra capacity should come from areas outside national landscape as the density is too high for these areas.

Comment ID: 8771

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I disagree with considering building houses in areas deemed unsuitable to meet the governments needs. I don't think the target is realistic if only areas outside national landscape are being considered for development.

Comment ID: 8772

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I would not approve of building flats to support higher density housing as this not in keeping with the local area. Smaller homes and or townhouses would be acceptable if they are in keeping with the village design and built to modern eco standards.

Comment ID: 8777

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I am a resident of Kemble and do not think the proposed development is sustainable. My husband is ex military and we have lived in 15 homes around the UK before settling permanently here. We have never lived anywhere with so many power cuts. We have at least 2 to 3 significant power cuts every year. Its seems that the current infrastructure is not adequate for 330 homes.

Comment ID: 8780

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I would like to raise an issue regarding road safety. Both junctions from Kemble to the A433 (Tebury - Cirencester Rd) are already dangerous and would become considerably more so if the proposed developments go ahead. The GCC public map of collisions between Nov 22 & Nov 25 lists 7 collisions (1 fatal) on the A429-A433 junction and a further 3 collisions (1 fatal) on the Windmill Rd-A433 junction (nr Thames Head pub). This must be taken into consideration. If population of the area to south of Cirencester grows significantly and these junctions will become busier.

Comment ID: 8775

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I understood that the Steadings would provide around 2,500 homes. Why has this been reduced to 400 until 2043 and 1290 post 2043? Cirencester is the biggest settlement in the area and can accommodate more homes than the outlying villages without completely changing the atmosphere and ethos of the current settlements

Comment ID: 8770

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Debbie Bracken

Comment: I am a resident of Kemble village. I would like to understand how Kemble can be considered to have the "best services, facilities, employment opportunities and transport connectivity". We have a church, a primary school, a two room surgery, a small shop, a village hall and a pub. There is a train station but a very limited bus service. A season ticket to London costs in excess of £13k. From my experience, many of the new people moving to the village into the recently built homes have come from the home counties or London. They are not local people. There are little to no employment opportunities in the village, no clubs for teenagers or sporting facilities. We are too small a community to support the number of new homes indicated without completely changing the ethos and atmosphere of the village.

Comment ID: 10288

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Deborah Clarke

Comment: Formal Objection to Cotswold District Local Plans

Locations : Ampney St Peter new settlement (Zone 16), Drifffield (zone 19), Ampney Crucis (Zone 18).

I am writing to object to the plans for new housing developments in the above areas mainly due to the existing flooding and unsatisfactory sewage facilities in the area, which will only fail increasingly with any future building work.

We have lived in Ampney St Peter for 30 years and in all that time there has been regular flooding to houses, and sewage problems. Even in the last couple of weeks (after only a few hours of rain), the roads were flooded badly causing danger to road users, and raw sewage was spewing out of the drains along the A417, causing environmental health problems.

The pumping station in Charlham Lane (which had its capacity doubled only a few years ago), is still completely unable to cope, as the local sewage network is being overwhelmed by groundwater ingress. Every time we get any rainfall at all, we have a convoy of tankers around the clock pumping out the waste, running their engines throughout, causing great distress to locals from air pollution and noise pollution also. Any additional pressure on this already overloaded system would be catastrophic.

We also know that the water company is releasing sewage into the Ampney Brook regularly causing damage to the environment and subsequent disaster to wildlife including some protected species like the great crested newt.

Other concerns about adding more housing in this sensitive area are regarding shortages of water, already resulting in hosepipe bans for months on end which more houses will only exacerbate the situation.

Also the weak power supply which results in recurring power cuts and huge inconvenience. The addition of more houses and the governments obsession with electric vehicles and the extra demands that would put on the system, make the development plan unsustainable.

Any new settlements or additional areas of development would completely ruin the locals safety, health and quality of life and would be hugely detrimental to our beautiful but delicate environment.

Comment ID: 8928

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Debra Andrews

Comment: There is a great need particularly in Lechlade for property for older people to down size into, eg bungalows. There are so many older couples and single older people living in large homes who would like to downsize but want to stay in their local area as this is where all their friends, activities are. This would also free up property for families to buy and also have a knock on effect for 1st time buyers

Comment ID: 9224

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Diana

Comment: I respectfully object to the proposed new housing development in Fairford. While I recognise the wider need for housing, the existing local infrastructure is already under significant pressure and cannot reasonably support the addition of so many new homes. In particular, our GP surgery is currently operating at full capacity, and there are no clear provisions in place to accommodate an increased demand for healthcare services.

Furthermore, Fairford does not have sufficient local employment opportunities to support the number of additional households being proposed, which would likely increase commuting. Public transport and road infrastructure are already limited and inadequate to support a substantial rise in population, particularly for families.

Without meaningful improvements to healthcare provision, employment opportunities, and transport infrastructure, I do not believe this development would be sustainable or in the best interests of Fairford or its residents.

Comment ID: 10508

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Diane Smith

Comment: 2.6.1 Mickleton should not be included in the Principal settlements. It has been wrongly categorised,. Unlike most of the other principal settlements it has no High Street, no car park, no large food store, no Post office, no medical facilities or pharmacy

Comment ID: 10516

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Diane Smith

Comment: What are the proposals for the genuine choice of transport modes in Mickleton? Currently there is an infrequent bus service which does not meet the needs of workpeople. there is traffic congestion in the village and with current developments between Mickleton and Stratford on Avon (within Warwickshire) are making travel northwards increasingly difficult

Comment ID: 9774

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: Agree with the principles outlined in the vision but do not believe that the major development currently planned will provide a sustainable future for the village of Siddington as the level of growth is disproportionate and will undermine the rural community heritage.

Comment ID: 9758

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: Uncertain about all scenarios that consider Siddington as a "Principal Settlement" as the infrastructure is not in place for it to be classified as such. Strongly object to any plan that involves Siddington becoming absorbed into Cirencester as a suburb and thus losing its rural identity. Allocating more than 1000 homes to a village of 339 dwellings a disproportionate and unsustainable expansion

Comment ID: 9760

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: No. Siddington is not a sustainable location for a major expansion and should not be targeted to meet housing numbers. Other options should be considered.

Comment ID: 9766

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: I object strongly to any plan to increase density in Siddington through higher buildings or more flats as this would be detrimental to the rural setting.

Comment ID: 9770

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: A development on the scale proposed for Siddington is not sustainable without off site infrastructure reinforcements and provision of new facilities. Therefore Siddington would be increasingly dependent on Cirencester and would be absorbed into the town and lose its own identity.

Comment ID: 9772

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Diane Stallabrass

Comment: The Development Plan should consider the incorrect classification of Siddington as a Principal Settlement and most certainly consider the retention of the green space gap between Cirencester and Siddington to maintain the village identity.

Comment ID: 9583

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Dilys

Comment: Stow is in desperate need of more housing & employment opportunities, but it is not mentioned specifically in your call for sites, because of its location within the national landscape. Harm to the national landscape would be more than balanced by public benefit form of affordable housing leading to a better demographic in terms of age. Stow needs provision of parking outside of the town centre because our lovely market, square which is one of the jewels in the crown of the Cotswolds is spoiled by the constant stream of cars & coaches looking for somewhere to park

Comment ID: 9579

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Dilys

Comment: The current suggestion of a significant strategic development in Moreton in Marsh is only sustainable if there is a huge investment in infrastructure: schools, healthcare, water & sewage for example, employment opportunities outside the tourist sector & in particular the road. The A429 Fosseway is already significantly congested, with traffic regularly queuing at the "pinch points" in Stow and Moreton.

Comment ID: 9571

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Dilys

Comment: Scenario 5 would be my preferred option but I would not discount scenario because there is a balance to be had between the national landscape an the viability of local communities.

Comment ID: 9572

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Dilys

Comment: Question 2. Scenario 6 is discounted because of the effect of strategic developments on the national landscape. However, the comment is made that the harm done could be weighed against the public benefit. Stow on the Wold is a community in decline because of the lack of affordable / social housing. It is becoming a community for the wealthy elderly, the cricket club has closed for example, the viability of the local primary school & the church are under threat if the decline in people of working age & children continues. Businesses in the retail & hospitality sector struggle to attract staff as do local care homes. A modest development of housing in Stow, with provision for parking which would take cars out of the market square would be of enormous public benefit which in my opinion would far outweigh damage to the national landscape

Comment ID: 9574

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Dilys

Comment: It is important to provide the type of housing which is required. Some small houses are required for single people & couples & also for older people who are downsizing but there is also a clear need for family houses. preferably with modest gardens. In addition there needs to be the provision of open spaces, play areas & allotments as well as employment opportunities within developments. These should not be given up just to squash nmore housing in.

Comment ID: 9580

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Dilys

Comment: The growth of tourism in the district needs to be considered. While tourists are vital for the local economy, the huge number of tourists descending on our towns & villages creates problems for local residents. For example, a significant number of properties which used to be small cottages which might have provided affordable starter homes have been bought up as holiday lets. Our roads & town centres are congested with tourist traffic, town centres cater for tourists rather than local residents, thoughtless & unrestricted parking spoils the appearance of our lovely towns.

Comment ID: 9582

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Dilys

Comment: The section on infrastructure could be expanded to include, for example, something about provision of healthcare & education. Distance from our major hospitals & ambulance response times mean that Cotswold residents are disadvantaged.

Comment ID: 10314

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: The allocation of an unimaginable number of new dwellings in such a tiny area does not make any sense. The planned development would swamp the original feudal hamlet of Preston that has existed since the 11th century

Comment ID: 10316

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: No

Comment ID: 10318

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: In no way would these projected ideas fit into the present rural area

Comment ID: 10309

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: There is no mention anywhere of fitting into the cultural and historical context of the area – how centuries of history are being swamped and utterly over-run, and how green space is being lost irrevocably for today's perceived need. Cultural and historical destruction is being wrought without full and proper local consultation.

Comment ID: 10320

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: None

Comment ID: 10322

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Dorothy Warren

Comment: I do not agree with the vision and objectives

Comment ID: 10798

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Douglas Looman

Comment: I would support the Council's preferred Option 5. Any local plan must align development to local needs, including a fair proportion of national targets, but crucially, must address:

- * Affordability, which is vital to retain young families in the District and which should provide a mix of housing to meet local demographics, not more 3- \$ 4-bed detached at £600k+ of which there is neither a national nor local shortage;
- * Sustainability & environmental impact, not least for the Cotswold National Landscape but more generally for established hedgerows and wild flower meadows essential to sustain threatened wildlife;
- * Infrastructure, including adequate provision of drainage and sewerage to avoid further increasing foul discharges (nobody would contemplate not connecting properties to the National Grid) and spillages; access to employment and transport, to avoid creating further commuter ghost towns, with no option other than to drive to more distant employment, or overloading already inadequate provision of other services - education, medical etc,

Comment ID: 8960

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Douglas Moore

Comment: Whist not opposed to new housing developments. The infrastructure has to be adequate. I am particularly thinking about Fairford and the capacity of the sewerage system and the pressure on doctors surgeries.

Comment ID: 9861

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Douglas Moule

Comment: Several areas identified for large housing allocations do not have sufficient local employment opportunities to support the expected population increase. Without meaningful job creation, these developments risk becoming commuter estates dependent on long-distance car travel.

This conflicts with the plan's stated aims of:

reducing transport emissions

supporting a low-carbon local economy

delivering sustainable, self-contained settlements

Housing growth must be matched by realistic, deliverable employment growth; currently, there is no evidence base demonstrating how this would be achieved.

Comment ID: 9865

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Douglas Moule

Comment: Several areas identified for large housing allocations do not have sufficient local employment opportunities to support the expected population increase. Without meaningful job creation, these developments risk becoming commuter estates dependent on long-distance car travel.

This conflicts with the plan's stated aims of:

reducing transport emissions

supporting a low-carbon local economy

delivering sustainable, self-contained settlements

Housing growth must be matched by realistic, deliverable employment growth; currently, there is no evidence base demonstrating how this would be achieved.

Comment ID: 9863

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Douglas Moule

Comment: The consultation acknowledges that Cotswold District is heavily constrained by the Cotswolds National Landscape designation, heritage assets, flood zones and limited transport corridors. However, the development strategy does not sufficiently account for the comparative lack of unconstrained land in the district relative to counties with larger available developable areas.

Applying the same government housing requirement to a district where over half the land is nationally protected places an unreasonable pressure on the remaining rural areas. This disconnect means the proposed level of growth is not proportionate or environmentally sustainable, and the Council should make a stronger case to government regarding local constraints and the need for a reduced housing requirement.

Comment ID: 9866

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Douglas Moule

Comment: Many of the proposed locations are served only by narrow, single-track or minor rural roads, which already experience congestion and safety issues. These routes cannot sustain the significant rise in traffic that thousands of new homes would generate.

The consultation document itself highlights infrastructure constraints, yet the development strategy appears to assume that these roads can absorb substantial growth without providing credible mitigation measures. Road widening, junction upgrades, and safe pedestrian and cycling connections would be essential—but these are neither costed nor evidenced as deliverable.

Until transport infrastructure is demonstrably capable of supporting such development, allocating large numbers of homes in rural areas is not sustainable.

Public transport provision across many rural parts of the district is sparse, infrequent or non-existent outside peak times. Locating large housing developments away from main transport corridors will inevitably increase private vehicle reliance, contradicting the plan's own objectives for net-zero transport emissions and sustainable mobility.

Unless significant investment in reliable, regular public transport is committed upfront—and secured before development begins—these settlements will not meet the tests of accessibility or sustainability required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Comment ID: 9862

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Douglas Moule

Comment: The proposed allocations, especially in smaller villages and village clusters, would fundamentally change the character of quiet, secluded rural communities. These settlements were not designed to absorb large-scale new development, and doing so would erode the qualities—peace, landscape setting, low noise, dark skies—that define the Cotswolds’ appeal and are central to the Local Plan’s own stated objectives.

The Local Plan should recognise that preservation of rural character is a material planning consideration and that excessive development in smaller villages is incompatible with maintaining the qualities that residents value and that attract visitors to the district.

Comment ID: 792

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Dale Thomas

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

Comment ID: 802

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Daniel Jones

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

Comment ID: 395

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Daniella Milligan

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

Comment ID: 650

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Daryl Bint and Olivia Griffin

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

Comment ID: 608

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Allerton and Tanya Ray

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

Comment ID: 102

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Barton

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

Comment ID: 161

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Barwick

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

Comment ID: 652

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Cracknell

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

Comment ID: 702

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Dunbar

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

Comment ID: 138

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Durston

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

Comment ID: 872

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Eglise

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

Comment ID: 225

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Evans

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

Comment ID: 869

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Hardy

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

Comment ID: 512

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Hill

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

Comment ID: 127

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 191

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 484

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Hopkins

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

Comment ID: 547

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David J Brown

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

Comment ID: 353

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Lattimore

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

Comment ID: 219

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Lattimore

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

Comment ID: 314

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Mills

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

Comment ID: 351

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Murray

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

Comment ID: 285

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Oliver

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

Comment ID: 861

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Oxenbury

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

Comment ID: 578

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Redgewell and Rosa Kell

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

Comment ID: 424

Email/Letter Representation

Name: David Wilson Redrow

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

Comment ID: 194

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Davina Morley

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

Comment ID: 708

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Deborah Crook

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

Comment ID: 289

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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

Comment ID: 291

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Defence Infrastructure Organisation

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

Comment ID: 754

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Denese Newton

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

Comment ID: 695

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Dennis Brady

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

Comment ID: 361

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Derek Green

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

Comment ID: 368

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Derek Green

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

Comment ID: 414

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Diana Kirk

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

Comment ID: 407

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Diane & John Stallabrass

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

Comment ID: 827

Email/Letter Representation

Name: DJ Bown

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

Comment ID: 824

Email/Letter Representation

Name: DJ Charlton

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

Comment ID: 866

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Dorothy Lucas

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

Comment ID: 648

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Douglas Benham

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

Comment ID: 758

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Douglas Benham

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

Comment ID: 808

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Douglas Crook

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

Comment ID: 538

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Down Ampney Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 125

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Drifffield and Harnhill Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 813

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Drifffield and Harnhill Resident Action Group

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

Comment ID: 182

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Dunstall Will Trust

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

Comment ID: 786

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Durdica Maderi

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

Comment ID: 798

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Dylan McCauley

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