

Comment ID: 9969

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: C Beer

Comment: Please consider new system pre-constructed homes that are built off site in large warehouse type buildings possibly within the Gloucestershire/ Wiltshire area. This providing local employment. The old way of bick by brick, stone by stone on site construction is slow, expensive and environmentally unfriendly. System building is fast, clean, caused less local noise and resultant properties can be made virtually carbon neutral meetin you Green to the Core aims. By changing the exterior appearance they do not have to look like multiple inferior identical litter boxes. They can provide, small, medium or large homes of one, two or higher stories.

Consider requiring roof orientation of homes to be optimised for PV solar collection with cells built into all roof structures and not added as an extra on top of existing roofs. Consider a system of interconnected PV power being central power convertors to domestic 240 AC. This reduces equipment costs and improves electrical conversion effeciency where every home had it own illtle independent system.

Also consider having a system of large ground source heat pumps across all the new estates. These can be constructed during the ground works at minimal additional cost with large central more efficient heat exchanges consrtucted in their sound proofed buildings. This will give almost zero carbon properties supporting your Green to the Core objectives,

Comment ID: 9980

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: C Beer

Comment: Sorry to say this section is stylistic council waffle it needs more substantive input. Suspect you were beginning to lose the will to live at this point (can't blame you either) and resorted to just copy and paste or poor AI. Strongly suggests this section is improved in you submitted document to HMG. For the Green agenda please see my earlier comments.

Comment ID: 9968

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: C Beer

Comment: In Fairford please do not rely only on new builds to the NE of the town as appears to be in your proposals. Possibly consider the land to the west of Fairford on the north side of the A417 along what is know as The Milking Path. This is poor quality farmland large sections are swampy due to no improved drainage. There are two lowish voltage overhead cables passing through which could be placed underground and provide power. A new direct access road would exit on a straight section of the A417. Believe the land is currently managed/owned by the Ernest Cook Trust.

Comment ID: 9970

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: C Beer

Comment: To minimise traffic congestion greatly improved public transport is needed. In a 24/7 world buses or other public transport needs to run all day and most if not all night. Consider preparing for driverless transport and small vehicles that could be pre-ordered by smart phone etc. The transport company can then optimise vehicle size, route and timings to meet needs and costs adjusted accordingly. As proof of above in a post retirement job I needed to be at work some days at 6am and on others finish at 10pm. That necessitated private car use. Don't think normal work is 9 to 5 anymore.

Comment ID: 9967

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: C Beer

Comment: 3.13 Water supply and sewerage. Ignor Thames Water's problems by our agreeing to HMG's claimed needs we can negotiate funding for water supply. Suggest consider using some of the water park lakes be repurposed as resevoirs. We will need a lot of gravel and sand in constructing the new buildings. This can come from new gravel pits nearby and on completion can become new lakes for the water park. New water treatment plants will be needed that are fit for purpose and do not pollute local rivers.

The water company (probably Thames water will be history) will gain additional revenue from the new homes and industrial premises thus a 20 year loan at commercial rate can fund the above constructions.

3.14 Forget reliaance on other areas. We need to be self reliant. This gives us control. Within a few years we may be part os a new unitory authority abd CDC may not exist. So planning for self reliance improved our negotiating stance again. Please think commercially on all matters. REMamber also that these days many families do not wok the old 9 to 5. We are now in a 24/7 economy. Transport

Comment ID: 9971

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: C Beer

Comment: Do not rely on consultants. Get up to speed your selves. It will increase you employability and reduce costs. Consultant frequently claim to know it all but in reality most are learing on the job at your expense and not necessarily doing a quality job. I know been these on both sides.

Comment ID: 9977

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: C Beer

Comment: For Fairford the schools are already over subscribed and need quality expansion. The local GP practice service is poor and needs expansion. Consider using the site of the old village hospital on Lower Croft road. This old building is seriously under used, poor design and expensive to heat and run. It is on a large site. Ideal for demolition and speedy rebuilding using system building to 2 or 3 stories. It can then be able to have a new fully serviced GP practice building plus extensive outpatients services and possibly recovery wards to take the load off large regional hospitals. Suggest several of these services could be provided by the expanded GP practice. It would make their job much more interesting as today they are too often degraded to little better than pill providers. Providing better local health services for Fairford and the surrounds will minimise travel to Cheltenham, Gloucester, Swindon, Oxford hospitals. Each is at least a 50 mile round trip. A waste of resources, time and bad for the environment. Poor transport necessitates use of private vehicles.

.

All these needs if met will improve the quality of life in the Cotswolds and help compensate for the increased homes need. By agreeing to meet HMG's claimed increased housing needs and having a green agenda we will be better placed to negotiate funding for these expanded services while minimising our carbon footprint. I commend these suggestions to you.

Comment ID: 9979

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: C Beer

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to express my ideas. In the unlikely event that you wish me to give you further help or expand on my comments I will be happy to help either my phone, in preson or video discussion. Good luck you will need it!

Comment ID: 9965

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: C Beer

Comment: Consider up to 4 stories for some new homes. Many of the existing older properties in or near town centres are this height and blend in well this includes small towns such as Fairford. Choose compatible designs to blend harmoniously.

Include some higher density homes but provide open designs with green spaces for outside recreation. Remember, many families have no interest in gardening they want parking (at least 3 per home) and open spaces with someone else to manage and tend the area.

Many single parents and those that rent /own flats are transient and move on frequently. It's the modern way. We need to meet all needs. Quality high density homes are ideal.

Comment ID: 9981

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: C Beer

Comment: Yes in general I do. But many sections need a more creative approach.
Please recognise we live in a rapidly changing world be more open to newer ideas and ways to approach problems.

Comment ID: 9963

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: C Beer

Comment: Agree senario 5 but we must propose an increased housing quantity to 18650 +1. You plans are 21% below requirements and will be rejected and we then suffer undesirable type and location of homes imposed. Not good. Please be realistic by meeting HMG's requirement we have a much better ability to negotiate for required capital funding for health, schools, power, water/ drainage, transport, road improvements etc. Fear you are setting us up to fail and suffer impositions that are more harmful to the area by being 21% below claimed need. Please be realistis and prepare to haggle from strength.

Comment ID: 9734

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: C Sharrock

Comment: Re. Q. 3 (To what extent would you support increasing housing density in developments to help meet the full housing target?) - I would support some density increases and infilling, etc. to maximise use of sites that are already within developed areas rather than spread development into unspoilt areas. However, I agree that "city-centre" densities are unlikely to be appropriate in the Cotswold district so this would seem to be more of a "windfall" than a larger scale contribution to housing stock.

Comment ID: 9422

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9432

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: Against

Comment ID: 9433

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: Against

Comment ID: 9423

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9424

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9425

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9426

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9427

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9428

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9429

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: I strongly object

Comment ID: 9430

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Camilla Burrige

Comment: strongly object

Comment ID: 10922

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Campden Society

Comment: The Campden Society advocate a mix of Scenarios 4 & 5.

We feel that Scenario 4 i.e. some of the growth of new houses is linked to being located near to improved public transport has strategic merit whilst Scenario 5 is pro-growth and pro-development. This latter option is likely to deliver the most housing, but some of the housing could be achieved under Scenario 4.

TCS strongly advocate for the reopening of Chipping Campden station to support Option 4. See separate submission.

Scenarios 6 and 7 both include major development within the Cotswold National Landscape, which is both undesirable and contrary to national planning policy. It is difficult to see any exceptional circumstances that make it desirable to put major development in the Cotswold National landscape; and any argument that suggests that the achievement of higher housing targets is a public interest that overrides the public interest in the protection of National Landscapes should be resisted strongly. TCS suggest that both these scenarios should be rejected.

Comment ID: 10924

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Campden Society

Comment: This would create problems in other areas of public services in both the short and longer term.

Additional stresses on transport, health provision, and social care requirements arising from lower well-being are obvious examples.

Comment ID: 10925

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Campden Society

Comment: Higher densities in developments help achieve higher housing provision which the Campden Society supports. We would also call for a greater number of smaller houses but not by reducing space standards.

Housing needs varies from place to place, depending on the nature of the local demographic, the local economy, and the facilities available. Higher density housing with a smaller area of private space would help to increase the density but must be offset by maintaining sufficient public space. Higher buildings should be considered depending on the local topography and sightlines. A suitable variety of housing typology is needed to reflect differing needs of a community. Flats are an acceptable way of increasing the density of housing provision.

The Campden Society would press for a higher density of housing than in previous developments citing Castle Nurseries and Wolds End Close in Chipping Campden as precedent. These two developments have mixed tenure, terraced housing (higher density of occupation) - and do not shy away from an urban vocabulary or three storey houses or apartment blocks.

Comment ID: 10929

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Campden Society

Comment: The proposed level of development across the whole of the Cotswold District Council area needs substantial infrastructure improvements which are not outlined in this proposal.

Any significant increase in housing is only sustainable if there is an improvement in the infrastructure e.g. public transport, road improvements, drainage and waste water plants, parking provision, additional schools and health services in the North Cotswolds.

Future housing should include retirement homes to accommodate a growing elderly population as well as starter homes for young people.

For the development in Chipping Campden, the former 'Polish Camp' at the top of Conduit Hill, and close to the A44, is a Brown field site suggestion which could be suitable for housing.

The area near the Great Western Railway line and the Campden Business Park, both for business and housing is also a location The Campden Society would also suggest. There is already a 1.7h business site allocated in the Local Plan to extend the Business Park.

For the development in and around this settlement, the Campden Society would press for more sustainable and increased public transport links; a detailed flood management strategy for the town; a Waste Water upgrade; and the social housing should be covenanted so that it is secured for permanent occupancy of local people rather than become short term residential accommodation or secondary homes.

Flooding is a concern for many areas of development in Chipping Campden and housing consent should not be granted for any sites that are either at risk in themselves or the development of them will increase the risk to any other housing in the area.

210 “new” dwellings (ie over extant permissions) is an 18% increase on the existing (including extant permissions). The town has facilities that will support this, although the surgery could be larger and parking for the surgery is inadequate. The main stress that this expansion will cause will be around parking generally. If the outline proposal for the Aston Road and Chipping Campden School development is realised, and the current school car park becomes a town car park, that will help significantly.

The most important questions around the expansion of 210 dwellings are around typology and density. There is a need for more smaller homes, more homes suitable for older people, and more affordable/social rent homes. There is very little local need for more larger homes, although such homes will normally sell at market prices to people moving into the town. The current typology of homes is unbalanced, with too many larger homes and too few smaller ones. Also, it will be important for measures to be put in place to ensure that the 201 additional homes are not available as second homes or for short term let.

For the Mickleton settlement, the Campden Society notes that 582 new dwellings is a 60% increase on the existing position. Mickleton has very limited facilities that cannot support such an expansion. If Mickelson is to stand alone as a sustainable community, then as a village of >1,500 dwellings, it would expect to have facilities comparable to those of Chipping Campden (expanded size < 1,400 dwellings). If the expanded Mickleton effectively relies on the facilities of Chipping Campden, then those will not be adequate, especially parking.

Comment ID: 10931

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Campden Society

Comment: The provision of facilities that are vital for a community but are market-delivered, such as food shops, leisure facilities, and other requirements make a community, need to be added.

For any new housing in Chipping Campden and elsewhere enforceable planning conditions and covenants need to be implemented to prevent new-build dwellings being used for holiday lets, second homes or short-term accommodation to ensure that new dwellings are for permanent residence and to encourage cohesive communities. In addition, a licensing scheme needs to be implemented for existing dwellings in the town to curtail the number of holiday lets, short term accommodation and second homes and encourage all dwellings to be used as principal dwellings.

For Chipping Campden the re-instatement of the Railway Station into the Local Plan is essential. Reinstating the station presents an opportunity to use existing infrastructure to improve connectivity and travel safety for Chipping Campden and surrounding villages whilst managing environmental and amenity impacts from travel. This reinstatement would also contribute to benefits and achieve better value in the business case to upgrade and modernise the North Cotswold Line as a whole, bringing mutual benefit to Gloucestershire and neighbouring counties. We understand the challenges of adapting the rail infrastructure to make this happen are diminishing on several fronts - including through rail sector cost reduction programmes and the availability of signalling and train technologies that offer the flexibility to cost-effectively re-introduce Campden station.

The Campden Society propose that rooftop solar panels are part of any new build and by way of a planning condition.

The Campden Society propose that dark skies enforcement is prioritised in any new planning consent.

Comment ID: 10933

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Campden Society

Comment: The Campden Society is broadly supportive of the vision and objectives set out in the update Local Plan, with certain caveats outlined in Q5 and below.

The Vision should reflect the fact that the Cotswolds have a significantly higher population of older people with 25-26% being over 60/65 compared with 20% nationally.

The cost of housing in the Cotswolds is also an issue that should be highlighted and the emphasis has to be on affordability.

The Campden Society strongly advocate that it is essential that the re-instatement of Chipping Campden Railway Station is put back into the Local Plan. Please see separate submission about the re-instatement of Chipping Campden Station.

Comment ID: 11005

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Carol Bezuidenhout

Comment: I am a resident of Ampney Crucis, where the CDC has suggested building 660 new houses in a village that currently has 246. This would be a 268% increase bringing the total number of houses to 906—3.68 times its present size.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed development in Ampney Crucis. My comments relate specifically to the development shown in “Indicative Map 4”, but apply equally to any other large development in or near Ampney Crucis that the council may sanction if its current call for new development sites attracts other offers.

I also have strong doubts about the wisdom of the entire project.

My response is organised using headings based on the CDC’s a—f “Objectives” list from Section 5.3, and the nested bullet points because I believe that the proposed building in Ampney Crucis would conflict with many of the objectives listed in section 5.3

5.3 Objectives

a. Respond to the climate crisis through adaptation and mitigation

- Require all new development to be zero-carbon and climate-resilient.

At the public meeting with CDC Development in Ampney Crucis Village Hall on November 15, 2025, it was suggested that large developments of 500 or more houses are likely to be greenlighted by or because of pressure from central government. Is the CDC sure that the developers who build the 660 proposed new houses in Ampney Crucis will be legally subject to climate-connected requirements?

Even if the 660 new homes in Ampney Crucis were built to be zero-carbon without reliance on carbon trading, the residents would be forced to use their cars on a regular basis, and indeed the number of cars might well be double the number of houses in order for both adults in a two-adult household to be able to get to and from work and the supermarket and to ferry their children to and from school and other activities, necessitating thousands of car journeys that would be unnecessary if houses were built near existing schools, shops and workplaces.

- Locate development away from flood-prone areas and promote water and energy efficiency.

This objective will not be met by any development in Ampney Crucis, although you have classified the flood risk at the building site as not high.

Ampney Crucis lies on Ampney Brook, a tributary of the Thames that makes low-lying areas of the village prone to flooding. All the roads through the village and leading towards the open fields that the CDC has earmarked for development are single-track and surrounded by runoff ditches that often flood, leading to rivulets that flow across the roads downhill toward the course of the brook, affecting the roads that lead through and from the village. The eastbound lane of the main access road (the A417) itself is often under water near the principal entrance to the village at the pub and there are often puddles on both sides of the road on the way to Cirencester. Where the road from the village meets the A417 at St Mary's church, water often overflows from the storm water drain onto the roadway. In wet weather, the surrounding fields become waterlogged.

These waste water runoff problems, which apply to the whole village and not just the flood-prone areas closer to the river, would be exacerbated by the proposed development. The high density of the proposed housing would mean that much of the newly developed area would be covered by houses and the associated hard paving, or by the suburban-type streets that would have to surround the houses, allowing water that the site previously absorbed to run off onto the roads.

- b. Conserve and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment

- Preserve the high quality, local distinctiveness, and diversity of the natural and historic environment.

Ampney Crucis is a lovely Cotswold village dating back at least to the 1066 Domesday book, and lying principally along a horseshoe-shaped access road that leads off from the A417, starting at the pub, near the Grade I listed Holy Rood Church, the foundations of which date back to Saxon times. From the pub, the road loops round towards the surrounding open countryside and back down to the 12th and 13th century Grade I listed St Mary's Church. The semicircular area bounded by the A417 and the horseshoe-shaped village road is mainly occupied by a lovely park that is privately owned but publicly accessible. This semicircle also contains the grounds of the village cricket club, one field where sheep are often grazed, and another where a herd of alpacas live, emphasising the village's rural environment.

Many of the buildings in the village are Grade II listed and other non-listed buildings also lie in a conservation area.

Adding a suburban-style housing estate to the north of the village containing more than twice as many houses as the original village would destroy the local distinctiveness of the village, not preserve it.

The village is very much residential.

Any commerce associated with the new housing estate would change the nature of the village, not preserve it.

Several landowners in the neighbourhood have taken advantage of a taxpayer-funded wildflower-planting initiative that was introduced with the aim of restoring health to soils depleted by careless farming practices. It appears that the landowner who has put forward the "development site" to the north of the village is now presenting this land as non-agricultural. But in fact, these wildflower meadows have been a boon to the natural world, attracting larks in particular as one can check by using the "Merlin" phone app to identify larks from their calls.

Permitting the development of a suburban-style housing estate on one of these wildflower meadows will halt the regeneration of the countryside, and slow the recovery of the population of larks. It would by no means preserve the diversity of the natural environment.

- Conserve and enhance the distinct character of the Cotswolds National Landscape and open countryside.

Ampney Crucis lies just outside the Cotswold National Landscape, which seems to be one of the motivations for targeting our village for intense development. But the village lies in open countryside, and adding a housing estate that dwarfs the existing village will irreversibly damage the distinct character of the open countryside surrounding our village as well as that of the contiguous Cotswolds National Landscape.

- Promote high-quality, sustainable design and green infrastructure that supports health and wellbeing.

High-quality, sustainable design is expensive. Promoting it would seem to contradict the aim in point c. below of delivering affordable housing.

It is unclear what you mean by “green” infrastructure, but it sounds expensive. Surely the cost of building such infrastructure means that it is better to link to existing infrastructure in larger settlements, rather than creating new infrastructure in many different small villages.

c. Deliver inclusive, healthy, and affordable housing

- Provide a diverse mix of housing types and tenures, with a focus on socially rented homes.

Either the rules relating to using building materials sympathetic to the setting will have to be relaxed, or the houses in the proposed housing estate will not be affordable. Recently, it has been a requirement for new-build houses in our area to be clad in expensive Cotswold stone. Again, are the rules to be relaxed because this estate will contain more than 500 houses?

Building “healthy” houses is expensive—much more so when they are detached. To achieve economies of scale for climate-friendly devices like heat pumps and solar panels, one needs to build multi-occupancy buildings. It is not really appropriate to build multi-story blocks of flats in what has up to now been a beautiful low-rise village that blends in with the surrounding countryside.

- Ensure development supports positive health outcomes and embeds local health and wellbeing strategies.

Most people still drive petrol-powered cars and the central government’s recent decision to tax electric cars will be that the adoption of electric vehicles will slow, so we can expect that most of the one thousand cars that the residents of the new estate will bring in will be polluting. This added pollution supports negative, rather than positive, health outcomes.

Already, with only 246 houses, the single-track roads through the village are dangerous for pedestrians, and the rights of way through neighbouring farmland are muddy in winter and do not necessarily lead in very useful directions. One of the easiest ways for people to remain healthy is to exercise, and the easiest and most accessible exercise is walking. With three times as many cars, the roads will become even more dangerous for walkers. Building this estate in this setting seems unlikely to promote walking. It is unclear why, if the new residents are not going to be enjoying the countryside, because the roads are unsafe and the paths are inaccessible, they need to live in this particular location.

Because of the narrowness of the roads, the proposed twenty years of building in our village would negatively impact the health (because of increased pollution) and safety (because of construction traffic) of existing and incoming residents.

For these reasons, the proposed Ampney Crucis development will not support positive health outcomes because it does not embed health and wellbeing strategies.

d. Enable a vibrant, low-carbon local economy

- Support the transition to a low-carbon economy and promote local employment.

Even with the 2000 new residents from the 660 new houses in the proposed development, it seems wildly unlikely that Ampney Crucis will be big enough to support its own economy. The idea that there could be local employment for the 1000 new adult residents in Ampney Crucis seems ludicrous. The new residents will have to work and send their children to school in larger settlements, and they will have to commute by car to work in Cirencester or further away. Once the A419 “Missing Link” project is completed, journey times to Gloucester from Ampney Crucis will be shorter and many of the new residents are likely to work there or in Swindon. It seems much more likely that the new development will be a dormitory suburb for people working elsewhere rather than that it will be a step in the transition towards a low-carbon economy.

- Encourage the vitality and viability of town and village centres as places that support a range of activities and uses such as shopping, leisure, cultural and community activities; as well as providing access to affordable homes.

There are no shops in Ampney Crucis. There are villages that do have shops. In its current configuration, the village is much too small to support shopping, leisure, cultural or community activities. Is it not better to support existing activities in larger settlements than to create a new, anonymous suburb and try to inject manufactured vitality? Because the village is only about three miles from Cirencester, surely the new residents will go there or further afield to do their shopping and enjoy their leisure.

- Promote sustainable tourism.

The proposed housing estate in Ampney Crucis seems more likely to scare off rather than attract tourists, but any tourism it did attract would not be sustainable because visitors would have to drive to the village, making the roads busier, more polluting and less safe for walkers.

- Maintain Cirencester's role as a key employment and service centre.

Building a dormitory suburb three miles from its centre might help maintain Cirencester as a key employment and service centre, but building houses in Cirencester itself seems more likely to contribute to this maintenance, and avoid the many disadvantages that building this suburb would entail.

Moreover, all the building that is proposed for Cirencester and surrounding settlements will mean that Cirencester will suffer traffic jams for the foreseeable future. Already there are traffic jams into Cirencester in the mornings and on market days at the weekend. With a huge increase in the number of houses and in the number of vehicles, there are likely to be traffic logjams, which might have the effect of discouraging people from going in to Cirencester and have the result of destroying rather than maintaining its role as a key employment and service centre.

e. Promote sustainable transport use and connectivity

- Reduce transport emissions by encouraging walking, cycling, and public transport.

Building a large housing estate in Ampney Crucis will not reduce transport emissions by encouraging walking or cycling because walking is not feasible on a daily basis and cycling is already dangerous and will become more so when increased traffic from new development makes the smaller, less direct, roads busier. The current bus service is inadequate and increasing the frequency of buses will create problems.

Cirencester is essentially inaccessible from Ampney Crucis by walking, mainly because it is too far for most people to walk and also because there are no convenient routes, partly because the existing rights-of-way lead very indirectly to Cirencester.

Most Fridays, my husband and I walk from Ampney Crucis to Dobbies on the old Swindon-Cirencester road. Our route involves running across the Fairford road (the A417), which, even before the extraordinary development the CDC proposes, is already busy enough to make crossing dangerous, tramping through fields whose rights-of-way are not well maintained and which are very muddy in the winter, walking along the Driffield road, an essentially single-track road that carries 60 mile-an-hour traffic and is therefore dangerous for pedestrians, taking a farm road to the big A417 freeway which carries 70 mile-an-hour traffic, running across the freeway at a designated crossing, proceeding along roads that flood in rainy weather and often-muddy fields and then running across the Swindon-Cirencester road to Dobbies. Very few people do this walk and it is not cyclable. There are some cycle routes using smaller (60 mile-an-hour single track roads), but they require riding along very busy main roads at least some of the time.

There is no law against walking on the A417 from Ampney Crucis to Cirencester, and every now and then somebody attempts the walk because, for most of its length, the A417 has no pavements and the verge is usually too overgrown to accommodate pedestrians. Some people (mainly serious Lycra-clad cyclists) cycle along the A417. But cycling and especially walking on the A417 are extremely dangerous because the road has a lot of bends that drivers travelling at 50 or 60 miles an hour cannot see around.

Currently, buses to Cirencester are very infrequent. On weekends, we sometimes take the bus in to Cirencester and walk back, and the bus never has many passengers. If there were more frequent buses and if they stopped on the A417 during busy times, traffic on the A417 would be even heavier than it already is.

For these reasons, the proposed development in Ampney Crucis would not promote sustainable transport use and connectivity and reduce transport emissions by encouraging walking, cycling, and public transport

- Focus development on accessible locations with strong transport links.

Ampney Crucis clearly does not meet the first of these two requirements, because access is by car along single-track roads that already—before increasing the number of cars by a factor of 3.68--carry a dangerous amount of traffic.

Nor does it meet the second requirement, unless “strong transport links” refers to its proximity to the (already overburdened) Swindon-Gloucester motorway, meaning that its location qualifies the village as an excellent site for a dormitory suburb to house people who work in Swindon, Gloucester, or even Bristol.

Comment ID: 11004

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Carol Bezuidenhout

Comment: Question 6 – Do you agree with the vision and objectives? Or is there anything else

that should be covered in the vision and objectives? Please explain.

My response to Question 6 is organised using as headings points from the CDC's a—f "Objectives" list and the nested bullet points.

5.3 Objectives

a. Respond to the climate crisis through adaptation and mitigation

- Require all new development to be zero-carbon and climate-resilient.

Requiring all new development to be zero-carbon and climate-resilient is a laudable aim. But I wonder if the council is aware that "zero-carbon" targets can be met by "offsetting" greenhouse gas emissions by buying "carbon credits". This usually involves funding projects in other, less developed, parts of the world. (For example, see the web pages at <https://www.green.earth/> for an organisation called Green.Earth.) While such projects deserve funding from the developed world, they do nothing to reduce our own carbon footprint. Even if these projects succeed in reducing carbon emissions or sequestering carbon elsewhere in the world, the effect of carbon trading may be simply to whitewash the generation of new emissions here in the UK. Some carbon-trading schemes do not even result in a net reduction of greenhouse gases anywhere, as reported in a 2023 article in the Washington Post (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2023/02/10/australia-carbon-farming-climate-environment/>). Does the CDC intend to impose a requirement that does not allow developers to present climate-damaging development as zero-carbon by buying carbon credits? Does the CDC have the power to implement its recommendations?

- Support the provision of renewable energy schemes and promoting community owned renewables initiatives.

Renewable energy schemes sound like a good idea, but I wonder if the CDC or the central government will have the resources to administer them. There have been so many scams associated with such schemes that the energy saving trust has recently added advice to its website <https://energysavingtrust.org.uk/how-to-spot-an-energy-scam/> about how to avoid being scammed in relation to such schemes. How does the CDC intend to support the provision of renewable energy schemes that it does not administer while protecting homeowners from scammers?

Comment ID: 9543

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Carol Young

Comment: All given scenarios are unsupported by the Local Plan. They encourage individual communities to be engulfed by larger towns, so removing community identity. Extensive newbuild to increase stock by 300% is wholly detrimental to sustainable development.

Comment ID: 9545

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Carol Young

Comment: Absolutely not. This level of proposed development cannot be sustainable. There are minimal resources already, and Siddington is heavily reliant upon Cirencester for most services.

300% increase in properties would engulf Siddington into Cirencester losing our village identity and community

Comment ID: 9544

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Carol Young

Comment: The plan should consider the protection of village identity and community, lack of supportive infrastructure, increased risk of flooding making homes vulnerable.

Comment ID: 8868

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton has been treated most unfairly; it has very poor infrastructure and the travel times in settlement role and function study are incorrect. Because Mickleton has land owners who want to cash in on housing does not mean the land should be used so. It has already grown by 38% since 2014 but with no added facilities and has lost a post office and shop since.

Comment ID: 8870

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton already exports workers, it is the second highest exporter of workers in CDC, increasing the population by 62% will only cause more workers to be exported and hence more road use, buses are very infrequent and not at times useful for work off college. The considered choice of expanding Mickleton is not Green to the core

Comment ID: 8885

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Caroline

Comment: As I have already stated, choosing to expand Mickleton by 62% is crazy. It has no health services and these are more than 15 minutes drive (on a Tuesday at 10am - there are errors in your study). Similarly further education is more than 15 minutes drive. It will create enormous social challenges as the police have already found with the recent expansion Mickleton has had. Mickleton is already the second highest exporter of employees per your study so expanding the settlement by the scale your study has is totally unsustainable and not green to the core. Mickleton needs the Principle settlement status rescinded and the number of new homes drastically reduced. The self imposed rules by CDC has created very poorly serviced local planning in this case. How will CDC improve the roads, access to services, retail and employment for all the people they wish to house in Mickleton?

Comment ID: 8886

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Caroline

Comment: Expanding Mickleton by 62% is madness, there is very little infrastructure and poor road/bus access/ very little employment. The Principle settlement status need to be rescinded and quantity of houseing drastically reduced

Comment ID: 8887

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton can not sustain this scale of expansion. Mickletons principle settlement status needs to be rescinded, there are assumptions in your study that are inaccurate - travel times to further education and hospitals are both 18mins at 10:10 am on Tuesday (I have screen shots from google) also buses are so infrequent they can not be used for work/college/health care. The settlement is already the second highest exporter of employees in CDC. Policing is already a problem. Town planning must offer a duty of care to residents, the expansion will not be Green to the core or sustainable.

Comment ID: 8888

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Caroline

Comment: The vision may be well meaning, but by developing Mickleton it will create more car travel and build on land known to flood - so a well meaning vision will be totally ignored

Comment ID: 8873

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton does not have sufficient employment for its current population, it is the second highest exporter of workers in CDC. It does not have a retail centre, only having one convince store. It does not have health services with in the settlement and bus services are so poor that they are very hard to access without driving. It will create a social disaster expanding the settlement as per your suggestions

Comment ID: 8876

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Caroline

Comment: Housing needs to be provided where there is employment and facilities. If that means some affordable homes in the AONB it will reduce travel for those that work in the rural industry and keep families together, providing support within family groups. Expecting people to live in settlements with very little employment opportunities such as Mickleton will create additional road pressure

Comment ID: 8879

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Caroline

Comment: The allocation of Principle settlement to Mickleton can not be correct. The assumptions of travel time by car to hospital and further education are both wrong. As many residents were shocked to see your study suggests these journeys can be done in 15 minutes- on at Tuesdays at 10am. To respond to you I googled from Mickleton to both establishments at 10:10am on a Tuesday and both were 18 minutes. How can you study force speeding? What is the evidence of your study? I have screen shots of both journey times. Similarly giving Mickleton a score of 3 for population number is harsh as Mickleton has received a massive increase from 2014 with 3 new developments - there needs to be an element to your system to take recent expansion into account. There have been no added facilities and policing has been a problem

Comment ID: 8880

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Caroline

Comment: This would be sensible as it could keep families together to support each other. Mickleton offers very little employment, being a net exporter of employees, the primary school is full, there is only a confidence store and everything else has to be accessed by cars - but per your proposed scenario this is fine.

Comment ID: 8881

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Caroline

Comment: This would be sensible as it- but your studies need to be carried out fairly. Saying Mickleton is within 15 minutes drive time to further education/hospitals and well serviced by buses is nonsense- especially as you have chosen to expand the settlement by 62%

Comment ID: 8882

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton can not be determined as a principle settlement, drive times per your study are inaccurate - at 10:10 in Tuesday it is 18 minutes to both further education and hospital, also buses are so infrequent they are no use for work/education/health services. Adding 62% to Mickleton will create a social disaster and is very poor planning. Other Principle settlement are not receiving this expansion, just because land owners are will ing to sell to housing is not the correct way to build sustainable communities.

Comment ID: 8883

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton can not be determined as a principle settlement, drive times per your study are inaccurate - at 10:10 in Tuesday it is 18 minutes to both further education and hospital, also buses are so infrequent they are no use for work/education/health services. Adding 62% to Mickleton will create a social disaster and is very poor planning. Other Principle settlement are not receiving this expansion, just because land owners are will ing to sell to housing is not the correct way to build sustainable communities.

Comment ID: 8884

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Caroline

Comment: Mickleton has very poorly serviced by public transport. Most homes need one or two cars. Increasing density would not work as the cars will need to be parked

Comment ID: 9736

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Caroline Beale

Comment: I have real reservations about the proposal to increase the quantity of new housing around Moreton in Marsh by such a large amount.

Firstly, land and ecological issues

1. The land in this area is wet marshland and is not suitable for disproportionate amounts of building. Increasing the amounts of concrete in the ground will affect the water table even more, make the flooding risks even more serious for existing housing.
2. There are regular cases of houses flooding and getting flood insurance will be a serious problem.
3. The sewerage system is already at capacity.
4. The River Evenlode is already poisoned by overflowing sewers.
5. The roads are already subject to flooding and in Evenlode we regularly have Thames Water tankers pumping water away from the village and water pouring from manhole covers. The fields around Evenlode are waterlogged and often under water.
6. Whilst the immediate area southeast of Moreton is not AONB it is just on the edge of, arguably, an arbitrary border, and is still in a beautiful area of the Cotswolds including conservation villages of Broadwell, Evenlode and Chastleton. The views from Chastleton House across to Broadway Tower are just one example of land and view that should be protected, in my opinion.

Secondly, infrastructure issues

1. Whilst the station has been flagged as a reason for development, there is very little limited parking at the station. The car park is in a one way system which feeds out onto a major trunk road the A429.
2. Cars that cannot park at Moreton station take space in, and congest, the town centre.
3. Traffic issues are a real problem already in this area. The merging of the A429 and A44 is a major pinch point. Traffic is not only an issue for Moreton but also for Stow on the Wold so any idea of a bypass around Moreton will not alleviate the issue as it will just build up again, further down the A429.

4. The Evenlode road off the A44 is becoming a busy rat run for cars avoiding traffic in Moreton and Stow. There are three livery yards between Evenlode and Moreton meaning a lot of horses using this road. This road is narrow, poorly maintained and unlit making it really unsuitable for walkers, cyclists and horseriders who use this road regularly, to share with volumes of cars.

Thirdly, local facilities

1. There is no secondary school in Moreton and the nearest secondary school would be in Bourton on Water or Chipping Norton. There is one primary school - St David's which is running at capacity. More cars transporting children to and from school in other areas would massively add to traffic.

2. The doctors surgery is at capacity - regular waits of a month to get an appointment are already unacceptable.

I do appreciate the need for more nationwide housing but feel strongly that affordable housing should take precedence over executive housing which is overpriced and out of reach for young first time buyers. I also feel that building in rural areas needs to be especially carefully evaluated due to distance from major business hubs and the inherent available jobs. Brown field sites within large, efficiently planned towns with an urban nature should be prioritised for building over small country towns which cannot cope and will inevitably lose their identity completely.

As for Moreton in Marsh, there has already been a huge increase in housing over the last few years and I feel the town needs much more time to adapt to this for the above reasons of ecology, infrastructure and availability of facilities.

Yours ever

Caroline Beale

AnchorFarm, Evenlode

Comment ID: 10444

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: none of the options, they are based on meeting a requirement that is not realistic ie the population growth. Where are the jobs for these occupants? Where is the infrastructure?

Comment ID: 10446

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: Why would a council suggest something it knows is unsustainable?

Comment ID: 10447

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: No I do not support increasing housing density to match that of inner city housing with little if any outside space. The council would be storing up problems for decades to come if it supports unsuitable design just to meet an exercise demanded by a government which is increasingly discredited.

Comment ID: 10449

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: Concern that developers can speculatively put forward sites that are not suitable - flood/ conservation/ national landscape/ - and that these will get through and gain planning permission.

Comment ID: 10452

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: The lack of infrastructure is a real concern. The sewage system, water, schools, healthcare - these are all already under strain. Why proposed to build on a place known to flood as it is a marsh?? Moreton in Marsh.

Comment ID: 10457

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: All settlements - all will require investment into water; sewage; healthcare; education; police... the list goes on.

Comment ID: 10458

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Caroline Bullen

Comment: it is totally offensive that more space is given to considering traveller needs than discussion of any individual item listed in 4.9, all of which affect every individual within the area.

Comment ID: 9001

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: will the result of the Call for Sites be made publicly available and when?

Comment ID: 9004

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: Infrastructure is essential. For Tetbury, we need to consider the sewage works as it cannot currently cope with the population number. Healthcare facilities, utilities, education, roads, public transport all need to be matched to the housing target before approval is given. Tetbury also lacks sports facilities such as a swimming pool.

Comment ID: 8998

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: Qu1 Prefer option 4 as it is centred around public transport nodes. Building more houses in rural settlements such as Tetbury will just attract more wealthy retired people, not working people with families, and increase traffic congestion, which will have a negative environmental impact - unless public transport is improved.

Comment ID: 8999

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: CDC should lobby central government over the arbitrary housing target for Tetbury as I believe this is unsustainable in a small rural market town. The approach is not joined up and representations should be made to government and developers to address this before they plan to build more. e.g. the sewage works cannot cope with the current population, there is no employment there, there is no public transport in Tetbury, there is a shortage of medical facilities such as hospital and GPs. Also the road infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in traffic, as there are many narrow country lanes and the roads are getting noticeably busier. Additional housing should be centred around public transport and employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 9000

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: where appropriate yes, e.g. large towns, but not in Tetbury where this would be completely out of place. There is a high proportion of retired people, in the over 65 age group, who want 2 or 3 bed bungalows with small or medium sized gardens, not high rise with no garden, and not 4 or 5 bed executive homes. There is already a new higher density development being constructed in the centre of Tetbury which looks out of character for the town.

Comment ID: 9002

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Caroline Hose

Comment: The indicative target for Tetbury appears too high - it's about 10% of the current size by dwelling. See my earlier comments about lack of infrastructure. Tetbury would be ruined forever. We have enough new building going on here.

Comment ID: 10923

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Caroline Mumford

Comment: Scenarios requiring housing development to be provided in neighbouring authorities with far less of their land within the Cotswold National Landscape (CNL) would be preferable. In this respect the current review appears premature in the light of the imminent local government reorganisation, which might see Gloucestershire as one unitary authority. This would enable a more strategic approach to planning, that would allow the majority of development to be placed away from the CNL and its immediate vicinity and located with proximity to the major road network and employment hubs, for example along the M5, A417 and A38 corridors and with access to rail lines

Comment ID: 10936

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Caroline Mumford

Comment: No level of development to 2043 and beyond is not sustainable particularly in respect of Fairford which would more than double in size. This would completely change the character of the town which is currently focussed around the Market Place, church, High Street and London Road, and provides a good example of a 15 minute neighbourhood. An additional c1800 dwellings on top of the existing 1800 would require new schools, shops and car parking, for which there is no space in the town centre without removing the green spaces which form part of the character. At present Fairford forms a cohesive community which would be lost under the current preferred option.

Comment ID: 10942

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Caroline Mumford

Comment: Car parking

Burial grounds

Comment ID: 10946

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Caroline Mumford

Comment: The vision should include a commitment to conserve and enhance the character of the Cotswolds Market Towns

Comment ID: 9692

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Carolyn

Comment: 3 or 4 as previously stated for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.

Comment ID: 9694

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Carolyn

Comment: No!

Because it is just that , unsustainable, its going to increase the problems that already exist at the expense of the environment that is uniquely rural

Comment ID: 9695

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Carolyn

Comment: Re Poulton

Poulton is not a viable place to develop due to the following

:•Infrastructure Deficit: Poulton lacks essential services—public transport, schools, healthcare, shops—making it unsuitable for significant development.

•Transport Limitations: No viable public transport; reliance on cars increases congestion, emissions, and road safety risks.

•Flooding & Sewage Risks: Existing issues with flooding and inadequate sewage capacity; further development would worsen these problems. I have personally experienced these issues for 27 years and it is getting worse.

•Scale of Proposed Growth: Adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints.

•Environmental & Heritage Impact: Development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm rural character and Cotswold landscape.

•Affordable Housing Concerns: New housing often unaffordable for locals; risk of properties being bought by outsiders or used for Airbnb.

•Planning Process Issues: Lack of meaningful early engagement with Parish Councils; local knowledge on flooding and infrastructure often ignored.

•Preference for Strategic Growth: Support for focusing development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.

•Opposition to Dispersed Development: Small-scale allocations in villages seen as inefficient, environmentally damaging, and contrary to sustainability goals.

Poulton is Not a Sustainable Settlement

Comment ID: 9673

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Carolyn

Comment: The idea of using Non-Principal Settlements and

Village Clusters in this area, specifically Poulton and surrounding villages, makes no sense as they lack the necessary infrastructure and sustainability.

Namely public transport, schools, healthcare, shops, effective sewerage systems, broadband, mobile phone coverage and narrow roads with no footpaths

Comment ID: 9675

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Carolyn

Comment: As with Scenario 1 my comments are that the the idea of using Non-Principal Settlements and

Village Clusters in this area, specifically Poulton and surrounding villages, makes no sense as they lack the necessary infrastructure and sustainability.

Namely public transport, schools, healthcare, shops, effective sewerage systems, broadband, mobile phone coverage and narrow roads with no footpaths. Neither of these scenarios makes any sense, furthermore the scale of the proposed growth is out of proportion for small villages , with reference to Poulton adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints and development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm the rural character and Cotswold landscape.

Comment ID: 9678

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Carolyn

Comment: This makes more sense to focus development in main service centres or large strategic sites to enable infrastructure-led planning.

Comment ID: 9679

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Carolyn

Comment: As with scenario 3, this makes more sense to focus development in areas that are sustainable and enable infrastructure-led planning.

Comment ID: 9682

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Carolyn

Comment: As with Scenario 1 and 2 my comments are that the idea of using Non-Principal Settlements and

Village Clusters in this area, specifically Poulton and surrounding villages, makes no sense as they lack the necessary infrastructure and sustainability.

Namely public transport, schools, healthcare, shops, effective sewerage systems, broadband, mobile phone coverage and narrow roads with no footpaths. Neither of these scenarios makes any sense, furthermore the scale of the proposed growth is out of proportion for small villages , with reference to Poulton adding 30 dwellings (17% increase) is unsustainable given current unsustainable given current infrastructure and environmental constraints and development near conservation areas and open spaces would harm the rural character and Cotswold landscape. Creating new settlements in rural areas will not solve the infrastructure problems, only add to them.

Comment ID: 9985

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Caron Elizabeth Bradstreet

Comment: Local Plan Review (Regulation 18) – Poulton is Not a Sustainable Settlement

Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

Submission – Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review (Regulation 18)

Name: Caron Bradstreet

Address: Priory Fields, Cricklade street, Poulton. I am a resident]

Date: 31st Dec 2025

I object to the proposed housing allocation for Poulton.

Poulton is a non-sustainable rural village and does not have the essential facilities or infrastructure required to support further housing growth.

For Poulton to be considered sustainable, the following facilities would need to be in place or legally guaranteed before any development:

- Village-wide flood mitigation (not site-by-site)
- Adequate sewage and wastewater treatment capacity
- Full-fibre broadband (FTTP) to every dwelling
- Reliable indoor and outdoor mobile phone coverage
- Viable public transport (including evenings and weekends)
- Access to primary education capacity
- Access to GP, Dentist and healthcare services
- Safe highway capacity and traffic management

These facilities do not exist in Poulton and are not secured by the Local Plan.

Flooding and sewage problems are long-standing and unresolved, particularly around Ranbury, Bell Lane, Stoney Pool and the A417 bridge. Past development has already worsened flooding elsewhere.

Poulton also suffers from poor broadband speeds and unreliable mobile signal, resulting in digital exclusion. This restricts home working, access to NHS digital

services, emergency communications, education and day-to-day public services. Digital infrastructure is now essential infrastructure, equivalent to water or electricity.

Allocating housing in Poulton fails the Local Plan soundness tests: • Not positively prepared (known infrastructure deficits unresolved)

- Not justified (reasonable alternatives exist in sustainable locations)
- Not effective (no guaranteed delivery of infrastructure before occupation)
- Not consistent with national planning policy

Failing even one test makes a plan unsound. Poulton fails all four.

Poulton is not an appropriate location for further housing growth. Unless flood mitigation, sewage upgrades and full digital infrastructure are delivered and operational before occupation, the proposed allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

Caron Bradstreet

Comment ID: 9986

Location in consultation document: 3. Indicative figures

Name: Caron Elizabeth Bradstreet

Comment: Local Plan Review (Regulation 18) – Poulton is Not a Sustainable Settlement

Why Poulton Is Not a Sustainable Settlement for Housing Growth

Resident

Submission – Cotswold District Council Local Plan Review (Regulation 18)

Name: Caron Elizabeth Bradstreet

Address: Priory Fields, Cricklade street ,Poulton resident]

Date: 31st December 2025

I object to the proposed housing allocation for Poulton.

Poulton is a non-sustainable rural village and does not have the essential facilities or infrastructure required to support further housing growth.

For Poulton to be considered sustainable, the following facilities would need to be in place or legally guaranteed before any development:

- Village-wide flood mitigation (not site-by-site)
- Adequate sewage and wastewater treatment capacity
- Full-fibre broadband (FTTP) to every dwelling
- Reliable indoor and outdoor mobile phone coverage
- Viable public transport (including evenings and weekends)
- Access to primary education capacity
- Access to GP, Dentist and healthcare services
- Safe highway capacity and traffic management

These facilities do not exist in Poulton and are not secured by the Local Plan.

Flooding and sewage problems are long-standing and unresolved, particularly around Ranbury, Bell Lane, Stoney Pool and the A417 bridge. Past development has already worsened flooding elsewhere.

Poulton also suffers from poor broadband speeds and unreliable mobile signal, resulting in digital exclusion. This restricts home working, access to NHS digital

services, emergency communications, education and day-to-day public services. Digital infrastructure is now essential infrastructure, equivalent to water or electricity.

Allocating housing in Poulton fails the Local Plan soundness tests: • Not positively prepared (known infrastructure deficits unresolved)

- Not justified (reasonable alternatives exist in sustainable locations)
- Not effective (no guaranteed delivery of infrastructure before occupation)
- Not consistent with national planning policy

Failing even one test makes a plan unsound. Poulton fails all four.

Conclusion

Poulton is not an appropriate location for further housing growth. Unless flood mitigation, sewage upgrades and full digital infrastructure are delivered and operational before occupation, the proposed allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

Caron Bradstreet

Comment ID: 10921

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I understand the rational set out by the council to support option 5. However I feel there is a strong public interest argument for option 6. Please see my previous comment on option 6. I am happy to support either option 5 or 6.

Comment ID: 10928

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: The council should consider locating development in areas ot considers unsustainable as it is baing it's assumptions on current data which does not take into account the future requirements for the provision of affordable housing and future employment requirements / opportunities. The current plans do not take into account the detrimental impact of the significant additional transport infrastructure and burden that this will create within the reguon.

Comment ID: 10938

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I moved from London to the Cotswold specifically for the benefits of lower housing density and easy access to rural environments. Higher housing density is only appropriate for an urban environment. It is highly unsuitable for an ageing demographic.

With an increased level of urbanisation CDC / NHS Gloucestershire will need to plan a response to the associated decline in health outcomes associated with that. See <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935118303323> for a good meta analysis of the impact. The additional burden on the NHS should be taken into account here.

Comment ID: 10964

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I really can not see that the proposal to extend the sites in Cirencester, Fairford and Preston are sustainable without significant infrastructure investment specifically in terms of transport between major sites including Cirencester to Stow.

Looking at the proposed planning development of Fairford all the traffic for the additional dwellings to the east of Farmours School site. This will increase the number of houses by 60% and likewise you can expect a similar rise in traffic which will require additional roads to either go via quenington and Fairford or through Kempsford / the air base. This would double the amount of traffic through the only access routes through Fairford which are both single track roads and already subject to significant congestion.

Comment ID: 10970

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I don't see any consideration of the demographic changes to the population over the period or anything addressing the requirements for affordable housing for key professions such as teachers and health / care workers. Without looking at this any plans on infrastructure will be undeliverable due to the shortage of qualified professional staff.

Comment ID: 10971

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: O agree with the council vision and objectives but I don't see how the location and distribution of strategic developments will align to this as the additional in sustainable transport requirements that they will incur will be hard to address.

Comment ID: 10902

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: How has the definition of a principle centre been made and why are they not set out here?

Comment ID: 10903

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I have lived in CDC for over 20yrs and the absence of efective transport nodes to support people commuting within the locality for work has been the subject of ridicule in the area. The defacto position for the vast majority of workers is that you must have a car. Even if I'm using Kemble to commute to London or Cheltenham to Leeds I need a car. Therefor I think this is somewhat unrealistic.

Comment ID: 10910

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: I would disagree with the council's opinion with reference to it being 'against national policy' and argue there is a clear public interest.

Setting aside the National Landscape argument thee continues to be within this area a significant shortage of affordable housing for people in lower paid roles. Including, and specifically relevant here, agriculture as well as service industries, social care (your population demographic shows that this will increase) and small start up industries.

Without this you will see an unsustainable rise in traffic across the district which will in turn require significant investment in the road infrastructure which will have it's own detrimental impact on the environment.

Comment ID: 10913

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Catherine Dmpney

Comment: Looking towards Gloucester & Cheltenham who are better placed on all the criteria set out in the previous options (employment / infrastructure / transport) are they willing to work with CDC on a more coherent strategic approach to development?

Comment ID: 11050

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Catherine Lynn

Comment: The proposed increase in numbers in Moreton in Marsh and particularly in Preston seem to be disproportionately large. Certainly in Preston there are already issues with infrastructure and traffic movement. Increasing the number of homes by such a large percentage will destroy this historic community.

Comment ID: 10195

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Cathryn Brickley

Comment: I agree with the council that this is the best scenario since it is the only option which proposes properly planning new settlements. In my view, given the lack of infrastructure in many existing settlements, the only way of coping with such a large population increase is to plan for it from the beginning of the development to ensure enough new surgeries, schools and local jobs.

Comment ID: 8964

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Charles

Comment: 4

Comment ID: 8965

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Charles

Comment: 4. Public transport access is imperative parking and traffic are making the Cotswolds look like a car park. Improving urban density around public transport hubs is the best way to reduce their impact.

Comment ID: 8966

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Charles

Comment: Yes! Traditional Cotswold villages had higher urban densities this should be maintained to keep towns and villages walkable and allow for cost effective public services. This should also incorporate mixed use development and utilise the extra space for public lands (parks and paths) to maintain good space and character in the assigned locations.

Comment ID: 8967

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Charles

Comment: Parking has not been addressed. The increased number of residents require more space in already overrun towns. The Cotswolds should be looking at tourist taxes and paid parking to fund underground parking structures in historic towns and beauty spots to maintain their attraction and allow better accessibility.

Comment ID: 8745

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Charles Caswell

Comment: Is there any point making any comment such as I fear the building plan is far too large for the current infrastructure of the area such as roads,sewerage,hospitals,flood plains or have all the decisions already been made and it doesn't matter what anyone thinks the building will go ahead anyway?

Comment ID: 8744

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Charles Caswell

Comment: If there really has been consultation why have the residents of Moreton-in-Marsh recently have a funeral day for the death of the old town and it appears none of their concerns are being listened to in the slightest

Comment ID: 8743

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Charles Caswell

Comment: Is this really a local plan or is it the council bending to pressure from the government in relation to their build,build,build plan to grow the economy which so far appears to have had no effect at all

Comment ID: 9584

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: How can this proposal claim to be Green to the Core in terms of protecting the environment. I don't see how trebling the size of a village such as Ampney Crucis whilst permanently destroying the natural environment to the north of the village could in any way seen to be "green".

Comment ID: 9585

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: I would like to understand how the CDC proposes the development of 600+ houses to the north of Ampney Crucis would be supported by the necessary infrastructure requirements especially with a view to:

- education
- transport (sustainable access)
- flood management
- water supply and waste water
- utilities

Comment ID: 10125

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: Scenario 1 or Scenario 4. Development should be focused around existing Principal Settlements and Transport nodes.

Comment ID: 10126

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: No for all the reasons I have listed in my comments to 2.16 (Scenario 5)

Comment ID: 9581

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: Re land to north of Ampney Crucis.

No the proposal is not sustainable. Ampney Crucis is a small linier village of circa 240 dwellings. It has 1 primary school, no shops and no other amenities beyond a pub on the A417. It is also accessed either by the A417 or very small country lanes to the north. The proposed development would not be able to access the A417 given there would be no ability to widen the roads from the village given existing housing already in situ. Instead, for an additional 600+ houses a whole new road infrastructure would need to be developed joining the B4435 Barnsley - Cirencester road. Any new road layout in this location would have a massive detrimental environmental impact on what is today an area made up of beautiful fields and country lanes. This proposal would be destroying natural landscape right on the boundary of the Cotswold National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10117

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: My comments relate specifically to the proposal of 600+ houses north of Ampney Crucis.

I believe from a planning perspective the proposal is unsound. It will have a significant detrimental impact on the historic environment, landscape and setting of a small Cotswold village with Domesday origins and a designated conservation area. This location compared with strategic alternatives identified elsewhere in the district does not make sense.

Ampney Crucis is identified in the existing and emerging Local Plan as a small, non-principal settlement, where development is expected to be limited to modest, proportionate growth, reflecting its size, services and sensitive rural context. The current strategy rightly focuses major growth on Cirencester and other larger settlements with better transport links, services and capacity.

The proposed extension of around 600+ houses would triple, the number of dwellings associated with Ampney Crucis, transforming it from a small historic village into an urban extension of Cirencester. This quantum of development is fundamentally at odds with the settlement's role in the hierarchy and with the "proportionate growth in villages" approach promoted in national policy, which expects plan-makers to direct the largest schemes to the most sustainable locations.

By forcing a strategic-scale allocation onto one of the smallest and most sensitive settlements in the district, the plan ceases to be a coherent expression of its own spatial strategy, and therefore fails the soundness test of being "justified" by a reasonable and proportionate evidence base.

The proposed development would:

- Introduce a large, modern estate-scale form of development immediately adjacent to and visually prominent in views towards and from the conservation area and listed buildings.

- Sever the historic relationship between the village and its surrounding open countryside, which currently provides an essential part of its character and setting as a compact rural settlement in the Cotswold landscape.

- Substantially alter the scale of Ampney Crucis such that an historic village would become a minor remnant at the edge of a much larger housing estate, undermining the very qualities the conservation area designation is intended to protect.

- The Council's own development strategy acknowledges the sensitivity of historic villages and the importance of protecting landscape and heritage assets, particularly within the Cotswolds National Landscape. There is no evidence that this has been properly weighed against the scale of development now proposed. In the absence of compelling evidence that the harm is limited and can be genuinely mitigated, allocating such a large site here cannot be reconciled with the requirement to conserve heritage significance and landscape character, and is therefore not consistent with national policy.

In terms of transport, traffic and infrastructure capacity a development on this scale will place significant additional pressure on the A417 and its junctions, in a corridor already subject to change and stress. In addition the local village roads and lanes will not accommodate the volume and type of traffic associated with an estate of 600+ homes, including service and delivery traffic. Further there is no clear or funded plan for local education, health care and utilities infrastructure.

The development strategy options papers identify a number of potential strategic locations, including:

- strategic extensions and intensification at Cirencester and other Principal/Key Settlements.

- a potential new settlement near Driffield and other locations with better access to strategic transport networks and services.

My understanding is the plan is required to choose the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. At present there is no clear evidence that a 600+ home allocation at a small, historic village like Ampney Crucis performs better than, or even comparably to, these alternatives in terms of sustainability, infrastructure, landscape and heritage impact.

Related to this, and I note I am not clear on landowner sentiment to the various development proposals of Scenario 5, I believe some strategic options are constrained by landowner willingness to develop. My understanding is this should be a matter for further engagement and not a reason to default to a clearly less suitable location. My understanding is that national guidance on land availability makes clear that suitability and conformity with policy cannot be sacrificed simply because one landowner is more willing to develop than another.

Therefore for the reasons set out above, the proposed strategic allocation north of Ampney Crucis is:

Not justified; as it conflicts with the settlement hierarchy and there is no robust comparative evidence showing it is a better choice than alternative strategic locations.

Not effective; as there is insufficient evidence that the site can be delivered with the necessary infrastructure and mitigation in a timely and viable manner within the plan period.

Not consistent with national policy; as it fails to safeguard the historic environment and landscape character of a small Domesday-origin Cotswold village and does not reflect the requirement to direct major growth to the most sustainable settlements.

Comment ID: 10122

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Charles Rupert Finch

Comment: See my comments against 2.16 (Scenario 5)

Comment ID: 8950

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Charlie

Comment: I am writing to object to the proposed allocation of Area 19 for a new settlement of 840 dwellings (with potential expansion towards 2,000+ homes) in the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan. Based on the evidence available, including the Parish Council's detailed analysis, the proposal fails key tests of soundness and presents substantial unresolved harms to the local environment, infrastructure, character and public safety.

1. Local Amenity and Enjoyment of the Area

The proposal would dramatically alter the rural landscape setting of Driffield and Harnhill, which are small historic settlements characterised by tranquillity, open countryside, and a tight-knit community structure.

The Parish Council notes that only a small portion of the land within Area 19 is genuinely available, making it impossible to deliver a well-planned "new village" with proper services, green infrastructure and separation from existing settlements .

Without clarity on the full land parcel, the indicative 840 homes would result in compression of development into an unsuitable footprint, leading to harm to visual amenity, loss of rural character, and over-intensification.

The Council's Local Plan Vision aims to protect "homes, landscape, livelihoods – a legacy we build together" . Locating a large new town immediately adjacent to a rural village with no facilities conflicts with this objective.

2. Traffic and Highway Safety

Existing access routes around Driffield and Harnhill are narrow, winding, and frequently made unsafe or impassable due to flooding.

Key evidence includes:

The Harnhill–Driffield lane floods 5–6 times per year, including to depths of 40cm above the crown of the road, enough to float a vehicle .

Even modest rainfall (40mm in 24 hours) is sufficient to sever access between villages.

Development pressures in nearby Ampney Crucis and Preston—also proposed growth areas—would further channel traffic through Driffield and Harnhill.

The Local Plan’s own transport policy INF3 requires development to avoid severe impacts on the network and deliver safe access. There is no feasible highway mitigation that can overcome the recurrent flood closures and narrow rural road geometry without causing significant landscape harm.

3. Flooding, Drainage and Environmental Impact

This is the most critical constraint, and the evidence is unequivocal.

Ampney Brook Catchment Sensitivity

Area 19 lies within a highly sensitive surface water catchment, where:

The land already channels large volumes of run-off directly through Driffield and Harnhill, frequently overwhelming downstream capacity.

Flooding persists despite routine ditch maintenance and previous highway interventions.

Dualing of the A419 further worsened run-off into the catchment.

Any loss of infiltration capacity from development will increase flooding severity and frequency—a risk the Parish Council emphasises clearly .

Sewage Infrastructure Failure

The existing foul drainage system is already at or beyond capacity:

The pumping station serving only ~60 homes routinely fails under heavy rainfall, requiring emergency tankering by Thames Water.

In 2023–24, raw sewage was discharged into floodwater, polluting properties and the Ampney Brook environment .

CDC policy CC5 (Managing Flood Risk) and CC6 (Water Infrastructure) require firm evidence that development will not increase off-site flood risk or overwhelm existing systems.

At present, the evidence strongly indicates the opposite.

Furthermore, the plan acknowledges that increased flows into the River Churn could worsen flooding in Cirencester, an area that already experiences high vulnerability.

This alone justifies removal of Area 19 from consideration.

4. Character, Design and Settlement Pattern

The proposal is inconsistent with the adopted and emerging development strategy, which seeks to:

Focus growth in Principal Settlements,

Support sustainability through access to services, transport links, employment, and

Avoid dispersal of major development into rural areas without existing infrastructure.

The Preferred Options Consultation highlights several spatial strategy scenarios, with the Council's preferred approach relying on evidence-led sustainable locations, not speculative new villages without demonstrable land availability .

Area 19 is:

Not adjacent to a Principal Settlement,

Lacks services, employment, public transport, schools, shops or medical provision,

And would impose a new town-size development onto a hamlet-scale landscape.

This undermines the settlement hierarchy and contradicts Local Plan policies DS1, DS2 and DS3 on appropriate location of growth.

5. Economic and Social Considerations

A new community of 840–2,000 homes would require:

A new primary school

Healthcare provision

Public transport connections

Retail, community spaces, employment land

Multi-million-pound upgrades to drainage and highways infrastructure

None of these are secured, evidenced, or deliverable within the land actually available.

This risks creating an unsustainable, car-dependent dormitory settlement, placing severe pressure on Cirencester for all services.

Conversely, the environmental and infrastructure costs—including potential exacerbation of flooding downstream—pose significant economic risks to existing residents and the wider district.

The Plan must demonstrate that development is justified, effective, and deliverable. Area 19 currently meets none of these criteria.

Conclusion: Area 19 Should Be Removed from the Local Plan

Based on the submitted evidence, Area 19 is not a sound or sustainable location for a new settlement of 840 homes. It would:

Increase flood risk locally and downstream,

Worsen sewage system failures,

Create unsafe and unmitigable transport conditions,

Damage landscape character and rural amenity,

Require services and infrastructure that cannot be viably delivered,

Contradict the Council's own spatial strategy principles.

I therefore request that Area 19 is removed from the site allocations at the next stage of the Local Plan.

I support the Parish Council's evidence-based objection and urge CDC to pursue alternative locations identified as more sustainable within the Preferred Options.

Comment ID: 10796

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Charlotte Pink

Comment: None of the proposed scenarios achieves a balanced distribution of growth required for the District that is realistic and deliverable for the plan period as National Landscape(NL) has been excluded and the Council have not provided any evidence that they have carried out an appropriate assessment of sites within NL to justify their exclusion. This methodology is flawed, lacks transparency and risks creating an unsustainable concentration of housing in locations chosen purely because they are outside the NL and without a feasible plan for the delivery of infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) encourages 'balanced growth' (Paras 8 and 73), is aspirational and deliverable (Para16(b)) with an overall strategy for infrastructure provision (Para 20). The document does not comply and requires a robust landscape assessment of areas within the NL which can be developed without compromising its character. It is simply disingenuous to suggest that some 70% to 80% of the District is not capable of supporting sustainable, deliverable housing without an appropriate evidence base.

Comment ID: 10813

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Charlotte Pink

Comment: None of the scenarios provide a plan for balanced and deliverable growth. Scenario 5 could be the base to achieve the housing numbers but it would need to be adapted as follows:

1. Distribute development proportionately across both principal and non-principal settlements, including those within the National Landscape, where evidence supports capacity for modest growth and considers landscape impact.
2. Avoid clustering development around Cirencester, there are many other Principal and non-principal settlements some within the Cotswold National Landscape area which can accept strategic extensions.
3. Ensure that the evidence base includes a sound landscape assessment as the driver to select locations for growth.
4. Ensure the locations chosen for development are supported by an infrastructure delivery plan.

Comment ID: 10830

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Charlotte Pink

Comment: In an ideal world No, although in making decisions on the direction of growth, para 36 of the NPPF requires plans to be 'justified', that is supported by proportionate evidence. On this basis the proposed strategic allocation at Ampney Crucis is unsustainable and is not supported by the Councils own evidence base as follows:

1. The Settlement Role and Function Study confirms that Ampney Crucis does not meet any of the criteria for a strategic extension, classifying it as 'rural' in the settlement role. It is a low-scoring settlement within the settlement hierarchy and is correctly classified as a rural village with limited services.
2. The Integrated Impact Assessment fails to consider Ampney Crucis as a settlement within the setting of the National Landscape. The NPPF considers that development 'should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts' on area designations. How can the proposed addition of 660 homes which is by an measure 'large scale development' be 'sensitively located' when the Councils landscape impact assessment of Broad Zone 18 relating to Ampney Crucis states: 'The elevated and open character of Broad Zone 18, combined with its rural setting and proximity to the Cotswold National Landscape to the north, limits its capacity for large-scale development'.

Comment ID: 10842

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Charlotte Pink

Comment: Without more evidence on infrastructure delivery across the District it cannot be robustly concluded that the proposed level of development is sustainable. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is surely a must have piece of evidence to support both the scenarios and the development proposals for housing sites. This is a failure of the Consultation and a requirement of the NPPF (para 20).

To use the proposed extension of Ampney Crucis as an example:

If it were to proceed as indicated, the scale of growth would effectively create a settlement comparable in size to Northleach. Such an increase in population would fundamentally alter the character of Ampney Crucis from a small rural village to a much larger settlement, requiring a comprehensive range of additional services and facilities to function sustainably. These would include:

1. A new GP surgery or medical centre, supported by sustainable transport links, to meet the needs of a significantly larger population.
2. At least one new primary school and potentially an expansion of existing facilities, in line with Department for Education standards.
3. Shops, small supermarkets, and essential services such as pharmacies to reduce reliance on accessibility to Cirencester.
4. Enhanced public transport services to connect Ampney Crucis with Cirencester and other principal settlements, reducing car dependency.
5. Allocation of employment land for small business units or light industrial uses to provide local jobs, to avoid dependency on employment in Cirencester or further afield.

Without these provisions, the development would replicate Ampney Crucis current unsustainable location, as identified in the Settlement Role and Function Study and would make the allocation financially undeliverable, compromising delivery of the overall housing numbers in the Plan.

Comment ID: 10858

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Charlotte Pink

Comment: No because to answer that question the vision and objective must be supported by a robust evidence base. At the moment the vision and objectives are merely words not connected to the reality of the housing sites allocated in the plan. In relation to the Strategic Objectives, the new local plan must fully recognise and assess the role that ALL existing settlements can play in meeting housing needs you cannot exclude almost 80% of the District from new development without the evidence. The NPPF requires plans to promote sustainable patterns of development and make effective use of land by considering proximity to existing services and transport networks, presumably wherever they are in the District.

As an example the proposed allocation at Ampney Crucis suggested by the Council seems to contradict the very objectives set out in the Plan document as follows:

1. The number of dwellings proposed at Ampney Crucis would represent a disproportionate addition to a rural village with limited services. The amount of housing would not provide the required infrastructure to offer the 'employment opportunities' and 'essential services' set out in the vision, the additional housing would, in effect, result in a significant development that would struggle to integrate within the existing community. Ampney Crucis is a healthy vibrant community that is valued by its residents.
2. The NPPF, at paragraph 8, recognises that sustainable development includes a social role for planning to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities. It highlights that planning policies should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take "local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.'
3. This clearly has not been considered as part of this process. Apart from the physical changes that would occur and be clearly out of character with the historical and natural character of the village, a sizeable expansion of the village would take the community some time to adapt, which in turn could have adverse consequences for the social and cultural wellbeing of existing residents. Whilst additional housebuilding in the village is not opposed on a point of principle, it is more a question of scale and the lack of substantive evidence to demonstrate that any allocation is sound.

4. The size of the development would be out of scale with the existing, historic, rural character, creating an incongruous physical relationship between the historical development pattern and the new development and in conflict with the proposed vision and objectives set out within the evidence base to date.

Comment ID: 8636

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Cherry

Comment: More put on our council tax for emptying holiday home bins. They need commercial bins. Businesses in village are using litter bins

Comment ID: 8637

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Cherry

Comment: Pages too much to read and comment

Comment ID: 8635

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Cherry Taylor

Comment: Too many holiday and second homes. Bourton on the water has maybe 2000 houses with a population of 2000? There are well over 500 holiday homes and probably nearer to 1000 with second homes. The council on behalf on residence in tourist hotspots need to lobby central government. There needs to be more tax on holiday homes. Restrictions on how many there can be in one village. Section 157 on ex authority houses is often ignored. Estate agent know how to get around this. Which is wrong. It was put on for reasons. For locals. More houses built should have this on. More and more family homes have been bought since Covid and turned into holiday homes. When homes are built they have been for well above £500,000. Locals can't afford. So for outsiders. Most retiring or living here but travelling outside the area to work. Locals have to move out as rents too high as landlords now do holiday homes as they make more money. Better help for landlords to do long term rentals. More incentives. Our locals move elsewhere and then that areas has a housing problem. Then in turn more homeless. There should be no need for homeless. There are plenty of 3 bedroom houses. Local authority with one person and have been in that house for 20 plus years. Once a sole person in a house they need to be offered a small house after a year or two. So a family can have. Many on benefits living in a larger house. It may have been a family home but they have moved out or died. They need more sheltered housing, flats in the same area. More support with moving. Locals have low paid seasonal jobs so can't afford inflated prices due to holiday homes. We need some but as many. Lots owned by foreign investors. So the money goes out of the country. The more houses means less fields. Mental health struggles and not enough doctors and schools.

Comment ID: 9909

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Chiquita Henson, Trust Lead (CEO)

Comment: We recognise the need for new and affordable housing in the area.

We are concerned to ensure the educational infrastrucutre, both primary and secondary, is in place, builds on the provision made by local schools and is sustainable.

The Corinium Education Trust currently has 6 schools and is currently working with Bathurst Developments Limited and Gloucestershire County Council in preparation for opening a new primary school to serve the Steadings. This has been postponed for a number of reasons, not least the dip in the birth rate and capacity across the town's other schools.

We seek to ensure that as new residential developments are planned and approved, significant thought is given to expanding existing schools through Section 106 funding, especially in areas like, Kemble, Siddington, Down Ampney and Ampney Crucis, rather than building new schools. Local schools currently have the space for expansion and larger schools, 1 or 2 form entry, are more sustainable than smaller schools.

The Corinium Education Trust and, we are sure other schools locally in partnership with GCC's primary and secondary place planning team, would be open to a conversation about how best we can support the new developments and serve all children and families effectively, by providing access to high quality education together.

Comment ID: 9911

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Chiquita Henson, Trust Lead (CEO)

Comment: We recognise the need for new and affordable housing in the area.

We are concerned to ensure the educational infrastrucutre, both primary and secondary, is in place, builds on the provision made by local schools and is sustainable.

The Corinium Education Trust currently has 6 schools and is currently working with Bathurst Developments Limited and Gloucestershire County Council in preparation for opening a new primary school to serve the Steadings. This has been postponed for a number of reasons, not least the dip in the birth rate and capacity across the town's other schools.

We seek to ensure that as new residential developments are planned and approved, significant thought is given to expanding existing schools through Section 106 funding, especially in areas like, Kemble, Siddington, Down Ampney and Ampney Crucis, rather than building new schools. Local schools currently have the space for expansion and larger schools, 1 or 2 form entry, are more sustainable than smaller schools.

The Corinium Education Trust and, we are sure other schools locally in partnership with GCC's primary and secondary place planning team, would be open to a conversation about how best we can support the new developments and serve all children and families effectively, by providing access to high quality education together.

Comment ID: 8711

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Chloe Jacquet

Comment: This appears entirely unbalanced. Why is Siddington bearing such a disproportionate amount of new homes? To nearly triple the size of the village will completely denature it, destroy its community feel and compromise its separateness from Cirencester. It will also mean the loss of many of the beautiful green spaces surrounding the village which are one of its main attractions. The burden of development needs to be distributed more evenly.

Comment ID: 9147

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Chris

Comment: The plan talks about ensuring that the new builds are supported by appropriate new infrastructure (schools, surgeries, shops, transport etc.). However, it does not seem to take account of existing issues before making the future choice. For example where I live in Fairford, the A417 sees very significant traffic already and the resultant congestion due to narrow carriageway and HGVs. This can only increase given that the town doubles in size as per the preferred plan. Access to the current schools is a similar issue with local roads and estates blocked by school buses and parents with cars ferrying children to and from school at the start and end of each day.

Existing poor conditions and deficits need to be addressed at the earliest stage!

Comment ID: 9547

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris

Comment: Of the options presented I believe Option 3 should be selected. This is because the principal driver for locating new development should be need based on employment. Employment should either be local or readily accessible via public transport (preferred) or private transport. There is a secondary driver of need which relates to access to affordable housing for current residents and their families.

The problem for places like Mickleton if Option 5 is adopted is that it fails to address all these aspects of primary need. There is limited local employment. While there is some employment in local towns such as Evesham and Stratford-upon-Avon, the nearest major centres of employment are more than 20 miles distant at Warwick, Worcester, Cheltenham, Oxford, and Birmingham.

Bus services to/from these locations are inadequate in terms of frequency, reliability, and period of operation. There is no public transport to the nearest mainline station at Honeybourne. For private transport to be efficient and viable the road system would need to be significantly upgraded as congestion and danger to pedestrians and cyclists are real issues right now, let alone after significant additional development.

The number of affordable houses needed in Mickleton is relatively small compared to the potential number of new houses being considered. These could and should be managed through smaller windfall developments on a local level.

Why was a combination of Options 3 and 4 not considered? This would much better meet the needs for employment and transport to/from centres of employment, and presumably the number of dwellings achievable would be somewhere between 9,190 (scenario 4) and 18,610 (sum of scenarios 3 & 4).

Comment ID: 9548

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris

Comment: This answer is dependent on the context. Further development in close proximity to existing areas of high(er) density housing makes sense as continuity of community is maintained. Ditto for significant new developments (Garden Village, New Towns). The decision should be based on conflict with existing community and impact on the landscape and character of a settlement rather than the benefits of one style of housing versus another.

Comment ID: 9549

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Chris

Comment: No. Unlike Central Government who have the luxury of either kicking cans down the road, or not being around to face the consequences for their poor decisions, populations need to have decisions made for the long term. This means having principles in addition to legislation. If the nice words in the draft plan are to have any meaning then the principles on which they are based need to be defended vigorously whenever they are challenged. Sustainability is one of those principles.

Comment ID: 9550

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris

Comment: All the following comments relate to Mickleton, and are divided into 2 parts.

First is identification of a number of factual errors and questionable assumptions that I believe have Mickleton misrepresented as a Principal Settlement. Second is specific areas where any further development in Mickleton should be considered unsustainable until these areas are addressed.

Mickleton as a Principal Settlement

Data issue 1 – Windfall Estimation

From Table 2 in the Preferred Options Consultation, Mickleton is shown with an estimated 15% windfall based on the existing dwellings number. This is the highest of all Principal Settlements by 50%, the next nearest being Andoversford at 10% of existing. This is grossly unfair for Mickleton as it is projecting forward from an existing historic injustice. In the 2010s it was proposed Mickleton could sustainably receive up to 80 new dwellings. Between 2010 and 2020 the actual number of new dwellings across 3 new developments totalled almost 240, three times the proposed number. Such was the scale of overdevelopment the Latest version of the Local Plan deemed there should be no further development in Mickleton to the expected end of that plan (around 2034). During this period of housing expansion there was no expansion of infrastructure, in fact there was a reduction in infrastructure services following closure of the Post Office and failure to deliver a promised GP surgery. Using this historic overdevelopment as justification for yet more overdevelopment is inequitable.

Data issue 2 – Non-strategic and Strategic Allocations

Again, from Table 2 in the Preferred Options Consultation, Mickleton has the highest non-strategic allocation at 46% of existing dwellings. The next nearest is again Andoversford at 16%. The average for all Principal Settlements is 7%. How can such a disproportionate increase be justified, particularly when set against the historic overdevelopment noted above?

When strategic allocations are included Mickleton ranks 5th overall with an expansion of 62%, and yet Mickleton possesses few of the infrastructure services associated with a Principal Settlement and will not benefit from the kind of infrastructure investment that would be expected from places receiving more strategic allocations.

Data issue 3 – Average Drive Times

Table 9 in the Settlement Role and Function Study contains a number of errors:

- The nearest true Supermarkets are located in either Stratford-upon-Avon or Evesham, neither of which is within a 15-minute drive from Mickleton.

This should be presented as 'poor' not 'fair'.

- There is no Hospital within a 15-minute drive. The nearest is at Moreton-in-Marsh, at least 20 minutes by car. The nearest A&E is at Gloucester Royal, 48 minutes away.

This should be presented as 'poor' not 'fair'.

- There is no Library in Mickleton. The nearest is at Chipping Campden.

This should be presented as 'fair' not 'good'.

- There is a 6th Form at Chipping Campden but there is no FE College within a 15-minute drive.

This should be presented as 'poor' not 'fair'.

All the above means the statement made in para 4.17 is incorrect in regard to Mickleton.

Data issue 4 – Sustainable Transport

The data presented in Table 10 is misleading. The only walkable 'key service' in Mickleton is the 'Primary School', however even this is problematic for numerous safety reasons; limited traffic calming, narrow roads without pavements, only one pedestrian crossing, excessive traffic volumes.

Similarly, the selection of an arbitrary travel time of Tuesday morning for journey consideration is understandable for generating statistical comparisons but does not reflect the real world of travel by bus in Mickleton. Timetables are essentially limited to main day hours, and frequencies / reliability are insufficient for any fixed-time appointment.

Data issue 5 – Settlement Scores and Employment Role

Table 12 positions Mickleton with the 3rd highest Employment density of all settlements. At 139.5% basic maths rounding would portray this as 140%, which would qualify for a reduction of 2 points rather than the 1 used in the calculation.

Using corrected data in the Settlement calculation for Mickleton:

Settlement Size = 3

Employment Role = 1 (or 0 if the 139.5% is rounded to 140%)

Services and Facilities = 4

With a total of 8 (or 7) Mickleton remains in the 'unclear' middle ground, however with a reduced Services and Facilities score of 4 it should not be classified as a Principal Settlement as paragraph 5.17 states "Settlements with a score above 4: Principal Settlement".

Setting aside the mathematics, paragraph 5.15 states "The identification of these different types of settlement promotes sustainable development by linking housing growth to the availability of jobs, facilities and services; therefore reducing the need to travel and supporting the vitality and viability of local facilities". This statement alone should rule out Mickleton from being considered as a Principal Settlement.

The nearest Supermarkets are 9 miles away. The nearest 'A' roads are more than 6 miles distant. People having to travel to work is the 3rd worst number of all settlements and yet the road infrastructure and public transport systems are woefully inadequate. Combine this with the history of overdevelopment that has been imposed on Mickleton and it is clear that Mickleton should only be classified as a Principal Settlement if there is a huge and committed plan for all aspects of infrastructure.

Making Mickleton ready for sustainable development

Just about every aspect of sustainability is under stress already in Mickleton, so any further development will need significant investment in the following, with the first 3 being the top 3 issues expressed by residents.

1. Traffic calming, additional pedestrian crossings, and the creation of footpaths.
2. Expansion of the Primary School and the introduction of Nursery services.
3. Rebuilding of the Sports Pavillion at the Senior Playing Field.
4. Enhancements to the bus timetable for greater frequency, extended hours, and connection to the nearest railway station at Honeybourne.
5. Water infrastructure for both supply and waste.
6. Access to expanded GP and dental services at Chipping Campden or Meon Vale, or possibly within the village directly.
7. Provision of a proper parking area at the village centre, particularly for those visiting the shop.

Comment ID: 9551

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Chris

Comment: Many smaller settlements struggle with 2 issues that might be considered in this category.

Firstly, Village Hall / Community Centres are critical parts of the social infrastructure. They need to be of adequate scale and be well provisioned with flexible facilities for catering, presenting, meetings, configurable rooms etc. They also need to have adequate parking, as does the community 'centre' in general.

Second, there must be provision for youth engagement. Delinquency and anti-social behaviour amongst juveniles is a growing problem in rural communities. Sport is one option that helps but is not sufficient.

Comment ID: 9552

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Chris

Comment: The vision and objectives are good as a set of words, but are worthless unless delivered without compromise.

Comment ID: 9656

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Chris

Comment: In the absence of a more appropriate place to post suggestions on strategic and methodological aspects of the Council's approach to this consultation, I post them here and refer back to this comment when responding on more specific issues below.

SUGGESTIONS ON STRATEGY AND METHODOLOGY

SPEED. The Council is racing to adopt a Plan as swiftly as possible to counter the perceived evil of loss of control due to lack of housing supply, but as a result is causing a greater evil, namely proposing choice of an Scenario (5) necessitating massive over-development in “extensions” such as proposed at Moreton-in-Marsh without being able to demonstrate to the public in a way that is at all comprehensible how such extensions would look, be managed, or the infrastructural master-plan needed to make them at all acceptable. This is putting the cart before the horse: I suggest that a full explanatory masterplan is required before putting the options before the public for consultation.

It is also rushing CDC residents into a “locked in” position of Planned over-development when the very near future (in relative terms) could see the position change (and allow less devastating targets to be set) due to the introduction of much larger unitary councils, the potential for the Government to be persuaded to review its inappropriate algorithm, and the potential for change in Government policies as a result of elections. I suggest that taking due time to consider master-planning and giving the public details to reflect upon would also reap potential benefits in terms of these changes in the planning environment.

LOCKING IN POST-2043 OVER-DEVELOPMENT TARGETS

To quote the Council’s excellent letter to the Secretary of State dated 23rd October 2025, the housing targets set by the Government are “by any measure, unrealistic... eye-watering... would irreversibly change the character of our world-renowned area... [do] not sufficiently reflect the constraints we face; [and are] entirely disproportionate.” They also risk damaging the Council’s laudable policy aims of delivering more genuinely affordable and socially rented homes.

For all of these reasons, it is particularly disappointing that the Council expresses a preference for Spatial strategy Scenario 5 when it includes proposals to allocate strategic sites for massive further development beyond the 2043 Plan period, thus locking-in for decades to come the very damage that the Council points out to the Secretary of State. As the Council itself admits, once allocated in the Plan there is no putting the genie back in the bottle; and there is no guarantee that these allocations will not come earlier (rather than post-2043). Taking the “strategic extension” to Moreton in Marsh as an example, a further 2,260 homes (on top of the 1,710 new homes suggested for the Plan period) will be “locked in” – Moreton will be destined to be 250% bigger than its current size, sprawling to the North, South and East into the Special Landscape Area, and permanently undermining its ability to act as a suitable gateway to the Cotswolds National Landscape.

This “locking in” of the over-development that the Council itself is opposed to would be a disastrous and unnecessary strategic error, when in the short-to-medium term the planning policy environment may well improve (at least from the point of view of the Cotswolds area) due to a) the impending arrival of one or two unitary councils for Gloucestershire, which will mean that planning policy and housing distribution can be viewed across a much broader area which is less constrained by the Cotswolds National Landscape; b) the potential for the Government to be persuaded to “u-turn” on its algorithm which provides such “unrealistic” targets for an area like the Cotswolds (we have seen plenty of u-turns already); and c) the potential for a change of Government and thus policies at the next national elections.

I urge the Council to think again about this approach - adopt a Plan that minimises the damage, not one that commits your residents to unwanted development based upon projections way beyond the Plan period.

Comment ID: 9662

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Chris

Comment: I wish to support the Council's view expressed at paragraph 2.14 that increased or "maximising" housing density is not an appropriate step for the Cotswold District given that it would conflict with the character of the area and the limits of infrastructure and services. It is vital that development in the Plan is suited to the Cotswolds environment; in town extensions such as proposed at Moreton-in-Marsh it is vital to adopt densities that reflect rural/town edge landscapes rather than urban centre townscapes, including substantial areas of open space for walking, recreation and the provision of wildlife corridors from the countryside into the centre of Moreton.

Comment ID: 9674

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris

Comment: I would support Scenario 1 but enhanced to deliver a focus more upon genuinely affordable housing and socially rented homes which are what the district actually needs rather than the unrealistic outcome of the Government's algorithm. As Scenario 5 is the Council's stated preference, I would reiterate here both that the suggested Plan period "strategic extension" proposals for Moreton-in-Marsh are unrealistic and undesirable given SLA and infrastructure constraints, but more importantly the post-2043 additional allocations proposed - in particular for the Moreton-in-Marsh area - amount to a long-term capitulation to the Government's "unrealistic", "disproportionate" and damaging shorter-term targets that must be resisted.

Comment ID: 9677

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Chris

Comment: If this question is intended to ask whether greater development should be allowed within the Cotswold Landscape Area than is proposed in Scenario 5 then the answer should be no. The CLA must be defended against development that would detract from quality of its landscape for intrinsic reasons and because the region relies upon the income generated by visitors attracted by its qualities.

Comment ID: 9680

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris

Comment: If smaller houses or the provision of flats can be delivered without compromising the provision of adequate gardens and open spaces then those may provide means of increasing density within the District, but I would oppose the use of any building types (in particular taller buildings) than would not genuinely fit in with the existing Cotswold mix of building types. In general, as stated in my comment at para 2.8, I believe that increased density would not be suitable for the Cotswold district as it would lend too “urban” a character to developments.

Comment ID: 9698

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris

Comment: As will be clear from my comments/suggestions/responses at 2.1, 2.6.16 (Scenario 5) and 2.18 (Questions 1 to 3), I do not think that the proposed levels of development up to 2043 or beyond are sustainable, nor do I think that any new services, facilities or infrastructure would save them from being unsustainable in terms of their inappropriateness for the CDC area.

You ask for settlement-specific suggestions regarding new facilities or infrastructure that the proposed developments may need. If some of the proposed developments in and around Moreton-in-Marsh as envisaged under Broad Zone 05 do go ahead, I would like to make a particular case for sufficient open land to be reserved and public footpaths dedicated for amenity use: walking, dog-walking, cycling, mental health, wildlife corridor, etc, to the south of Moreton, using the series of wild and flood-prone fields on the east side of the railway line running all the way from the town centre to open countryside towards Evenlode. This would function along the same lines that the Blenheim Meadow, Cotswold Gate and Moreton Park areas of green space connect together and provide both a substantial area for recreation/amenity and also a wildlife corridor all of the way from the centre of town to the open countryside beyond the Todenham road. Given all of the development along the Fosse Way to the south of the town, and the proposals for further development there and along the Evenlode Road, such spaces will be needed to compensate for the loss of proper footpaths and dog-walking fields nearer the town centre, and would form a necessary/suitable use of s.106 contributions or equivalent from developers.

Comment ID: 9722

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Chris

Comment: ADVERSE IMPLICATIONS OF POTENTIAL MORETON-IN-MARSH BY-PASS

Although – so far as I can see – it is not alluded to expressly anywhere in this consultation or the accompanying documents, perhaps because all detail of Infrastructure has unhelpfully been omitted pending the external specialist consultant's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (see paras 4.8-4.10), the suggestion that a by-pass be constructed around Moreton-in-Marsh has been mooted in previous Plan consultations. From the point of view of a resident of southeast Moreton-in-Marsh, this proposal threatens to divert the very busy traffic of the Fosse Way around the East and South of the town with severely adverse impacts upon the existing residents through noise pollution, environmental pollution and loss of amenity in terms of the peaceful and rural setting. Mitigation of these impacts via speed restrictions, noise baffles or sinking the road, prevention of rat-runs through existing residential streets, etc, will be essential and costly. Even if the disastrously huge “strategic extension” proposed in Scenario 5 is not in the end pursued, the building of such a by-pass would also have the damaging consequence of creating a de facto new development boundary for Moreton, within which there would no doubt be heavy housing development as a result.

It is the immense cost of this Moreton-in-Marsh by-pass, and in particular the fact that it would require a new bridge to be constructed over the railway line, which I understand may be one of the explanations for so very many new houses being proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh both up to 2043 and beyond. Enough developer contributions are needed for the relevant infrastructure, it is said, but the unspoken reality is that they may be largely swallowed up in “paying for” such a by-pass. As explained in my comments to paragraph 2.1, it is quite wrong to expect residents/consultees to prioritise strategic development proposals when their internal logic (i.e. the sheer number of houses proposed) is driven by infrastructure proposals of which we have no details at all - such as a potential by-pass which at least half of the town may be adversely affected by and thus opposed to.

Comment ID: 9728

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Chris

Comment: I agree with the vision as expressed in the following sentence (para 5.2):
“Development will have been guided by a spatial strategy that prioritises environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic vitality, while respecting the district’s unique landscape, heritage, and character.”

But sadly the scale of the housing targets built into the Council’s preferred Scenario 5 are entirely inconsistent with that vision, and the Council’s own words in its letter to the Secretary of State dated 23rd October 2025 make it clear that the Council itself knows this. The vision and objectives should be adjusted to expressly record the fact (as set out in that letter) that the housing targets are being forced upon the Council by central Government and are regarded as “unrealistic”, “damaging” to the Council’s more appropriate wish to deliver “genuinely affordable housing” and likely to “irreversibly change the character of our world-renowned area.”

The Vision and Objectives should also expressly reflect the fact that the Plan is being created in the final year or two of the existence of the CDC, after which it will be superseded by a unitary council of the whole or part of Gloucestershire, which may develop different priorities. Ideally, the Plan should build in a commitment (and reserve the right) for the targets/allocations to be reviewed downwards by the successor unitary council, and/or in response to changes in Government policy.

Comment ID: 9672

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Chris

Comment: In my responses at para 2.1 above and to Questions 1 to 3 below I set out my broader views on the Scenarios, but these comments focus upon why the adverse impacts of the potential strategic extensions to Moreton-in-Marsh and neighbouring areas (Broad Zones 04, 05 and 06) render them unsuitable except on a much smaller scale than the numbers of houses proposed in Scenario 5.

Most significantly, as the Summary Findings of the Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations document (Nov 2025) confirms, strategic development here would have a High damage impact on the local landscape, as Broad Zones 04, 05 and 06 are almost entirely within the Special Landscape Area - "only the area directly to the east of the town does not fall within the [SLA]". To the North, there are historic sites, ancient woodlands and the conservation area of Todenham, to the South there are historic woodlands and the conservation area of Evenlode, with Adlestrop and Broadwell in close proximity beyond.

Within the Broad Zone 05 around Moreton itself the areas under consideration for development to the south along Evenlode Road all encroach upon the Special Landscape Area which provides a crucial landscape buffer to Evenlode village itself and to the Cotswold National Landscape which abuts it. I entirely agree with the Overview of Sensitivity for Broad Zone 05 when it concludes that this zone is "highly sensitive to changes in openness, skyline character and settlement edge definition. Particular care would be needed to protect visual amenity and the role the landscape plays toward the Cotswolds National Landscape to the south.

While the summary for Broad Zone 06 South of Moreton concludes that the zone is unlikely to be suitable for strategic scale development due to the SLA and as there would be significant adverse effects upon water quality in an area with numerous watercourses and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone, precisely the same considerations apply also to the southerly areas within Zone 05 along the Evenlode Road.

The sustainability of these areas within Zone 05 to the south of Moreton must also be questioned - the Backhouse development of 67 dwellings off Evenlode Road has already demonstrated that its residents consider it too far from the centre of Moreton in Marsh to consider anything other than car transport for shopping trips; there is no

evidence at all of more sustainable forms of transport such as cycling being adopted, although these were much vaunted in the planning application. The Backhouse development also demonstrates that even the current Plan's rules on design have failed to deliver housing that is suitable for an edge of town/rural location - instead all 67 houses are of the same brick and with very urban layout, fenestration, etc creating a monolithic development quite out of place with its setting.

Comment ID: 9085

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: If you increase density to a site you must ensure that adequate parking is available to the residents and visitors, in the past we have built developments where insufficient parking was considered, hence a knock on effect for immediate surrounding areas.

Comment ID: 9086

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

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: Can CDC please inform the local Parish Council of all sites that have been put forward by a landowner, even prior to assessment so that they (PC) can be fully appraised of the current situation locally.

Comment ID: 9087

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: Can you provide an explanation of windfall sites ? if all infill sites have been built on within a Parish I struggle to see where the extra windfall numbers come from.

Comment ID: 9088

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: Can we presume that if a settlement has a large increase in dwellings that the local utilities (particularly Water Treatment Plants) will be upgraded significantly to cope with the demand prior to any development work begins.

Comment ID: 9089

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: I understand why you have to look towards 2043 and beyond for this LP document, however I think you should also state that come 2028/29 CDC is unlikely to exist and this plan will presumably rolled into the new UA plan.

Comment ID: 9090

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Chris Baxter

Comment: In your vision you name Cotswold District (will there be a Cotswold District ?)

Comment ID: 8946

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Chris Herbert

Comment: Please ensure that mineral safeguarding continues to be a key consideration when allocating sites for future development and that particular regard is paid to the existing mineral sites in the District and any allocations for future working that they have. Close liaison with Gloucestershire County Council as mineral planning authority is strongly supported.

In addition we would like the Plan to recognise that the use of domestically produced dimension stone and slate has a number of important sustainability benefits:

- ☐ inherently lower energy/carbon intensity in production than their conventional equivalents;
- ☐ lower transport-related carbon emissions than imported materials;
- ☐ higher potential for subsequent re-use; and
- ☐ high levels of durability and relatively low through-life maintenance.

The MPA therefore believes that the use of local dimension stone needs to be more actively supported and promoted in design and development policies in local Development Plans. By doing so the planning system can help to deliver design excellence, contribute to local distinctiveness and reduce carbon emissions as well as supporting a long established industry which provides traditional, skilled work.

The type of materials used, the prudent use of existing and new resources and the use of low embodied carbon building materials are all important contributors to reducing carbon emissions during the construction process.

The MPA would therefore welcome local planning policies which:

- ☐ support the use of locally produced dimension stone to help maintain and enhance local character and distinctiveness in our built environment;
- ☐ support the use of locally produced dimension stone as a low-embodied carbon building material; and
- ☐ support the use of building materials which deliver high levels of durability, low through life maintenance and high potential for subsequent re-use in the construction process.

Comment ID: 8947

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Chris Herbert

Comment: Please ensure that mineral safeguarding continues to be a key consideration when allocating sites for future development and that particular regard is paid to the existing mineral sites in the District and any allocations for future working that they have. Close liaison with Gloucestershire County Council as mineral planning authority is strongly supported.

In addition we would like the Plan to recognise that the use of domestically produced dimension stone and slate has a number of important sustainability benefits:

- ☐ inherently lower energy/carbon intensity in production than their conventional equivalents;
- ☐ lower transport-related carbon emissions than imported materials;
- ☐ higher potential for subsequent re-use; and
- ☐ high levels of durability and relatively low through-life maintenance.

The MPA therefore believes that the use of local dimension stone needs to be more actively supported and promoted in design and development policies in local Development Plans. By doing so the planning system can help to deliver design excellence, contribute to local distinctiveness and reduce carbon emissions as well as supporting a long established industry which provides traditional, skilled work.

The type of materials used, the prudent use of existing and new resources and the use of low embodied carbon building materials are all important contributors to reducing carbon emissions during the construction process.

The MPA would therefore welcome local planning policies which:

- ☐ support the use of locally produced dimension stone to help maintain and enhance local character and distinctiveness in our built environment;
- ☐ support the use of locally produced dimension stone as a low-embodied carbon building material; and
- ☐ support the use of building materials which deliver high levels of durability, low through life maintenance and high potential for subsequent re-use in the construction process.

Comment ID: 9416

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris Langdon

Comment: All scenarios undermine the ethos of the Cotswolds and they take little account of policies contained in Neighbourhood Plans .

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

Scenario 5 is only workable if strategic sites are located where genuine infrastructure exists , not in Siddington. Allocating 1100 homes to a village of less than 350 dwellings is wholly disproportionate and inconsistent with sustainable development. Surely a better alternative is to allow a larger expansion of the Steadings to the south of the existing plan where at least some infrastructure has been developed.

Comment ID: 9417

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Chris Langdon

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

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

Siddington is being targeted because it lies outside the National Landscape, not because it is sustainable. The incorrect Principal Settlement classification further hides the fact that Siddington lacks services, transport and infrastructure.

Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers and targets .

Comment ID: 9418

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris Langdon

Comment: Increasing housing density in developments in rural locations such as Siddington is inappropriate and would threaten its rural character.

Comment ID: 9420

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris Langdon

Comment: There is no prospect whatsoever of the proposed level of development in Siddington being sustainable. Siddington is currently reliant on Cirencester and , in my view , that would continue to be the case .

The level of expansion being suggested would merge Siddington with Cirencester , overwhelm its rural infrastructure, increase flood risk and destroy the village's identity. The strategic gap between Siddington and Cirencester is important to maintain Siddington's rural identity and should be maintained.

Siddington's misclassification as a Principal Settlement further undermines the justification for this level of growth .

Comment ID: 9421

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Chris Langdon

Comment: In my view the following matters should be considered beyond conventional housing. The Plan should consider :

1 The incorrect Principal Settlement classification .

2 The protection of village identity and cohesion.

3 Flood resilience

4 Rural infrastructure limits

5 The importance of the green buffer , (Strategic Gap) between Siddington and Cirencester

Comment ID: 9431

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Chris Langdon

Comment: I agree with the vision but the proposals in the Consultation will not deliver that vision. With regards to Siddington the proposals :

1 Do not deliver a sustainable community but threaten the destruction of our existing community.

2 Will not respect Siddington's unique landscape, heritage or character.

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

4 Will not offer employment opportunities in Siddington

5 Will not offer additional essential facilities to Siddington

6 Are unlikely to involve integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks

7 Will involve Siddington growing disproportionately.

8 Will reduce the green space available to the Siddington community.

Comment ID: 11128

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris Merrett

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

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

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

Scenario 5 is only workable if strategic sites are placed where genuine infrastructure exists—not in Siddington. Allocating 11051 to a village of 339 dwellings is wholly disproportionate and inconsistent with sustainable development.

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

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

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

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

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

Comment ID: 11129

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Chris Merrett

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

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

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

Comment ID: 11130

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris Merrett

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

Comment ID: 11132

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris Merrett

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

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

Comment ID: 11133

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Chris Merrett

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

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

Comment ID: 11134

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Chris Merrett

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

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

Comment ID: 9104

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: Option 5

Comment ID: 9106

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: Scenario 5 is the least worse. There should be no building in Fairford until a new sewage system is in place.

Comment ID: 9105

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: No

Comment ID: 9107

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: Minimal

Comment ID: 9108

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: Where are the residents of these new houses going to find work?

Comment ID: 9109

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Chris Peachey

Comment: All very apple pie-- and pretty meaningless?

Comment ID: 9522

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Chris Sands

Comment: Just looking at the map to more than double the size of Moreton In Marsh is terrifying! The current infrastructure for the development as it stands now is insufficient to meet the needs required and this is having an environmental impact on the town now. Aside from what this would do to the town, turning it from a Cotswold Market Town to some sort of Metropolis, drastic measures MUST be taken to invest in infrastructure to cater for this enormous expansion in the form of bypasses for the A44 and A429 plus management of sewage and other services to the community. Further investment for schools, doctors, dentists etc will also be needed.

Comment ID: 10037

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Christine Copley

Comment: Scenario 3, while not delivering the largest number of new homes, seems to be the optimal solution in terms of providing economic opportunities, services and amenities for new residents. This option would minimise the need for car-based commuting & traffic growth throughout the district, which would otherwise be significant from rural areas with poor or limited public transport; would reduce the loss of important habitat areas and biodiversity; and maintain the agriculturally productive land important for food security and jobs in the rural economy. Agreements with neighbouring councils with opportunities for increased housing density would seem a sensible option to maintain the historic and rural nature of the greater Cotswold area.

Comment ID: 10063

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Christine Copley

Comment: The addition of housing to the north of Ampney Crucis will significantly alter the character of the village and its rural landscape. The village is built around a set of very narrow lanes, and it is difficult to see how hundreds of new houses could be absorbed without very significant impact to services. New dual lane roads would be required to provide suitable access, severely diminishing the rural character of the village and surrounding area and increasing traffic. The constrained entrance to the village from the south and east would be unable to cope with increased traffic flow and would likely significantly impact on highway safety on the lanes and on the A417. Increased hard standing and built surfaces would significantly impact the water absorption capacity of the area, leading to greatly increased volumes of surface run-off entering the sewage system. This is already struggling with existing flows and storm events, with raw sewage being forced out of manhole covers on the A419 near St Mary's Church and in the village street at Ampney St Peter at times of intense rainfall - an increasingly frequent feature of the local climate. Sewage from Ampney Crucis is fed to the small sewage treatment works at Ampney St Peter, which is well recognised to be significantly under capacity. Tankerage is frequently required to manage the flow, the works release into the nearby Ampney Brook (spills were noted for 129 days in 2024, over 30% of the year). Although Thames Water had plans to upgrade the works, their financial problems have led to a suspension of many capital projects and it is unclear when this work could take place.

Comment ID: 9726

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Christine Sharrock

Comment: Re. Q. 5 (Are there any other matters beyond conventional housing that have not been listed here that you think should be considered) - Parking considerations.

Comment ID: 9730

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Christine Sharrock

Comment: Re. Q. 2 - Perhaps I am not properly understanding what you mean by "unsustainable" but, if a development is truly unsustainable, then it seems imprudent to invest time and resources into developing it at all.

Comment ID: 9732

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Christine Sharrock

Comment: Re. Q. 1 (Which of the above scenarios has your preference?) - I have a general comment to make, whichever scenario is selected.

I would appeal to all involved in the decision-making to please remember that once an area is developed, it can rarely be returned to its natural state if the development is found to be above and beyond what is required in the future. I hope the Council will be suitably cautious about developing unspoilt sites. Nature and the environment are depending on us to get this right.

Beyond that, I would tend towards whichever scenario the Council prefers since you are the ones with the detailed knowledge of each scenario, the data and assumptions applied, etc. Thank you for all your hard work.

Comment ID: 10950

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Christine Sharrock

Comment: Parking, especially provision for off-road parking without creating enormous expanses of paved areas.

(Apologies if this duplicates a comment I've already submitted; I posted several comments but see no trace of them and am wondering if I did something wrong the first time!)

Comment ID: 8695

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Christopher

Comment: Given we know, for a fact, that there is negligible population growth driven by those born in the UK before the year 2000, what precisely?is driving the need for new homes at all?

Comment ID: 8696

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Christopher

Comment: In addition, when you say 'homes' what exactly do you mean? Are we talking about one bedroom flats or six bedroom executive homes? What problem, precisely, is this this home building program designed to fix?

Comment ID: 10484

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Christopher

Comment: I object to the target numbers for the district due the impacts outlined below and fully support the council's approach outlined in the public meeting of "writing to the Secretary of State for Housing, supported by all political groups, arguing the 18,650 home target is undeliverable due to protected landscapes and limited buildable land".

The target has increased from 475 to over 1,000 per year (over 100% increase each year) and part of the argument for this, is need for affordable homes. This implies lower cost homes, higher-density homes and jobs for the owners to be able to afford them. Part of the tourist attractiveness of the district, is the design and appearance of the homes, which means they cannot be built affordably and attracts those earning better and wanting to move out of the larger towns and cities to the 'country'. These owners have the means to own multiple vehicles and travel for work, further increasing the environmental impact of the building, whilst not providing homes for the target group. The road system in the area suffer with potholes due to wear and tear and will increase the risk of accidents, given the narrow lanes away from the main A roads.

Increased traffic through Tetbury town would have a negative impact on the historic buildings from increased vibration and pollution. We already suffer with RTAs between pedestrians and cars / lorries, which increasing the volume of traffic would increase the probability. Tetbury often suffers with gridlocks because of the volume of traffic and the need for lorries and vans to park on Long Street to deliver to the local shops.

Given the lack of employment in the more rural areas, it would increase the traffic further. With the unlikely number of jobs being created in the areas proposed with the target number of homes, there will be a need to travel by train or bus to larger principal centres (e.g. Stroud, Gloucester, Cheltenham, London etc.) and though Kemble has some good train links, there is no public transport available between Tetbury and Kemble, to reduce the use cars. If Kemble is to be a target for a high number of homes, this will cause increased congestion and pressure on parking in Kemble Station.

The lack of schools in the Village Clusters and hamlets, would increase traffic and overload the existing schools in the immediate area. Further, it is better for children to be going to school within their community, than travelling by car to a remote school.

This causes impacts to their mental wellbeing as they can't play with their friends without the need for parental intervention.

An alternative planning strategy is to focus building on brown-field sites near to major settlements where jobs are available and higher-density, affordable homes, within easy commute of work and schools would be the better option. This approach could be made more attractive to developers if a subsidy on building on Brown-Field sites were made available, instead of always looking at the cheaper development options of Green-Field development. This approach to Brown-Field development safeguards:

- * Economic impact from loss of tourism (Bourton-on-the-water, Stow, Moreton-in-Marsh, Bibury, Tetbury (and many others) are all busy tourist locations and putting many homes around these towns would detract from them as Tourist destinations, putting risk into the economic benefits (i.e. revenue for the district), which comes from tourism) and the need for expensive road and services provision implementation for the increased volume of people and vehicles, as opposed to extending already higher capacity road and services for additional homes.
- * Social impact (especially on children) as work and schools would be closer to the homes.
- * Environmental impact (less need for individual cars to be driven and more access to public transport as schools and places of work would be closer.
- * Highway safety as there would be relatively less increase in traffic due to public transport and other means of commuting to work and school) and existing highway safety features can be used for the higher numbers of home owners families.
- * Impact on amenities and services as these already exist and can be extended to cater for the increased home owner families (and in doing so provide viable new. employment opportunities, which is not possible when considering smaller settlement extensions)
- * Affordable homes can be built without the need for expensive design and appearance considerations given the generally higher density housing already in place.
- * Due to the availability of different types of homes level of cost, this provides the new home owners future opportunities, in the area they live, to move into larger homes as their family needs change, without the need for moving area.

So in summary, I object to the target numbers for the district due the impacts outlined above.

Comment ID: 10491

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Christopher

Comment: For Tetbury. There is an acute shortage of infrastructure including sewage processing, mobile data/phone coverage and electricity supply. There were a large number of residents without power for days because 1 substation failed. More resilience for the town is required.

We have an increasing issue with traffic through Tetbury town already, as there is no by-pass available. The impact on historic buildings and the increasing risk of pedestrian / vehicle accidents. With more and more house being built, there will be an increase in road traffic as a) there are no local jobs to sustain more home owners and b) there are shortages of school places, requiring parents to drive their children to the nearest school.

As mentioned previously, the area takes a good revenue from the tourist trade, which could be undermined if more houses are built, without due consideration of the impact.

Comment ID: 10492

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Christopher

Comment: My apologies. I typed the comment for Question 5 into the Question 1!!
Please ignore previous comment

Comment ID: 10493

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 1:

To be clear, I am not in favour of the target but of the options, my preference is option 5 because it is closest to meeting the governments target, whilst protecting our district and Cotswold National Landscape. The key here is getting contractual agreement to provide road, schools, water and sewage, doctors, dentists etc, ahead of the building or at least sales commencing. As stated at the overall review, spreading the new homes around the district outside of Principal or even large Settlements, causes issues, which will not be dealt with due the incremental nature of the increases. Focussing on where established larger settlements already exist, will reduce this risks posed. Any new Settlements should be focused on re-using land, not the cheaper and more invasive use of Green-Field sites. The Council should lobby for incentives to developers for Brown-Field developments, rather than the cheaper Green-Field.

Comment ID: 10494

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 2:

No, as this causes ongoing issues for the home-owners and local communities. Unsustainability criteria have been defined for good reason and should not be changed for short-term political ends. It will cause many issues for the existing communities and those new home-owners.

Comment ID: 10495

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 3:

I would support this in areas where it can be done, which does not impact the overall appearance, economy of the area (e.g tourism), highway safety or amenities of the area. Many of the Cotswold Principal Settlements, Villages and Hamlets are tourist attractions, which brings in much needed employment and revenue to the area.

There are good ways to take existing listed buildings and convert to higher density living. There are a number in Tetbury, where this has been successfully achieved.

Comment ID: 10496

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 4:

For Tetbury. There is an acute shortage of infrastructure including sewage processing, mobile data/phone coverage and electricity supply. There were a large number of residents without power for days because 1 substation failed. More resilience for the town is required.

We have an increasing issue with traffic through Tetbury town already, as there is no by-pass available. The impact on historic buildings and the increasing risk of pedestrian / vehicle accidents. With more and more house being built, there will be an increase in road traffic as a) there are no local jobs to sustain more home owners and b) there are shortages of school places, requiring parents to drive their children to the nearest school.

As mentioned previously, the area takes a good revenue from the tourist trade, which could be undermined if more houses are built, without due consideration of the impact.

Comment ID: 10497

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 5:

Where is the support & incentives given to the farming community? We are part of the farming industry, which currently under heavy threat from the lack of funding. Without our famers providing foods, our country is at high risk. Currently it is reported that if we had a full blockade of the UK, we'd have enough food for 2 weeks! We cannot keep giving up farmland for homes.

Comment ID: 10499

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Christopher

Comment: Question 6:

The vision and objectives are good and supportable. They are well thought through and address the needs of the District evident.

In addition, I would ask:

- In support of ecology vision, include requirement to add solar to all new builds. With so many new houses planned, there is a real opportunity to equip each with a level of Solar and battery technology to contribute to the ongoing need for power.
- To support the developments required, change the rules so the developers provide the infrastructure to support the houses they are building, before building and before sales commence.

Comment ID: 10485

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Christopher

Comment: Option 1 - Allocate sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters and support Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements

Of all the options, this one is likely to have the least impact on Amenities, Highway Safety, Design and appearance of houses, Environmental Impact, Economic Benefit, Social Considerations and Planning History given the lower numbers being considered for building.

Rural exception site in rural settlements will have an impact on the provision of infrastructure to the principal and surrounding locations. For example, there is currently an overload of the sewage processing already evident in Tetbury.

Option 2 - Allocate sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements, Village Clusters and Rural Settlements

This option does not meet the underlying need for affordable homes and has an increased risk profile for Amenities, Highway Safety, Design and appearance of houses, Environmental Impact, Economic Benefit due to tourism impact and Social Considerations, especially in Village Clusters and Rural Settlements.

The road system in the area suffer with potholes due to wear and tear and will increase the risk of accidents, given the narrow lanes away from the main A roads.

Increased traffic through Tetbury town would have a negative impact on the historic buildings from increased vibration and pollution. We already suffer with RTAs between pedestrians and cars / lorries, which increasing the volume of traffic would increase the probability. Tetbury often suffers with gridlocks because of the volume of traffic and the need for lorries and vans to park on Long Street to deliver to the local shops.

Given the lack of employment in the more rural areas, it would increase the traffic further. With the unlikely number of jobs being created in the areas proposed with the target number of homes, there will be a need to travel by train or bus to larger principal centres (e.g. Stroud, Gloucester, Cheltenham, London etc.) and though Kemble has

some good train links, there is no public transport available between Tetbury and Kemble, to reduce the use cars. If Kemble is to be a target for a high number of homes, this will cause increase congestion and pressure on parking in Kemble Station.

The lack of schools in the Village Clusters and hamlets, would increase traffic and overload the existing schools in the immediate area. Further, it is better for children to be going to school within their community, than travelling by car to a remote school. This causes impacts their mental wellbeing as they can't play with their friends without the need for parental intervention.

Option 3 - Service Centres

Slightly better by keeping to the established principal centres which already have some public transport and are better placed for extension to existing amenities and services, this providing localised employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 10486

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Christopher

Comment: Option 4 - Focus growth around transport nodes

This option is no real practical difference for option 3.

Comment ID: 10487

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Christopher

Comment: Option 5 - Allocate sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters. Support Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements. Create new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s)

Must include infrastructure including roads, schools, water and sewage, doctors, dentists etc. and the needed employment.

Comment ID: 10488

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Christopher

Comment: Option 6- Allocate sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters. Support Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements. Create new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s). Support major development within the Cotswolds National Landscape

No. "Given this option is contrary to national planning policy, Scenario 6 is not considered to be a viable option."

Comment ID: 10489

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Christopher

Comment: Option 7 - Maximise growth across the district with sites assessed to be unsuitable for development (for example, via additional new settlement(s) / strategic extensions)

No. This is not a sustainable option. We have many sites where flooding is frequent, during the winter months along with road systems that cannot carry regular traffic to new settlements.

Comment ID: 10540

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: New build developments already suffer from a too high a density and should not be compressed more. Limited land availability should NOT be wasted on highly expensive profit making developments of "Care Home Settlements" forced through on Appeal to the detriment of housing.

Comment ID: 10543

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: Scenario 4 leaches commuters away from the District without excessively impacting on other forms of home to work transport.

Comment ID: 10544

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: No, no. no quoting Mrs Thatcher.

Comment ID: 10545

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: There should be no increase in density and high rise buildings in the District should not be allowed where they change the character of the location. Housing targets are a whim of government when they do not meet local needs. The present government is a busted flush waiting to die - procrastinate until it has gone.

Comment ID: 10546

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: To support travel to and from Moreton in Marsh, the A429 must be significantly improved and bottlenecks eliminated, not only in Moreton but also in Stow on the Wold which can take up to 30 minutes to transit at the moment in peak periods.

The A44 through Moreton must be rerouted to avoid the centre and also take it away from Bourton on the Hill.

Through traffic destined for the Vale Business Parks should be taken away from Stow and Moreton by rerouting from Bourton up on an improved Buckle Street to join the A44 closer to Fish Hill.

Comment ID: 10547

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: Nationally, there is a realisation that "green to the core" is too expensive to accommodate especially some of the pie in the sky building construction objectives. Moderate this nonsense in the light of national and local affordability. People, councils and the nation cannot afford it.

Comment ID: 10523

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: The housing requirement bears no relation to the amount of employment in the District so many new occupants will join the already large commuting numbers that have to travel away to work. The capacity of the road network is already oversubscribed especially as it also has to cope with transit and tourism requirements. The local highways authority appears oblivious to this - there has been no improvement in the A429 Fosse Way in the 45 years I have lived in Stow on the Wold and there are no intentions in improving it. Long traffic delays are now tending to become the norm. Consequently, greater use should be made of the rail hubs of Moreton in Marsh, Kingham, and Kemble which provide potential for easy commuting to many destinations and take housing requirement numbers away from the congested road network.

Comment ID: 10534

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: This may seem a viable solution but it brings with it an considerable increase in road based short and long range commuting. To support this, improvements in roads, including bypasses, are required before building houses. This is unlikely to occur as the Transport Authority is, and always has been, Cheltenham / Gloucester centric with no regard for the rest of the county. This bias will only increase under the reorganisation plan for Gloucestershire government when total control is vested in Gloucester.

Comment ID: 10536

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: The restrictions on free for all and nibbling at the edges building in the protected Cotswolds Landscape must be preserved.

Comment ID: 10538

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: This brings future rural, high density. inappropriate slum building into the area and destroys the beauty of the countryside for short term political gain by a metropolitan centric government.

Comment ID: 10542

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Christopher Ayers

Comment: Ensure that infrastructure, roads, schools, medical facilities, water and sewage provision, drainage etc are provided in tandem with any development. This is not happening now and this "lazy" approach must not continue.

Comment ID: 10035

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Christopher Giles

Comment: I support the objective to conserve and enhance the distinct character of the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) and open countryside. It is important that sufficient weight is given to this when assessing planning applications. Any developments that will have a detrimental impact on the character of the CNL should be refused. Landscape assessments should be undertaken to assess whether a proposed development is likely to have a detrimental impact on the overall character, and key characteristics of the relevant landscape types, found within the CNL.

Comment ID: 9258

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Christopher Hall

Comment: Formal Consultation Response

Cotswold District Local Plan Update – Preferred Options Consultation (November 2025)

Respondent: [Your name / “Local resident” / Organisation name]

Location referenced: Cirencester and neighbouring settlements

Relevant sections: Chapters 2 and 3 (Spatial Strategy, Indicative Figures)

1. Summary of Representation

I object to the Council’s preferred development strategy (Scenario 5) on the grounds that it is unfair, irresponsible, and not realistically deliverable, due to the disproportionate concentration of housing growth in and around Cirencester and a small number of neighbouring settlements.

I consider that a more evenly distributed pattern of growth across the Cotswolds, including modest but meaningful development in a wider range of settlements, would be fairer, more sustainable, and more likely to be delivered, while better aligning with the Plan’s stated vision and objectives.

2. Unfair Concentration of Growth on Cirencester and Surrounding Settlements

The Preferred Option places a disproportionate share of housing growth on Cirencester and a limited number of settlements outside the Cotswolds National Landscape.

The Council’s own figures show that:

Cirencester already has 2,306 homes with planning permission, largely at The Steadings.

The strategy proposes a further c.3,200 homes by 2043, rising to over 4,100 homes including development beyond 2043.

This represents an exceptional scale of growth relative to the town's existing size and infrastructure.

By contrast, many other towns and villages across the district are expected to accommodate little more than windfall development.

This approach places an inequitable burden on specific communities, requiring them to absorb:

Long-term construction impacts

Traffic congestion

Pressure on schools, healthcare, and utilities

Loss of countryside buffers and settlement identity

A plan-led approach should distribute both the benefits and impacts of development more equitably across the district.

3. Artificial Distinction Between “Protected” and “Sacrificial” Areas

The consultation document repeatedly indicates that settlements outside the Cotswolds National Landscape are expected to accommodate “disproportionately more development”.

While the protection of designated landscapes is essential, this approach:

Creates a two-tier planning system

Implies that communities outside the National Landscape are less deserving of protection

Fails to recognise that these areas also have historic character, environmental sensitivity, and infrastructure constraints

This is inconsistent with the Plan’s stated commitment to social equity and inclusive place-making.

4. Infrastructure Constraints Make the Strategy Irresponsible

The Council’s own evidence highlights serious infrastructure risks:

Water supply and wastewater treatment capacity are already under pressure.

Thames Water’s financial position may delay essential upgrades.

Large strategic sites are frequently delayed.

The Council estimates that around 20% fewer homes than planned may be delivered within the plan period.

Despite this, Scenario 5 relies heavily on:

Eight strategic sites of 500+ homes

Concentrated infrastructure delivery in a small number of locations

Assumptions about timely delivery that the Council itself acknowledges are uncertain

This represents an unacceptable level of risk and undermines confidence that the strategy can be delivered in a coordinated and sustainable way.

5. Transport and Sustainability Objectives Are Undermined

Cirencester is proposed to accommodate major growth despite:

Having no railway station

Limited public transport capacity

Heavy reliance on private car use

This conflicts with the Plan's objectives to:

Reduce transport emissions

Promote sustainable travel

Focus growth in locations with strong transport connectivity

Concentrating growth in largely car-dependent locations risks increasing congestion and emissions, contrary to the Plan's climate commitments.

6. Density Assumptions Are Acknowledged to Be Unrealistic

The Council's own analysis (Table 1, paragraphs 2.13–2.17) states that to meet the housing target under Scenario 5:

Average densities of around 106 dwellings per hectare would be required.

This level of density is comparable to inner London developments.

Such densities are explicitly described as out of character for the district and likely to compromise housing mix and quality.

If the preferred strategy depends on densities that the Council itself accepts are inappropriate and unrealistic, then the strategy is not soundly based.

7. Over-Reliance on Strategic Sites Increases Delivery Risk

Scenario 5 depends on a small number of very large sites, which:

Have long lead-in times

Require complex infrastructure coordination

Are more vulnerable to market and funding delays

A failure or delay at even one major site would significantly undermine housing delivery. A more dispersed approach, including smaller and medium-sized sites across a wider range of settlements, would spread risk and improve resilience.

8. A More Dispersed Strategy Would Be Fairer and More Sustainable

The Council has dismissed more dispersed scenarios largely because they do not meet the full housing target. However, this approach underestimates the benefits of:

Incremental delivery

Faster build-out of smaller sites

Supporting village services and rural vitality

Enabling locally appropriate affordable housing

A hybrid strategy that allows modest growth across a greater number of settlements, alongside genuinely sustainable strategic sites, would:

Reduce pressure on Cirencester

Better reflect historic settlement patterns

Improve deliverability

Align more closely with the Plan's vision and objectives

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, the Preferred Option:

Is unfair, placing a disproportionate burden on Cirencester and neighbouring settlements

Is irresponsible, given acknowledged infrastructure and delivery constraints

Is not realistically deliverable, relying on densities and site delivery assumptions the Council itself questions

I urge the Council to reconsider its spatial strategy and pursue a more balanced and distributed approach to growth across the Cotswolds, which would be fairer, more sustainable, and more likely to succeed at Examination.

Comment ID: 10723

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Christopher Johnston

Comment: I would support an increase in density provided it helped in the provision of some smaller first and second time buyer properties which were genuinely affordable to local people on average incomes.

Comment ID: 10725

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Christopher Johnston

Comment: I agree with the visions and objectives but do not have confidence that the council (in whatever form it may be at the time) will have the ability and political will to ensure that they are fully implemented.

Comment ID: 10713

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Christopher Johnston

Comment: This would be my preferred option. I think it represents the absolute maximum development that could be undertaken without causing a very serious negative impact on the area.

Comment ID: 10718

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Christopher Johnston

Comment: This would be my preferred option. I think it represents the absolute maximum development that could be undertaken without causing a very serious negative impact on the area. However, I think the amount of building proposed for Moreton in Marsh is excessive and cannot be supported by the existing infrastructure. In particular, the sewage system is inadequate and cannot cope with the number of properties in the town at present, the road system is frequently choked both in Moreton and in adjoining towns, there are considerable flooding risks due to the topography of the locality and the local health, education and other services are already under considerable strain. It is essential that these issues be addressed before there is any further substantial development.

Comment ID: 10980

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Christopher Kenney-Herbert

Comment: 5.3.a states "Locate development away from flood-prone areas and promote water and energy efficiency". This being the case why are the directional arrows for development south of Moreton pointing directly into a flood prone area which is exasperated by the Moreton Drain which runs along the boundary?

Comment ID: 10976

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Christopher Kenney-Herbert

Comment: 4.5. In the current Local Plan, 2011 - 2031, Mor_E6 was designated an Employment Allocation yet there has been no such development. What makes CDC believe, with the current lack of infrastructure, that such allocations are realistic?

Comment ID: 10962

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Christopher Kenney-Herbert

Comment: 3.13 states "some housing developments may be held back until the necessary infrastructure is in

place." If CDC is green to the core how can it even consider allowing development before the infrastructure is in place e.g. Dunstall Farm 19/02248/FUL where development has continued despite the lack of sewage capacity? If CDC were serious about their green commitment it would state "must be held back" and not "may be held back".

Comment ID: 9483

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: Cirencester Action on Buses (CAoB) welcomes the revised Vision, particularly the commitment to reducing transport emissions and to investment in public transport and growth around transport nodes.

To strengthen deliverability, we recommend that the Vision and Objectives more explicitly recognise bus accessibility as essential social infrastructure, especially for young people, older residents, disabled people and households without access to a car and in facilitating modal shift away from car use.

In Objective (e) Promote sustainable transport use and connectivity, we suggest adding that new development should be required to:

maintain and enhance viable bus access for existing communities as well as new ones, provide early-phase bus services, not only infrastructure, so sustainable travel is established from first occupation, and

ensure services are available beyond peak commuting, reflecting access to education, healthcare and local services.

In Objective (f) Infrastructure and services, we recommend clarifying that “timely delivery” includes public transport provision and service support, not only physical infrastructure.

More generally, the Vision’s reference to integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks would be strengthened by an explicit expectation of early joint working between CDC, Gloucestershire County Council as transport authority, developers and local communities, so that passenger experience and accessibility needs shape development from the outset.

These additions would help translate the Vision’s ambitions into outcomes that genuinely reduce car dependency and improve inclusion across the district.

Comment ID: 9484

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: CAoB recognises why the Council prefers Scenario 5 to maximise housing delivery. However, from a sustainable transport perspective we strongly support the principle of Scenario 4, which focuses growth around public transport corridors and nodes.

If Scenario 5 is taken forward, it should explicitly embed this principle by:

prioritising sites that can be served by viable, frequent bus routes and rail-bus interchanges,

avoiding patterns of growth that disperse development into locations where car use will be unavoidable, and

requiring early funding and delivery of bus services alongside development.

Without this, there is a risk that Scenario 5 will lock in car dependency rather than deliver the Vision's aim of reducing transport emissions.

Comment ID: 9485

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: CAoB does not support locating development in areas that are unsustainable in transport terms simply to meet housing numbers. Development in locations with little or no realistic potential for bus services — particularly off-peak — will increase car dependency and social exclusion for those without access to a car.

Instead, the Plan should:

focus growth where public transport can credibly be delivered, and

use planning obligations to improve services in those locations, rather than lowering sustainability standards elsewhere.

Meeting housing need should not come at the expense of long-term transport sustainability and inclusion.

Comment ID: 9488

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: CAoB supports higher density development where it is aligned with strong public transport accessibility, as this can support more frequent and viable services and reduce car dependence.

However, increasing density in locations without good bus or rail potential risks intensifying traffic and parking pressures. Density policies should therefore be closely linked to public transport provision and accessibility standards, not applied in isolation.

Comment ID: 9486

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: CAoB strongly supports the intent of Scenario 4 to focus growth around public transport corridors and hubs. The acknowledgement that bus coverage is currently “sporadic or even non-existent” off-peak highlights exactly why the Local Plan must actively plan to improve bus provision, not assume it.

This scenario should be used to set:

clear expectations for minimum service levels,

early engagement with GCC and operators, and

developer funding for both infrastructure and initial service support.

Comment ID: 9487

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

Comment: If Scenario 5 is the preferred strategy, CAoB urges the Council to ensure that "transport connectivity" is defined in practice as access to viable public transport, not simply proximity to roads.

Strategic sites and new settlements should be required to:

be designed around direct bus corridors,

include high-quality bus-rail interchange where relevant (e.g. Kemble), and

deliver bus services from early phases, so sustainable travel habits are established.

Comment ID: 9248

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q1- Cirencester Site 21d – Accepting, as a primary settlement, Cirencester is included in ALL the scenarios, as the Civic Society we favour 21d, an extension of the Steadings site, as a sustainable location for further housing within the town. It is outside the special landscape area, has low flood risk and a new sewer. The proposed primary school, when built, should be able to cope with the extra pupil's numbers. However, this extension **MUST** be accompanied by extra primary care provision (see response to Q4 below) and sensitive landscaping that mitigates the visual impacted on one of the main roads into the town from the west.

Comment ID: 9249

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q2-NO - The core principle of the current planning system is development that balances social, economic, and environmental objectives. QUANTITY of housing, despite the new targets, should NEVER be pursued at the cost of all other considerations, including the 2021 Environment Act, NPPF and the current Local Plan, negating the need for Infrastructure beyond the critical elements. Any authority's primary duty is, and should remain, to ensure ALL development is sustainable by identifying strategic locations that meet housing needs without compromising critical protections. There should be NO consideration of the alternative, which will cause greater car dependence, reduce social cohesion and limit connectivity to health care, social and leisure facilities or strain natural resources. The Civic Society reject this proposal.

Comment ID: 9250

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q3-SUPPORT – The principle of increasing housing density is supported by the Civic Society, particularly within the primary settlement of Cirencester. This assumes such development is proportional to and in keeping with the immediate built environment, AND respects existing Local Plan policy EN4 and emerging Neighbourhood Plan policy DBE2 on protecting current important views and vistas. Higher density will help to reduce potential urban sprawl, facilitate the provision of smaller housing units for purchase and rental, and increase the efficiency, viability and potential expansion of services within the town, such as retail, hospitality and transport. Designed appropriately they can enhance and facilitate more mixed communities, but must be executed thoughtfully, sympathetic to the character of the historic town, with accessibility to green spaces to compensate for smaller private gardens and in parallel with Infrastructure development to prevent strain on existing services. The aim must be liveable high-quality spaces that respect privacy, mitigate noise pollution and blend with the existing rooflines and visual aspects of the town's urban landscape.

Comment ID: 9251

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q4-NO (CIRENCESTER) – The Civic Society are concerned that the primary health care land provision within the current Steadings development has failed to be resolved, with the absence of meaningful conversations with any of the primary care providers within the town, but particularly Phoenix surgery who, as the nearest practice, would typically be expected to absorb the increase in population. There was never a desire by Phoenix surgery to add a further satellite surgery to its main premise on Chesterton Lane, and direct discussion would have established that they are looking to move the ENTIRE surgery to a more suitable location. This is a 10-partner practice and the Steadings had identified a practice for 3, neither requested nor desired. As future primary care looks to bring more services in house – blood tests, physio etc – an early discussion would have established the need for a bigger site. This position is a direct result of the failure of the developer in planning to engage with not only the local GPs, but Gloucestershire Integrated Care Board (ICB), who in recognising the need for further provision have allocated capital specifically to accommodate this pending town problem. Should the site be extended further, the expansion of the population within the next decade will potentially be 30-40%. Ensuring that communities have adequate, accessible primary healthcare supports public health, reduces pressure on hospitals and forms the foundation of a healthy, productive, and economically resilient community. Any further town housing MUST be accompanied by a strategy of engagement with ICB and the local GPs to facilitate the primary care provision required.

Comment ID: 9252

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q5-THREE:

1. The Cotswold Design Code within the Local Plan review should have greater consideration of sustainable energy provision and climate mitigation strategies such as SUDS.
2. Housing should be developed with connected GRID road layouts over the traditional cul de sac that encourages and supports car dependency. Grids provide better connectivity, safer streets and crime mitigation through natural surveillance, support public transport networks, encourage inclusive mixed development and are a more efficient use of land.
3. There needs to be greater regulation and developing policy about external light sources in development to better protect dark skies - position, orientation, types of lighting and the avoidance of reflective surfaces. This is necessary not only for wellbeing but nocturnal wildlife and the expansion of Cirencester on the periphery will, by default, extend the night light.

Comment ID: 9253

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Cirencester Civic Society

Comment: Q6-Some of the language should be tougher or expanded.

Draft Vision

By 2043, Cotswold District will be a resilient, inclusive, and forward-looking rural district that has successfully responded to the climate crisis, conserved and enhanced the Cotswolds National Landscape, delivered sustainable communities, and supported a vibrant, low-carbon economy. Development will have been guided by a spatial strategy that prioritises environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic vitality, while respecting the district's unique landscape, heritage, and character. The district will have delivered a diverse range of housing, including a significant increase in socially rented and affordable (entry level) homes, enabling residents of all ages and backgrounds to live securely and sustainably. New settlements and strategic sites will have matured into thriving communities, offering high-quality homes, employment opportunities, and essential services, all supported by integrated infrastructure and sustainable transport networks. Existing Principal and Non-Principal settlements will have grown proportionately (with supporting infrastructure), enhancing their role as local service centres while maintaining their distinct identities. The district will have transitioned to zero-carbon development, with new buildings and infrastructure designed to minimise energy use and maximise renewable energy generation. Biodiversity Net Gain will be embedded across all development, contributing to a richer natural environment and improved ecological resilience. Transport emissions will have been significantly reduced through investment in active travel infrastructure, public transport, and strategic growth focused on transport nodes. Communities will be healthier, more connected, and better supported by local services, green spaces, and digital infrastructure. Cotswold District will continue to be "Green to the Core," with planning decisions consistently reflecting the long-term interests of people, place, and planet.

Draft Objectives

1. Respond to the climate crisis through adaptation and mitigation
 - Require all new development to be zero-carbon and climate-resilient.
 - support (Require) the provision of renewable energy schemes and promoting community owned renewables initiatives.
 - Locate development away from flood-prone areas and promote (facilitate) water and energy efficiency.

2. Conserve and enhance the natural, built, and historic environment
 - Preserve the high quality, local distinctiveness, and diversity of the natural and historic environment.
 - Support the sympathetic retrofit of historic buildings.
 - Conserve and enhance the distinct character of the Cotswolds National Landscape and open countryside.
 - Promote (Require) high-quality, sustainable design and green infrastructure that supports health and wellbeing.
3. Deliver inclusive, healthy, and affordable (entry level) housing
 - Provide a diverse mix of housing types and tenures, with a focus on socially rented homes. (Avoid clusters of age-related housing unless a proven need exists)
 - Ensure development supports positive health outcomes and embeds local health and wellbeing strategies.
4. Enable a vibrant, low-carbon local economy
 - Support the transition to a low-carbon economy and promote local employment.
 - Encourage (Protect) the vitality and viability of town and village centres as places that support a range of activities and uses such as shopping, leisure, cultural and community activities; as well as providing access to affordable homes.
 - Maintain Cirencester's role as a key employment and service centre.
5. Promote sustainable transport use and connectivity
 - Reduce transport emissions by encouraging walking, cycling, and public transport.
 - Focus development on accessible locations with strong transport links.
 - Create active transport hubs to aid health outcomes and reduce emissions and pollution.
6. Ensure infrastructure and services support sustainable communities
 - Deliver (accessible) infrastructure, services, and facilities that meet the needs of residents and businesses.
 - Ensure the required infrastructure, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, is delivered in a timely manner.

Comment ID: 10221

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Cirencester Community Railway Project

Comment: A- We note that a recent government announcement in the House of Commons has indicated their intention to limit the number of parking spaces which developers are permitted to include in residential developments.

While it is some way from becoming law, if it does, this limitation will reduce the attractiveness of the dwellings unless acceptable alternative transportation is provided. However, such a limitation, coupled with the establishment of a Very Light Rail service, fits neatly to support the district's Green-to-the-Core philosophy.

B- In terms of the relative cost of the VLR project, we note that a report for GCC in 2015 predicted that relatively minor improvements to the accessibility of Kemble Station could boost the local economy by £28m every year, which coupled with the increase in the developers' profits, easily justifies such investment.

Comment ID: 10643

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Introduction: Cirencester Town Council's Planning Committee considered the document and noted that Cotswold District Council's preferred option, Scenario 5, will only achieve 79% of the target. (Scenario 5 – Allocate Sites in Principal Settlements, Non-Principal Settlements and Village Clusters. Support Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements. Create new settlement(s) and/or strategic extensions to existing settlement(s). This shortfall would require seeking support from neighbouring authorities to absorb some of the excess. The Government's current 'one-size-fits-all' approach to housing targets fails to account for the unique constraints faced by areas like the Cotswold District, where 84% of the district is designated national landscape. This leaves only 16% of the land available for all remaining development, which is not viable.

However, the Town Council concurs with Cotswold District Council that Scenario 5 remains the soundest option to meet its obligations and is therefore the most practical choice. However, when considering the proposed strategic extension map for Cirencester, the necessary infrastructure must be put in place to support this level of housing. This includes addressing water supply/wastewater treatment, transport requirements, provision of a transport hub and associated bus services and mitigating the impact on Cirencester town centre, particularly in relation to traffic on the ring road, the availability of parking and safe cycle routes.

Response to Question 1:

Scenario 5 represents the most attainable option for meeting the required obligations. However, when considering the proposed strategic extension map for Cirencester, the necessary infrastructure must be delivered to support this scale of housing development. This includes ensuring adequate water supply and wastewater treatment, addressing transport requirements, and mitigating potential impacts on Cirencester town centre.

Particular attention should be given to traffic management on the ring road, the provision of sufficient parking, the creation of safe, accessible cycle routes and pathways and of a transport hub and the institution of comprehensive bus services to the new housing estates. Also, reference should be made to the Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan, which sets out a long-term vision for sustainable growth while safeguarding the town's distinctive character and qualities.

Comment ID: 10644

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Response to Question 2:

No.

Comment ID: 10646

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Response to Question 3:

The Council supports increasing housing density within new developments by incorporating smaller homes with modest gardens and a greater proportion of flats, provided these are designed appropriately and maintain the character and ambience of the town. There is a clear need for one and two-bedroom dwellings in the area. However, the Council does not support the introduction of high-rise buildings.

Comment ID: 10649

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Response to Question 4:

Yes, subject to the appropriate infrastructure development in the town (Cirencester) – see Cirencester Town Council's response to Question 1.

Comment ID: 10650

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Response to Question 5:

The light rail proposals connecting Cirencester to Kemble should be identified and cycleway plans must ensure they do not conflict with each other. Additionally, population analysis for settlements of Cirencester's size and age profile is essential.

Future developments must provide genuinely affordable housing and be accessible to all, catering to both younger and older residents. This includes amenities such as cinemas, bowling alleys, and business start-up units, so families are not forced to commute out of town for work or leisure.

Reference is made to The Community Needs Index, which "measures social and cultural factors that impact community well-being, helping policymakers target investment in social infrastructure." Cirencester scores poorly compared to the English average, particularly in the availability of key civic, educational, and cultural assets. These facilities, often free or low-cost, are vital for fostering a positive sense of community. Notably, some large housing areas in Cirencester lack even a basic community centre or meeting space, so such facilities should also be provided.

Whilst the data provided in the consultation document is valuable, a concern remains that significant housing growth could alter Cirencester's population profile, which is a factor that is difficult to predict with certainty.

Comment ID: 10652

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Cirencester Town Council

Comment: Response to Question 6:

Yes. A comprehensive assessment of the wider community's needs is essential. Significant work is required to determine the most appropriate approach, ensuring that future plans align with demographic trends, infrastructure capacity, and social priorities.

Comment ID: 10346

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Claire Griffiths

Comment: I object to the focus on the South Cotswolds area for new houses. Rural villages such as Drifffield, Down Ampney and Ampney Crucis will not be able to maintain their character and scenic beauty with the proportion of new houses to existing homes, nor do they have the infrastructure to cope.

Comment ID: 10369

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Claire Griffiths

Comment:

I object to the proposed housing allocation for Poulton.

Poulton is a non-sustainable rural village and does not have the essential facilities or infrastructure required to support further housing growth.

For Poulton to be considered sustainable, the following facilities would need to be in place or legally guaranteed before any development:

- Village-wide flood mitigation (not site-by-site)
- Adequate sewage and wastewater treatment capacity
- Full-fibre broadband (FTTP) to every dwelling
- Reliable indoor and outdoor mobile phone coverage
- Viable public transport (including evenings and weekends)
- Access to primary education capacity
- Access to GP, Dentist and healthcare services
- Safe highway capacity and traffic management

These facilities do not exist in Poulton and are not secured by the Local Plan.

Flooding and sewage problems are long-standing and unresolved, particularly around Ranbury, Bell Lane, Stoney Pool and the A417 bridge. Past development has already worsened flooding elsewhere.

Poulton also suffers from poor broadband speeds and unreliable mobile signal, resulting in digital exclusion. This restricts home working, access to NHS digital services, emergency communications, education and day-to-day public services. Digital infrastructure is now essential infrastructure, equivalent to water or electricity.

Allocating housing in Poulton fails the Local Plan soundness tests:

- Not positively prepared (known infrastructure deficits unresolved)
- Not justified (reasonable alternatives exist in sustainable locations)
- Not effective (no guaranteed delivery of infrastructure before occupation)
- Not consistent with national planning policy

Failing even one test makes a plan unsound. Poulton fails all four.

Conclusion

Poulton is not an appropriate location for further housing growth. Unless flood mitigation, sewage upgrades and full digital infrastructure are delivered and operational before occupation, the proposed allocation should be removed or substantially reduced.

Comment ID: 10711

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Claire Sharp

Comment: General Planning Notes for CDC Local Plan Consultation: Concerning Area 17 (Down Ampney)

Highway Safety and Traffic

Highway safety is a serious concern in Down Ampney village. The existing route through the village consists of narrow rural roads that were not designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic. These roads have poor visibility around bends at both ends of the village meaning pedestrians, the many cyclists and vehicles must share the same restricted space. Any further housing development would lead to greatly increased traffic bringing an unacceptable risk to highway safety and the wellbeing of existing residents.

Flooding

Any further housing development should be refused due to the well known risk of flooding in the village and on the surrounding land, which is known to have a high water table. During heavy rain surface water is already unable to drain away leading to flooding in the centre of the village with road closures. With the recent housing developments existing village drainage is already beyond capacity and any further developments with large areas of hardstanding would significantly reduce natural absorption, increase surface water runoff and make the flooding more severe.

Sewerage

The existing sewage treatment plant is already operating far beyond its intended capacity of 200 houses with regular discharges by Thames Water into the Down Ampney Brook. During periods of heavy rainfall and flooding there is back flow onto the village high street. Any further development would place more pressure on the already inadequate sewerage infrastructure increasing the number of sewage discharges. Without evidence from Thames Water on when overdue upgrades will be planned and

finished, any additional housing development cannot be considered sustainable to the local area.

Character of the Village

A development giving rise to a 2.5 times increase in the number of homes in Down Ampney will cause significant and irreversible loss to the village character. The scale and housing density of any development would not be in keeping with the historic layout, architectural style, and rural setting that define our Cotswold village and contribute to its sense of place, one of the key reasons residents choose to live in Down Ampney.

Environmental Impact

The scale and nature of any development would result in the loss of valued green space, disruption to local wildlife habitats and increased pressure on the surrounding natural environment. Greatly increased levels of traffic noise and pollution from a car dependent development would have a serious impact on the environment, a major point that does not align with the stated sustainable development principles outlined by Cotswold District Council and would be unacceptable on landscape impact and heritage grounds.

Social Considerations

The scale of development would place significant strain on the limited existing local infrastructure and services. Down Ampney village school is already at capacity and the village relies only on a small community run shop. Nearest medical facilities for basic healthcare needs require a car journey to either Cricklade, Cirencester or Swindon. Without clear and funded plans to expand these essential services, the proposal would be detrimental to the wellbeing of both current and future residents.

No Employment or Transport

Down Ampney village has no local employment opportunities and any development would increase reliance on commuting to other areas for work, placing additional pressure on the rural road network. Any feasible alternative transport to private car use would require a comprehensive bus network. Without realistic access to local jobs and sustainable transport options any development risks increasing traffic congestion, pollution and social isolation, and does not represent balanced or sustainable development for the village.

High Car Dependency

The location and scale of the development does not provide realistic alternatives to private vehicle use, given the limited public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure. This would obviously lead to increased traffic congestion, road safety concerns, and higher emissions which are contrary to sustainable development objectives and would negatively affect the quality of life in the village.

Introducing a Significant Area of Built Form into a Rural Landscape

The scale, density, and urban character of the development is not considered in keeping with the setting of Down Ampney and would significantly change the rural landscape, eroding its openness and visual amenity. Such an intrusion would be harmful to the established rural character of the area and is not consistent with the environmental stewardship outlined in the Cotswolds District Council's Vision for 2043.

Comment ID: 11066

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Clare Champion

Comment: Increasing density in housing sites too significantly would impact the quality of the living areas (reducing green space etc) and negatively effect the consistency in style of housing developments within the cotswolds. This comment is particularly prevalent for the suggestion of high rise buildings.

Comment ID: 11072

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Clare Champion

Comment: The scenarios presented do not include allowing small development sites adjacent to development boundaries in principle settlements (even if just primary facility towns). This seems like an obvious infilling option for identifiable sites which would be of small enough scale to be 'in keeping' in design/style, a faster build and could also be planned locations to avoid undesirable sprawl or generic policy.

Comment ID: 11107

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Clare Champion

Comment: this policy proposal is already acceptable for villages under local plan and National Planning Policy (thus extending to principle settlements is proposed).

Additional windfall potential or identified strategic small scale sites.

Comment ID: 11077

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Clare Champion

Comment: support main service centre extension, but with small scale developments to ensure maximum style adherence with historic town buildings

Comment ID: 10828

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Clare Garlick

Comment: Policing needs other than emergency services, addresing the increasing issues with antisocial behavior and local crime, drug dealing etc affecting our young people in particular, as well as the whole community. This will only increase with an expanded population and is somewhat out of control at present.

Comment ID: 10834

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Clare Garlick

Comment: Will all new buildings incorporate solar panels etc and swift boxes to help the endangered birds our area currently supports? swift boxes in particular are a small way to make a huge difference to an endangered species in our area.

Comment ID: 10183

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: Central Government must urgently rethink both the housing allocation and the strategy that sits behind it. The current approach prioritises building on open fields and countryside land before fully exhausting the enormous potential of empty retail space and brownfield sites across the country. This is not only environmentally damaging, it is also illogical when so many town centres already contain vacant buildings and underused land that could be repurposed quickly into homes. If the stated goal is genuinely affordable housing, then it must be delivered where people can live without needing a car for every journey, in places that already have transport links, shops, schools, and essential amenities. Concentrating development in existing towns and urban centres, where infrastructure is already in place, is a far more sustainable and financially responsible solution than sprawling estate building that erodes the countryside and leaves communities with years of congestion, service pressure and environmental loss.

Comment ID: 10254

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: Scenario 4 is my preferred option. However, any proposal for affordable housing must be rooted in the principle of sustainable integration, not isolation. National planning policy dictates that new developments should be situated near established transport hubs, such as rail links, to ensure residents are not trapped in 'forced car ownership.

Furthermore, I challenge the 'housing-first' approach of this proposal. It is a fundamental failure of planning to consent to residential units before a robust, binding infrastructure strategy, encompassing medical capacity, retail amenities, and expanded road access, is fully costed and approved. Finally, greenfield development should only ever be considered as a last resort. The council must demonstrate a 'Brownfield First' strategy, proving that all viable urban infill, vacant retail conversions, and brownfield sites have been exhausted before permanently destroying the Cotswold countryside.

Comment ID: 10256

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: No. Central Government must urgently rethink both the housing allocation and the strategy that sits behind it. The current approach prioritises building on open fields and countryside land BEFORE fully exhausting the enormous potential of empty retail space and brownfield sites across the country. This is not only environmentally damaging, it is also illogical when so many town centres already contain vacant buildings and underused land that could be repurposed quickly into homes. If the stated goal is genuinely affordable housing, then it must be delivered where people can live without needing a car for every journey, in places that already have transport links, shops, schools, and essential amenities. Concentrating development in existing towns and urban centres, where infrastructure is already in place, is a far more sustainable and financially responsible solution than sprawling estate building that erodes the countryside and leaves communities with years of congestion, service pressure and environmental loss.

Comment ID: 10229

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: This is my preferred option. However, any proposal for affordable housing must be rooted in the principle of sustainable integration, not isolation. National planning policy dictates that new developments should be situated near established transport hubs, such as rail links, to ensure residents are not trapped in 'forced car ownership.'

Furthermore, I challenge the 'housing-first' approach of this proposal. It is a fundamental failure of planning to consent to residential units before a robust, binding infrastructure strategy, encompassing medical capacity, retail amenities, and expanded road access, is fully costed and approved. Finally, greenfield development should only ever be considered as a last resort. The council must demonstrate a 'Brownfield First' strategy, proving that all viable urban infill, vacant retail conversions, and brownfield sites have been exhausted before permanently destroying the Cotswold countryside.

Comment ID: 10230

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: This is my preferred option. However, any proposal for affordable housing must be rooted in the principle of sustainable integration, not isolation. National planning policy dictates that new developments should be situated near established transport hubs, such as rail links, to ensure residents are not trapped in 'forced car ownership.'

Furthermore, I challenge the 'housing-first' approach of this proposal. It is a fundamental failure of planning to consent to residential units before a robust, binding infrastructure strategy, encompassing medical capacity, retail amenities, and expanded road access, is fully costed and approved. Finally, greenfield development should only ever be considered as a last resort. The council must demonstrate a 'Brownfield First' strategy, proving that all viable urban infill, vacant retail conversions, and brownfield sites have been exhausted before permanently destroying the Cotswold countryside.

Comment ID: 10226

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Clare McDougall

Comment: I strongly object to this development on the grounds that it represents a disproportionate and unsustainable expansion into the Cotswold countryside. Ampney Crucis lacks the infrastructure to support such a significant increase in residency (even 100 houses would be too much!); specifically, the local road network consists of narrow lanes with no physical scope for widening, which will inevitably exacerbate the existing severe congestion and 'rush hour' bottlenecks in nearby Cirencester. Furthermore, the proposal poses a significant environmental risk. The Thames Water area, specifically the Ampney Brook, has already documented issues with sewage discharge and drainage capacity; adding hundreds of homes will dangerously overwhelm this fragile system. Socially, the development is flawed: with no local employment opportunities and a public transport network that is functionally non-existent for commuters, residents will be forced into car dependency. This is particularly punitive for lower-income households and directly contradicts national carbon reduction targets. With local GP services already at a breaking point (frequently seeing wait times exceeding two weeks) this development would irreparably degrade the quality of life for both existing and future residents of the village.

Comment ID: 11074

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Clare Turner

Comment: Many Cotswold settlements have examples of good quality, higher density homes in the form of attractive terraces constructed from Cotswold stone. Many of these were constructed to address the same challenges we currently face ie a lack of affordable homes for those on low incomes. It would be great to see, where appropriate, this type of high quality housing, which is typically modest in size (suited to first homes), can be more energy efficient than other construction types and can reflect the character of existing accommodation in some settlements.

Comment ID: 11089

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Clare Turner

Comment: I recognise the logic of option 5 and am unable to propose a better solution to the problem of meeting the government's housing targets but think that the housing targets alone are unlikely to address the affordability challenges the district faces. There must be an emphasis on the creation of social rented homes and smaller homes, but only where they can be delivered as part of sustainable communities with employment opportunities and no detrimental impacts on the wider environment or economy (eg with sewerage that is fit for purpose and without excessive loss of land currently in food production).

Comment ID: 11075

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Clare Turner

Comment: The Council should not consider locating development in locations it considers unsustainable, just to meet the government targets. To do so would be detrimental to the nature of the area and generate problems for communities down the line (due to inadequate access to services and employment opportunities for example).

Comment ID: 11083

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Clare Turner

Comment: I support an increase in density, providing it is in keeping with existing settlements. In recent years, much of the windfall development in the parishes of Blockley and Ebrington has involved construction of a small number of very large properties which does not meet local housing need and contributes to the lack of housing affordability in the area: an end to this type of development would be welcome.

Comment ID: 11098

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Clare Turner

Comment: I agree with the vision as set out, particularly in relation to responding to the climate crisis, delivering inclusive, healthy, affordable homes, promoting sustainable transport and enabling a low carbon economy.

Comment ID: 10461

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Clemency

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

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

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

Comment ID: 10460

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Clemency

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

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

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

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

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

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

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

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

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

Comment ID: 10463

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Clemency

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

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

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

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

Some alternatives to be given further consideration are:

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

Changing the designation of holiday homes in the Cotswold Lakes.

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

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

Comment ID: 10464

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Clemency

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

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

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

Comment ID: 10465

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Clemency

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

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

Comment ID: 10467

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Clemency

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

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

We moved here from Cirencester centre to be part of a small rural community.

Comment ID: 10468

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Clemency

Comment: Yes. The Plan should consider:

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

The complete inability of this small village to support growth of this nature.

Comment ID: 10471

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Clemency

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

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

Comment ID: 10119

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: Coates Parish Council is very concerned about the number of houses being dictated by central government to be built in the Cotswold District. The government's calculation does not reflect local need nor the fact that most of the area is with the Cotswold National Landscape. Coates Parish Council prefers either Scenario 3, apart from service centres which 'lie within the Cotswolds National Landscape', or Scenario 5 apart from supporting 'Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements.' It doesn't make sense to build affordable housing in rural areas where residents need to rely heavily on a car. There is also considerable concern about the proliferation of the village of Kemble because of the impact such development would have on the main access routes serving nearby villages which are already under great strain.

Comment ID: 10129

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: Scenario 5 is a preferred scenario as it builds on the current strategy and the district will not get anywhere near the unobtainable government target without building a new settlement. Scenario 3 is also preferred as it preserves the local villages. It of course falls far short of the government target.

With regard to Scenario 4, there is concern about over-development of Kemble as a result of its railway station and its proximity to neighbouring villages some of which are located in the CNL. Over development of Kemble will impact the main access routes into Cirencester and Tetbury which serve local villages. It will also increase cut traffic through/ rat runs through local hamlets and villages including Coates.

Comment ID: 10130

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: Definitely not as such development would only exacerbate existing difficulties, increase transport issues and be contrary to the Council's environmental policy. As such, it would fail to meet the expectations of both existing and potential residents.

Comment ID: 10131

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: Minimally because this would create its own problems for residents in terms of lack of amenities and space. It will also ruin the character and beauty of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 10133

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: No – not in the Cotswold District because 80% of its land is in the CNL and, therefore, is not developable. The government's blanket policy cannot be applied equally to every area without regard to its individual characteristics and local needs.

Comment ID: 10134

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: Yes - matters such as medical facilities (surgeries and hospitals) educational facilities (schools and colleges) and Designated Green Spaces, not just fabricated parks but natural spaces in the countryside, must be an integral part of any Development Strategy. Current facilities are already under extreme pressure.

Comment ID: 10136

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Coates Parish Council

Comment: CPC is largely supportive of CDC's vision and, in particular, its focus on conserving the CNL and developing only where it is sustainable. With improved facilities and designated Green Spaces and preservation of the countryside, communities should enjoy healthier lives.

CPC is broadly supportive of CDC's objectives: in particular, a(3), b(1,2,3), c(2), d(4), e(2 and 3), f

Comment ID: 10057

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Colin Gibson

Comment: Concerning increased Traffic and Safety: -

1) As it can take over 1hr to travel through Moreton in Marsh and Stow on the Wold at times, when the towns are only a few miles apart. New developments in these towns and the Villages such as Broadwell between will make this congestion worse and degrade the quality of life in Broadwell.

2) When the Fossway is blocked or slow, motorists cut through Broadwell. Many of them ignoring priority at junctions and exceeding the speed limit. This already presents a danger to pedestrians in Broadwell, as there are few pavements and street lighting is inadequate. Increased planning in and around Broadwell will increase the risk to life and property.

Concerning Property: -

3) In 2007 this area and Moreton in Marsh was badly fooded. Increased surface water drainage from new properties will only make this possibility worse. There is a need for a surface water storage and drainage system in Broadwell and the surrounding area to prevent serious flooding in the future. During the heaviest rain storms, the river Evenlode is slow to take the water away from the area and water backs into Broadwell.

Concerning Services: -

4) Water and sewage disposal is already stretched, such that Broadwell experienced months of a hosepipe ban in 2025 and occaisional overflow of foul water to the local rivers. Global warming is set to continue such that dry summers may see a more serious water shortage. Increased resovoir capacity and distribution infrastructure is already required without Increased development.

Social Services: -

5) In Broadwell we must wait as much as 8 weeks for a Doctors appointment. There must be a plan in place to bolster all the local infrastructure for social and travel requirements of local people before planning additional development.

Comment ID: 9364

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: The idea that the majority allocation needs to sit outside of the AONB and these areas should receive a disproportionately high amount of development is fundamentally flawed. The current proposed plan is in no way sustainable and requires a complete re-think. In order to become sustainable, significantly more development would be required in the AONB, especially given the large proportion of the total area that it occupies. The impacts on basic infrastructure, hydrology and flooding and on the rural character of those highly impacted settlements outside of the AONB is likely to be very significant.

Comment ID: 9366

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: The allocations for a very few smaller settlements e.g. Ampney Crucis, Preston etc. are extremely high. In the case of Ampney Crucis making the village 3-4x as large. A village with little or no infrastructure (bar a small primary school), serviced by narrow winding lanes, with a poor/intermittent electricity supply which fails on fair regular basis and without mains gas. And with high sewage overflows into the Ampney Brook already. The indicative maps highlight just how disproportionate and fundamentally unfair the allocation of development is to the area of land around Cirencester and stretching to Fairford. Entirely a consequence of the decision to avoid development in the AONB. This is completely unsustainable.

Comment ID: 9387

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: Why is the 660 proposed homes to the North of Ampney Crucis included in both the leading up to 2043 figures and development post 2043?

Is the allocation expected to span both periods? What are the proposed timescales?

Comment ID: 9391

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: These figures look completely unsustainable for a rural area, The new settlement at Drifffield at over 2000 homes for example. It is difficult to understand how anyone could view these as realistic or deliverable or that there will be the infrastructure and transport in place to support these numbers.

Comment ID: 9394

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: These plans are completely unsustainable. I don't think anything could make this level of development sustainable in this area.

The main existing issues are with healthcare provision for an aging population, lack of transport links (trains, buses etc. The roads which are mostly narrow country lanes across most of the proposed areas. Sewage and waste water provision - we already have large amounts of sewage flowing into the Ampney Brook and Coln without the development - there would have to be massive investment by Thames Water to even get anywhere near providing for the level of new homes proposed here, And a lot of planning and infrastructure to avoid a big increase in flooding risk. The electricity grid would also need large scale improvements across the villages as the supply is currently very intermittent and long outages have been experienced recently in Ampney St Peter and the surroundings.

Comment ID: 9398

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: These maps show very powerfully the impact of the decision to avoid any of the housing burden being imposed within the AONB.

In map 1, Moreton carries most of the burden as part of it is outside of the boundary.

Map 2 has very little development (inside the AONB)

Map 3 has the vast majority of the housing development. With very large scale developments around and between Cirencester and Fairford. Just outside of the AONB boundary.

This proposal is very skewed and the allocation is just unsustainable in nature. Apart from the burden on infrastructure (which is already scarce), the rural character of the area would be completely changed.

Why have smaller levels of development spread proportionally across the AONB not been proposed? It seems like the AONB boundary has been used as an excuse to limit the development to very large-scale increases in a relatively small area and to a smaller number of villages, reducing the backlash from resident outside of those areas.

The small area of land outside of the AONB makes this proposal especially unsustainable - and probably not deliverable.

Comment ID: 9411

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: Can you guarantee that the proposed housing development will be low carbon and meet net zero objectives. Which mandatory measures will be put in place? Will heat pumps and solar panels be mandatory? What local green energy generation capacity will be required to support this high level of development?

Comment ID: 9412

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: You mention resiliency, sustainability and a 'rural' district in the vision statement. All while proposing unsustainable development levels, reduced resilience (in the absence of an infrastructure plan) and a great reduction in the rural nature of the communities in the south of the district. How does your plan match your vision? There seems to be gulf between what is being proposed and what you say you want to achieve? How do you reconcile that?

Comment ID: 9413

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: What is the point of these objectives as your plan mostly seeks to achieve the opposite of them? A vision is only worthwhile if you actually make an attempt to achieve it.

In what way is the historic or rural character preserved by these plans? they actively reduced the rural character of the south of the district,

Most of the proposed development is on Greenfield sites, mostly farmland. The fields currently being proposed in the vicinity of Ampney Crucis and Driffield support nesting red list bird species such as Lapwing, Skylark, Corn Bunting, Yellowhammer, Grey Partridge and are used by animals such as Brown Hare.

In what way does this unsustainable level of development serve to 'Conserve and enhance the natural, built and historic environment?

There is no point in having defined objectives or a vision in these areas if your proposed plan delivers the complete opposite. It really isn't sustainable development, however you seek to present it,

Comment ID: 9414

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Colin Kilpatrick

Comment: Why are you including previously rejected sites in this process? We have an example of a site being shown for proposed development on the map which has already been assessed for development and rejected, appealed and rejected again. It was deemed unsuitable then and still is.

Comment ID: 9385

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Colin Kilpaytrick

Comment: Where is the detailed Infrastructure Plan which underpins this proposed very large scale of development?

The document notes issues with infrastructure provision e.g. Thames Water, As I type this there are sewage discharges currently happening at Ampney St Peter, Fairford into the Ampney Brook and River Coln and at Shorncote. These are very frequent regular occurrences without the extra development. Where is the commitment for sewage treatment and waste water infrastructure for such a large increase in housing?

The electricity supply locally was out for 3 days recently (has happened before in the last few years) and regularly drops. Is there provision for improving that? It doesn't cope with the current load. There is also no mains gas in the area.

What about healthcare, roads, schools? Some of the villages which are proposed to increase 3-4 times (some even more) in size have no real infrastructure- connectivity, transport etc.

Hydrology is another key problem. Water pours down the lane adjacent to our property every time it rains, when heavy it floods and has damaged the surface of the A417 which it meets, Above the lane is a site is proposed for development. The lane itself if is narrow (single track in places), winding, has no pavement or street lighting (neither does the whole area) and is already dangerous to walk on. It is busy already at school start and end of day, the big increase in housing will make that very much worse.

What infrastructure plan is in place to meet this proposed massively increase demand, as part of 660 new homes of Ampney Crucis. The infrastructure simply is nowhere near that - and these issues are replicated right across the area

Comment ID: 9440

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Colin Rank

Comment: Broad Zone 23, Map 4 - Ecological suitability and impact on important wildlife habitats.

Broad Zone 23 should be re-examined as suitable for housing development in regard to the significant adverse effect highly likely to cause considerable harm to natural habitats and wildlife within and in close proximity to Kemble Wood which is designated by ENGLISH HERITAGE as an ANCIENT WOODLAND and KEY WILDLIFE SITE by Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust.

Within Kemble Wood itself indigenous Woodcock (*Scolopax rusticola*) nest and live (Listed as highly threatened on the IUCN Red List).

Surrounding Kemble Wood is a unique area identified by the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust as conducive to Wild English Partridge (Grey Partridge *Perdix perdix*). Two coveys inhabit the area East and South of Kemble Wood and have done for a great many years. Grey Partridge are also on the IUCN Red List (Most endangered in the UK and identified as a priority for recovery efforts).

The Common Snipe (*Gallinago gallinago*) is a regular visitor to this part of the farm with visiting numbers in a typical Dec reaching up to 100 birds. Listed as Threatened on the IUCN Red List.

The area is also home to many Brown Hares (*Lepus europaeus*) A species of significant conservation concern in the UK. (BAP species)

In the plantation immediately to north east of Kemble Wood known as High Stubbs there are around 12 semi mature English Elms (*Ulmus procera*) once common in Kemble but now almost extinct. It would appear that the surrounding conifers proved an acidic litter which has protected this small colony.

It would be impossible to build 590 house in this area without devastating these threatened species. Even a small development in this area would have catastrophic consequences on these and many other species because of the inevitable disturbance from Human activity. The area should be protected from development rather than exploited. Activities like the Airport and F Site have minimal impact on wildlife.

These considerations make this area, above all other reasons, wholly unsuitable for housing development.

Comment ID: 8642

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: I have emailed my PDF Umbrella Representation yet shall highlight on the digital format the references where my PDF Representation corresponds for the Local Plan Team.

Comment ID: 8643

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: My PDF Umbrella Representation may be useful for previous and ongoing Conservation Area Appraisals

Comment ID: 8641

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8668

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8674

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Emphasise TRADITIONAL DESIGN CODES

Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8677

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: There is only cause for this if TRADITIONAL DESIGN COES are utilised otherwise this is sacrilege of an internationally acclaimed part of the World.

Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8644

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8659

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: The organisations I have cited will be able to best support the Council with this- Create Streets, The King's Foundation, Shaw & Jagger, etc.

Comment ID: 8663

Location in consultation document: Development beyond 2043

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Full consultation consulting my own Placemaking Principles and Role of a Traditional Town InYourArea Articles will be very useful when planning the next 30 years ahead.

Comment ID: 8669

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8670

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8660

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

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: As immediately above- the organisations in my PDF Umbrella Representation are worth consulting.

Comment ID: 8653

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8661

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see organizations cited in my PDF Umbrella Representation.

Comment ID: 8666

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: My Umbrella PDF Representation will be able to support this most effectively. The Organisations should be consulted, especially for long-term strategy. I recommend this for wider objective input and a track record for delivering high quality design popular amongst everyone.

Comment ID: 8671

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8656

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Lowest possible density with High quality Traditional Design Codes, otherwise no matter the density chosen this is just going to antagonise local residents, all types of high quality investors and reduce the appeal of the area which will impact economically over the future decades.

Comment ID: 8657

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: The Council needs to be practical so that it doesn't create avoidable problems for itself, such as costly strains on infrastructure that could alienate local residents and future ones from moving or doing business here if the area becomes too congested. Housing Targets should be fully queried by ALL Officials.

Comment ID: 8658

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: None- This is an internationally renowned quiet area serving as a microcosm of Old England that is beloved by all creeds and denominations. Filming opportunities will eventually decline altogether if settings, such as Neil Gaiman's Stardust starring Michelle Pfeiffer become gradually erased or spoilt through streetscapes and background vistas becoming juxtaposed with new modern buildings clearly out of place.

Comment ID: 8667

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Yes- consult with the organisations I have mentioned to give true professional guidance on how to address and resolve these (avoidable) issues.

Comment ID: 8673

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: YES- Traditional Design Codes of high-quality that will substantially mitigate concerns over congestion improving local economics, good will with the community and wider investment sources and of course central Government of all stripes.

Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8676

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Ambivalent as some effort being made presently, but insufficient. Clear drive on TRADITIONAL DESIGN CODES IS NEEDED. This will alleviate many concerns held by all key stakeholders.

Comment ID: 8646

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8647

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8648

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8649

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8650

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8651

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8652

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Please see my PDF Umbrella Representation which focuses upon the immense value of High Quality Traditional Design Codes and their overlapping benefits ranging from combatting the climate crisis, improved mental health and well-being benefits to the array of grant funding advantages from inward private investment and much more likely Central Government funding for key infrastructure projects such as transportation, road resurfacing and drainage/ flooding defences, etc. I shall highlight each relevant chapter, although these must be cross-referenced against my original PDF Document which expands in detail on each point with evidence from leading Academics and Architects, etc.

Comment ID: 8654

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: These figures must be benchmarked against practical requirements. Use of organisations, such as Create Streets, The King's Foundation, Francis Shaw at Shaw & Jagger Architects, etc will be able to better guide this.

Comment ID: 8662

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Much wider grassroots consultation required- the organisations I have referenced will be very useful in supporting the Council do this.

Comment ID: 8664

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: There must be a roadmap of universal essential infrastructure and businesses, etc essential that I have listed in my InYourArea Articles contained in my PDF Umbrella Representation.

Comment ID: 8665

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: My PDF Umbrella Representation contains useful sources for this in detail.

Comment ID: 8655

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: Wider consultation with bodies, such as Create Streets, The King's Foundation and Francis Shaw at Shaw & Jagger, etc are pivotal to get the best possible outcomes.

Comment ID: 8645

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Community Campaigner David Barton

Comment: High Quality Traditional Design Codes will support appropriate house-building where distinctive unique styles are utilised NOT Modern day contemporary interpretation that are CAD Software shapes with no indication of which part of the country they're from. This causes much objection from residents and investors alike through an apparent disregard for true high quality design that disregards local beauty.

Comment ID: 9182

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Conor Brennan

Comment: I don't see how the current infrastructure can support this level of increases. Being specific the Toll Bar and the end of Preston which is already a dangerous crossing. Also add Hospitals and Schools. Area also suffers from flooding.

Comment ID: 9180

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Conor Brennan

Comment: No. This is not sustainable. The proposed increase is huge and i don't see how this can be absorbed

Comment ID: 9181

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Conor Brennan

Comment: Comment relates to Preston

Comment ID: 9178

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Conor Brennan

Comment: The proposed Increase in housing in Preston would be 10x the current housing. How can this be acceptable to the people currently living in Preston. This would totally overwhelm the current character of the village

Comment ID: 9179

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Conor Brennan

Comment: This is almost a 3000% proposed increase in the housing in Preston. This cannot be described as Fair or doing our bit under any criteria.

Comment ID: 184

Email/Letter Representation

Name: C Mainwaring

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

Comment ID: 468

Email/Letter Representation

Name: C. Owen

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

Comment ID: 236

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Calvert

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

Comment ID: 714

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cameron Kirk

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

Comment ID: 449

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Camilla Burrige

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

Comment ID: 207

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Campden Estate

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

Comment ID: 725

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Campden Society

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

Comment ID: 727

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Campden Society

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

Comment ID: 673

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carla Patridge

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

Comment ID: 350

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carol and Adrian Ruskell

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

Comment ID: 177

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carol Hayes

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

Comment ID: 358

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carol Young

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

Comment ID: 593

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carole O'Brien

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

Comment ID: 114

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caroline Byrne

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

Comment ID: 398

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caroline Pattison

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

Comment ID: 804

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caroline Pearce

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

Comment ID: 795

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caroline Robinson

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

Comment ID: 617

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caroline Ungood-Thomas

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

Comment ID: 477

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carolyn E Mansell

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

Comment ID: 554

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Carolyn E Mansell

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

Comment ID: 375

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caron Bradstreet

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

Comment ID: 372

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Caron Westcarr

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

Comment ID: 780

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cas Boddam-Whetham

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

Comment ID: 341

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Castle House Group

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

Comment ID: 425

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Catherine Groombridge

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

Comment ID: 232

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charles and Penny Henty

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

Comment ID: 257

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charles Bishop

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

Comment ID: 301

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charles Levinson

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

Comment ID: 302

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charles Levinson

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

Comment ID: 303

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charles Levinson

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

Comment ID: 831

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charlie Jefferies

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

Comment ID: 748

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charlie Robinson

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

Comment ID: 399

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Charlotte Wilton

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

Comment ID: 464

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chipping Campden Town Council

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

Comment ID: 474

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris & Amy Merrett

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

Comment ID: 576

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris and Amy Merrett

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

Comment ID: 231

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris and Kim Tye

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

Comment ID: 504

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris and Susan Thomson

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

Comment ID: 559

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Cottam

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

Comment ID: 835

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Davies

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

Comment ID: 208

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Hall

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

Comment ID: 263

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Langdon

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

Comment ID: 657

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Roche

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

Comment ID: 409

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Rycroft

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

Comment ID: 565

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Rycroft

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

Comment ID: 423

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Smith

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

Comment ID: 306

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Chris Tye

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

Comment ID: 316

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christ Church

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

Comment ID: 860

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christine Oxenbury

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

Comment ID: 862

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christine Perry

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

Comment ID: 190

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christopher (and Gillian) Peachey

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

Comment ID: 209

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christopher Hall

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

Comment ID: 255

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Christopher Kingsley

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

Comment ID: 799

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cienna Finch

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

Comment ID: 396

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cirencester Action on Buses

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

Comment ID: 658

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Claire Pulley

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

Comment ID: 374

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Claire Robinson

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

Comment ID: 433

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Claire Turner

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

Comment ID: 557

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Clare Bacchus & Sarah Green

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

Comment ID: 581

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Clare Ulyatt

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

Comment ID: 739

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Clinton Grimmer

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

Comment ID: 462

Email/Letter Representation

Name: CNLB

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

Comment ID: 852

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Colin Braithwaite

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

Comment ID: 249

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Colin Godfrey

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

Comment ID: 487

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Coln St Aldwyns Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 128

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Corylus Planning and Environmental Ltd

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

Comment ID: 129

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Corylus Planning and Environmental Ltd

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

Comment ID: 286

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cotswold Oak

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

Comment ID: 482

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Countdown

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

Comment ID: 646

Email/Letter Representation

Name: CPRE North Cotswolds District Committee

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

Comment ID: 599

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Craft

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

Comment ID: 613

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Craig Titchener

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

Comment ID: 844

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cressida Landless

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

Comment ID: 762

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cricklade Town Council

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

Comment ID: 763

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cricklade Town Council

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

Comment ID: 764

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Cricklade Town Council

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