

Comment ID: 9460

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Adam

Comment: The target set by the government feels arbitrary and extremely high for district that has only a small bit of area outside of the AONB to work with. Suggesting that the CDC push back as many of these small rural villages do not have the infrastructure or employment opportunities to support this kind of growth.

Comment ID: 9463

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Adam

Comment: Regarding Fairford - It seems impractical to locate such a large volume of housing in an area without corresponding employment growth. This risks embedding higher levels of car dependency and longer-distance commuting to places such as Swindon, Oxford and larger centres across Gloucestershire - placing further pressure on an already constrained road network.

Comment ID: 9462

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adam

Comment: I would strongly encourage the Council to reconsider the scale of development proposed for Fairford, as the current plan feels very misaligned with infrastructure capacity, local employment realities, and the long-term health and character of the town. Instead, it would seem wise to concentrate future development in large towns where there is both infrastructure and employment opportunities, as opposed to building at this scale in small rural villages and towns like Fairford.

Comment ID: 9461

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Adam

Comment: This number seems radically too high for Fairford. The A417 narrows to a single lane through the town centre. This already creates regular congestion and significant delays. At one point at the base of the market square, the road is only 3m wide, and is flanked by historic buildings that are central to the town's character, making it impossible to widen. An increase of this magnitude would, in my view, make traffic conditions unmanageable - even with a far smaller uplift than currently proposed.

Comment ID: 8925

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adam Billing

Comment: This level of development is ABSOLUTELY UNSUSTAINABLE! This much building, especially in places like Fairford, Kemble and Ampney Crucis will devastate the character of these small rural communities. This must not be allowed to happen!!

Comment ID: 9078

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adam Billing

Comment: I think the CDC has been put into an impossible situation given that 80% of the land within the district is AONB, and cannot be developed - thereby forcing a housing target (recently doubled) into the 20% of the district that is not in the AONB. The result is clearly impractical, unsustainable, and will likely result in the ruin of these communities.

I feel the CDC needs to push back (as other councils have done) on the gov target itself, and question the grounds on which the "affordability" criteria were implemented for a town like Fairford.

Comment ID: 9076

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Adam Billing

Comment: I believe the growth target for Fairford is unsustainable as there are no employment opportunities in the area, and therefore most people would have to drive to work. This is would seem to make this expansion impractical as the main roads here are not capable of handling more volume - the A417 is SINGLE LANE already as it goes through the centre of the town, and is flanked by historic buildings that would prevent widening.

This would also cause an environmental impact - noise, and air pollution - reducing the quality of life we currently enjoy here.

Comment ID: 9077

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Adam Billing

Comment: This level of development in Fairford would put an unmanageable burden on the current water / drainage systems / sewage , which are already badly stressed.

Comment ID: 9704

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: I believe scenario 6 should be adopted. Although it is stated this scenario is against national planning policy scenario 5 with planned large developments in broad area 17 in open rural countryside is also against national planning policy. Smaller sympathetic developments are allowed in the AONB and these should be considered.

CDC should go back to central government to have the housing requirements reduced bearing in mind 80% of the land area falls within the AONB. CDC is sacrificing the remaining 20% merely to fill a nonsensical quota and this will destroy this area of the Cotswolds forever.

Comment ID: 9735

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: Objective 5.3 states to locate development away from flood prone areas or help support climate issues. Down Ampney with it's high water table is very susceptible to highly documented flooding so how does CDC reconcile recommending large scale development in this village.

Comment ID: 9706

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: In small rural villages such as Down Ampney increasing housing density in large developments is completely out of place. Down Ampney is identified in the current local plan as a small rural settlement with limited services where development is expected to be small scale and proportionate.

Comment ID: 9711

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: Scenario 6 is the preferred option. This spreads the development over a much larger area and if done appropriately would not have such a huge impact on the Cotswolds as scenario 5 which sacrifices open rural areas with out of character developments.

Comment ID: 9714

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: Yes. If the areas are unsustainable purely because they are in the AONB then development could be allowed in smaller scale as long as it's in keeping with the character of the villages.

Comment ID: 9717

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: Limited numbers of smaller sympathetically designed terraced houses could be built as villages tend to have such older properties already. Large scale developments with virtually no gardens and houses built without sufficient space between are not in keeping with the village character and must be avoided. In Down Ampney this is already evidenced by the ongoing development at Overlord Way which is suited more to a town than a village rural setting.

Comment ID: 9723

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: Propped large development at Down Ampney is completely unsustainable. CDC 2021 Settlement Analysis (area17) identifies Down Ampney as having limited capacity for growth as its constrained by infrastructure, accessibility and environmental sensitivity. How can CDC just 4 years later now recommend the near tripling of the housing stock.

Comment ID: 9731

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Adam Crawford

Comment: CDC vision in paragraph 5.2 is a meaningless and morally bankrupt statement that I would like to discuss with your officers. Building large developments in rural areas does not in any way conserve and enhance the Cotswold National Landscape. Environmental stewardship does not include destroying habitats and concreting over farmland. Building unsympathetic housing developments with high densities does nothing but detract from the unique landscapes, heritage and character. As for successfully responding to the climate crisis, on what factual basis is this comment. It's a statement that CDC appears to make with confidence yet cannot be substantiated by CDC with any factual evidence and has no place in the vision.

Comment ID: 9443

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: The Committee prefers Scenario 5 and agrees with Cotswold District Council's rationale.

Comment ID: 9442

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: No as it conflicts with national planning policy and the Local Plan's objectives

Comment ID: 9444

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: Support would depend on area proposed and type of development. Mixed age-groups in low-rise flat or maisonette-style accommodation can be good for town or large villages. (Netherlands model which mixes students and senior citizens, for example.)

Bourton Chase phase 3 in Bourton-on-the-Water is a good example of mixed tenure, 1 and 2 bed flats through to 4 bed detached housing to 2.5 storeys.

Comment ID: 9446

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: 1. Only if appropriate infrastructure improvements are carried out e.g. to the transport network. (Moreton in Marsh being a prime example of requiring a bypass if more housing is built.)

2. Concern for impact on the Cotswold National Landscape and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, road network, environment both green and blue spaces and wildlife, including dark skies, flooding and sewerage infrastructure. Roads are increasingly potholed, and flooding over roads common as drains and grips not maintained adequately.

3. Accessibility and capacity of health services, especially time taken to respond by ambulances, travel times to hospitals, wait times for appointments and lack of NHS dentistry.

4. Support job creation via sympathetic development of Industrial Estate and policies leading to quality jobs to rectify the current imbalance with lower paid and insecure tourist economy jobs. . Such physical development into the landscape should be carefully designed to meet policies such as dark skies, tranquillity and other special qualities of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 9445

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: Yes. The impact of tourist influx to the Cotswolds throughout the year. Traffic congestion, and the proliferation of Airbnb type accommodation which reduces housing stock for locals, particularly first-time buyers and those in need of affordable housing. The impact on local schools, particularly Bourton-on-the-Water Primary Academy and The Cotswold School (Academy).

Comment ID: 9447

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: 1. The Council broadly agrees with the vision and objectives, however, unsure whether they are achievable given the pending upheaval and dissolution of Cotswold District Council as a local champion. The proposed unitary authority may have different aims and objectives.

The Committee places a strong emphasis on “partnership” ways of working, with a good look at ensuring local democratic representation through Local Government Reorganisation is not weakened but strengthened in line with the government’s Community Engagement Principles. The community right to buy and similar should be reflected in this Local Plan.

2. Greater emphasis on enforcement; local capacity requires significant strengthening.

3. Reinstate support funding for communities to create and maintain Neighbourhood Plans. Locality and similar bodies have been undervalued by the government decision to withdraw future funding.

Comment ID: 9448

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council welcomes the new Local Plan that aims to support required infrastructure-led development while conserving the Cotswold National Landscape. It agrees with Cotswold District Council's suggested development programme but strongly feels any development should provide the facilities and services that would be needed by the new residents.

It understands that whilst a number of new homes will need to be built in the parish this number will be met by the development of the old Co-Op store and other infill sites.

The Parish Council wishes Cotswold District Council to use the new plan to restrict the number of Airbnb rentals in villages and rural locations. The conversion of existing properties for holiday let use is affecting both our younger residents but also our growing elderly population in the parish and the Parish Council feels that some way of controlling the amount of Second Homes, Airbnbs, holiday homes and even guest houses is essential. These properties are restricting the opportunities for our local adults to buy a house in the village and for elderly residents to downsize. Their use creates noise and parking congestion problems for our residents.

Comment ID: 9441

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Administration Officer Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

Comment: The Council prefers Scenario 5 and agrees with Cotswold District Council's rationale.

Comment ID: 8957

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Adrian Bott

Comment: I have viewed the proposed 500 odd new homes that are planned for the Mickleton community and am wondering how the present infrastructure of the village will be able to cope? The school is at capacity with no room for expansion. The local doctors are also at capacity as are any dentist surgeries. My wife and I have been on the waiting list for NHS dental care for over 7 years! You never see a policeman and with the massive increases of affordable homes, crime will without doubt become a massive issue. The main street is now so busy that crossing has become an issue for the infirm and the elderly.

Job vacancies are non existent for the younger members of the village and future prospects for decent employment in the area are just not there. Decent transport links at timely intervals do not encourage workers to commute to the jobs that may be available in both Stratford or Evesham. Roads to Stratford are chock a block in the early morning and in the late afternoon and with the proposed massive future developments in the Long Marston area it will become impossible to get too and from work in good time.

In conclusion there are absolutely NO benefits from future Mickleton developments that will help or improve life for the present residents of our village. Crime, schooling, transport links and jobs are my issue with this proposed housing plan because you also HAVE to consider that already live in this stunning village when there are other suitable options.

Comment ID: 10733

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Adrian Holloway

Comment: I understand the dilemma of trying to meet challenging house building numbers, but there seems little mention of the rurality, agricultural and forestry nature of the District. Very material factors in any local plan and how new or additional housing fits within these constraints. Economic and social aspects should be importantly drivers to ensure that employment, services and transport links are genuinely linked to the needs of the area. The proposed delivery looks horrendous with the Thames Valley area of the District likely to change out of all recognition and transport links are likely to be overloaded or in need of major upgrade with associated loss of amenity and landscape. More growth around Moreton in Marsh is going to make the already congested through road impossible. The real needs of the District seem to be being sacrificed over bringing more people into the area.

Comment ID: 8774

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Adrian Valentine

Comment: Whilst I understand the need for more housing in the UK, there must be better options for development than the Cotswolds. It's like cutting off your nose to spit your face given that the natural beauty of this area brings in much revenue from a tourist point of view and if we build all over it - what legacy would that provide for future generations? As this Government seems hell bent in pursuing a 'green' policy in order to safeguard our environment for the future what lesson does this provide for our children and grandchildren when the powers in Westminster dictate what they want according to their manifesto in order to get re-elected at the next election. You just cannot trust them - so who's to say that their current wishes will not be extended further before we even reach 2043!

Comment ID: 8776

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Adrian Valentine

Comment: In order to meet Trump's requirement that we spend 3% of GDP on defence and given that the Government does not have any money, with the MoD being particularly poorly funded, why don't you approach the MoD to inquire about the possibility of acquiring the South Cerney Aerodrome (which seems to be hardly used or of any significant strategic importance) to see if they would sell it and raise well needed funds and utilise a huge area of an under-performing asset and turn it into something really useful by providing housing, both affordable and individual, to help meet the building requirements. Transport, access and infrastructure is in place or good value and easy to develop and it could provide a nicely landscaped environment, close to Swindon/Cirencester and their amenities and jobs, whilst not unduly detracting from the beauty of the surrounding area

Comment ID: 8779

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Adrian Valentine

Comment: I would not support an increase in housing density. In cities and/or urban areas that is fine but in the Cotswolds it would fundamentally change the nature and character of the area and leave future generations, who want to experience the true beauty of nature and the area, with no purpose or inspiration to keep things as original as possible

Comment ID: 8782

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adrian Valentine

Comment: With Reference to Ampney Crucis

I OBJECT to the proposed indicative building to increase the size of Ampney Crucis

1) Being a dog walker, the junction of Backs Lane and Butchers Lane is incredibly dangerous

already. As you approach the junction you cannot see traffic coming from either the left or right

direction. It is a blind spot and the number of times I have had to jump back to avoid lorries, cars or

vans that speed past is unacceptable. We do not need or want further vehicles making what is a

hazard even more perilous.

2) Walking down through the Village towards the London Road there is no street lighting and

the pavement stops soon after the Village Hall. This forces the Villagers to walk in the road. We have

a great facility in the village, namely The Crown at Ampney Brook Pub which we must continue to

support as we are lucky to have it. Unfortunately, the road narrows so much going towards the

bridge that an accident is waiting to happen. Someone is going to be hit, run-over or worse. I found

myself in February walking back from the Pub when a car or van passed me at the narrowest section

of the lane and the wing mirror brushed my coat as it went past – and I was using a torch!! With

walls on either side – there is nowhere to go! I fear that more traffic will only lead to villagers staying

away from the Pub because of the danger which would not be good for the Village community.

We do not need any further traffic as it would only exacerbate an already dangerous situation

3) Whilst I understand the need for extra housing, the near tripling of Ampney Crucis (according to your indicative figures) is clearly impossible given the limited infrastructure (which can barely cope with the existing 246 houses - witness the number of times Thames Water is in the village tending to the drainage) which is old and inefficient. The village school is at its maximum and cannot be expanded, we get 2 buses per day - which if you do not have a car is nowhere near enough. There is no industry or scope for future jobs - so what will the proposed occupants of the 660 houses do?

4) If you hard landscape the area north of Ampney Crucis for building where will all the waste water go to? It is already a massive problem as the fields to the north cannot absorb all the excess rainwater so it runs down Butchers Lane and Allotment Lane into the village as the existing waste water drainage can not cope. If you hard landscape a further huge area for new housing this will rob the land of whatever remains of its ability to absorb the water which could and will lead to flooding in the centre of the village as the land to the north of Ampney Crucis is on a slope and everything, even now, runs down into the village when the drains cannot cope. In order to put in and build up to date and modern drainage infrastructure, the cost alone would make the proposed project uneconomic to the developers which could lead to a sub-standard quality project being undertaken and all the sundry problems that could arise from the new purchasers of the buildings. Also, in the field where our house is situated there are seven underground springs (I know this as I have one in my garden) This leads to continual water-logging of the field which is why there have never been any sheep/cows or horses kept in the field as it leads to foot rot for the animals and the cost of the vets makes this unviable.

5) Danger to Life - We have already had a number of incidents, with the police, fire and ambulance services over the last few years with cars turning left or right onto the London Road by the Crown at Ampney Brook, being involved in accidents. It is a nasty turning with limited visibility both ways, especially when the Pub is busy and customers park on the pavement on the London Road which is often used as an overflow carpark. I know the police have issued warnings both to the Pub itself and by placing signs of 'No

Parking' on the pavement - but it is an accident waiting to happen and someone will be killed in due course if nothing is done about it. What we certainly do not want is more cars and traffic in the village spilling out onto the busy London Road as it will just exacerbate the situation and increase massively the chances of a serious accident and possible death.

I OBJECT to the proposed planning application as it seems to me that it has been put together with no due

consideration to the Villagers safety and the local community in general

Comment ID: 10250

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Why are you calling for more sites in Mickleton when we already have or will have applications for 475 homes. Asking when they would be deliverable is rather like putting the cart before the horse considering all the infrastructure that would be needed before a single spade should be put into the ground. This looks like a race to get homes built, consideration for existing residents, the countryside and future impact should come first! This consultation should count for something if the democratic process is to be believed.

Comment ID: 10219

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Mickleton for example has been identified as a principal settlement. Why, when it would need every item on the infrastructure list substantially improving or provided. The cost to do this would be huge to the council. Trying to make settlements sustainable when they are clearly not is a huge mistake and will cause chaos. The developers would have you believe otherwise, but when the problems arise they will be long gone.

Comment ID: 10237

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: My choice would be option 3 as the best way to ensure sustainability and deliver an overall professional response to the situation being addressed.

The favoured choice by the council option 5 has the potential to deliver housing in the wrong locations which have poor infrastructure and serious traffic and social issues. Employment should be a key driver and settlements on the edge of rural settings do not provide this and as such will never be sustainable unless a lot of money is invested. Leaving these communities to fend for themselves would be totally unacceptable.

I do also believe that housing for local young people to live in should be allowed in any village or town regardless of ANOB. This has happened in the past in the form of council houses and providing it is done in a careful manner is best way to increase population harmoniously in rural locations.

Comment ID: 10233

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: When a site is classed as sustainable careful study needs to be applied to those who have classed it as such. My observations are that sometimes this is not always cross checked by independent experts. However, if this means good roads, healthcare facilities locally, nearby schools with capacity to expand, realistic and sensible opportunities for alternative means of transport and infrastructure which provides good opportunities for leisure and job opportunities locally then no the Council should not consider sites which are unsustainable.

Comment ID: 10227

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: This should only happen where there are good transport links, job opportunities, and access to cycleways and recreational areas such as parks. Schools and health provision, including social care, also need to have the ability to expand. If this done in the wrong locations parking and car usage will be a major issue.

Comment ID: 10222

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Mickleton for example has been identified as a principal settlement. Why, when it would need every item on the infrastructure list substantially improved or provided. Cycling does not lead to a site being more sustainable if there is no employment within cycling distance and the roads are too dangerous and difficult to ride on. The cost to do this would be huge to the council. Trying to make settlements sustainable when they are clearly not is a huge mistake and will cause chaos. The developers would have you believe otherwise, but when the problems arise, they will be long gone. Just come to Mickleton and view all of the infrastructure we already have, you'll be amazed how little and old it is considering all the extra housing the village has already had imposed upon it. It certainly can't be expected to cope with any further expansion.

Comment ID: 9625

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Scenario 3 has to be the best option. Properly designed developments near key infrastructure will be the most cost effective in the longer term. People and businesses need easy access to good road networks, jobs, health care and education facilities. If these criteria cannot be met then the sites are not sustainable. Using public transport and cycling seem to be the key to this . However many sites located outside main service centres realistically do not and most likely never will have these as a reliable, regular and safe means of transport. Developers suggesting otherwise should be challenged to prove this, once developments are built they are here forever and issues not resolved now will be too.

Comment ID: 9640

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Scenario 3 is the best option to meet the needs of a modern community. It may not be the quickest to develop but it is the most professional approach which should in the long term be the most cost effective. It will ensure sustainability in the future. Developments attached to existing settlements (Scenario 5) bring with them long term on-going costs such as: maintaining poor quality roads, transportation costs for medical and education needs, continual upgrades to electricity and water supplies and ongoing works relating to new developments impacting on the whole road networks in those areas. Often developers don't provide the facilities needed and CDC tax payers will be left to fill in the gaps! People have to travel to their places of work and the most sustainable way of doing this should be key to all decisions.

Comment ID: 9636

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Scenario 5 means that large scale developments can be built in more rural locations. This may be a quicker way to get houses built, but in the long term will cost CDC far more than option 3. Sustainability is often quoted as being an important driver for new development locations and yet many of these proposed development locations are not and never will be. People will drive cars in favour of other transport modes because the ideal does not match reality. Providing facilities in new developments to promote cycling should not be seen as a solution to this if it is not safe or is only used for leisure purposes.

Mickleton has seen 3 major developments over the past 12 years - far in excess of what we should have had. The roads have become much busier and congested because Mickleton is not a sustainable location. The schools and medical facilities are overloaded and other facilities are absolutely minimal. Many of the other principal locations have town centres, parking facilities and other amenities. Can I ask that those making these key decisions actually visit the locations and experience what is happening on the ground, look at all the key village amenities. These decisions will be with us for ever and so may be the problems if the wrong choices are made.

Comment ID: 9638

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Adrian Webb

Comment: Scenario 5

means that large scale developments can be built in more rural locations. This may be a quicker way to get houses built, but in the long term will cost CDC far more than option 3. Sustainability is often quoted as being an important driver for new development locations and yet many of these proposed development locations are not and never will be. People will drive cars in favour of other transport modes because the ideal does not match reality.

Providing facilities in new developments to promote cycling should not be seen as a solution to this if it is not safe or is only used for leisure purposes.

Mickleton has seen 3 major developments over the past 12 years - far in excess of what we should have had. The roads have become much busier and congested because Mickleton is not a sustainable location. The schools and medical facilities are overloaded and other facilities are absolutely minimal. Many of the other principal locations have town centres, parking facilities and other amenities. Can I ask that those making these key decisions actually visit the locations and experience what is happening on the ground, look at all the key village amenities. These decisions will be with us for ever and so may be the problems if the WRONG choices are made.

Comment ID: 9293

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

Name: Adrienne

Comment: I know this is difficult and no one wants development ..but the development that is suggested around Down Ampney ..is too large our infra structure already cant deal with the 3 large housing estates that are in the process of being completed I have been here since 1980 and although the village on occasions has flooded I have never seen flooding in the back lane and that has happened in the last 2 years..our drains cannot cope our road has been closed 3 times this year owing to flooding and we have had a sink hole appear outside one of the developments ..we have no links to transport the bus is almost non exsistant ..

Comment ID: 10989

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Alan

Comment: Government algorithm is wrong, how can it work out a number of houses to build based upon 100% of the area when only 20% is possible to build on. Cramming all the allocation into 20% of the space is an impossible situation and would further compound all sorts of current congestion issues.

Comment ID: 10991

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Alan

Comment: If having to develop areas then some National landscape and all brownfield sites should be considered too

Comment ID: 10996

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Alan

Comment: How does the government and council think that Preston asa settlement can go from 90 to 2890 properties without any impact ? Turning a tiny village into a sizeable new town and destroying its character, without any form of infrastructure or logistics

Comment ID: 8918

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

Name: Alastair

Comment: It seems very strange to add developments where you have interest from landowners. This means you “dump” development in areas disproportionately and others have nothing.

Comment ID: 8917

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Alastair

Comment: Why does the proposal not look at the AONB in this plan? You are proposing to keep all development in the area of the councils remit not in the AONB this seems both untenable and unfair. There should be some development in the AONB area - this has to be managed sensibly, sensitivity and where the opportunities exist to add some development.

Comment ID: 8916

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Alastair

Comment: Representation on the Cotswold District Local Plan Preferred Options (Regulation 18)

Settlement: Poulton

I am writing to comment on the Council's preferred development strategy and the indicative distribution of housing growth, specifically in relation to Poulton.

1. Poulton's allocation is already at or beyond a sustainable level

Poulton is a small rural village with limited facilities and services. Residents rely primarily on surrounding towns and larger settlements for employment, shopping, schooling and healthcare. Public transport is limited and most everyday trips are made by car.

In this context, the proposed level of growth for Poulton represents a significant proportional increase for a small, constrained village and will permanently change its scale and character. Given its size, facilities and rural road network, I do not consider it realistic or appropriate for Poulton to accommodate more growth than is already indicated. If anything, the current figure should be treated as a ceiling and revisited for potential reduction, not as a starting point for further expansion.

2. Risk of unfair and inconsistent distribution between villages

The indicative figures across the district show a pattern where:

- Some villages of a similar size and character to Poulton have no additional housing allocated
- Others are expected to grow by very large percentages, effectively turning them into much larger settlements within a single plan period

From the outside, this feels inconsistent and unfair. It is not clear why certain villages are effectively protected, while others are required to absorb a disproportionate share of growth. For a small settlement such as Poulton, this raises understandable concern about why our community is being asked to take more housing when others are not.

Any rebalancing of growth across villages must start from the principle that Poulton is already at or beyond a reasonable level of planned expansion given its characteristics, and should not be treated as a candidate for additional allocations.

3. Sustainability, infrastructure and cumulative impacts

Additional housing in Poulton:

- Increases reliance on private cars for almost all essential trips
- Adds pressure to a rural road network that is already under strain
- Pushes more demand onto services located in other settlements, rather than providing them locally

These impacts are not isolated to Poulton. Several villages in the same wider area are also earmarked for growth, creating a cumulative effect along the same limited corridors and shared services.

Describing this pattern as “sustainable” in practice is difficult when it entrenches car dependency and stretches infrastructure in locations that have neither the scale nor the service base to support such growth comfortably.

4. Over-reliance on the 20% of land outside the Cotswolds AONB – and what that shouldn’t mean for Poulton

Approximately 80% of Cotswold District lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB), leaving only around 20% outside. Current thinking appears to push almost all major development into that 20%, effectively treating it as the only place where substantial growth should occur.

There is a legitimate concern here: concentrating so much of the district's housing burden into a relatively small proportion of its land area creates intense pressure on a limited set of villages and corridors.

However, this should not be interpreted as an argument for increasing Poulton's allocation. Poulton is:

- A small rural village
- With limited services
- And a sensitive character and setting

It is already carrying more growth than many villages of similar size, and any attempt to "solve" the imbalance by adding further numbers to Poulton would simply make that imbalance worse at the local level.

If the Council wishes to address the wider issue of over-reliance on the 20% outside the AONB, that should be done through:

- Strategic choices at the district level about where new or additional growth might be more appropriately located, and
- A transparent, evidence-based review of other settlements and options

It should not result in Poulton being asked to take more housing than currently proposed.

5. What needs to change

In light of the above, I ask the Council to:

1. Confirm that the proposed level of growth in Poulton will not be increased, and that the village will not be used to "make up numbers" if other sites face delivery challenges.

2. Revisit the current figure for Poulton to ensure it genuinely reflects what is sustainable for a small, rural village with limited services and a sensitive character.

3. Provide a clearer justification for why some villages receive no planned growth while others, like Poulton, are asked to grow significantly, so residents can see that decisions are fair and evidence-based.

4. Address the district-wide imbalance in a way that does not further overload small villages like Poulton, but instead looks strategically at where any additional capacity might be better accommodated.

6. Conclusion

I recognise that Cotswold District Council is working within a difficult national policy framework and a significantly increased housing requirement. However, the current approach leaves communities such as Poulton feeling exposed to a disproportionate share of growth, with limited evidence that this is genuinely sustainable or fair.

Any changes made to improve the district-wide pattern of development must not result in further housing being added to Poulton. On the contrary, Poulton's allocation should be treated as the upper limit of what is acceptable for the village, and potentially reduced if the evidence supports that.

Comment ID: 8737

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Alastair Pegg

Comment: Representation on the Cotswold District Local Plan Preferred Options (Regulation 18)

Settlement: Poulton

I am writing to comment on the Council's preferred development strategy and the indicative distribution of housing growth, specifically in relation to Poulton.

1. Poulton's allocation is already at or beyond a sustainable level

Poulton is a small rural village with limited facilities and services. Residents rely primarily on surrounding towns and larger settlements for employment, shopping, schooling and healthcare. Public transport is limited and most everyday trips are made by car.

In this context, the proposed level of growth for Poulton represents a significant proportional increase for a small, constrained village and will permanently change its scale and character. Given its size, facilities and rural road network, I do not consider it realistic or appropriate for Poulton to accommodate more growth than is already indicated. If anything, the current figure should be treated as a ceiling and revisited for potential reduction, not as a starting point for further expansion.

2. Risk of unfair and inconsistent distribution between villages

The indicative figures across the district show a pattern where:

- Some villages of a similar size and character to Poulton have no additional housing allocated
- Others are expected to grow by very large percentages, effectively turning them into much larger settlements within a single plan period

From the outside, this feels inconsistent and unfair. It is not clear why certain villages are effectively protected, while others are required to absorb a disproportionate share of growth. For a small settlement such as Poulton, this raises understandable concern about why our community is being asked to take more housing when others are not.

Any rebalancing of growth across villages must start from the principle that Poulton is already at or beyond a reasonable level of planned expansion given its characteristics, and should not be treated as a candidate for additional allocations.

3. Sustainability, infrastructure and cumulative impacts

Additional housing in Poulton:

- Increases reliance on private cars for almost all essential trips
- Adds pressure to a rural road network that is already under strain
- Pushes more demand onto services located in other settlements, rather than providing them locally

These impacts are not isolated to Poulton. Several villages in the same wider area are also earmarked for growth, creating a cumulative effect along the same limited corridors and shared services.

Describing this pattern as “sustainable” in practice is difficult when it entrenches car dependency and stretches infrastructure in locations that have neither the scale nor the service base to support such growth comfortably.

4. Over-reliance on the 20% of land outside the Cotswolds AONB – and what that shouldn’t mean for Poulton

Approximately 80% of Cotswold District lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB), leaving only around 20% outside. Current thinking appears to push almost all major development into that 20%, effectively treating it as the only place where substantial growth should occur.

There is a legitimate concern here: concentrating so much of the district's housing burden into a relatively small proportion of its land area creates intense pressure on a limited set of villages and corridors.

However, this should not be interpreted as an argument for increasing Poulton's allocation. Poulton is:

- A small rural village
- With limited services
- And a sensitive character and setting

It is already carrying more growth than many villages of similar size, and any attempt to "solve" the imbalance by adding further numbers to Poulton would simply make that imbalance worse at the local level.

If the Council wishes to address the wider issue of over-reliance on the 20% outside the AONB, that should be done through:

- Strategic choices at the district level about where new or additional growth might be more appropriately located, and
- A transparent, evidence-based review of other settlements and options

It should not result in Poulton being asked to take more housing than currently proposed.

5. What needs to change

In light of the above, I ask the Council to:

1. Confirm that the proposed level of growth in Poulton will not be increased, and that the village will not be used to "make up numbers" if other sites face delivery challenges.

2. Revisit the current figure for Poulton to ensure it genuinely reflects what is sustainable for a small, rural village with limited services and a sensitive character.

3. Provide a clearer justification for why some villages receive no planned growth while others, like Poulton, are asked to grow significantly, so residents can see that decisions are fair and evidence-based.

4. Address the district-wide imbalance in a way that does not further overload small villages like Poulton, but instead looks strategically at where any additional capacity might be better accommodated.

6. Conclusion

I recognise that Cotswold District Council is working within a difficult national policy framework and a significantly increased housing requirement. However, the current approach leaves communities such as Poulton feeling exposed to a disproportionate share of growth, with limited evidence that this is genuinely sustainable or fair.

Any changes made to improve the district-wide pattern of development must not result in further housing being added to Poulton. On the contrary, Poulton's allocation should be treated as the upper limit of what is acceptable for the village, and potentially reduced if the evidence supports that.

Comment ID: 8808

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Alex Head

Comment: I would like to object to the increase in numbers for Preston. Preston is a village of 89 houses, part of which is a Conservation Area, and is a historic settlement mentioned in the Domesday book.

An increase to over 1100 houses would completely destroy the essence of the village and its sense of community.

Preston has always been separate to Cirencester, but an increase of this size subsumes the village to becoming a suburban area of Greater Cirencester.

Furthermore, the village itself runs mainly along one road - the increase in traffic through the village, as well as becoming a rat run through to the extra 660 houses to nearby Ampney Crucis, the 280 houses approved at Kingshill and the 1000 houses of the new village at Driffield will cause major issues. That is aside from the major infrastructure challenges this volume of housing would bring; flood issues, schooling, health provision, etc.

In sum, I object on the grounds of local community and the thousand year history of the village, highways issues, infrastructure issues, and Preston being swallowed up as part of a larger Cirencester.

Cotswold village settlements should be respected, a green buffer protecting Prestons settlement status, and surrounding road infrastructure assured to avoid a massive increase in traffic through the village itself.

Comment ID: 8943

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Alexander

Comment: These figures for Moreton-in-Marsh would completely alter the town and surrounding area, destroying the North Cotswolds as we know, and love, it. This does not represent sustainable growth and would impact the protected landscape. These numbers should be revised down significantly.

Comment ID: 10501

Location in consultation document: Scenario 2

Name: Alexia Monroe

Comment: We cannot see where in Bourton on the Hill there could be an allocation of houses without building onto green fields.

Moreton-in-Marsh cannot sustain more houses until the power, sewage and transport issues are addressed. We have had months of the road being dug up by the different utility companies causing major disruption. Previous plans have shown cycle paths which have come to nothing, and the parking around the railway station will not support the number of new houses proposed.

We need a joined up thinking for utilities, transport and better infrastructure before more new houses are built.

Comment ID: 9948

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Alf Troughton

Comment: We are responding to the CDC housing plan with particular reference to the Driffield suggestions but our comments may also apply to the Ampney Crucis and Preston proposals which are adjacent.

We live at Rats Castle, GL7 5PG. This lies on the lane between the Army Camp and Harnhill Healing Centre to Ampney St Peter. We are close to the bridge over the A417/9.

We have the lane as our northern boundary and we are surrounded on the other 3 sides by farmland belonging to Ampney Brook Farm from Harnhill. This is now privately owned by a keen environmentalist but was previously owned by the Royal Agricultural University.

Environmental issues - The field above our boundary lane regularly floods and fills up with water. On November 24th 2024 during Storm Bert this was particularly pronounced. The water flooded over the road as the culvert could not cope with the volume of water. This water poured down our paddock and through our house to the height of 1 foot. The water continued flowing past our property and into the fields below us. We were flooded out for 10 months. There was a huge amount of damage and the whole downstairs had to be refurbished.

Even since we have been back there has been marked flooding in the lane and further along from us towards Harnhill and into the villages of Harnhill and Driffield. The lanes have at times been impassable to cars.

I think the examples above show that the local area would be impractical for new housing schemes.

Transport issues- The lane above our property is unsuitable for increased traffic. It is very narrow being single track in places. It is especially narrow up to and over the bridge above the dual carriageway. I feel there is a risk of a collision every time I go over the bridge at the moment due to traffic not realising how narrow it is. I regularly have to take avoiding action by driving into the verge. The lane is very potholed throughout and the verges have all been destroyed. There are steep drops down to the culvert with no

barriers or warnings. It is only a question of time before a vehicle falls down the embankment.

A large development of new houses in the area would cause an increase in traffic that the lane would be unable to accommodate.

Comment ID: 10289

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Alison

Comment: Was it fair to set the consultation period for the six weeks running up to and including the Christmas period, which not only is peak distraction period for most people but also peak winter virus season making weighty documents hard to absorb?

Comment ID: 10303

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Alison

Comment: The is the most unhelpful site for commenting on the document, the comment box comes up over the document.

Comment ID: 10286

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Alison

Comment: This appears to be a plan aimed to exacerbate the problem of unaffordable homes in the rural areas (Nov 2025 2-3 bed cottage in Syde with less than half an acre of land =£1,700,000). It becomes exclusively the playground of the mega-rich, most of whom will occasionally enjoy a weekend or holiday in their property. The communities become fragmented with their old traditions and buildings (eg churches) impossible to maintain.

Comment ID: 10299

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Alison

Comment: How can you protect the historical and natural environment by covering it high density new build houses?

Comment ID: 10294

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Alison

Comment: Looking at the pie charts shows how disproportionate the plan for Preston is. Basically the village will be annihilated, the community subsumed by urban sprawl.

Comment ID: 10298

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Alison

Comment: No, the rural and non-principal settlements using Cirencester as their principle settlement would increase the numbers using the town by almost double (6,593 houses, how many in each?). Where would the parking be, how safe would the narrow streets be?

Comment ID: 10301

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Alison

Comment: In an era when house-building costs and house prices are continually increasing so that developers have difficulty selling at affordable prices this appears to be a fairytale idea. Perhaps the government should be challenged and a realistic formula be suggested.

Comment ID: 10293

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Alison

Comment: Preston has no school or pub, post office or shop. The only reason it can be described as a non-principal settlement is because it is close to Cirencester. But it is currently a rural settlement with a tight community, which it appears is going to grow by 1270%

Comment ID: 10296

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Alison

Comment: An increase of 3011% for Preston. Not proportionate.

Comment ID: 10994

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Alison

Comment: No, the government needs to be challenged on this. A blanket policy that favours the meg-rich and urbanises the agricultural landscape in an area that is not adjacent to any large cities should not be a Labour policy.

Comment ID: 10999

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Alison

Comment: The enormity of this plan, the amount of agricultural land that will be lost, the tight communities that will be swallowed up and the small market towns that will be overwhelmed whilst property ownership in the villages in the National Landscape become the privilege of the weekend mega-rich is all unsustainable. It is disproportionate and deeply unfair, and the council should be challenging the government.

Comment ID: 10187

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Alison Clifton Barnard CPRE North Cotswolds

Comment: We fully support the letter from Cllr Mike Every, Leader Cotswold District Council, dated 22 July 2025 to the Secretary of State for Communities requesting a reassessment of the housing target for the District.

The NPPF allows a Local Authority to propose lower annual numbers of houses than would be the case by simply applying the revised Standard Methodology, if there are good reasons for doing so.

Comment ID: 10070

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Alison Hughes

Comment: This government has absolutely NO idea what rural areas and families need. Its certainly not more housing! People move to these rural areas to escape the rat race of city life. Fairford does not have the infrastructure to support the level of housing they say is needed and it is certainly not up to the local people to push for a bigger doctors surgery or bigger schools or a bigger supermarket. That should be part and parcel of wanting to build! It should be in place before building even begins. And the Cotswold district council tend to forget we have the smallest stretch of the A417 going through an already busy A road that gets gridlocked on a daily basis! You also allowed Coln House School to be built on by a private developer, not locals and Yells Yard, also private and not the mention the utter monstrosity that is the Lakes By Yoo apartments on the Lechlade road. Stop building on green space!!! There soon wont be any left for our children to enjoy! Nature and wildlife is being killed off because of the constant incompetencies by councils and the government do not understand what its council tax paying public really needs!!!

Comment ID: 8856

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Alison Pine

Comment: We moved to Siddington 30 years ago as it was rural. We think that keeping a gap between Siddington and Cirencester is vital to maintain that rurality.

Comment ID: 9489

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Amanda Cully

Comment: If Fairford is a main service centre where are the main services to cover all this extra development? Water, sewerage, medical facilities, bus services. None of these can cope with the existing housing level as it is. ANY new development MUST NOT START until these services have been improved. That applies to the current development which is going ahead north of Fairford

Comment ID: 9490

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Amanda Cully

Comment: Having housing of greater density in a semi rural area means that even less car parking spaces will be provided. Any 3+ bedroom house **MUST** be provided with 2 parking spaces per house. Most families now have 2 cars and the current situation is that there is nowhere for them to park so they leave their second car nearby on the roadside.

Comment ID: 9491

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Amanda Cully

Comment: The Meeting held in Fairford was, I understand, considered to be well attended. However, if half of those attending manage to get through this document I will be really surprised. It is too long and too complicated.

I understand the need for an increase in housing and the only realistic way of solving this seems to be a New Town.

Adding bits here and there destroys the village/town atmosphere that has been built up over generations.

A New Town will involve new infrastructure, schools, shops, medical facilities and allow the small towns and villages to grow at their own pace.

Comment ID: 10151

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

Name: Amanda Warrington-Gray

Comment: Increasing the number of homes in Siddington by the planned amount would join Siddington, a rural village, with Cirencester, thus erasing Siddington as a village and its community. I strongly oppose these plans

Comment ID: 10150

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Amanda Warrington-Gray

Comment: The plans for Siddington would be utterly detrimental to the rural character of the village. These numbers would also put large strain on infrastructure and community services, such as transport, increased risk of flooding (we already have issues with that here) access to GP appointment and sewer capacity

Comment ID: 9325

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: This appears to be a somewhat leading question, implying that no alternative options are available. A careful analysis of the proposed methodology, however, suggests that

other options do exist. Having reviewed the range of scenarios, it seems that none of the proposed options is appropriate or fully justified, given the absence of supporting

evidence to explain the spatial distribution of housing across the District. The Preferred Option places a disproportionate emphasis on concentrating development around Cirencester, with very little consideration or justification and within areas the Council

have described as the “least sensitive” parts of the District. This approach conflicts with the principles of sustainable development and ‘balanced’ spatial planning set out in the Framework.

Having reviewed the Role and Function of Settlements Study, it is clear that further options should explore the potential for proportionate development within settlements located in the Cotswold National Landscape. Evidence in that report suggests that some settlements could support additional growth without compromising their character or

environmental constraints, yet the Council has chosen not to present this as part of this consultation. The omission of the Stage 2 Landscape Study for the National Landscape is particularly disappointing and significantly concerning and shows a lack of transparency in the process. This is a key document to fully understand why nearly 80% of the district has been discounted in the preferred option for further strategic sites, yet it has not been presented as part of this consultation. This would have provided essential analysis of settlement specific constraints and opportunities,

enabling a more informed and balanced assessment of site selection at this stage.

Paragraph 73 of the Framework supports that Small and medium-sized sites can make a significant contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential

for small and medium enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes, and are often built out relatively quickly, helping with overall delivery of the housing targets during the local plan period. This also helps support the local rural economy

The Framework requires strategic policies to set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale, and design quality of development. While I appreciate that major development

should be avoided, exceptional circumstances provide the opportunity to explore proportionate growth in appropriate settlements, which can help meet housing needs while supporting rural vitality. This approach would also align with Paragraph 8, which requires planning to pursue economic, social, and environmental objectives in a mutually supportive way.

In summary, none of the proposed scenarios achieves a balanced distribution of growth required for the District that is realistic and deliverable for the plan period. A more appropriate strategy would:

- 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.
- Avoid clustering development around Cirencester, which risks creating an unsustainable concentration of housing and infrastructure cost and requirements resulting in failed delivery.
- Ensure that the Council's Landscape Sensitivity Assessment is transparent and within the public domain to allow for assessment to ensure it is properly assessed to influence decision making moving forward.
- The CDLPR should not rely on the same flawed methodology previously used by other local authorities within Gloucestershire just to be consistent, which has

fundamentally failed to deliver a sound plan capable of meeting housing requirements and passing examination by the Planning Inspectorate. This approach lacks contextual sensitivity, and the proposed methodology has not

adequately addressed the unique characteristics of the Cotswold District.

This alternative approach would deliver a more sustainable and evidence driven spatial strategy, consistent with the Framework and the Local Plan's objectives.

The Respondent considers that exceptional circumstances exist to justify proportionate development within the Cotswold National Landscape, consistent with Paragraph 190

of the Framework. Paragraph 190 requires that major development within designated landscapes should only proceed in exceptional circumstances and where it can be

demonstrated to be in the public interest. The Council believes these circumstances are present for the following reasons.

2.22. The District faces a significant housing delivery shortfall, compounded by the government's housing targets, which are highly aspirational and challenging to achieve and deliver within the plan period. Failure to meet these targets risks prolonged under delivery, increased reliance on speculative development. Allowing proportionate

development within appropriate areas of the National Landscape would help meet housing needs in a sustainable manner, supporting rural vitality and reducing pressure on less suitable locations. This aligns with Paragraphs 8 and 73 of the Framework, which emphasise the need for balanced growth and the contribution of small and medium-sized sites to housing delivery.

2.23. Exceptional circumstances exist because the current spatial strategy concentrates development in a limited number of locations, creating significant infrastructure

burdens and delivery risks. A more balanced distribution, including modest growth within the National Landscape, would reduce infrastructure pressure, improve

resilience, and support sustainable communities. This approach would comply with Paragraph 16(b), which requires plans to be “aspirational but deliverable,”

and Paragraph 20, which identifies strategic policies to set out an overall strategy for infrastructure provision. Failure to address these requirements risks breaching the tests

of soundness under Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which require plans to be positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

Proportionate development within the National Landscape can be achieved without compromising its character or statutory purpose, provided robust landscape assessments and design principles are applied. The omission of the Stage 2 Landscape Study from the evidence base is concerning, as it prevents a transparent assessment of settlement specific constraints and opportunities. Exceptional circumstances exist because excluding nearly 80% of the district from consideration without proper evidence undermines the plan’s soundness and conflicts with Paragraph 31 of the Framework, which requires plans to be informed by a proportionate and substantiated evidence base. Failure to provide this evidence could also breach Regulation 18 of the

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which requires meaningful consultation supported by adequate evidence.

Comment ID: 9326

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: It is an inevitable consequence of the Local Plan process that housing allocations will have to be made on sites which are considered (through the prism of the current Local Plan) as being unsustainable, by virtue of their location. The Respondent accepts this reality.

In making decisions on the direction of growth, paragraph 36 of the Framework requires plans to be 'justified', supported by proportionate evidence. There now follows a critique of certain parts of the evidence base, which does not support the proposed allocation at Ampney Crucis.

Firstly, 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. Ampney Crucis is a low-scoring settlement within the settlement hierarchy and is correctly classified as a rural village with limited services. Treating it as a Principal or Non-Principal settlement would conflict with the evidence base and the Framework's requirement that those decisions are justified.

Secondly, the Integrated Impact Assessment, which deals with environmental heritage and landscape constraints.

There is a failure in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to consider an assessment of Ampney Crucis as a settlement within the setting of the National Landscape. Paragraph 3.67 of the IIA sets out the settlements within the 'setting' in terms of the National Landscape, but fails to mention or consider Ampney Crucis, clearly highlighting that the Strategic extension was an afterthought with no consideration or justification provided through the evidence base. Please can you advise why, if you are proposing a strategic extension at Ampney Crucis, it hasn't been highlighted as within the setting of the National Landscape?

In addition, in line with the Framework at paragraph 189, it sets out 'while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.'

Clearly, the addition of 660 houses in the setting of the National Landscape is not sensitively located or designed and would result in an adverse impact on the setting. This is further highlighted within the Landscape sensitivity assessment for Broad Zone 18, within which the allocation for 660 houses falls within. The summary for the Landscape impact assessment for development in 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. The central plateau is visually prominent, and development here would likely appear intrusive, altering key views and undermining the relationship between landform and existing settlement.’ (our emphasis)

It is clear that no assessment has been considered as to the impact the proposed allocation would have on the landscape setting.

It is very concerning that there is a fundamental failure from the Council to understand the basic constraints for the proposed strategic extension at Ampney Crucis within its own consultation documents. This critical failing undermines how the consultation has been carried out and demonstrates the failure of the Council to fully consider the options set out within all the scenarios presented and how the allocation of such significance for Ampney Crucis has not been fully assessed or considered. The evidence provided also highlights why this allocation would not be deliverable and should be removed from the Local Plan review process.

A further failure in the evidence base is how the National Landscape issue is addressed in the various documents. The tests in Framework paragraphs 189 and 190 are well documented. However, in the Broad Strategic Locations Study, paragraph 3.10, it states the following: “With 80% of Cotswold District being covered by the Cotswold National Landscape, the majority of land in the district is excluded at this stage. The NPPF (paragraph 189) specifically states that development in the National Landscape should be limited in scale and extent and is therefore unsuitable for strategic scale development.”

Regrettably, this is factually incorrect, as the tests in the Framework at paragraph 190 are framed in terms of ‘major development’. There is no specific statement that strategic development cannot take place. In such cases, major development in the National Landscape can be permitted where there are exceptional circumstances, and it is in the public interest. In addition, the specific tests in paragraphs 190A, B and C need to be satisfied. In deciding to limit development within the National Landscape and concentrate the bulk of it to those locations outside, there is no evidence of such an assessment having been undertaken.

Taken together, these shortcomings demonstrate that this Strategic Allocation has not been tested at the level necessary for the Regulation 18 consultation and cannot be considered deliverable in accordance with paragraph 16(b) as well as the requirement of paragraph 36(b). Its inclusion at this stage risks securing the spatial strategy to a 10 Cotswold District Preferred Options Consultation (Regulation 18) Ampney Crucis Parish Council 1176 site whose delivery is highly uncertain, threatening the overall effectiveness and soundness of the emerging local plan.

Comment ID: 9327

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: Increasing housing density in a rural context is inherently challenging, particularly given the sensitive nature and environmental constraints that characterise many of the District's settlements. These areas often have limited infrastructure capacity, heritage considerations, and landscape sensitivities that must be respected.

Nevertheless, it is essential that new residential development delivers a diverse range of accommodation and an appropriate housing mix to meet the varied needs of the District's population. Higher densities should be acceptable within defined settlement boundaries or on the edge of larger settlements where services, transport links, and employment opportunities are more accessible.

Therefore, a justified increase in housing density could be provided to a limited extent, subject to contextual analysis and design justification in accordance with national policy and in particular the local context. Higher densities can help make efficient use of land and contribute to meeting the District's housing targets, particularly within existing settlement boundaries or on the edge of larger settlements where infrastructure and services are available.

However, any increase in density must respect the historic character, architectural quality, and established pattern of development. Poorly designed schemes risk undermining local vernacular, creating visual intrusion, and eroding the rural character that defines the District.

Therefore, while higher densities may be appropriate in sustainable locations, they must be accompanied by well-informed design justification that safeguards heritage assets, landscape quality, and community cohesion. Edge of settlement development should maintain lower densities, incorporate appropriate green infrastructure, respect the surrounding landscape character, and maintain visual connectivity with the rural landscape to ensure compliance with these principles.

Comment ID: 9328

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: Unfortunately, with the limited information provided, particularly the absence of an IDP, it is extremely difficult to conclude that the proposed level of development is sustainable. The IDP is a fundamental component of the evidence base required to demonstrate how essential infrastructure, such as transport, utilities, education, and healthcare, will support the scale of growth proposed. Without this, the consultation fails to meet the requirements of Paragraph 20 of the Framework, which states that strategic policies must set out an overall strategy for the provision of infrastructure, facilities, and services necessary to support development.

The failure to justify why development within the Cotswold National Landscape is not considered under exceptional circumstances is also concerning. Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires that major development within designated landscapes should only proceed in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. The consultation does not provide a clear rationale for excluding these areas while simultaneously proposing highly concentrated growth in less sustainable locations. This omission undermines the credibility of the spatial strategy and raises questions about compliance with national policy.

To make the proposed level of development sustainable a comprehensive IDP detailing how transport networks, utilities, drainage, and education facilities will be delivered and funded, in accordance with Paragraph 34 of the Framework, which requires plans to set out how infrastructure will be provided.

There is no understanding and evidence of how transport hubs and improved connectivity between settlements to reduce reliance on private vehicles and support sustainable mobility has been considered, in line with Paragraphs 104 and 105 of the Framework. This is a key consideration when planning for sustainable transport and reducing car dependency.

There is no evidence to show how there would be future safeguarded land for healthcare facilities in accessible locations, ensuring that rising land values do not prevent delivery of essential services, consistent with Paragraph 20 of the Framework. Employment land allocations near principal settlements and transport corridors to provide local job opportunities and reduce commuting pressures, in accordance with Paragraph 82 of the Framework which requires planning policies to support economic growth and job creation.

A balanced spatial distribution of housing across the District, including smaller, proportionate sites within appropriate areas of the National Landscape where evidence

supports capacity for modest growth, in line with Paragraph 73 of the Framework, which emphasises the role of small and medium-sized sites in meeting housing needs.

If the proposed level of development at Ampney Crucis 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:

- A new GP surgery or medical centre, supported by sustainable transport links, to meet the needs of a significantly larger population.
- At least one new primary school and potentially an expansion of existing facilities, in line with Department for Education standards.
- Shops, small supermarkets, and essential services such as pharmacies to reduce reliance on accessibility to Cirencester.
- Enhanced public transport services to connect Ampney Crucis with Cirencester and other principal settlements, reducing car dependency.
- 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 the settlement's current unsustainable location, as identified in the Settlement Role and Function Study characterised by a heavy reliance on private transport for access to jobs and services, contrary to the principles of sustainable development in Paragraphs 8, 20, and 104 of the Framework.

In addition, the lack of IDP and employment land allocations raises significant concerns regarding compliance with the tests of soundness, which require plans to be positively prepared, justified, and effective. To address these risks, the Local Plan must clearly demonstrate how infrastructure and employment provision will be delivered to support a settlement of this scale, in line with Paragraph 34 of the Framework and statutory requirements under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Comment ID: 9329

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: Yes. There are several critical matters beyond conventional housing that must be addressed to ensure the Local Plan delivers sustainable and resilient communities. These include integrated infrastructure planning, transport connectivity, healthcare provision, and employment opportunities. The current consultation demonstrates a lack of comprehensive planning for these essential elements, which are fundamental to creating sustainable settlements and ensuring a sound plan is produced for examination.

Transport connectivity is a major concern. The vision for “integrated infrastructure” and “sustainable transport networks” cannot be achieved without clear proposals for transport hubs and improved connectivity between settlements. At present, there is no evidence that Cirencester or other principal settlements can accommodate the additional traffic volumes anticipated. In addition, clear direction and understanding of where such critical infrastructure requirements within the towns need to be addressed, particularly in Cirencester, where there is currently no provision for such a transport hub. Without robust public transport provision, residents in rural locations such as Ampney Crucis will remain heavily dependent on private vehicles, contrary to national policy objectives for sustainable development.

Healthcare provision has historically been treated as an afterthought. Once development boundaries are established, rising land values often prevent the allocation of suitable sites for essential healthcare infrastructure. The Development Strategy must identify and safeguard land for new medical facilities in accessible locations, supported by sustainable transport links, to avoid exacerbating existing deficiencies in current service provision.

Employment opportunities also require careful consideration. Large-scale housing allocations in rural settlements will not generate long-term, sustainable employment opportunities locally. Without a coordinated approach to employment land provision and transport connectivity, residents will be forced to commute by private car, adding pressure to already constrained infrastructure. Employment sites should be planned near principal settlements and transport corridors to ensure accessibility and reduce car dependency

Finally, this highlights the need for a balanced spatial distribution of growth. The current strategy concentrates development in a few locations, creating infrastructure constraints and delivery risks. A more proportionate approach, incorporating smaller, well-integrated sites that utilise existing infrastructure within the Cotswold National

Landscape where appropriate, would enhance delivery resilience, ease infrastructure pressure, and align with the sustainable development principles set out in the Framework.

Comment ID: 9330

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Comment: The Respondent wishes to make the following observations on the vision and strategic objectives set out in the Consultation.

Focusing on the proposed strategic extension to the village at Ampney Crucis. The number of dwellings proposed 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. It is a historic rural village in which its residents are engaged in matters of community interest where there is also a wide range of clubs and associations.

The Framework, at paragraph 8, recognises that sustainable development includes a social role for planning to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities, and Section 8 sets out how healthy communities can be promoted. Paragraph 9 highlights that the objectives set out in paragraph 8, including social objectives, should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in this Framework. 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.'

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. The Respondent is keen to stress that it does not oppose additional housebuilding in the village on a point of principle, it is more a question of scale and the lack of substantive evidence to demonstrate that the allocation proposed is sound.

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. Ampney Crucis has significant constraints with limited ability to connect to larger scale developments with existing built form and highway infrastructure which would result in a poor relationship with large scale development and a poor design that is inappropriate to its context, which

would lead to an unattractive and a less cohesive built environment, wholly out of keeping with the historic and natural character of the area. Clearly, this would be in conflict with the proposed vision and objectives set out within the evidence base to date.

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. The current approach demonstrates a significant gap in evaluating the contribution of settlements, including their accessibility to services, employment, and infrastructure. The Framework requires plans to promote sustainable patterns of development and make effective use of land by considering proximity to services and transport networks. This principle is critical to ensuring housing is located where it can best support sustainable communities.

There is a clear failure to consider the sustainability credentials of settlements that lie in the National Landscape or those close to the District boundary, particularly those adjacent to larger towns and cities such as Cheltenham and Gloucester. These areas offer strong sustainable credentials, including access to employment, public transport, and existing infrastructure, yet they appear to be excluded from the spatial strategy. This omission risks undermining the Plan's ability to deliver housing in the most sustainable locations and may lead to an over reliance on less accessible rural sites.

Furthermore, the Framework encourages a 'balanced approach to growth', avoiding over-concentration and ensuring housing is distributed to meet needs across the district. A more even distribution of housing, including smaller scale developments within the National Landscape where appropriate, would support resilience in delivery, reduce infrastructure pressure on single locations and clustering of development, and align with the objective of creating sustainable communities. This approach also mitigates risk by ensuring that housing delivery is not dependent on a limited number of large strategic sites, which often face delays due to infrastructure constraints.

Comment ID: 10572

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andrena

Comment: There needs to be major improvements to the infrastructure in the majority of these areas. As a resident of Fairford I am mindful of the problems experienced in recent developments where Thames Water said the sewage system could not cope with the proposed development but it went ahead anyway and the new residents were the ones who had to bear the brunt. There has to be major investment in the infrastructure not just lip service. This includes utilities and roads as well as Doctors surgeries, schools and shops.

Comment ID: 10573

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andrena

Comment: Consideration needs to be given to where all these people are going to work. Public transport needs to be conducive to working hours and community spaces should also include facilities for small businesses.

Comment ID: 10574

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andrena

Comment: I applaud the Councils vision for the district but am hesitant to believe it will be so as all this work will be put out to contract, and CDC will lose control. Measures should be put into place to not only ensure contractors sign up to this vision but that work is inspected to ensure it will happen.

Comment ID: 10576

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Andrena

Comment: As a resident of Fairford I can remember with recent developments, where Thames Water said the sewage system could not cope but the development went ahead anyway and the new residents had to cope with the results. There needs to be major investment into infrastructure, not just lip service.

Comment ID: 10577

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andrena

Comment: I applaud the vision but as the work will be carried out by contractors and CDC will no longer be operative, I am hesitant to believe it will come to fruition.

Measures should be put in place to ensure that contractors carry out these measures and inspections made to ensure that it is so.

Comment ID: 10578

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andrena

Comment: Public transport needs to be conducive to working hours. Community buildings should incorporate space for small businesses / start ups.

Comment ID: 9112

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew

Comment: The Local Plan does not seem to confront the main issue of the algorithm put forward by the government. CDC need to be proactive and not wait for other councils outcomes to play out in this regard. At the last few public meetings, councillors seem to be proud of the fact that CDC are aware of other councils legally challenging the governments absurd housing numbers. This isn't good enough and should be 'leading the charge' in this regard and not just seeing how other areas get on.

Comment ID: 9111

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew

Comment: The Local Plan does not seem to confront the main issue of the algorithm put forward by the government. CDC need to be proactive and not wait for other councils outcomes to play out in this regard. At the last few public meetings, councillors seem to be proud of the fact that CDC are aware of other councils legally challenging the governments absurd housing numbers. This isn't good enough and should be 'leading the charge' in this regard and not just seeing how other areas get on.

Comment ID: 9113

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Andrew

Comment: There is considerable disparity between the targets proposed by government and the realistic numbers CDC can put forward. This is mainly due to the fact that much of the Cotswolds is protected in one form or another. In light of this, why are the proposed numbers not already being amended to reflect this?

Comment ID: 9115

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andrew

Comment: Scenario 1 is the most suitable approach for the district. the very fact that the district is struggling to meet housing numbers as a result of c80% of it being protected is the very reason why other scenarios simply aren't suitable. Development should predominantly come from Principle Settlements together with a complementary ad-hoc approach of Non-Principle Settlements and village clusters. A scenario such as Scenario 5 applies an approach of a district that does not suffer the same constraints as the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 9116

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andrew

Comment: No - there simply needs to be a harder approach to reflect the fact that numbers put forward by the government do not reflect reality.

Comment ID: 9117

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andrew

Comment: See comment against question 2.

Comment ID: 9124

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andrew

Comment: Driffield and Harnhill - In short, no, I don't believe the proposed level of development is sustainable.

FLOODING - Given the time of year, it makes sense to start with flooding issues. The flood zone mapping data does not note the actual flood issues at hand. Already on 4 occasions in 2025, the Harnhill road has flooded to a point where it is impassable. This has clearly not been considered, as any proposed development would worsen.

WATER - The immediate area is already constrained in terms of water and sewerage needs. To overcome this position, there would have to be considerable expense and time of any proposed development which delays and compromises deliverability of the site. The building process would negatively impact the surrounding water courses considerably. This negative impact will continue to be detrimental through surface water run off once any proposed development is complete.

ECOLOGICAL - The proposed scenario / development will destroy the ecological balance of the surrounding area. In addition, the building phase of this scale will hugely impact air quality of the surrounding residents. Even when complete, the proposed 840-house development would result in circa 1500 vehicles on the roads. Again, causing pollution impacting the surrounding residents and contradicting the government's 'clean air strategy'.

BIODIVERSITY - the land proposed is truly organic farmland. This is a scarce resource and once developed, is gone forever. The land, other than the natural resource, currently also provides jobs which of course will be lost.

The land also contains ancient hedgerows, roman drains and local ponds house great crested newts, tawny owls, protected Barn Owls, bats, and migratory birds. Again, development this nature will negatively impact all these areas of concern as as highlighted in previous points, there is no means for any developer to 'offset' these impacts and would be in breach of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as the land is home to many vulnerable wild bird species.

TRANSPORT - the proposed development would increase vehicular movements in the village not by 2 x, not by 3 x, but by approximately 70-90 x, which is unacceptable and hugely detrimental across various aspects outlined above.

Comment ID: 9114

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Andrew

Comment: It is my understanding that any positive effects of the future creation of a new habitat, which has to be created as part of this strategy to compensate for the loss of area and quality of the existing habitats, are highly difficult to forecast with any degree of certainty or will be visible only in the future. CDC will have to guarantee, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the area. If it can't, the compensatory measures fail to be considered. Sceario 5 is the one scenario that will impact habitats the most.

Comment ID: 10290

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew

Comment: I have not found this document easy to make comments. It is not clear at what stage my comments will be recorded and forwarded to CDC

Comment ID: 11025

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: Scenario 5, for the reasons given by the Council.

Comment ID: 11027

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: No

Comment ID: 11029

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: Some flats, where appropriate, and higher buildings. This would be to make better use of the limited space available, and to meet the targets imposed by central government.

Comment ID: 11061

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: Question 4: No. The present sewage system is not adequate for the needs of Fairford i its present size (as is clear from the discharge of untreated sewage into the River Coln) and a substantial upgrade would be required to be completed prior to any further development. Additional road improvement and extension would also be required, as well as provision of additional medical services, shops, businesses and employment opportunities to cater for the extended population residing in all these extra dwellings.

Comment ID: 11070

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: Question 5. It should be a requirement of every planning permission for the proposed new dwellings that suitable solar panels for the production of "green" energy be built into the roof of every such building with all ancillary equipment so as to minimise as far as possible the need to draw on mains services.

Comment ID: 11041

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Andrew Brand

Comment: Fairford. The indicative site allocation of 780 dwellings is excessive, as it will add almost half as many more dwellings as the existing 1,800 current dwellings shown in the second column of this Table. The vast increase in the number of dwellings built in the town during the last ten years should be taken into account.

Comment ID: 9054

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andrew Coles

Comment: It is vital in view of the large increase in housing and population of the Cirencester area envisaged by the plan that transport infrastructure is improved BEFORE development takes place.

In particular , the proposed reopening of the branch line railway between Cirencester and Kemble should proceed without delay, to reduce road traffic between these settlements. The proposal is for a very light railway, which is ideal for this project. Kemble station has become much busier in recent years due to increased development in the area, and the bus service no. 882 is totally inadequate. It does not tie in with train times, follows a peculiar route, and finishes early in the evening.

The proposed very light railway would serve the Royal Agricultural University, Cirencester College and Deer Park School, which between them have approximately 6,000 students plus staff. Traffic at opening and closing times of these establishments in the Chesterton area and along the dual carriageway is very heavy without any additional development.

Cycle tracks into Cirencester town centre from Chesterton are in a very poor and dangerous condition, and end abruptly on existing busy roads. These cycle tracks should be improved, again BEFORE any development starts.

These suggestions would reduce pollution and congestion in the Cirencester area.

Comment ID: 9027

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Andrew crouch

Comment: We live at pound clise and in recent years gave seen a decline in deers
hedgehogs and birds since the recent developments in the area. Even more houses will
reduce the area for
wildlife

Comment ID: 10717

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: Paragraph 1.8 of the Introduction states that the absence of any overall planning guide may result in critical infrastructure (roads, schools, health services etc) not being planned or provided alongside new development. The stark reality, of which the Steadings development is a prime example, is that such infrastructure will not be planned or provided. It is beyond comprehension that both national and local government would undertake such a reckless path and permanently ruin the south Cotswolds in the manner proposed.

Comment ID: 10773

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: Paragraph 3.12 recognises that CDC's preferred Scenario 5 relies on the delivery of eight large sites similar to the (delayed) Steadings development of 500 + homes and states that "Large sites can be difficult to deliver and are often delayed, so Scenario 5 has a higher risk of not delivering housing on time".

This risk is confirmed by paragraph 5.33 of the Cotswold District Local Plan Update Development Strategy Options Technical Report dated November 2025. This refers to the Lichfield's Start to Finish 3 Report, which found that large strategic sites (ie those comprising 500+ dwellings) "typically take 7 years from the first planning application being validated to the first home being completed". Even if planning were granted to the eight large sites being considered by CDC shortly after the Local Plan commences in 2027, it is probable that no new homes on those sites will be completed until 2034 at the earliest.

It is therefore difficult to understand how Scenario 5 is going to alleviate the shortage of housing in the Cotswolds in the short term, let alone help to deliver the government's target of building 1.5 million homes during the current Parliament.

Comment ID: 10775

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: I prefer Scenario 6. For the reasons set out in my comments, I do not think that the Cotswold National Landscape should automatically be excluded from the process. Permitting development of several small sites in the CNL would mean that the south Cotswolds would not have to bear such a grossly disproportionate number of new dwellings.

Comment ID: 10776

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: Yes, please see my answer to question 1 above.

Comment ID: 10778

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: No, I consider that the required housing density of 106 dwellings per hectare, comparable to parts on inner city London as the Consultation recognises, would be totally inappropriate in an area that is, at least for the time being, predominantly rural in character.

Comment ID: 10782

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: No, I do not consider the proposed level of development sustainable without detailed plans and the necessary capital being available to ensure timely delivery of the necessary critical infrastructure to support it including, inter alia:

- roads
- water
- sewerage
- schools
- healthcare (hospitals, GP and dental surgeries)
- flood mitigation
- employment opportunities
- town centre parking

Stringent measures should also be put in place in order to ensure that developers cannot renege on obligations to provide infrastructure such as schools, for example.

Comment ID: 10804

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: No, I do not agree with the objective of constructing around 18,500 new dwellings in the Cotswolds by 2043 and beyond.

In additions to the comments and answers to questions that I have already provided to this consultation, I believe this target to be disproportionately allocated but also far higher than the actual demand for new housing in the area.

The latest ONS forecast for population growth in the Cotswold District during the period 2027 - 2047 (which approximates with that for the revised Local Plan) is nearly 15,000. The forecast size of Cotswold household during the same period of 2.1 indicates that building around 350 homes per annum would satisfy the forecast need, not the 543 additional homes being demand by the current government.

Comment ID: 10721

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: It is ludicrous to suddenly categorise Siddington (a small village of 339 dwellings and a pub, church, corner shop and village hall that together provide very limited employment opportunities) as a Principal Settlement alongside large towns such as Cirencester, Tetbury and Fairford.

Comment ID: 10731

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: Paragraph 2.6.19 states that there is a presumption against major development taking place with the Cotswold National Landscape" other than in exceptional circumstances and development being in the public interest". CDC has therefore unilaterally decided any new settlement or strategic site should be located outside this area. By any standards, building 18,650 new homes in the Cotswolds by 2043 is an exceptional circumstance and one that warrants far greater thought, imagination and fairness than CDC's sledge hammer approach of siting 80% of the new dwellings in 20% of the Cotswold district. The so called "presumption against development" in the CNL did not apply in the case of, for example, Tetbury and Moreton in Marsh. CDC should be urged to reconsider its position as such a grossly disproportionate allocation of new housing in a relatively small but populous area can not be in the public interest.

Comment ID: 10742

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: Please see comment above. For the reasons already stated, I believe that Scenario 6 would provide a much fairer solution, sharing the pain by the allocation of smaller sites throughout the Cotswolds, obviating the need for any major developments such as those proposed at Preston and Driffield. It is likely that there are several landowners in the CNL who would be happy to sell relatively small parcels of farmland to developers, releasing much needed capital to service their future inheritance tax liabilities.

Comment ID: 10757

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Andrew Griffiths

Comment: CDC's preferred option, Scenario 5, is projected to deliver 79% of the government's housing target. This suggests an average density of around 84 dwellings per hectare, compared to the current average density of potential development sites for the Cotswold District local plan of 21 dwellings per hectare. CDC's assertion in paragraph 2.9 that Scenario 5 strikes a balance "between maximising density, whilst also ensuring the character and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds and the wider district is retained" is absurd: by its own recognition, this would necessitate densities not dissimilar to parts of inner city London.

Comment ID: 9906

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andrew Kitching

Comment: Given our wet winters of late, it would be prudent to remap the Churn valley flood plan. Too much development close to the river is going to exacerbate flooding in future years.

Comment ID: 9912

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andrew Kitching

Comment: It is important that the council holds the developers' feet to the fire on infrastructure. There needs to be rigorous enforcement of their obligations in building schools, and communal buildings, and social housing- no backsliding!

Comment ID: 9903

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Andrew Kitching

Comment: I note that there are to be no new developments on the Bathurst estate lands. This skews all new development to the south, east and north of Cirencester. Surely the Bathurst estate should supply some land for local development?

Comment ID: 9917

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: How has the high value of houses in the area (compared to the national average) contributed to increasing the new housing targets?

Comment ID: 9932

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: How has the size of the new target been' largely due to high house prices in Cotswold District'?

Comment ID: 9975

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: This reads like an aspirational political statement by the Liberal run CDC Board rather than an objective assessment of the state of the District.

Comment ID: 9930

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: How has the price of housing in the area affected the housing target?

Comment ID: 9974

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: 'Green to the core' seems to me to be a meaningless strap line. It has no substance in this environment.

Potential employers would be enticed to set up business in the area if there are good public transport facilities.

Comment ID: 9957

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: Scenario 5 is the most feasible for the District

Comment ID: 9958

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: This is a long term project and my fear is that the timescale for the development is too short. Speaking to one of the CDC planners his main concern was that 'pressure to hit targets could result in poor quality housing with inadequate infrastructure in place to cope with the massive resulting increase in the local population.

Comment ID: 9959

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: Smaller houses and cramped conditions could give rise to social tension but access to the countryside and/or open public recreation areas could help offset these problems.

Adequate car parking is essential combined with effective public transport. Light rail solutions should be considered as Bus services have proved unreliable and ineffective.

Comment ID: 9973

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: Infrastructure has to be improved, particularly the potential for a light railway system at its core. The road transport network will become clogged with cars (and buses) otherwise.

Comment ID: 9976

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andrew Lennard

Comment: See my earlier comments .

It has been a useful consultation document and covers the main aspects of the exercise. It would be helpful if the views of the local MPs are included.

Comment ID: 9307

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew Scarth

Comment: The government's new method of calculation is flawed and will lead to the opposite effect of what is being attempted to be addressed in certain areas. Cotswold District is 80% Cotswold National Landscape; this is difficult to develop. The consequence is that the majority of housing increases will occur in the 20% area. This area already has housing that with modest increases will meet the needs of local people. The price of houses in the 80% area will increase because of the increased desirability of an area that will retain its very rural character. Wealthy individuals from out of the area will be attracted to the detriment of local people who will be priced out of the market.

Comment ID: 9308

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andrew Scarth

Comment: The government's new method of calculation is flawed and will lead to the opposite effect of what is being attempted to be addressed in certain areas. Cotswold District is 80% Cotswold National Landscape; this is difficult to develop. The consequence is that the majority of housing increases will occur in the 20% area. This area already has housing that with modest increases will meet the needs of local people. The price of houses in the 80% area will increase because of the increased desirability of an area that will retain its very rural character. Wealthy individuals from out of the area will be attracted to the detriment of local people who will be priced out of the market.

Comment ID: 9309

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Andrew Scarth

Comment: In Scenario 6, it is stated that this scenario is ruled out because it is contrary to national planning policy. As is explained below this is not the case. Medium and small sized developments are not ruled out and a consideration of where and how big these may be in the Cotswold National Landscape should be made. It is also contrary to the government's obvious intentions of ensuring lower housing costs for local people which is not something available for many residents within the Cotswolds National Landscape area.

The Assessment of Broad Strategic Development Locations Paragraphs 1.5 to 1.7 "Policy Context" focuses on large scale developments and uses the NPPF to justify this. However, the NPPF in paragraph 72 it is stated "Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability." Paragraph 73 states that "small and medium sized sites can make important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area ..." and identifies means to do this and also states that at least 10% of housing requirements on sites no larger than one hectare. This not the same as is stated in paragraph 1.7 that the NPPF confirms that LPAs can meet up to 90% of their requirements via larger sites. This misses out the "medium" sized sites stated in the NPPF.

It therefore follows that the Step 2 in the assessment of land to be removed from further consideration is flawed. The section on Landscape Designations in Table 1 rules out any strategic development consideration in the Cotswold National Landscape on the grounds of paragraph 189 and 190 of the NPPF. These paragraphs do not rule out development in National Landscapes but rather stress that major development should be refused. This does not rule out the small to medium sized developments which should have been included in the overall strategic assessment.

In summary to totally remove all the Cotswold National Landscape from the assessment is wrong and therefore Scenario 6 should be considered further or at least modified. One of the drivers of the government's new assessment of housing provision is based on the cost of housing and aims to bring down the cost of housing in an area. By ruling out the whole of the Cotswold National Landscape the cost within this area will increase (supply and demand). This will rule out housing for local people. I am definitely not suggesting that the Cotswold National Landscape should be built over willy-nilly but every village and hamlet in the district must bear some of the pain from

the ridiculous government instructions on house numbers until, one hopes, sanity will prevail.

Comment ID: 9702

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Andy

Comment: Housing allocations in smaller towns, especially in the north Cotswolds, will only result in more commuters and vehicles on the roads despite the railway in Moreton. There is little employment in these areas, apart from tourism. It is ridiculous and unsustainable to propose these high numbers of houses just to achieve the housing numbers

Comment ID: 9707

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

Name: Andy

Comment: How strong will approved Neighbourhood Plans be in the selection of sites especially within the AONB? How likely is it that these will be ignored or overruled in the pursuit of housing numbers as intimated by Westminster?

Comment ID: 9703

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Andy

Comment: Who is going to pay for this infrastructure which will have to be built in advance of new housing and any CIL payments.

Comment ID: 9699

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andy

Comment: Option 5 is the least harmful to the Cotswolds but will still have cause unacceptable harm to the natural environment and infrastructure. Moreton, for example is outside the old AONB but the huge increase in vehicles will cause even further long queues on the A429 and there is not enough water or sewage infrastructure to cope with the extra development. Total proposed will almost double the number of houses which is totally out of proportion to the current size of the town

Comment ID: 9700

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andy

Comment: Definitely not

Comment ID: 9701

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andy

Comment: An increase in housing density can be achieved by forming more terraces instead of large stand alone detached houses that are more profitable for the housebuilders.

Comment ID: 9705

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andy

Comment: These 'visions' will only remain as visions and will mostly be ignored or overwritten to achieve the politically driven £1.5 million houses required by Westminster. And CDC know it!

Comment ID: 9721

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Andy

Comment: There does not appear to be any information on the amount of so called 'affordable' or 'social' housing although it may be in another document. What is mostly required in our area is genuinely affordable houses rather than expensive market housing that people, on an average wage in the Cotswolds, cannot afford. Even 80% of the market price (which is the official definition of affordable) in the Cotswolds is NOT affordable. How is the provision of housing at a genuinely affordable price or rent going to be funded? There are too many loopholes that house developers use to avoid providing the affordable and social requirements specified in a planning consent. How is the problem of 'right to buy' going to be overcome after the sale of affordable houses. How is the purchase of houses as second homes and holiday rentals going to be controlled. Increasing the Council tax on such properties is little deterrence to wealthy investors.

Comment ID: 9333

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: Scenario 3 would appear to be the most sustainable of the seven, as it concentrates growth around the seven main service centres and thus aligns this with facilities, services, transport and employment infrastructure. This is also the greenest of the potential scenarios as it limits the need to travel, especially by means of a car, and thus helps to reduce carbon emissions, noise and light pollution. Villages with less services, facilities and infrastructure, would also not be at risk of being over-developed

However, given that scenario 3 would only deliver 51 per cent of the housing target, this is unlikely to be a viable option, and scenario 5 would appear to be the next best alternative. There are certain drawbacks with scenario 5, as have been alluded to on pages 45 and 46 of the Integrated Impact Assessment. Increased traffic and congestion; carbon emissions; loss of open countryside and productive agricultural land, with major negative effects on the historic environment. Roads and transport infrastructure will need to be the central elements of infrastructure provision in such circumstances. Furthermore, any plan-led development affecting Principal and Non-Principal Settlements should only be permitted if there are adequate services, facilities and other infrastructure to support it. This will be best achieved through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which can forecast what is required and thus lay the foundations for any section 106 planning obligations.

Comment ID: 9335

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: The Council should not consider locating any developments in unsustainable locations in order to meet the centrally imposed housing target. The figure of 18665 takes no account of the environmental sensitivities that pervade the vast majority of the District, whilst simultaneously allowing the 35 per cent urban increase target to fall by the wayside. This is nonsensical, as it effectively redirects housing development away from the most sustainable urban locations into rural areas which cannot provide the requisite infrastructure, and whose unique historic and environmental characteristics are very much under threat of being irreversibly harmed.

I therefore urge Cotswold District Council to redouble efforts to resist the unrealistic targets set by the Government, by relying on Paragraph 11b of the latest iteration of the NPPF, which states that there are some exemptions to the requirement for local plans having to meet objectively assessed needs in full, including where the application of NPPF policies relating to the national landscape provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type of, or distribution of development in the plan area. I suggest that this would cover the present position in which the Council is effectively concentrating the majority of future development in just 16 per cent of the District in order to protect the National Landscape and SSSIs. As I will argue under Q4, the disproportionate imbalance created, will lead to the 16 per cent being extensively overdeveloped and ruined for present and future generations and result, in "the paving over of paradise", as District Councillor Lisa Spivey remarked recently. That would surely represent a poor legacy from CDC as it exits the stage to give way to the new unitary authority in 2028.

Comment ID: 9336

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: Housing density must be sympathetic to both the historical environment and character and setting of any settlement in which development is proposed. High rise blocks, for example, would not be in keeping and are far more appropriate for towns and cities that are not within, or closely adjacent to, a National Landscape. Open spaces, vistas and a sense of place are vital factors for preserving in the District, and these do not lend themselves to incongruous high density developments. Green buffers and wildlife habitats/corridors are also important considerations in any development proposal.

Comment ID: 9349

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: Firstly, in general terms, I would submit that it is entirely disproportionate and grossly unfair to direct 75 per cent of planned development into the 16 per cent of the Cotswold District that falls outside the National Landscape and accounts for 56 per cent of the existing overall population. Proportionate development would split the 44 per cent inside the CNL at an additional figure of around 6500, with some 8115 outside. Instead, it is proposed to build around 10500 homes outside the CNL, around three times as many as inside. This disproportionality will have major negative impacts upon many affected settlements outside the CNL, with implications for both their character and setting and their reduced attraction for tourists, with a consequent negative economic impact.

Secondly, I turn to my village of Mickleton, which is the northernmost gateway to the Cotswold District via the heavily used B4632. I will now provide subheadings below for ease of reference.

Historic overdevelopment of Mickleton

Back in 2013, the Preferred Options Consultation paper proffered a figure of 80 future dwellings as being reasonable for Mickleton for the plan period up until 2031. This was exceeded over threefold during the next five years, resulting in a 38 per cent increase in the village population as against the more incremental 9.7 per cent that had been recommended. Furthermore, despite this disparity, there was no commensurate improvement in village infrastructure. Prior to its adoption in August 2018, the current Local Plan took account of the significant housing development that had arisen during the intervening period, by stating that a zero-housing figure was appropriate in all of the circumstances. I am not aware of anything since that can be said to justify any departure from this figure now, and will suggest below that the indicative figure of 589 now put forward is both disproportionate in itself as well as being unsustainable due to poor services, facilities and other infrastructure.

Disproportionate indicative allocation for Mickleton for 2025 to 2043

It is clear that the 61.74 per cent indicative growth of Mickleton is far beyond the 21 per cent average for the District. This would result in Mickleton becoming the sixth most populous Principal Settlement. Furthermore, whilst Mickleton has a lowly sustainability ranking of 14th out of the 16 Principal Settlements, its projected growth will result in a population exceeding those in more sustainable service centres such as Tetbury, South Cerney, Stow on the Wold, Bourton on the Water and Chipping Campden, all of which have been allocated increases of under 20 per cent. Mickleton would have the greatest

divergence between low sustainability and high housing growth in all of the Principal Settlements. Such disproportionality is as unfair as it is unsustainable.

The pie chart featured in indicative map 1 of the North Cotswolds on page 26 of the Preferred Options consultation document is inaccurate as it does not reflect the projected 61.74 per cent growth of housing in Mickleton. The pink and green segments need to be reversed to do this.

Reasons why Mickleton should not be classed as a Principal Settlement due to its lack of sustainable infrastructure

The Settlement Role and Functions Study provides clear evidence that Mickleton is a major exporter of its workforce, 27 per cent of whom commute more than 10 kilometres to work by car. Less than 1 per cent use public transport for commuting. Clearly, such data demonstrates that Mickleton has a poor employment role through a density statistic of 139.5% in paragraph 3.9 and table 4. However, the scoring of the employment role needs to be amended to zero to fully reflect the high net export percentage of 139.5.

From tables 6 and 7 on page 20 of the same document, it is evident that Mickleton possesses just one convenience store and lacks any of the itemised strategic services.

Page 23, at paragraph 4.11, overstates the position by stipulating that the location of all strategic services and facilities is clustered around larger settlements. If that is the case, then why does a main service centre, such as Chipping Campden, lack a supermarket and bank and thus require travelling long distances to access these and hospital services?

There are also inaccuracies within the Accessibility Matrix which require rectification in order to provide an accurate sustainability score. On page 26, in table 9, there are references to drivetimes to strategic facilities. Access to a supermarket is incorrectly categorised as fair (5 to 15 minutes) when it should be classed as poor, as the nearest supermarkets are at Evesham and Stratford, which would entail drives of around 25 minutes each.

Similarly, in relation to a College of Further Education, the facility score needs to be downgraded as the nearest is at Stratford and requires a drive of around 25 minutes.

Hospital A&E and other major departments are located approximately 50 minutes away by car at Warwick and Cheltenham respectively, and again the matrix score requires amendment.

Library access would require a journey to Chipping Campden and so would not be attainable within 5 minutes as suggested by the matrix. Again the score needs downgrading.

Beyond the above, there will be many hurdles to overcome in order for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be able to ensure growth in Mickleton is aligned with the timely provision of transport, utilities and community facilities. Primary and secondary schools are already operating at full capacity, which begs the question as to where incoming pupils will have to travel to be educated. Health and dental services are already stretched. Bus services are infrequent and unreliable. Water supply, sewage and electricity are already at critical levels (see my response to Q6). Traffic volumes through the village exceed 500 vehicles per hour and so create air, noise and light pollution, with major safety hazards resulting from congestion and speeding motorists. The position is only likely to intensify as the burgeoning developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield progress over coming years. Furthermore, if all the available land in Mickleton has been built upon, where will there be left to provide any additional infrastructure?

The need for more joined up thinking and actions involving Stratford and Wychavon District Councils

I believe that there needs to be far more joined up strategic thinking involving both Stratford and Wychavon District Councils in relation to cross-border planning strategies in terms of education, social and open market housing, traffic and the local road network etc. Stratford District faces huge potential swathes of housing development that could heavily impact upon the Cotswold District. There is the potential for huge increases in traffic passing through Mickleton, with the detrimental impacts this could have upon the locality and general amenity, and the knock-on effect in relation to tourism. It already takes an inordinate amount of time to pass through Stratford in any direction, so if additional highways congestion ensues then this will act as a deterrent for potential visitors to the area and hit the economy accordingly.

Comment ID: 9350

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: Infrastructure delivery needs to drill down into a variety of practical aspects.

Taking bus services, for example, how regular are the services and how reliable? Can buses actually be relied on to tie in with GP and hospital appointments for example? Are all nearby towns accessible by public transport?

Can cyclists safely access local services and facilities?

What about access to major hospital facilities?

How long does it take for emergency services to access the settlement?

Live traffic surveys are required to establish actual vehicle flows so as to gauge how roads will be able to cope with increased through additional housing developments.

Flooding, water supply, sewage and electricity outgo issues are also relevant to assess utilities infrastructure.

Where will young children have to travel to be educated and can then be accommodated in the nearest primary school?

Beyond the above, cross-border liaison with neighbouring local authorities is essential to assess how developments there may impact upon the Cotswold District.

Furthermore, if Mickleton residents are eligible for social housing accommodation in the Stratford District, then this would potentially ease the requirement for such properties to be built in the village, by addressing local need..

Strategic transport and traffic planning will be fundamental to addressing the major increases arising from Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield developments.

Comment ID: 9353

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andy Crump

Comment: Comments /questions on Vision (para 5.2 on page 33)

Will existing Principal Settlements such as Mickleton have grown proportionately, given a population increase touching 62 per cent? How is it proposed to maintain its distinct identity if all of its development boundaries have been stretched beyond breaking point and its rural setting compromised by the introduction of urbanising housing sprawl built onto productive green fields that characterise the rural environment?

Who exactly is going to invest in active travel infrastructure and public transport? Who will fund this across the District? What local services are envisaged to provide better support for communities and who will procure and fund them?

The long-term interests of many people is to continue to live in a safe and recognisable environment which retains its rural characteristics and is not transformed into something very different, through overdevelopment and dysfunctional urbanisation, heralding a breakdown of social cohesion.

Comments/ questions on objectives (para 5.3 on pages 34 and 350)

Under b, the local distinctiveness of the natural and historic environment will be eroded as a result of disproportionate housing development.

Open countryside will also be under threat if it is built upon.

Under d, how is it proposed to encourage the vitality and viability of town and village centres?

Under e, who will pay for an improved public transport system?

If Mickleton is developed in the manner envisaged, how will this equate to focusing development on accessible locations with strong transport links?

Under f, who will provide and pay for the infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the needs of residents and businesses?

Comment ID: 9382

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: This is not a user-friendly format to complete a survey and elicit responses.

Comment ID: 9383

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Option 5. Agree with CDC's rationale.

Comment ID: 9384

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Support would depend on area proposed and type of development. Mixed age-groups in low-rise flats or maisonette-style accommodation can be good for town or large villages. (Netherlands model which mixes students and senior citizens?)

Bourton Chase phase 3 in Bourton-on-the-Water is a good example of 1 and 2 bed flats through to 4 bed detached housing to 2.5 storeys with mixed tenure.

Comment ID: 9386

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Q2. No as it conflicts with national planning policy and the Local Plan's objectives

Comment ID: 9388

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Q3. Support would depend on area proposed and type of development. Mixed age-groups in low-rise flats or maisonette-style accommodation can be good for town or large villages. (Netherlands model which mixes students and senior citizens?)

Bourton Chase phase 3 in Bourton-on-the-Water is a good example of 1 and 2 bed flats through to 4 bed detached housing to 2.5 storeys with mixed tenure.

Comment ID: 9389

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Q4. Only if appropriate infrastructure improvements are made, e.g. to transport network. (Moreton in Marsh being a prime example of being in need of a bypass if more housing is built.)

Concern for impact on CNL / AONB, road network, environment both green and blue spaces and wildlife, including dark skies, flooding and sewerage infrastructure. Roads are increasingly potholed, and flooding over roads common as drains and grips not maintained adequately.

Accessibility and capacity of health services, especially time taken to respond by ambulances, travel times to hospitals, wait times for appointments and lack of NHS dentistry.

Support job creation via sympathetic development of the Industrial Estate and policies leading to quality jobs. Current imbalance with lower paid and insecure tourist economy jobs. Such physical development into the landscape should be carefully designed to meet policies such as dark skies, tranquillity and other special qualities of the Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 9390

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Q5. Yes. The impact of tourist influx to the Cotswolds throughout the year. Traffic congestion, and the proliferation of Air B&B type accommodation which reduces housing stock for locals, particularly first-time buyers and those needing affordable housing. Impact on local school, particularly Bourton-on-the-Water Primary Academy and The Cotswold School (Academy).

Comment ID: 9392

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Broadly agree with vision and objectives, however, unsure whether they are achievable given the pending upheaval and dissolution of CDC as a local champion. Unitary authority may have different aims and objectives.

Strong emphasis on “partnership” ways of working, with a good look at ensuring local democratic representation through LGR is not weakened but strengthen. This would be in line with the name of the Act which includes “community engagement”. Community right to buy and similar should be reflected in this Local Plan.

Greater emphasis on planning enforcement with capacity locally requiring significant strengthening.

Reinstating support funding for communities to create and maintain Neighbourhood Plans. Locality and similar bodies have been undervalued by the government decision to withdraw future funding.

Comment ID: 9393

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andy Roberts

Comment: Q6. Broadly agree with vision and objectives, however, unsure whether they are achievable given the pending upheaval and dissolution of CDC as a local champion. Unitary authority may have different aims and objectives.

Strong emphasis on “partnership” ways of working, with a good look at ensuring local democratic representation through LGR is not weakened but strengthen. This would be in line with the name of the Act which includes “community engagement”. Community right to buy and similar should be reflected in this Local Plan.

Greater emphasis on planning enforcement with capacity locally requiring significant strengthening.

Reinstating support funding for communities to create and maintain Neighbourhood Plans. Locality and similar bodies have been undervalued by the government decision to withdraw future funding.

Comment ID: 9464

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q1 Which scenario is preferred and why?

Scenario 5 is preferred for the following reasons:

1. It's the most comprehensive within existing national and local planning guidelines and gets closest to the government's target
2. Scenarios 1-4 are not worth pursuing because they would almost certainly be unacceptable to the government: a) because they do not push to the limits that current policy allows, and b) fall even further short of the government's target
3. Further consideration of scenarios 6 and 7, with the resulting negative impact on the Cotswolds National Landscape, should only be undertaken if the government instructs CDC to do so

Comment ID: 9465

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q2 Should the council consider development in locations it considers unsuitable to meet government housing targets? Please explain

The CDC should back its expertise and therefore not consider locations it deems unsuitable. Consideration of such sites should be undertaken only if the government insists that CDC do so.

Comment ID: 9466

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q3 To what extent do you support higher density developments(e.g., smaller houses and gardens, flats and other taller buildings)

BPC's recent neighbourhood priorities survey demonstrated a clear demand for starter and smaller homes, which could potentially require higher-density developments to realise. On that basis, BPC is supportive of higher-density developments, as long as they use materials and designs that are in keeping with existing parish buildings and incorporate suitable environmental protections.

Comment ID: 9468

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q4 Do you think the proposed level of development up to and beyond 2043 is sustainable? Please explain

The scale of development up to 2043 is probably sustainable, with nearer-term plans the most reliable and those closing in on 2043 less so; much of the projected housing up to 2043 is based on existing approvals that have not yet been built, realistic windfall projections and submissions from developers and landowners that could be feasible. But the world could look very different in 20-25 years in terms of climate deterioration, economic stability, global conflicts and other factors that introduce considerable uncertainty. Hence, plans beyond 2043 are considered less sustainable.

Comment ID: 9469

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q5

Are there any other groups beyond those listed that should be considered by the updated local plan?

Answer: None

Comment ID: 9470

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Q6 Do you agree with the Local Plan vision and objectives? Is there anything else that should be considered?

The vision and objective stated are compelling, comprehensive and realistically achievable. No other considerations require inclusion.

Comment ID: 9467

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Andy Turton on behalf of Blockley Parish Council

Comment: Blockley Parish Council commissioned an independent review of the CDC 2021 SHELLA, which concluded that Landscape and settlement patterns remain the decisive constraints. As a result, the majority of sites discounted in 2021 were rejected due to harm to the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB). Which includes: High visibility on valley sides or open slopes; poor relationship to the historic settlement pattern; Flood Zone 3b constraints; the creation of isolated or ribbon development. These constraints remain largely unchanged and have actually been strengthened.

If CDC would like a copy of the report, please ciontact Councillor Turton at BPC

Comment ID: 10257

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Angela

Comment: I believe that the Cotswolds unique heritage and character is at risk with the number of developments planned.

Comment ID: 10259

Location in consultation document: Gypsy and traveller needs

Name: Angela

Comment: This should be done with specific rules in place that protect local residents and the environment.

Comment ID: 10255

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Angela

Comment: Doctors surgery in Lechlade is already very busy. The extra population will put an additional pressure which will affect health outcomes.

Emergency services are also under pressure which will be made worse by extra people.

If schools are unable to accommodate the extra capacity people will have to travel causing more traffic congestion

Comment ID: 10243

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Angela

Comment: Transport links in Lechlade are already very limited, Additional housing would mean even more road congestion as transport is not easily available.

Comment ID: 10249

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Angela

Comment: Lechlade has very limited transport facilities. The extra population would mean that the roads would be even more congested due to the lack of public transport.

Comment ID: 10245

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Angela

Comment: Lechlade is already congested at peak times and especially during roadworks as it is a small village it is unlikely to be improved

Comment ID: 10873

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Angela

Comment: My comment is in respect of the impact of the preferred scenario (Scenario 5) on Kemble, which is located on the edge of the Cotswold National Landscape and contains the Kemble Special Landscape Area. The village has significant heritage value, with two Conservation Areas and a significant number of listed buildings. It is bordered by open countryside consisting of agricultural land with some woodland. This is a special place that is worthy of protection.

Although Kemble has been identified as a Principal Settlement it currently consists of only 388 dwellings. The proposal for a significant extension (590 dwellings) to the south west of the village is out of scale and would have a very deleterious effect on Kemble's character and identity. It fails to take account of the rural nature of the village and the potential impact of such large scale development on the village character. Kemble retains its close relationship with the surrounding agricultural land which is accessible to the residents for informal recreation and protects the views of the village and its Grade II* church. The development is likely to require significant investment in infrastructure which may also have a significant negative effect on the landscape.

Comment ID: 10212

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: I do not support any of the scenarios as they do not support the stated aims of the Local Plan to be sustainable and green. CDC's local plans have preservation of the Cotswolds characteristics and culture at their core so would be completely undermined by all the scenarios, which also disregard the local Neighbourhood plan policies.

In particular, Scenario 5 will destroy rural communities in small villages, making some mere extensions of larger towns and destroying their identity.

Siddington's classification as a Principal Settlement, by Cotswold District Role and Settlement Function Study is

flawed as it includes developments outside the village boundary and subsequently incorrect population and employment counts.

Siddington village does not have the infrastructure to support the Scenario 5 proposal to increase its current 339 homes to over 1,000, which is not only disproportionate but also inconsistent with sustainable development.

Alternatives to consider:

Further expansion of the existing Steadings development which already has additional infrastructure in place would provide a quick win, i.e. extra homes with minimal impact.

It seems short sighted to dismiss any potential development in the Cotswold National Landscape thus placing the entire burden on the remaining 20% of the Cotswolds. Surely there is also a requirement for new homes in CNL which could be satisfied by local offers of land thus spreading the load.

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

Comment ID: 10215

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: 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 because this is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and is totally at odds with CDC Local Plans.

Comment ID: 10217

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: I believe that increasing housing density by developments such as smaller houses/gardens, more flats or higher buildings should be confined to towns and is not appropriate in rural villages such as Siddington.

Comment ID: 10231

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: No, I do not think the proposed level of development up to and beyond 2043 is sustainable, which is further exacerbated by Siddington being wrongly classified as a Principal Settlement. The proposed expansion not only threatens to destroy Siddington's rural identity, by potentially merging it with Cirencester, but also to completely overwhelm its local infrastructure and services such as roads, water supply, drainage, sewage treatment capacity, transport and school. There are already major local issues with flooding/drainage and sewage leaks which often lead to dangerous road conditions, initially from excess water and further down the line from pot-holes. It is frightening to imagine how much worse the above problems will be if the proposed level of new homes becomes reality.

Comment ID: 10236

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: Question 5 - Yes

Protection of Biodiversity by retaining fields, trees, hedgerows and wildlife corridors, i.e. retention of green spaces.

Maintenance of a settlements gap (between Siddington and Cirencester).

The potentially devastating impact of increased local flooding.

Siddington being incorrectly classified as a Principal Settlement.

The protection of rural communities outside of the Cotswold National Landscape.

Comment ID: 10248

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Angela Flett

Comment: Question 6

I agree with the vision but the objectives in the Consultation document will not deliver that vision. The objectives:

Will mean that Siddington grows disproportionately and loses its rural identity, sense of community, unique landscape, heritage and character.

Will destroy Siddington's surrounding green space and incumbent wildlife, thus having a detrimental effect on locals and visitors wellbeing and mental health.

Do not include mention of essential infrastructure, sustainable transport links, extra essential facilities or employment opportunities.

Comment ID: 9122

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Angharad

Comment: This form has not been easy to navigate

Comment ID: 9127

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Angharad

Comment: Do you allow editing of comments once posted ?

if so, I can not find how to do which is frustrating

Comment ID: 9121

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Angharad

Comment: The percentage of available/unprotected land should be taken into account by central government and targets re-calculated by them to reflect this enormous constraint on land available for housebuilding.

Comment ID: 9128

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Angharad

Comment: I do not feel that this document has given enough detail on the areas that would be involved other than in Option 1 for me to make an assessment.

I can only comment, therefore, on CDC's preferred option.

Comment ID: 9129

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Angharad

Comment: Does CDC envisage that under their preferred option, that high rise or higher buildings will be permitted in order to reach targets? I believe that current policy restricts building height in order to preserve the character of the area.

Does this not also apply to the number of homes per hectare irrespective of height, which CDC seem to admit will need to increase far beyond the average.

I do NOT support housing density in developments through either higher building or high numbers as NOT in keeping with our historical character

Comment ID: 9125

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Angharad

Comment: To fully appraise this option, which are these 'Main Service Centres'? Where & how nay have houses in each centre been considered to meet 9420 homes.

Comment ID: 9126

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Angharad

Comment: should read

where and how many houses have been considered to meet 9420 homes

Comment ID: 9146

Location in consultation document: 6. Call for sites

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: Has the owner of the land formerly owned by the RAU in Drifffield & Harnhill agreed to sell land/make available for development? In the interests of transparency are you able to answer this directly?

Comment ID: 9143

Location in consultation document: Employment and commercial development needs

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: Where is employment believed to be for the working population of new homeowners in Broad Zone 19 - particularly when other developments in and around Cirencester are also taken into account. How does CDC consider this sustainable?

Comment ID: 9148

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

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: When further assessment is made on the proposal for an additional 840 homes in Drifffield with a current population of 173 (2021 census) can it be acknowledged that this will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the character of the area and is totally disproportionate to the size of the existing communities. It can not be seen as a new development as the site does not offer enough of a buffer zone to Drifffield and Harnhill. Villages that are quintessential to the character of the Cotswolds and whose identity and agricultural environment must be preserved for future generations to enjoy and to farm.

Indeed our major economy is agriculture and change in use of this land will reduce productive farming (including sustainable organic farming) and diminish the area's agricultural heritage.

Comment ID: 9144

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: As a resident of Driffild, I have serious concerns over road infrastructure, connectivity and highway safety. Many of our existing roads are lanes, edged by hedgerow and dry-stone walls. These historical and landscape features are integral to the rural aspect of the area and preservation of the village character. They are not suitable for high volumes of traffic. New road systems would be inevitable but how can these be delivered sensitively? They will dramatically and negatively impact on our rural community which dates back over centuries and lies within a conservation area and should be protected by decision makers.

Comment ID: 9145

Location in consultation document: Infrastructure needs

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: Other concerns of lack of public transport, supply of water, flood management have already been commented on by me. Accessibility to healthcare is an obvious concern, given the situation both locally and nationally. How will this be guaranteed?

Comment ID: 9158

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: No, I do not. The proposal for Broad Zone 19 in respect of Driffield & Harnhill, raises many concerns over its sustainability. The proposed 'new settlement' sits alongside existing and centuries old hamlets. It is not a 'new settlement'. It sits in a rural, agricultural location with two grade listed village churches and Cotswold stone cottages dating back to the 18th & 19th centuries, where lanes and homes already suffer from flooding. I challenge the idea that development will have a 'negligible effect' (Site assessment Environmental Constraints) on this flooding – The flood signs are up at the moment (December 2025) and cars have been stranded in the recent past. The development of farmland will put further strains on infrastructure and exacerbate the problem. Similarly, the quality of drinking water has been acknowledged as at 'significant adverse' risk. This document 3:13 further acknowledges the challenges of supply and waste water infrastructure. CDC's site assessment reckons that the current capacity for waste water is c225 homes. Will Thames Water receive government funding to meet the demands of current homes let alone of those proposed? Thames Water are in severe financial trouble and CDC admit that this may impede building and may not in fact happen in the local plan timescale!. The development of Broad Zone 19 is unsustainable in this regard and will negatively impact the lives of residents and community wellbeing.

The accessibility of the site to employment and transport networks does not meet sustainability criteria. Exactly how is it imagined that the development will promote 'sustainable transport use and connectivity'? Driffield and Harnhill (Broad Zone 19) has no rail links, no existing or nearby cycle ways, no main employment within 20 minutes (5km) cycle journey, very limited public transport (National bus services operating from Cirencester and Stratton with very limited parking) and realistically very little prospect of any additional provision being taken up. I challenge the comment that busses are within 500m of the site and that only 50% of commuters will use a car as their 'method of travel to work'. I believe air and noise pollution will increase alongside greenhouse gas emissions.

Indeed, Driffield and Harnhill has NO strong transport links other than road. So how is this considered sustainable?

Furthermore, where is the local employment envisaged for these increased inhabitants? The local economy offers a limited job market and travel further afield will be necessitated. The sustainable livelihoods of those involved in farming, on the other

hand, will be taken away. Agricultural land will never be reclaimed and its demise will have serious consequences on the food supply for future generations. Rather agricultural land should be protected if sustainability is considered the benchmark.

Comment ID: 9161

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: Cohesive placemaking requires that CDC ensure development that fosters a strong sense of community. A collaborative approach which must at its heart take into consideration the legitimate concerns of the already inhabitants, the unique beauty of Cotswold hamlets and their historical significance, Driffield being mentioned in the Domesday Book, their right to amenity of such, their right to have this upheld and 'conserved' for future generations- that is a sustainable objective, which the expansion of Driffield by 840 houses will demolish

Comment ID: 9137

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Angharad Clark

Comment: The proposed new settlement west of Drifffield will impact directly on the hamlet of Drifffield and Harnhill. No figures are given here to expose the enormity of the proposal on the traditional villages it is set amongst. Why is this? Where are the buffer zones?

Comment ID: 10688

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Yes, there are further requirements. It's critical that a base of work opportunity is partner to housing. Many people want to live in proximity to work. We do not want the district to become retirement only. That means that there must be locations where businesses can be established and infrastructure to support the generation of business. This is particularly so in strategic sites where very large development is to take place. If a town is to double, it must at least double its amount of economic activity locally. We are not trying to establish dormitory towns in which everybody has to go somewhere else to work. That kills community. The infrastructure is therefore a combination of several parts, including the establishment of strategies, networks, physical locations, programs. It's also important to recognise that many people will work from home and they need some kind of local opportunity to meet or work outside the home for a variety of reasons that are surely well understood. This is also a multi Agency issue and it will need commitment initially from the county and then from the unitary.

These are also very high-level statements so for the avoidance of doubt, it will be important to have community centres and that this needs to address the needs of children and young people on the one hand and the elderly on the other. We have an aging population and their needs for social encounter are different. Similarly, there is a dearth of availability for young people of places where they can engage together and enjoyable and meaningful ways. This also avoids antisocial behaviour which is what boredom produces.

Furthermore there is a more subtle and complex issue: with slow growing established communities of modest size there is a strong sense of community. Even in very large cities, local communities that are established over long periods gain this kind of cultural residence as a matrix for living. When large scale change takes place over a short period, this involves the arrival of many new people from different parts and there is a fundamental problem of creating and preserving the community culture. For example, five years ago Moreton-in-Marsh was not noted for its friendliness, and this has already been affected by various adversities. 10 years ago, many people (a high percentage) were familiar with the town over decades.

The Cotswolds are a tourist destination and this aspect has an important infrastructure element in which a balance must be preserved between local residence and making it attractive to visitors and a thriving economy. This would need management. One important issue is the principle of Ecotourism, that is tourism that supports and encourages ecological development rather than harms it and this ecology is both that of wider nature (including farms) and social ecology.

Comment ID: 10692

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Do I have to add my name and details every time I post a comment? That's very inefficient. Why when it says "full screen" is it not full screen but rather a window inside the page that doesn't get any bigger. This is unhelpful. Why am I being asked to comment before I've actually read anything.

Comment ID: 10755

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Of course not. That's obvious. Naturally, there would be a reason to take the wrong choice in order to protect individuals or the council against the wrath of the government and the danger of poor inspectorate decisions, but the only responsible choice for a professional professionals with integrity is to do what is right and make the case for why is right. It's clear that there is no practical way to achieve the goals that the government has in mind and that even those efforts that are being made are creating serious problems for the public who are being asked to comment.

However, I think that council is in danger of coming up with plans that are in fact unsustainable by the standards that the people living in this district expect. People living in a rural area most of which is internationally recognised national landscape do not expect to be swamped in heavy goods vehicles and traffic, blocked from being able to access their own town, pouring sewage into rivers, streams that are toxic denying children access to water play, inability to find Work and so on. And at least one principal settlement, Moreton-in-Marsh, these plans are going to pour stress upon stress unless the government comes up with serious funding to put the town in order and enable it to grow.

Comment ID: 10759

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Housing should be developed in order to meet the demand and needs along with fitting in with the maintenance of an integral community and its organisation and appearance and facilities. This almost certainly does include more smaller houses, even apartments which would be attractive to many, but these need to be located within the spaciousness of a rural setting, a rural market town or village. So the total amount of space per habitation should be conserved but properties should be varied to meet needs. It may be that in some areas the overall space can be reduced and that might in some cases improve for example walking accessibility. But it's important to recognise that every town and village has a serious opportunity to contribute to climate and ecology needs. Well managed green spaces can absorb large quantities of carbon and soak up water to prevent flooding as well as providing for pleasant streams and water spaces as both ecological benefits and amenities. This is not a location for city scale density. It is part of the character and diversity of the country is a hole that there are great cities and beautiful rural towns and villages. That balance needs to be maintained. But I could imagine retiring to a pleasant apartment overlooking a beautiful area or close by where I can walk, enjoy natural environment, head off into the wider world on footpath and so on.

Comment ID: 10810

Location in consultation document: 4. Beyond conventional housing

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: What does Green to the Core really mean in this context? It generally gets used in the context of the CDC administration itself but of course there was an original intention I believe for it to be much broader but if so it would need a much more fundamental approach. Obviously within the planning framework there are many opportunities to ensure that buildings are climate friendly both in development and in use.

Comment ID: 10824

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: This is a further answer. Although I am reporting for Moreton-in-Marsh, I imagine that this may be relevant elsewhere too.

A great deal of development has taken place in the town without anyone considering effective cycle paths or useful footpath to connect through the town and to nature. On the first, there are no effective cycle paths through any of the developments and no designated cycle lanes on any of the main roads. No provision has been provided for this. A recent housing development application by Bloor proposed but this did not correspond to best practice design and was considered unsafe by the Cycling Club. If the town is going to grow then it is critical to provide effective cycle paths to the centre and to the railway station and perhaps to shopping and other amenities. This will take some careful planning as all of the estates have been separated from each other with few exceptions. The Blenheim Meadow footpath has not been designed for cycles. A project to create circular footpaths was initially blocked by the town council and then permitted but with no funding. This would enable walks around some of the scenic parts of the town. Having come here after six years in London I find it harder to get a good walk in the countryside than I did in London. Once you get to a good foot path, of course it's fine but the journey is much longer and not as easy. This will obviously vary depending on where people live.

If CDC wants to be Green to the Core it needs to develop programmes to facilitate farmers in transitioning to nature friendly farming to develop carbon sinks. These are by far away the most effective way in terms of both cost and speed (whatever else you have been told) and help ecology — if the farming is done right — to achieve a significant climate mitigation result. That means it is important to provide suitable infrastructure in the way of the farming equivalent of Business Hubs.

In order to facilitate economic development it will be necessary to have a business hub in the North Cotswolds.

Comment ID: 10835

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Given that CDC has a limited life, I see this question as primarily relevant to this particular consultation exercise and the needs of forward planning. If we are to consider what could be achieved by 2043 as a total vision, it is considerably more than this in specific areas but this still contains many good challenges and necessary steps. I'm sure the forthcoming unity will develop its own vision, but what is important is that this area plan provides an excellent platform for the development at least in this part of the country.

I am concerned that in effect agriculture is always a blind spot because it's not a conventional business, there are special rules pertaining for planning, and it's a specialised area that requires scarce knowledge. But there are very good reasons why there should be more animals in the fields at least through the spring to early autumn, why farms should be required to manage their soil more effectively in order to capture water and prevent flooding, conserve water for the dry season, prevent soil erosion, which also contaminate rivers and neighbourhoods, and make the extraordinary contribution that they can to the transformation of biodiversity and carbon capture.

I think that the concept of eco-tourism would be important. The national landscape should have a brand in which its foods are toxic free and nutritionally dense, it demonstrates how the landscape can be beautiful, climate and ecology friendly, and profitable. This is not the general case today.

Comment ID: 10707

Location in consultation document: Scenario 3

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: While it obviously makes sense to focus development in either principle settlement or empty spaces, it is important to recognise the nature of our principal settlement. They are not principal settlements in the context of large towns or cities. Here there are little towns at best or in one case only a pleasant mid-size market town. None of them is well equipped with public transport. So if development is to be concentrated where good public including local transport exists, there are none and the amount of development that should take place across the district should reflect that. For example, one of the principal settlements is Moreton in-Marsh. No teenager (unless old enough and equipped with a car) can go with friends to the cinema. None of them can go and visit a local location where there might be some activity such as a chess club in Stow or singing in Bourton on the Hill, although the latter is accessible since only a few miles away on foot. You need to be able to get there at the right time and get home. If it requires parents to drive, the whole idea of good public transport is lost. This principal settlement has the further problem that it has no secondary education. That cuts pupils off from their friends from school. It means that when they get to 16 parents have to fork out over £1000 a year to send their children to mandatory schooling. It means they have to return home when the bus goes. And in the case of those over 16 there is no guarantee that they will even be space on the bus. When I compare this with the kind of public transport available in a city, it's a joke. Building thousands more houses without high-quality public transport is a problem and since we have distributed villages so that if someone in a principal settlement wants to visit a friend in a village they can't, you can see the problem.

A further issue is this: it's all very well to have a town that has got some relatively good resources, but part of the attraction of that town is that it is a small rural market town. Dublin triple the size and it will not be the same town. People will put up with the absence of certain facilities when they have an alternative set of benefits. But if they lose those alternative benefits, being embedded in nature and a small community for example, why would they live there? There's nothing here that provides a legitimate case for a demand for housing in these locations. Nor is there any evidence that the demand for housing is appropriate for building a balanced community. It is not a balanced community if the only people who come are those retiring from the city and downsizing who will also have a car or two. We have very many properties with a single person living in it. Large settlements grow because there is a demand for people to live there. The original location of Moreton in-Marsh was predicated on the presence of the meeting of

two highways and it's position on the margin of four counties. It made it suitable for example in the development of the wool and corn markets. Those have since declined and subsequently the town grew very slowly. Businesses develop where there is a natural reason for them to be and businesses provide work that is attractive for people to live and to stay there when they grow up. This is demand to build houses without any analysis having been done (by the government) on the necessity and the correct assessment the building at larger places is better than building in small villages along with a hope that it will sort itself out, and if not, "we don't have a choice because we are forced to do this". It is vital to communicate to the inspector that this program of development that is being imposed on the district is not organic and it is not based on a fit for purpose analysis.

Comment ID: 10716

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: The consultation says: "provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes). Local Plan policies on strategic sites should be set within a vision that looks ahead at least 30 years to take into account the likely timescales for delivery."

This consultation is necessary in order to be able to meet the government requirements to develop a Local Area Plan, since the government has negated the existing five-year land supply that the council had. It is necessary to find out what space is available and to investigate various requirements and options for a larger scale growth taking into account a variety of feedback. But at the same time this creates a problem for proposing 30 year horizons. How can citizens sensibly comment if an integrated 30 year vision is not available for a principal settlement? In the case of the most significant development, at Moreton-in-Marsh, there is no available master plan at this stage and no clarity on fundamental gaps in infrastructure. One of those fundamental gaps is extremely expensive – a bypass – and satisfying that could eat up necessary funds for other crucial community infrastructure. That means, to avoid business trade traffic (HGV's) and passing vehicles destroying the character and business effectiveness of the centre of town, it's necessary for the town to develop to deploy a bypass that has the effect of reducing funding for the development that is needed for the growth of the town itself. Let me spell this out. Either a very large chunk of the likely funding of infrastructure will go not to benefit the town itself but to reclaim the centre from the passing traffic, including high volumes of large vehicles. This only benefits the town in the sense that it would reset the centre back to its proper normal state. It doesn't provide any further Improvement. But further improvement would be needed in order to meet the needs of a growing town and there are a variety of other critical infrastructure demands some of which are very expensive for example a new clinic– or expanded clinics – for medical practice since the present facilities for the two doctors practices are already overloaded. That's an expensive ticket. (By the way, this has already been reported to the planning committee and the text of the letters from the two doctors practices sent to me has been shared. They are under stress already.)

Now 30 year plans to build houses are being proposed but we don't have a corresponding set of facts as outlined above: there is no master plan, no vision, no clarity about what infrastructure will be available. I have no doubt that the officers and

planning function has sincere and professional and competent intentions to do their best. This is not therefore intended as a criticism of the CDC planning function but rather the imposition of unrealistic demands on a district. If the best consequence as a response to those demands is to substantially increase the size of an already stressed town without being able to provide any guarantees other than good intentions and professional commitment, the demand to build is unrealistic and is based on a faulty algorithm.

This algorithm assumes the building more houses will depress prices. That is highly unlikely. Construction companies are not famed for building houses that reduce the price of the product they sell. Prices can be reduced by reducing standards and sometimes by new smart methods of development, but we need to recognise that the development that must take place must be in keeping with the existing tenor of the town and district and its proximity to and presence within a national landscape.

While it is essential to do everything possible to investigate options, that must not lead to the foisting of inappropriate development on this and other settlements.

Comment ID: 10720

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: The idea of building in a new site a high-quality garden village/town seems to me to be in principle a good idea. It has the merits of being able to create a vision for a high-quality new settlement in keeping with its neighbourhood but with all the benefits of modern planning and infrastructure and if Done well will be attractive as a locus for business, community, and good blue, green and housing along with community centres and so forth. The vision can be paced and developed in tranches that are already sited within an integrated plan. Sufficient infrastructure can be provided at all stages.

Unfortunately, the government demands make this of Little relevance to our present requirements. This means that the government and its short-term political need is destroying long-term benefit. This is a plan without vision. The issue is that we have to be able to provide a five-year land supply and any such development would provide no houses in the first five years and not much in the first 10. But it's always the case, unless you plan for 10 and 20 years out, you won't find yourself in the right place when you get there. So in order to meet an unrealistic five-year plan, already more than a year used up, we are effectively prevented from doing much to meet long-term needs. So I congratulate the planners on coming up with one proposal for a new settlement but I would want assurance that the work that is being done on it will be fully funded by the government, for otherwise it will take away critical resources needed to manage the workload in implementing the houses that need to be built during the next five, 10, 15 years. Unless this is provided, this idea is problematic.

Comment ID: 10728

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: I agree with this conclusion

Comment ID: 10745

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: The Councils says: "National policy also emphasises the importance of creating sustainable places of high

quality design, conserving and enhancing our national landscape and building houses to meet the needs of our communities. A balance therefore must be struck between maximising density, whilst also ensuring the character and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds and the wider district is retained, as well as providing the right types and sizes of homes that are needed..." Certainly, a balance must be struck. However how this balance is struck depends on design principles as well as assumptions about what is appropriate in a given locale. I believe that we fail to take account of the historic development and its characteristic density in a number of cases.

Certainly, there were many very large properties, estates and mansions built in this district as a result of wealth and the desire of great land owners to own such properties. But much of the housing consisted of terraces. I would ask planners to take a walk around Moreton in-Marsh looking at property built before the second world war. This is because the National Landscape is a huge part of our district and it's historic character is considered to be a key to the design code for building. If you walk down the High Street, up the A44, along Evenlode Road and the Todenham Road, and indeed the first major new estate of the 21st century at Blenheim Park, you will find large quantities of terraces or closely spaced semi detached properties. The historic build quality was such that the variety – for example in the town centre of the height of buildings, widths, and colours– provided an exciting view but they belong to a natural colour palette arriving from the area that made them integrate well. Moreover they were textured and complex in detail so that they were attractive at a distance and close-up. This is an important architectural principle. Building houses close together in this way provides more space for gardens behind them and also more space for public amenities, such as properly designed and managed internal green and blue spaces within the town boundary. Many older people do not want to rattle around in a huge house and we have a large number of old people. They also find it extremely difficult to get hold of a bungalow and since bungalows take up more space, they need to be smaller and compact. Few old people can look after large gardens anyway.

So I am recommending a rediscovery of historic building codes as part of the development plan. What I think is inappropriate is the building of suburban settlements

in Cotswold market towns and villages. These can appear very bland, and provide a curious isolation even within the estate. An example that is interesting is Cotswold Gate. It has a very sizable public open space but it does not have a good community centre within the housing area although this could've been developed easily, to make something like a village Green. Moreover, the method of creating public open spaces such as this in which local owners have to pay for the maintenance of what is a public space for everyone is a problem. These should be publicly own spaces and they should be managed to public standards that include a recognition of the importance of ecology and climate change as well as the value of the experience of nature for young people especially. In addition to protecting views and outlook is out of the town we should be managing views and outlooks within the town and looking across the road at a series of detached properties or separated semi detached properties in little blocks each with their own front garden and back garden might be some kind of an American idyll but it is not rural West Country England

Comment ID: 10747

Location in consultation document: Table 1

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: Building on my previous comment in this section (endorsing the principles of historic development, which included attractive terrorist properties, the issue of density like this for consultation purposes is that it is not easy to make it meaningful. I'm not saying that the total amount of space that should be allocated for a certain number of properties can be reduced. What I'm arguing is that the organisation of the buildings themselves can be more dense in some cases and done in such a way that this is very attractive but also leave space for village green style spaces, for blue and green organisation, for allotments, for community centres, and if it increases the efficiency of housebuilding this should be turned into better quality materials and presentation to meet the standard that the built view or outlook is interesting from a distance and close-up.

Comment ID: 10749

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: This is clearly making the best of a bad job – I mean that the work and assessment is good, but the rules and requirements under which it is done are inappropriate and require what would be a bad job if fully exercised. I agree that the council is making the right choice among the options.

However, once again I reiterate that at least in some locations it's clear that the public are being required to make choices between one inappropriate solution and another with a necessary lack of information about them. A distillation of some of these comments should be sent to the government. Some of the bodies such as MOAD who have been complaining about council development should turn their skills towards a concerted campaign informing the government in its own best interests why its plan is not going to be successful for either it or the country.

Comment ID: 10753

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: The right choice has been made to the wrong requirement by the government

Comment ID: 10709

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Angus Jenkinson

Comment: First, I am once again distressed at having to put in my details on every single comment. Why can we not have a facility to sign in and be recognised?

I have already posted general remarks about principal settlements in relation to transport.

"None of them is well equipped with public transport. So if development is to be concentrated where good public including local transport exists, there are none and the amount of development that should take place across the district should reflect that. For example, one of the principal settlements is Moreton in-Marsh. No teenager (unless old enough and equipped with a car) can go with friends to the cinema. None of them can go and visit a local location where there might be some activity such as a chess club in Stow or singing in Bourton on the Hill, although the latter is accessible since only a few miles away on foot. You need to be able to get there at the right time and get home. If it requires parents to drive, the whole idea of good public transport is lost. This principal settlement has the further problem that it has no secondary education. That cuts pupils off from their friends from school. It means that when they get to 16 parents have to fork out over £1000 a year to send their children to mandatory schooling. It means they have to return home when the bus goes. And in the case of those over 16 there is no guarantee that they will even be space on the bus. When I compare this with the kind of public transport available in a city, it's a joke. Building thousands more houses without high-quality public transport is a problem and since we have distributed villages so that if someone in a principal settlement wants to visit a friend in a village they can't, you can see the problem."

Comment ID: 10239

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: Scenario 4 is my preference, followed by scenario 3. I am against Scenario 5 because I do not endorse the creation of new settlements in rural areas, such as that proposed to the west of Driffield, and am completely against the significant extension of existing rural villages, such as the proposed expansion of Ampney Crucis. Other than the fact that the government's standardised method for calculating the number of homes needed in each local planning authority is completely unsustainable and disproportionate for the Cotswold District, given its unique local constraints, there are a myriad of reasons why new settlements and significant extensions to existing villages should not take place. These include:

1. The proposed housing allocations would fundamentally change the character of quiet, secluded rural communities.
2. These settlements were not designed to absorb large-scale new developments.
3. The proposed housing allocations will erode the qualities for which the Cotswolds are renowned, namely peace, landscape setting, low noise, wildlife habitats and dark skies; these are the attractive qualities that define the Cotswolds' appeal and are central to the Local Plan's own stated objectives.
4. There are insufficient local employment opportunities to justify the location of new settlements of the scale being proposed in rural areas. These developments will risk becoming commuter estates dependent upon long distance car travel. This conflicts with the plan's stated aims of reducing car emissions, supporting a low-carbon economy and delivering sustainable, self-contained settlements.
5. Many of the proposed locations, Ampney Crucis being a good example, are served only by narrow, single-track or minor rural roads, which just about manage the volume of today's traffic. These routes cannot sustain any rise in traffic that the proposed levels of new homes would generate. Furthermore, safety on these roads not just for other car users but also for pedestrians, dog-walkers and cyclists, would become severely compromised.
6. Public transport provision across many rural parts of the district is sparse, infrequent or non-existent outside peak times. Locating large housing developments away from main transport corridors will inevitably increase private vehicle reliance, contradicting the plan's own objectives for net-zero transport emissions and sustainable mobility.

Scenario 4 is preferred as it goes further in addressing the concerns cited above. The fact that Scenario 4 delivers a lower percentage of the government housing target than Scenario 5 I consider to be a non-issue as I feel very strongly that the government's standardised method for calculating the number of homes needed in each local planning authority is completely unsustainable and disproportionate for the Cotswold District and should be reviewed following pressure from Cotswold District Council.

Comment ID: 10240

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: Definitely not. A strategy of considering development in locations that are unsustainable is completely at odds with the interests of existing local communities, their quality of life and cultural heritage, and is completely at odds with the protection of existing landscapes, natural heritage and environment, and air quality targets, all of which are of paramount importance.

Comment ID: 10241

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: I broadly favour increasing housing density in existing large towns or near major transport nodes such as railways stations as a way of preventing the development in rural areas, including exiting village locations. I feel that the protection of our natural and rural heritage is of over-riding importance and that we should resist development overall as much as possible.

I do not support increasing housing density in rural areas and existing villages.

Comment ID: 10265

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: My comments relate to Ampney Crucis:

I do not think that the proposed level of development up to 2043 is sustainable at all. Furthermore, I feel strongly that it is actually impossible to ensure that the proposed development can become a sustainable location as any steps taken, other than not building at all, will be at odds with the Council's stated approach to sustainable development.

At Ampney Crucis, the proposed housing allocation would fundamentally change the character of this quiet, secluded rural community and greatly upset the way of life of existing village residents. This particular settlement was not designed to absorb a large-scale new development such as the one proposed. The proposed housing allocation will completely erode the qualities for which the Cotswolds are renowned, namely peace, landscape and village settings, low noise, a habitat for wildlife and dark skies.

Ampney Crucis is served only by narrow, single-track or minor rural roads, which just about manage the volume of today's traffic. This holds particularly true on the north side of the village, where the new housing development is proposed to be located, and also holds true for the main village access road that runs through the centre of the village. These routes cannot sustain any rise in traffic that the proposed levels of new homes would generate, and safety on these roads, not just for other car users but also for pedestrians, dog-walkers and cyclists, would become severely compromised. Of particular concern is the area around the village school where traffic volumes at school drop-off and pick-up times are already high and pose a risk to children and parents.

Furthermore, there are insufficient local employment opportunities to justify the location of the settlement at the scale being proposed and should the development go ahead, it will become a commuter estate dependent upon long distance car travel. Compounding this, public transport provision to Ampney Crucis is infrequent in the form of a very limited bus service along the A417, which is some considerable walking distance from the location of the proposed development. It is also impractical to route public transport any closer to the village centre. This will inevitably lead to a reliance on private vehicles, greatly increasing the volume of traffic through the village and on surrounding single track lanes, contradicting the plan's own objectives for net-zero transport emissions and sustainable mobility.

The proposed development at Ampney Crucis conflicts with the plans stated aims of reducing car emissions, supporting a low-carbon economy and delivering sustainable, self-contained settlements.

Comment ID: 10453

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: I agree with some of the elements of the vision elements and some of the objectives but entirely disagree with other elements of the vision and other objectives. I therefore cannot agree with the whole vision, nor can I agree with the entire list of objectives. I find it impossible to agree with the whole vision and full set of objectives because many of the elements strongly contradict each other.

The vision states that the “Cotswold District will continue to be ‘Green to the Core’, with planning decisions reflecting the long-term interests of people place and planet.” I agree with this statement very strongly. I also agree with the vision element that states that the Cotswold District will have responded to the climate crisis, conserved and enhanced the Cotswold National Landscape, delivered sustainable communities, and supported a vibrant, low-carbon economy.

I agree with the vision statement that 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 only if the elements of “social equity” and “economic vitality” do not come at the cost of losing landscape (both within and without the Cotswolds National Landscape), the urbanisation of rural villages and further urban sprawl to heritage towns such as Cirencester and Fairford, whose town centres are close to bursting at the seams.

The above elements are essentially contradicted by most of the remaining vision elements which envision the large-scale increments in housing and supporting infrastructure to existing towns such as Cirencester and Fairford, and rural settlements such as Ampney Crucis, Driffield, Preston and Kemble. This is not “Green to the Core”, this does not prioritise environmental stewardship, this does not respect the district’s unique landscape, heritage and character and it will not deliver sustainable communities, nor deliver a low-carbon economy. It will deliver the opposite.

I would urge the council to give greater prominence to conservation and green objectives in their vision and objectives statement and to take issue with the Government’s Standard Method for calculating the number of homes needed in each local planning authority as it is at odds with the unique set of constraints and challenges that apply in the Cotswold District.

Comment ID: 10191

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Angus Maclaren

Comment: Scenario 5 acknowledges that the Cotswold District is heavily constrained by the Cotswolds National Landscape designation. The development strategy does not sufficiently account for the comparative lack of unconstrained land in the district relative to counties with larger available developable areas. Applying the same government housing requirement to a district where over half the land is nationally protected under the "Area of Outstanding Beauty" limitations places an unreasonable pressure on the remaining rural areas. This disconnect means the proposed level of growth, amounting to approximately 14,600 homes in the constrained area, is neither proportionate nor environmentally sustainable. My suggestion is that the Council makes a stronger case to government regarding local constraints and argue that the level of housing development that is currently proposed in the Cotswold District should be significantly tempered to reflect the proportionally lower areas of land available; the government's Standard Method for calculating the number of homes needed in each local planning authority is not suitable for the Cotswold District.

Comment ID: 10416

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Annabel McEune

Comment: None of the scenarios supports the aim of the Local Plan to be “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: 10418

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Annabel McEune

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 the village lacks services, transport, and infrastructure. Unsustainable locations should not be used to meet housing numbers.

Comment ID: 10421

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Annabel McEune

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

Comment ID: 10424

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Annabel McEune

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: 10426

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Annabel McEune

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: 10428

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Annabel McEune

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: 10121

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Anne

Comment: Ludicrous number of houses & no joined up schools/solar/water/roads

Comment ID: 10714

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Anthea Palmer

Comment: It's unrealistic to expect this amount of houses to be built

Comment ID: 10724

Location in consultation document: 1. Introduction

Name: Anthea Palmer

Comment: Food production hasn't been fully taken account, especially in the context of climate change. It should include considerations of local food production and potential for sustainable agriculture as well as local allotments.

Furthermore, does the need for local jobs match the housing position?

Comment ID: 10719

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Anthea Palmer

Comment: Prefer option 5 but the area cannot support this many houses in terms of infrastructure, environmental health and social structure.

Comment ID: 10727

Location in consultation document: The different scenarios

Name: Anthea Palmer

Comment: I am concerned that the infrastructure for these areas would be insufficient in terms of water supply, drainage and public transport.

Where is the provision for community based energy supply?

It would also be important to provide adequate social facilities such as schools, health, shops and other community services.

Comment ID: 10074

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Anthony

Comment: option3. To reduce the disproportionate increase in the scale of development of Kemble brought about by the perceived future Rail link to Cirencester and Proposed improvement of the Rail Link to Birmingham making it a target for Commuter development.

Comment ID: 10075

Location in consultation document: Question 2

Name: Anthony

Comment: Yes . Some Development should be permitted within the AONB to reduce the impact of major areas of the County outside the AONB.

Comment ID: 10078

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Anthony

Comment: Increasing house densities can be achieved e.g Housing in keeping with Cotswold Vernacular Style for example 3 Storey with Weavers style Third Floors , 2.5 Storey Homes, Flats and Maisonettes on Basement, Ground and First Floors where appropriate dependent on topography and street scene.,

Comment ID: 10140

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Anthony

Comment: NO ITS NOT SUSTAINABLE IN THAT SUCH A SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT WILLIRRETRIEVABLY DAMAGE AND ALTER THE RURAL AMENITY ECOLOGY SETTING OF KEMBLE WOOD AN ANCIENT WOODLAND WITH SNIPE, TEAL, MUNTJAC, ROE AND FALLOW DEER, ADDERS, GRASS SNAKES, GOSHHAWKS, BUZZARDS, HONEY BUZZARDS, RED KYTES, WOOD PECKERS, FOXES, BADGERS, RABBITS AND FIELDS WITH ENGLISH PARTRIDGE, BROWN HARES, COMMON LIZARDS AND SKYLARKS ENGLISH PARTRIDGE AND THE PLANTATION WITH SURVIVING ELM AND ASH TREES AND WILL NOT BE REMEDIED BY A BIODIVERSITY PLUS 10% POLICY AS WILL THE LOSS OF THE HEDGEROWS AND TREES PLANTED UNDER THE LOWLAND PLANTING SCHEME.. THE LOSS OF THE OPEN FIELD LANDSCAPE TO DEVELOPMENT VISUALLY LINKING WITH THE SOLAR FARM WOULD CHANGE THE WHOLE RURAL FEEL OF THE VILLAGE SURROUNDED BY FIELDS AND CENTRED ON THE CHURCH AND CONSERVATION AND STATION AREAS. THE INADEQUATE NFRA STRUCTURE IN TERMS OF WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, SIZE OF SCHOOL, LACK OF PERMANENT SPORTS FACILITIES, SMALL VILLAGE HALL, WOULD BE INNADEQUATE FOR SUCH A DEVELOPMENT. LIKEWISE THE LOSS OF VALUABLE FARMLAND FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIONCANNOT BE REPLACED. THERE WOULD BE INCREASED PRESSURE ON WILDLIFE FROM DOMESTIC CATS AND DOGS AND DISTURBENCE AND PRESSURE ON THE ECOLOGY FROM THE INCREASED POPULATION.THE OPEN ASPECT OF THE COUNTRYSIDE WOULD CHANGE FOREVER

Comment ID: 10141

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Anthony

Comment: NOT ENTIRELY

Comment ID: 10132

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Anthony

Comment: THIS SHOWS A DISPROPORTIONATE AND UNACCEPTABLE SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT FOR THE VILLAGE OF KEMBLE CREATING A SMALL TOWN SEVERELY COMPOUNDING THE IMPACT ON THE RURAL SETTING ALREADY DAMAGED BY THE SOLAR FARM AND IMPACTING ON THE COMMUNITY VILLAGE FEEL AMENITIES INFRASTRUCTURE, ECOLOGY AND HIGHWAYS.

Comment ID: 10137

Location in consultation document: Table 4

Name: Anthony

Comment: THIS GRAPHICALLY INDICATES THE DISPROPORTIONATE SCALE OF THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED FOR KEMBLE

Comment ID: 10142

Location in consultation document: Scenario 1

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: The whole process of allocating sites should be revisited.

Top Priority should be given to brown or grey field sites - old airfields, old factories, old railway facilities. These will most probably have infrastructures in place and will be close to transport facilities and employment facilities.

The next priority should be on the edge of major settlements where infrastructure, transport and employment facilities already exist

Only after these sites have been exhausted should other sites be considered and then evenly across the district with a maximum of 100 new houses per large village where infrastructure, transport and employment exists. Smaller villages with no or minor facilities should have a maximum of 20 new houses each. Villages such as Mickleton and Willersey in the North Cotswolds should not be swamped because that has already changed them from villages to small towns with no facilities to match and it does not result in community integration. In fact the opposite occurs.

Comment ID: 10143

Location in consultation document: Scenario 4

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: Future growth must be allocated close to existing transport facilities and whoever possible that should be public transport.

Wherever possible employment facilities should be married to transport facilities at every considered site

Comment ID: 10144

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: This may be a good idea in principle but does not work in practice.

In particular Community Housing does not work when people are allocated from a city or a large town to a rural location.

Comment ID: 10145

Location in consultation document: Scenario 7

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: Lobbying the government regarding targets must intensify.

A "same approach across all areas of the UK" does not work and will not work.

Targets must consider geographical, infrastructure, employment and transport facilities either existing or proposed

Comment ID: 10146

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: Increasing density must not happen and is an insult to future homeowners and their communities.

We must all have space to live and enjoy our surrounds

Comment ID: 10147

Location in consultation document: Increasing density

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: Whatever housing is considered it must be to the highest standard possible and always include solar panels and the latest and most economical utility systems.

Building must relate and blend in with the locality by style and materials.

Comment ID: 10148

Location in consultation document: Table 2

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: The current planning rules must be revised so that all current applications in a Parish plus any pre-application discussions are both considered when an application for housing is discussed for a decision at Planning Decision meetings.

Mickleton has the ridiculous position whereby some five planning applications application are either in application or pre application , including some sites which border each other, but only one site can be considered when reaching a decision.

Comment ID: 10149

Location in consultation document: Indicative maps

Name: Anthony Boyse

Comment: Chipping Campden, which already has all the facilities required, should have a greater allocation of new housing compared to Willersey and Mickleton.

A railway station at Chipping Campden should also be re-opened as part of this revised allocation

Comment ID: 10344

Location in consultation document: 2. Spatial strategy options

Name: Anthony de Beaufort-Suchlick

Comment: I have great sympathy for CDC in respect of the entirely unreasonable housing demands imposed by the Government. The key problem is the allocation of the housing into a very small part of the overall area with the risk that the very nature of the Cotswolds will be permanently changed. The risk of ribbon development resulting in the linkage/significant expansion of both Cirencester and Moreton or Fairford to Lechlade will result in something similar to Newbury and its environs or Bracknell merging with Wokingham. Both of these cases (and many others) resulted from poor local planning decisions changing the nature of both areas. It would seem imperative to avoid these mistakes in the Cotswolds. This countryside that can never be replaced.

Comment ID: 8757

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Antony Lodge

Comment: In reference to section (e) of the objectives section, it seems to me almost without fail councils / relevant authorities historically do not insist that protected cycleways from new housing development sites into a town centres are constructed.

How will we EVER change our unhealthy overuse of cars unless councils / relevant authorities do this?

We have to make a step-change on this.

People cycling short distances (less than 5 miles) boost people's health (thereby reducing NHS bills) and protects the environment.

Cycle lanes must be protected from roads by hard infrascture, otherwise you will not tempt people to use them and the health and environmental benefits will simply not be realised.

Comment ID: 8758

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Antony Lodge

Comment: In reference to section (e) of the objectives section, it seems to me almost without fail councils / relevant authorities historically do not insist that protected cycleways are constructed from new housing development sites into a town centres.

How will we EVER change our unhealthy overuse of cars unless councils / relevant authorities do this?

We have to make a step-change on this.

People cycling short distances (less than 5 miles) boost people's health (thereby reducing NHS bills) and protects the environment.

Cycle lanes must be protected from roads by hard infrastructure, otherwise you will not tempt people to use them and the health and environmental benefits will simply not be realised.

Comment ID: 8759

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Antony Lodge

Comment: In reference to section (e) of the objectives section, it seems to me almost without fail councils / relevant authorities historically do not insist that protected cycleways are constructed from new housing development sites into a town centres.

How will we EVER change our unhealthy overuse of cars unless councils / relevant authorities do this?

We have to make a step-change on this.

People cycling short distances (less than 5 miles) boost people's health (thereby reducing NHS bills) and protects the environment.

Cycle lanes must be protected from roads by hard infrastructure, otherwise you will not tempt people to use them and the health and environmental benefits will simply not be realised.

Comment ID: 10338

Location in consultation document: Context

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: The Government policy is very misguided and unreasonable in requiring such a significant housing increase within the District, given its character and limitations in suitable development.

Comment ID: 10350

Location in consultation document: Scenario 5

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: Although the rationale for Scenario 5 is understandable, I believe it is inappropriate, due to the scale of the proposed development. Many villages in the southeast of the District are in beautiful countryside and have key heritage considerations to be taken into account, as well as issues related to infrastructure and local employment. As a councillor with 25 years' experience in Down Ampney (ref Area 17) I see the 'preferred plan' as unacceptable. The housing demands being made by the Government must be revised for the District, so that the areas outside the AONB are not loaded with almost the entire increase. Either the demand must be reduced by 80%, due to much of the district being AONB, or the AONB will need to take a higher load by using many small and appropriate sites. The aim of the the new Local Plan is to take away the blight of speculative and potentially unrestricted developments that do not enhance the area but to accept the Government demands and then push almost ALL of the whole area's building requirements into 20% of the land risks creating an 'official' blight on village communities.

Comment ID: 10363

Location in consultation document: Scenario 6

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: Notwithstanding the issues related to building within the AONB, Scenario 6 should be considered instead of Scenario 5 unless the Government accepts the demands being placed on Cotswold District should be reduced to a level commensurate with a district having such a high percentage of AONB. It is unacceptable to push almost the entire additional building into the southeast of the district, along with some in Moreton-in-Marsh, as this will radically change the village communities and landscapes in what is a beautiful area with a rich heritage, albeit just outside the AONB.

Comment ID: 10378

Location in consultation document: The Council's preferred option

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: Unless the Government can be persuaded the demands for Cotswold District should be significantly reduced, Scenario 5 should not be the preferred option, as pushing the entire area's additional building into the 20% of the land that is not AONB is unacceptable. I have made additional points under Sc5 and Sc6. Although outside the AONB, there are many beautiful villages (and towns) in the southeast with vibrant communities and a rich heritage, and these would be completely changed by the extraordinary indicative figures being proposed.

Comment ID: 10382

Location in consultation document: Question 1

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: Critically, I propose the Government should reduce significantly the demands being made on Cotswold District, due to the large proportion of land under AONB. If this does not happen, Sc6 should be considered, not the 'preferred' Sc5, for reasons I have made in the Scenario sections.

Comment ID: 10397

Location in consultation document: Table 3

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: Notwithstanding the reasons for the LP exercise, these figures are far in excess of an area's ability to integrate without an unacceptably radical transformation on communities, heritage and landscape. Furthermore, the infrastructure demands to support this level of building are hard to imagine being achieved.

Comment ID: 10411

Location in consultation document: 5. Revised vision and objectives

Name: Antony Matthews

Comment: The Vision in 5.2 is barely recognisable for those living in the southeast of the district if the Sc5 proposals and indicative figures ever came to fruition. The last line, being important, appears almost an adjunct.

Comment ID: 9220

Location in consultation document: Indicative figures

Name: Austin Hind

Comment: The housing figures appear arbitrary. Has any scientific methodology been used to determine the ACTUAL housing requirement for the Cotswolds? If not then the whole system is flawed - Demand should drive the supply, not the other way round.

Comment ID: 9219

Location in consultation document: Question 3

Name: Austin Hind

Comment: It is imperative that in rural locations such as Kemble, that new buildings are not built higher than existing dwellings - 3 floors maximum. Otherwise the profile of the landscape will be significantly altered. The houses built need to reflect the ACTUAL needs of the community who require these houses, rather than hoping that wealthy retirees purchase.

Comment ID: 9221

Location in consultation document: Question 4

Name: Austin Hind

Comment: Kemble.

388 current dwellings are catered for by:

100 primary school places,

1 small Dr surgery.

Small village hall.

A small village shop/post office.

The public play park is to the NE of the village across the busy A429.

An additional 588 dwellings will necessitate a significant expansion of all the above facilities. It should be a condition of development that new facilities are provided to account for the 52% increase in the number of dwellings.

It can be reasonably expected that the population will increase by more than 52%, as many of the existing residents are elderly couples. A significant proportion of these new builds would be housing families of 3+

Comment ID: 9222

Location in consultation document: Question 5

Name: Austin Hind

Comment: Water Supply - Reservoir.

~18K homes = >40K persons. Whilst water and sewage is mentioned, there is no indication of expanding the existing water supply.

Where is the building of a new reservoir? In these times of climate change it is obvious that our water is under extreme pressure (hosepipe bans are an annual occurrence), and yet no extra storage is being proposed.

Kemble traditionally provided water from boreholes, to the Swindon Railway works. They are currently no longer used, but I propose that these boreholes are utilised to provide water for the Kemble development.

I also posit that a reservoir is as important as the housing developments themselves and should be an integral part of the plan.

Comment ID: 9223

Location in consultation document: Question 6

Name: Austin Hind

Comment: Agree - however my point about a reservoir still stands.

Comment ID: 528

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adam Bates

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

Comment ID: 349

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adam Billing

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

Comment ID: 400

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adam Wilton

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

Comment ID: 848

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adele Barton

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

Comment ID: 144

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adrian Butters

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

Comment ID: 441

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adrian Grazebrook

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

Comment ID: 529

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adrian Mayer

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

Comment ID: 838

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adrian Sellars

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

Comment ID: 508

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Adrian Webb

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

Comment ID: 420

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ailsa Summers & James Marks

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

Comment ID: 622

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alasdair Nicol

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

Comment ID: 536

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alex & Penny Paterson

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

Comment ID: 807

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alice Jones

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

Comment ID: 172

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alice Valentine

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

Comment ID: 572

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alison Collyer-Bristow

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

Comment ID: 490

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alison Dear

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

Comment ID: 167

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Alison Wagstaff

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

Comment ID: 192

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Amanda Taylor

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

Comment ID: 791

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Amelia Thomas

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

Comment ID: 713

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Gardening Club

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

Comment ID: 287

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Parish Council

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

Comment ID: 769

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Residents Action Group

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

Comment ID: 770

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Residents Action Group

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

Comment ID: 771

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Residents Action Group

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

Comment ID: 772

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney Crucis Residents Action Group

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

Comment ID: 639

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampney St Peter Parish Meeting

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

Comment ID: 388

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ampneys Gardening Club Committee & Members

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

Comment ID: 588

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anastasia O'Brien

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

Comment ID: 732

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrea Fielder

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

Comment ID: 223

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrea Hughes

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

Comment ID: 582

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Cullen

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

Comment ID: 122

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Grier

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

Comment ID: 591

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Griffiths

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

Comment ID: 197

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Ives

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

Comment ID: 832

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Ives

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

Comment ID: 598

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew King

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

Comment ID: 501

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Kirk

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

Comment ID: 716

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Kirk

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

Comment ID: 422

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Lazenby

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

Comment ID: 493

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Raphael

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

Comment ID: 611

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Sabourin

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

Comment ID: 526

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Silén

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

Comment ID: 479

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andrew Young

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

Comment ID: 135

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andy Crouch

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

Comment ID: 359

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Andy Crump

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

Comment ID: 749

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Angela Goodchild

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

Comment ID: 377

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Angela Kilby

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

Comment ID: 491

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Angela Peryer

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

Comment ID: 729

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Angus Jenkinson

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

Comment ID: 730

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Angus Jenkinson

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

Comment ID: 774

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ann Bullock

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

Comment ID: 242

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ann Kelly

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

Comment ID: 562

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ann Silén

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

Comment ID: 705

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anna Bilton

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

Comment ID: 563

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Annabel McEune

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

Comment ID: 579

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Annette Stannard

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

Comment ID: 250

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anthony Kingsley

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

Comment ID: 290

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anthony Kingsley

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

Comment ID: 109

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anthony Lodge

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

Comment ID: 864

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anthony Ross

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

Comment ID: 571

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anthony Van Oss

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

Comment ID: 816

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Anton Borg

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

Comment ID: 675

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Archie and Juliet Mason

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

Comment ID: 767

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Arenite Developments Ltd

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

Comment ID: 108

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Arthur Cunynghame

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

Comment ID: 344

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ashberry Strategic Land

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

Comment ID: 710

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ashley Clarkson

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

Comment ID: 777

Email/Letter Representation

Name: Ava Hardman

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