

Annex B: Summary of feedback from Moreton-in-Marsh Community Event Report (Planning for Real, October 2024)

Summary of suggestions – working group membership:

- Charity representative: should be from widest community provision Charity i.e. one assisting all community positively.
- Business representative: a concern was expressed that due to the fact that there is no existing “business group” that there was a risk of self-interest.
- Representation needed from immediately adjoining smaller villages, not just District Councillors, need individuals to report back as satellite villages are directly impacted.
- Thames Water needed for key issues such as sewage overflow and building flood defences. There was also a suggestion that a Water / Naturalist representative is required.
- Gloucestershire County Council needs to be represented for traffic issues and infrastructure. Could be co-opted. Another comment about Gloucestershire County Council was about the need to address how the Working Group will work with the County Council and obtain relevant input from them regarding infrastructure.
- Someone with a grasp of Planning.
- Bus provider / Pulham could be co-opted.
- Fire Services College representative.
- Specific local groups mentioned were Moreton Against Over Development and Cotswold Friends. There was also a comment that membership should include someone representing the traditional town.

Consideration of membership of the working group generated a list of individuals who participants felt would be good representatives on this group.

Summary of suggestions – Morton-in-Marsh Working Group Terms of Reference:

It was commented that the Terms of Reference should be amended to allow substitutions as relying on one individual is a risk. A recommendation was put forward that there be two representatives (each) for business and residents’ perspective with only one needed to attend the meeting and that there needed to be an open mechanism for replacing any residents or business representatives who

withdraw. A comment was made that the “nomination given for Chairperson not optimal”.

The point was made that it is only the Town Council who can appoint their representative and also a Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Group representative and not Cotswold District Council choosing.

Other comments included that the Working Group should be representative of the community and communicate with them; that the Working Group needs to “officially report and feedback” information and work to implement change where it is required; and this was an opportunity for scrutiny for the wider area; that the Working Group should be able to challenge decision that Moreton-in-Marsh gets all housing; and that the Local Authorities need to be honest and transparent and give enough time for feedback.

It was felt that Cotswold District Council should provide funding for a Secretary to Working Group and for a public website and that it had been useful to see the Terms of Reference to understand how it is being run.

Summary of suggestions – methods for engagement and communication:

The methods put forward by participants concentrated on communication - access to information and how this could be achieved. Amongst the methods mentioned were: use of social media; a dedicated website that was separate from Cotswold District Council Planning; leaflets funded by Cotswold District Council; Royal Mail door drop; dedicated space in Cotswold News; publishing Agenda in advance (of Working Group meetings); the publication of summary of discussion / decisions; and regular reports to residents and local villages. A comment was made that different methods of communication were needed as “paper is not for everybody”.

Participants views on engagement were recorded as: develop an Engagement Strategy; an interactive website for engagement between residents and the Working Group; Working Group members to engage with the town to seek wider views; a request for open meetings as well as the use of WhatsApp for meetings; seek a route to engage younger people; and for simple summaries of consultations that the non-technical can understand.

Other more general comments sought genuine, sensible, reasoned debate and collaboration; that monitoring of representation of voice was needed; and the existing resources available should be used and new resources made available.