

Siddington Neighbourhood Development Plan -Regulation 14 Consultation Record of Responses Received

Ref	Status	Date	Policy/ Section	Comment	Support/ Object	SG Response	Action
R		3.4.26	Objectives	Maintaining the character and equestrian elements of the village are also very important	Support	Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	Objectives	Traffic and transport tends to sit outside the scope of a NP, except for e.g. allocating land for a car park. There are parts of S12 which are useful, but this objective seems greater than could be realistically achieved through a NP.	Object	Note that other made NDPs include a similar policy	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	Para 3.3.7	There is no reference in the document to non-designated heritage assets. I would therefore suggest including a paragraph after 3.3.7 which refers to listed buildings, to advise that other buildings of historic interest can be identified as non-designated heritage assets and also form an important part of		Agreed	Plan amended (see paragraph 3.3.8)

				the character and historic interest of Siddington.			
Comments on Policy S1: Preventing Coalescence							
SC1	Statutory Consultee	9.5.26	S1	While the objective of maintaining the separation between Siddington and Cirencester is understandable in seeking to preserve local identity, it does not appear to fully reflect the position established in the Local Plan in relation to land use.		The policy is consistent with the CDC Local Plan adopted in 2018	No action required
L1	Landowner	6.5.26	S1	The SNDP should follow the adoption of the new Local Plan so that its policies can help shape the design and appearance of any housing allocations proposed..	Object	As noted in paragraph 7.1.1, the Plan will be reviewed once the emerging local plan has been adopted	No action required
			S1	The Old Talland site should be excluded from the gap	Object	There is no compelling justification for excluding the Old Talland site from the Policy designation. Note that the policy does not preclude development but supports proposals that maintain the physical	No action required

						and visual separation and openness between Cirencester and Siddington village. As such it is considered that the Policy would not prevent the sympathetic and appropriately designed development of the Old Talland site	
R13	Resident	30.3.26	S1	Siddington needs to stay as a village, not as a suburb or an estate of Cirencester	Support	Noted	No action required
R14	Resident	30.3.26	S1	Siddington's status as a village should never be compromised with overdevelopment	Support	Noted	No action required
R15	Resident	30.3.26	S1	Keep Siddington apart from Cirencester. It is a village not an estate.	Support	Noted	No action required
R21	Resident	18.4.26	S1	Siddington needs to retain its identity and not be a part of Cirencester.	Support	Noted	No action required
R1	Resident	4.5.26	S1	Policy should go further and include in its definition of "the gap" all of the undeveloped land to the north of Parkway.		The Policy is intended to preserve a green buffer between Siddington village and the built form of Cirencester, including North Siddington, thereby preventing the	No action required

						coalescence of the two settlements. It is our view that the Gap boundary as currently defined achieves this objective	
R38	Resident	10.5.26	S1	Would like to see north of Orchard Field woodland included in the gap.		See comment above	No action required
SC	Statutory Consultee	8.5.26	S1	Respondent supports maintaining the "Siddington Gap" separation from Cirencester	Support	Noted	No action required
R33	Resident	10.5.26	S1	Ensuring that Siddington remains a separate rural village and does not become part of a "Greater Cirencester" is the overarching aim of the SNDP	Support	Noted	No action required
R39	Resident	10.5.26	S1	Any new expansion of the village should be Somerford Road side due to the new installation of sewer pipes for the Bathurst development. This would prevent overloading the village sewer system. No development in the area between Spire View and the main village due to	Support	Noted	No action required

				existing problems in this area.			
R41	Resident	10.5.26	S1	Support protecting the rural nature of Siddington and preserving separation between Cirencester and Siddington	Support	Noted	No action required
R18	Resident	3.4.26	S1	It is very important to me that Siddington remains a separate settlement from Cirencester.		Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S1	It might be worth differentiating between Siddington Parish and built form (village) of Siddington, and ensure correct terminology used throughout the document.		Agreed	Plan amended
Comments on Policy S2: Development Boundary and Infill Development							
R5	Residents	8.5.26	S2	The boundary should remain the same with no further infill development on green space.	Support	Noted	No action required
L1	Landowner	6.5.26	S2	The Development Boundary should be expanded to include all built up areas within the settlement boundary	Object	The Development Boundary reflects feedback from residents of the parish through the NDP survey and is drawn to follow the existing built form of the Siddington	No action required

						village, supported by clear natural features such as the canal, tree belts and valued green spaces. It excludes the Severells Field development, as it sits outside the main nucleus of the village	
R43	Resident		S2	Development at the top of Parkway to the left where it joins Spratsgate would not be welcome. Development needs to be small and adjoining current residential areas. Jubilee flats should be replaced with better quality housing for the current residents/demographic.		Noted	No action required
R7	Resident	Richardson	S2	Infill development should be small scale (less than 10 properties) and NOT seek to create new estates on the fields within the village; e.g. the fields either side of the Coach Road including that to the south of Severells Field, with the exception of that outlined		Noted	No action required

				in Policy S5 that we support			
R18	Resident	3.4.26	S2	I like the infill developments and incorporating the heritage sites into new developments	Support	Noted	No action required
R20	Residents	15.4.26	S2	Would strongly approve if caveated so that conditions of any infill development include (1) being appropriate to the location and context both in scale and design (2) cause no access or egress issues for affected neighbours and (3) does not overlook neighbouring gardens that were not previously overlooked.	Support	Noted	No action required
R35	Residents	10.5.26	S2	We don't want to lose the land that is farmed down the Coach Road to houses.	Support	Noted	No action required
R44	Resident	Not dated	S2	The boundary should remain the same and no infill developments especially if it impacts on green space. If one development gets approved, then more will likely follow resulting in even less green space.	Support	Noted	No action required

				<p>We don't have an issue with redeveloping existing sites.</p> <p>We are worried that in future years this will no longer remain a village and will inevitably be joined to the main town. Our green space is consistently being filled with solar panels and adding housing will end up making Siddington more urbanised and not rural. If more housing is built you will need the extra infrastructure on top of that and everyone needs to remember we are a small village.</p>			
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S2	<p>In the Local Plan any settlement with a settlement boundary is considered a principal settlement.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans should not change the spatial strategy of a Local Plan. We are assuming that Siddington intends to be a non-principal settlement with a settlement boundary,</p>	Object	<p>Siddington is currently identified as a non-principal settlement and should remain so designated and should continue to be assessed against Local Plan Policy DS3</p>	No action required

				meaning the provision of Local Plan policy DS3 still applies?			
				Can figure of 452% increase in homes since 1945 (para. 6.8.3) be evidenced?		The calculation of 452% was based on the 1931 census figure of 123 households in Siddington CP and the 2021 census figure of 588 updated by the 91 houses subsequently built in the parish. The Plan has been revised using the 1951 census (144 households) and the estimate of household numbers in 2026 (679) f	Plan amended. See paragraphs 3.10.1 and 6.8.3
				Settlement boundaries are used to discourage expansion into open countryside and encourage/ prioritise re-use of buildings, development of	Object	The approach taken follows the existing built form of the Siddington village, supported by clear natural features such as the canal, tree belts and valued green	No action required

				<p>brownfield sites etc. Most settlement boundaries would be “rounded”. As drawn, it excludes a lot of potential sites that would be larger infill (within the built form) without the village extending outwards. Most settlement boundaries are drawn to include recent developments, such as Rural Exception Sites, or in conjunction with the allocation of a site outside an existing settlement boundary. Both are to support development, whereas this appears to only constrict development. As drawn this would seriously restrict sustainable development, additional housing and could jeopardise the longevity of facilities and services. Does Policy 1 do enough to protect coalescence, that this policy would be largely unnecessary?</p>		<p>spaces. It is considered that Policy S1 does not render Policy S2 unnecessary. Policy S1 addresses coalescence along the northern edge of the village. Policy S2 provides protection to the settlement boundaries to the south, east and west. This approach is consistent with Local Plan Policy DS3, which supports small- scale residential development where it is proportionate in scale, maintains sustainable patterns of development, and avoids adverse cumulative impacts. The policy also requires that the development is appropriate to the rural character of the locality and safeguards open spaces and gaps that contribute positively to the village character, including views and vistas. It further recognises the importance of considering</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

						cumulative impacts over time in relation to the potential erosion of rural character and the risk of coalescence or a more urban form of development	
				The implication of para. 6.8.4 is that the NP is enabling Old Talland as a makeweight to this policy - there would already be support through planning policy if it secured the future conservation of heritage assets	Object	It is not accepted that this is the implication of the wording referred to. The wording in question has been moved to the explanation of Policy S5 (paragraph 6.11.1)	Plan amended
Comments on Policy S3: Housing to meet the needs of the community							
L2	Landowner	9.5.26	S3	Questions whether all requirements can be accommodated given the small scale of proposals likely to come forward within the Development Boundary.	Object	The criteria set out in Policy S3 are intended to apply to development of any scale	No action required
R9	Resident	29.3.26	S3	Although I understand some houses need to be single storey to suit older people, I also think it cuts off attracting younger people who might not		Noted	No action required

				wish to live in a bungalow.			
R39	Resident	10.5.26	S3	Important that any new housing developments include social housing. This is especially important for youngsters in our area who are being driven out due to being priced out.		Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S3	The SG could identify neighbouring parishes for purposes of what constitutes "local".		Noted	No action required
Comments on Policy S4: General Design Principles							
R6	Resident	24.3.26	S4	Adding even one "swift brick" to every new build would help swifts, an endangered species, survive.		???????????????	
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S4.2	Could add ... by respecting building lines, orientation, heights, and dormer levels, where appropriate.		Policy changed to include proposed wording	Plan amended
			S4.5	Would this not contradict Policy S1		It is not accepted that this contradicts Policy S1 but the words 'wherever sited' have been deleted	Plan amended
			S4.7	All policies of the Local Plan should be adhered		This policy will help ensure that the relevant	No action required

				to where relevant. And likely to be a new policy adopted soon. Suggest deleting.		policy protection is maintained as the Local Plan framework evolves	
			S4.9 &10	These are prudent, but would be better move to support text for interpretation of S4.8, not as policy wording.		Noted. Considered appropriate to retain as part of policy	No action required
			S4.16 - 25	Much of these criteria are duplicative of the Local Plan. Only locally specific points adding to an existing policy will be effective. Remove where duplicate wording or same approach?		Noted. Considered appropriate to retain?	No action required
			S4.16	Preserve or enhance is a term associated with heritage assets, just to clarify that this is intended to apply to all development.		The wording in the Plan is 'protect or enhance' and it is considered this applies to all development	No action required
Comments on Policy S5: Old Talland School of Equitation							
R3	Residents	6.5.26	S5	The main part of the Old Talland site is in flood zone 3b and the remainder is in flood zone 3a. Any development here would be inconsistent with that and	Object	Policy amended by addition of a new paragraph 3(c) which indicates that proposals should "appropriately respond to the constraints	Plan amended (paragraph 3(c))

				would be extremely likely to increase elsewhere.		of the site including flood risk”.	
L1	Landowner	6.5.26	S5	It would be useful for the Policy to set out the scale and form of development that would be supported.	Support	It is not considered appropriate to include additional detail in the Policy	No action required.
R11	Resident	30.3.26	S5	I agree that this area needs to be preserved and maintained but have concerns as to how it is developed. Although the area is not designated flood plain its close surrounding area is. My concern is the detrimental effect development could have on problems with surface water and the sewerage system and local flooding		Policy amended by addition of a new paragraph 3(c) which indicates that proposals should “appropriately respond to the constraints of the site including flood risk”	Plan amended (paragraph 3(c))
R26	Resident	7.5.26	S5	Suggest the following addition. It is important to note that the Talland site is in the floodplain, and new development would not therefore be supported. Redevelopment should avoid any increase in hardstanding or otherwise lead to a loss of vertical drainage or increase in runoff and also be in		Policy amended by addition of a new paragraph 3(c) which indicates that proposals should “appropriately respond to the constraints of the site including flood risk”.	Plan amended (paragraph 3(c))

				accordance with Policy S4 (General Design Principles: Water management) and S9 (Flood policy).			
R27	Resident	8.5.26	S5	Does this not go against S1, reducing the green gap.		Most of the site comprises existing heritage assets and dilapidated stabling. Any (re)development that would harm or reduce the green gap would not be supported	No action required.
R29	Resident	10.5.26	S5	Please note comments about Talland development in [Respondent]'s email to the committee regarding the precedent set by promoting a development in zone 3b functional flood plain and with poor vehicular access.		Policy amended by addition of a new paragraph 3(c) which indicates that proposals should “appropriately respond to the constraints of the site including flood risk”.	Plan amended (paragraph 3(c))
R36	Resident	10.5.26	S5	What is meant by a redevelopment of Old Talland/Church Farm? Will it be housing? Does it form part of the designated heritage assets - surely these are separate from the Old Talland farm? The tithe barn I do understand has		The Policy encourages redevelopment of the site that will secure the long term conservation of the important historic assets. The site also has significance as a gateway to the village, which any proposals should respect and enhance	No action required

				historic significance. The stable surely are not worth preserving - are they?			
R37	Resident	10.5.26	S5	Redevelopment of Old Talland site long overdue. Turned down the last time. It's a disgrace. Would it be possible to include parking for the church - long needed.		Noted	No action required
R41	Resident	10.26	S5	Important to maintain heritage features and protect from future housing		Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S5	As per the SEA screening response from Historic England, we would suggest trilateral work on this policy, particularly around 'tightening up in the policy of the criteria in heritage terms'.		The Policy has been amended to include the wording provided by CDC	Plan amended
Comments on Policy S6: Local Green Space Policy							
L1	Landowner		S6	The allocation of the green spaces is supported but notes that Local Green Space designation is superfluous to safeguard their kind term protection.	Support	It is considered that designation as Local Green Spaces is important to safeguard the sites identified	No action required

R30	Resident	10.5.26	S6	My Grandpa helped me read this plan - I often with my mum and sister go to the playpark from home and would welcome the road (Canal Lane) becoming a green space to keep it protected as I grow up	Support	Noted	No action required
R31	Residents	10.5.26	S6	I often go to the park- I take my bike sometimes - I really hope [Canal Lane] can be maintained as is and become a Green Space so I can use it safely and unchanged	Support	Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S6	As (a) and (b) are already designated in the Local Plan, and they will be "passported" into the new Local Plan good to draw attention to them and indicate the boundaries in this document, but recommend deleting this policy. This would be duplicating, and their designation does not need to be assessed again.		It is considered that designation as Local Green Spaces is important to safeguard the sites identified notwithstanding the inclusion of 1(a) and 1(b) in the Local Plan. This is particularly important because a new Local Plan is to be produced	No action required

Comments on Policy S7: Important Views Policy							
L2	Landowner	9.5.26	S7	This policy is inconsistent and poorly evidenced and detracts from the Plan.	Object	The Plan has been amended to include the criteria used to assess the views. The Policy reflects wording commonly used in other Neighbourhood Development Plans and is based on established assessment principles	Plan amended (Appendix C)
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S7.4	This is too strong, and not positively worded		Comment appears to relate to policy S7.2. It is not considered appropriate to change the wording	No action required
Comments on Policy S8: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands Policy							
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S8	Policy S8 duplicates Local Plan policy EN7.		It is agreed that Policy S8.1 duplicates Local Plan Policy EN7 and it has been removed. S8.2 and S8.3 provide further definition of Policy EN7 and introduce a local element to its application and have been retained.	Plan amended
Comments on Policy S9: Flood Policy							
SC4	Statutory Consultee	8.5.26	S9.1(b)	Betterment in surface water flows is sought for brownfield sites, where 40% improvement over	Object	Policy S9.1(b) has been amended to remove reference to greenfield sites	Plan amended (Policy S9.1(b))

				current rate or greenfield runoff rate is sought			
			S9.1(d)	It is too vague to require flood attenuation areas to be outside flood zones. Attenuation basins in flood zone 2 are acceptable.	Object	Policy S9.1(d) has been amended to refer to Flood Zones 2 and 3 for the reasons given in paragraph 6.5.16 of the Plan	Plan amended (Policy 9.1.(d) and paragraph 6.5.16)
L2	Landowner	9.5.26	S9	The Policy should follow National Standards for SuDS.	Object	Policy S9.1(d) has been amended to refer to Flood Zones 2 and 3 for the reasons given in paragraph 6.5.16 of the Plan y	Plan amended (Policy 9.1.(d) and paragraph 6.5.16)
L1	Landowner	6.5.26	S9	Questions whether the Policy is needed as it sets out requirements in the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework		Noted. It is acknowledged that the Policy covers the same matters as Local Plan Policy EN14 but it is considered that the Policy is desirable to reflect local concerns	No change required
R23	Resident	28.4.26	S9	Policy S9 provides a policy to mitigate flooding, but there is little mention of the serious sewage discharge issue in the village resulting from insufficient capacity in the Ashton Road sewer. Also, there is no mention of the unacceptable sewage discharges at the		Plan amended to include reference to concerns about inadequate sewage capacity in Section 7	Plan amended (Section 7)

				Shorncote WWTW. These problems need highlighting as persistent overflows indicate insufficient wastewater capacity relative to housing growth. There should be a policy requiring phased development closely linked to wastewater upgrades by Thames water both in the main sewer for Siddington and at the Shorncote WWTW			
R12	Resident	30.3.26	S9	Flooding and the recent almost continuous sewage spills on Ashton Road and Cherry Tree are a serious concern. There should be no more development in the area until this is resolved.		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity	Plan amended
R10	Resident	29.3.26	S9	Any development should take into account the existing problems of flooding and sewage spills that the village has encountered frequently.		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity	Plan amended
R42	Resident	10.5.26	S9	The prevention of leaking sewage and flooding due to cracked pipes and poor maintenance must be put		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity	Plan amended

				in place before any new development/building works is carried out			
R10	Resident	29.3.26	S9	Crucial that any future development does not worsen the existing flooding problem in the village. Similarly future developments must be fully supported by improvements in the currently totally inadequate sewerage infrastructure		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity	Plan amended
R22	Resident	27.4.26	S9	I live on Ashton Road close to the Parkway junction. The roads flood every time there is heavy rain. This has worsened since the new buildings were constructed at Severells Field and the Spire View Estate. We are also plagued with heavy traffic that causes disruption for people trying to get in and out of the village. New buildings are likely to make the flooding and traffic problems worse.		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity	No action required
SC7	Statutory Consultee	8.5.26		Respondent notes that the flood plain south of		Noted	No action required

				Siddington (and north of South Cerney) is not recognised and needs to be strengthened			
R16	Resident	31.3.26	S9	On the basis that in the future change will occur with the addition of further housing, attention to flooding and traffic conditions is critical/essential.		Noted. See above comment in relation to sewage capacity. Appendix B of the Plan includes aspirations relating to transport conditions	Plan amended
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S9	Although this has been highlighted as a key issue, nothing locally/ site specific being added to the scope/ approach of Local Plan policy EN14.		Noted. It is acknowledged that the Policy covers the same matters as Local Plan Policy EN14 but it is considered that the Policy is desirable to reflect local concerns	No action required
			S9	Detailed drafting comments.		Noted	No action required
Comments on Policy S10: Sustainable Transport and Active Travel							
R4	Resident	12.4.26	S10A.2	Route of proposed footpath from Siddington Road to Tesco would destroy security of properties along Primrose Way, the equanimity of the residents and tranquillity of the area and encourage antisocial behaviour. If accessible from Wildwood Park, it		The route of the proposed footpath is indicative only. Residents' comments will be taken into account in the detailed planning stage if any proposal is submitted	No action required

				would lead to parking in Wildwood Park and shopping trolleys being dumped. An alternative route from Church Avenue or South Cerney Road is suggested.			
R19	Resident	13.4.26	S10	Especially like the pathway ideas. As a wheelchair user connectivity is vital to Cirencester and South Cerney	Support	Noted	No action required
R2	Resident	24.4.26	S10A.2	Concerns about the route of proposed footpath from Siddington Road to Tesco: flooding, wildlife disturbance, antisocial behaviour.		The route of the proposed footpath is indicative only. Residents' comments will be taken into account in the detailed planning stage if any proposal is submitted	No action required
SC4	Statutory Consultee	8.5.26	S10	The policy should be strengthened by distinguishing between routes that are to be safeguarded through development management and routes that are aspirational, dependent on third party land, funding or delivery	Support	Agreed. Policy S10A.2 has been amended	Plan amended (Policy S10A.2)
			S10A	Strengthen Policy by requiring development that would prejudice one		Agreed. Policy S10A.1 has been amended	Plan amended

				of the routes should demonstrate how the route will be safeguarded or incorporated.			(Policy S10A.1)
			S10	Clarify that relevant development proposals should proportionately contribute to improvements and make reference to s 106 and/or CIL funding as delivery mechanisms		Agreed. Policy S10C.1 has been amended to refer to s 106	Plan amended (Policy S10C.1)
			S10A.2(b)	Acknowledge engineering, land and environmental constraints		Agreed. Paragraph 6.16.5 has been amended.	Plan amended (paragraph 6.16.5)
			S10	Recognise the importance of protecting bus route viability		Agreed. Policy S10B.1 has been added	Plan amended (Policy S10B.1)
R8	Resident	27.6.26	S10	I don't agree with section 11 when you say there is a desire for a footpath between Tesco and Siddington Road. I don't think you will find that desire in the area that it would have the greatest impact. This was tried before when Tesco bought one of the houses in Cherry Tree drive with the plan to knock through		The route of the proposed footpath is indicative only. Residents' comments will be taken into account in the detailed planning stage if any proposal is submitted	No action required

				to Tesco. This plan has been rejected and is not what the residents of Cherry Tree Drive, and wildwood park, want as it will bring more unnecessary footfall into a quiet cul de sac area. If there was a footpath from the village to Tesco through the fields no one would object- but it would be under water half of the year due to flooding			
R24	Resident	3.5.26	S10A.2(d)	The proposed foot and cycle route should be a bridle path.	Object	Agreed. Policy S10A.2(d) has been amended to refer to a bridleway.	Plan amended (Policy S10A.2(d))
R24	Resident	3.5.26	S10A.2(e)	The Green Lane / Quiet Lane off Clarks Lane must not be downgraded to a cycle track and footpath. It has always been used by horse riders. If its status is to change it should be designated a bridleway.	Object	Agreed. Policy S10A.2(d) has been amended to refer to a bridleway.	Plan amended (Policy S10A.2(d))
R25	Residents	4.5.26	S10A	We strongly support the creation of better and additional footpaths	Support	Noted	No action required

				around the village, for example improving walking access to Cirencester and the creation of a footpath from the village to Tesco			
SC7	Statutory Consultee	8.5.26	S10A.2(d)	Respondent strongly supports the proposal for a walking and cycle route along the old railway line from Siddington to South Cerney.	Support	Noted	No action required
R28	Resident	8.5.26	S10A.2(d)	I am just a little confused about the conflict between the desire for the disused railway line to have a cycle lane and footpath but it being privately owned. I would very much support this being made available to connect with South Cerney and would use it regularly	Support	Noted	No action required
R	Residents	10.5.26	S10A,	We strongly object to a footpath along the back of our boundary where it floods. We bought our property for the lovely views and wildlife.	Object	The route of the proposed footpath is indicative only. Residents' comments will be taken into account in the detailed planning stage if any proposal is submitted	No action required
R34	Residents	10.5.26	S10A.2(a)	The proposed footpath may encourage		Noted	No action required

				unwelcome traffic and parking in a residential area by shoppers driving north via Siddington Road.			
			S10A.2(b)	This is long overdue but would be best routed well away from the road itself. It is suggested that a new path could start near the junction of South Cerney Road and Siddington Road, cross the field to Church Avenue, proceed past the church, proceed across Wildwood Park and meet Siddington Road where it meets Cherry Tree Drive. It would have spin-off benefits to policy S5 (the redevelopment of Talland/Church Farm).		Noted	No action required
			S10A.2(e)	This would exclude many disabled people who cannot walk or cycle that far and therefore need access by car. It is a peaceful and quiet spot to visit.		Noted	No action required
R27	Resident	8.5.26	S10	Policy should include provision for a footpath/pavement along		Noted	No action required

				South Cerney Road to join up with footpath to Dobbies			
R40	Resident	10.5.26	S10A.2(e)	Unethical to use public money to remove public rights of way	Object	Noted	No action required
R43	Residents	10.5.26	S10	Whenever a new estate or group of dwellings is designed and built, sustainable transport (walking and cycling) and flood impact needs to be planned for.		Noted	No action required
CDC1	CDC	28.5.26	S10	Detailed drafting comments.			

