

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 15 LGS		<p>Under Local Green spaces (pg 15) I see the plan is proposing the Glebe Field is reserved as a Green space. I believe this is a mistake as the Glebe Field is clearly a good location for an out of town Car Park within a short walk of the town centre. The Town desperately needs an out of town Car Park and in my opinion this is the best available location. The Car Park proposed by the Church on the Glebe Land several years ago was an excellent proposal and was well supported by the town in two separate democratic votes. Why the historic Town Council ignored that proposal will always be a mystery to me.</p> <p>My recommendation is to put a caveat in the NDP proposal that the Glebe field could be a future Car Park for the benefit of the whole town after proper consultation.</p> <p>Clearly a sizable Car Park (150 to 250 spaces) is required to enable Town Centre AND connected side street parking management to be implemented.</p> <p>Measures could be:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Initial free parking period in some areas of the High Street followed by Pay and display thereafter</li> <li>-Parking permits in High Street and connected side streets to prevent commuter and all day parkers clogging up the town</li> </ul> <p>None of this is rocket science and all of the systems, equipment and tools are available through GCC.</p> <p>The small car park proposed in the so called Transport Hub location is not big enough to solve any parking issues in the Town Centre and side streets. The Transport Hub development is a red herring and only supports the GWR business model on passenger growth in my opinion.</p>		Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
				Commenting	I received this proposed Plan this morning, to which I agree in principal, providing these ideas are seen through to the end. An example is the developers of phase two of Cornflower Road spent a lot of money & effort planting well established young trees in the Park to the right of the Road and then left to die, because NOBODY was left responsible to water them in, during the hottest part of last year. All six trees subsequently died..... What a complete tragedy, seeing the beautiful saplings die, just because some jobsworth was too idle to water them in! Yes, these ideas of modifying old ground and saving trees etc is all very well, providing these ideas are properly seen through. I feel sure someone living on the Cornflower estate would 'step upto the plate' and volunteer to do the watering, like they do with the flowers planted in the troughs in the High Street and beds underneath the Birch trees, in the carpark opposite the Bank etc. taking pride in being a proactive part of the community. I have lived nearby all my life (76 years) and congratulate you on what the Council have done to resurrect the beautiful town hall clock!		Noted	None
			NDP Document	Commenting	Approach to Sustainable Development page 22. 2nd paragraph discussing leisure facilities, the Fire College actually has a gym and a swimming pool available to the public, only it is not advertised enough and obviously the community don't realise.		Noted	No action taken
			Profile of Community	Commenting	<p>(a) The NDP Document page 11 paragraph 21. I believe there are contradictions between this data and data provided in the GRCC Housing Needs Survey Report (HNSR) of May 2021. NDP Document - 2011 ONS Census- 3493 population with 1799 households. GRCC (HNSR) - 2011 Census- 4200 population with 1802 dwellings. The documents above seem to be referring to the same document source, but with differing published data. GRCC (HNSR) (Para'21) States- "According to Cotswold District Council there were 2470 dwellings on Council Tax register in 2019", yet the NDP document page 11 states "2021 ONS Census" data 2021at 2400 Households. I recognise why this data is apparently different, but there is no explanation as to why. The way the data is referenced actually implies a reduction between 2019 and 2021, which I am fairly sure is inaccurate.</p> <p>(b) On page 12 of the NDP plan, the profile of the "Tenure" provides a comparison between Moreton-in-Marsh, Cotswold and England. It does not state where the data is from, but I assume 2021 Census.</p> <p>(c) The comparison data referenced above, shows Moreton specifically has a higher proportion of Social rented property than either Cotswold or England. If you are referencing this data, where is the evidence that a higher proportion of socially rented property is actually required in Moreton when this data shows the exact opposite? I can only assume the evidence is anecdotal, because collected data suggests there is no requirement to increase socially rented properties in Moreton. The data shows more socially rented properties are required, but elsewhere in the Cotswolds, not in Moreton.</p>	(a) 2011 & 2021 census data checked & correct in NDP. Suggest going to CDC to ask for their explanation? (b) Noted (c) Noted	(a) No action taken. (b) added footnote to NP to make clear all graphs referencing relevant census data. (c) No action taken.	
			Policy 10	Commenting	The tenure data actually implies there is a need for a higher proportion of privately rented properties within Moreton, however the objective of NDP policy 10 will curtail private rental properties. GRCC (HNSR) 2021, Table A7 Housing tenure, shows 650 responses, 10% socially rented and 6% private rented. This data also shows private rental being 37.5% of all available rented property. The GRCC (HNSR) 2021 (Para' 6.5) references the 2011 Census data, where it also shows over 16% of rented property as either "private" or "other rented" and it can be calculated 36% of all available rented property is "private" These two sources imply the percentage of privately rented property available in Moreton, is reasonably constant over the ten-year period. Even though 55% of respondents support Government Starter Homes (20% discount on market value for under 40s), there is no way of ensuring potential buyers can raise funds to complete a purchase. I understand what policy 10 is trying to achieve, however it is far too over reaching and will have a detrimental impact on the much needed private rental sector. The proposals must recognise, not all tenants want or are entitled to, a socially rented property.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 10	Objecting	I disagree with the reasoned justifications and there is no evidence to support the policy. The stated justifications are not for Moreton-in-Marsh, they are for the Cotswold District as a whole. Para' 49 references analysis by "Action on Empty Homes" as 3,409 empty homes in Cotswolds, it cannot identify how many were directly in Moreton. The calculation of 1 in 17 is also inaccurate, as the referenced document states there are 46,109 total homes and 3,409 empty homes, realising a ratio of 1:13.5 empty homes to total homes. Using the 2021 Census data of 2400 households within Moreton and using the worst-case calculation above of 1:13.5 empty homes, equates to 178 potentially empty homes in Moreton. According to the 2019 CDC data there are 2470 dwellings in Moreton, this would then equate to 163 potentially empty homes. The closest and arguably most accurate comparison available, is between the 2019 CDC data and the 2021 Census data, which shows 2470 dwellings and 2400 households respectively. The comparison provides information to show 2400 households out of the potential 2470 dwellings, responded to the 2021 Census, which implies only 70 dwellings were not occupied in Moreton at the time of the 2021 Census, or only 2.8% empty homes. The reference data does not identify the number of "second home" responses or the tenure of the non-responding homes.		Noted	No action taken
			Policies 3.4 & 10	Objecting	May have undesirable consequences, the policies are written with the intent to achieve a balanced mix, however, what they seem to ignore is the affordability factor. When affordable homes are built, some of the homes are "purchased" by housing associations, some are fully rented and some part buy, part rent. The recent market situation has seen housing associations refuse to purchase the homes. The developers are then left with affordable homes to sell, but even at discounted values, they are too expensive for first time buyers. The GRCC (HNSR) 2021 clearly identifies the low uptake of affordable homes and the difficulties of purchasing with a mortgage. No local policy can overcome this directly. If local people cannot afford to buy and housing associations do not purchase to rent, then the only option is investors for private rental. Private rentals are expensive, but for some, there is presently, no alternative.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 1 (d)	Commenting	If the development is conditional on an energy assessment, is there an expectation for a minimal EPC rating? Maybe "B"		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 6	Commenting	The average walking speed of an adult is deemed to be between 3.2 and 4mph. A 15mins walk is equivalent to approximately 1 mile. Policy 6 (g), implies even a single residence or conversion within a 1-mile radius from the town centre, should explore the provision of public car parking. What are you expecting an applicant to provide as evidence? The first statement below the coloured sections of the documented section, states the objective of policy six is to reduce on-street parking in residential areas, but Policy 6(e) states "visitor parking can be off-street or on-street". I would expect on-street parking to be classified as the exception.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 8 (b) (3)	Commenting	I agree traffic and transport assessments are required, however, any substantial development should also consider the impact vehicles will have specifically on parking within the town centre. Outside the 15-minute walking time, it seems a developer does not have to consider the impact additional vehicles parking in the town will have on centre parking. The further away from the town centre a development is built, the more likely a resident will use their car, therefore parking in the town in these circumstances should be a consideration at planning.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 9 (c)	Commenting	Phasing larger developments can be more detrimental to the locality through disruption (e.g. Spifire), however the justification (48) implies developers consider surrounding parish facilities. Are developers allowed to include facilities available in neighbouring parishes, potentially offsetting any need to improve Moreton-in-Marsh facilities? This potentially opens up the "parish" facilities much wider and I recommend removing the words "and surrounding parishes" How does a developer provide proof of adequate services with no adverse impact on soft infrastructure and over what timescale? I do not believe this can be administered by the council. Any evidence provided may not be independently verified or just anecdotal. Although required, I do not believe any sensible data could be provided.	surrounding parishes refers to other parishes using MM facilities, as MM is recognised as main service centre for the Cotswolds in the Local Plan.	No action taken.	
			Policy 11 (b), Policy 13 (b) 1	Commenting	The change of use resulting in the loss of employment area potentially requires the property to be marketed for a minimum of 12 months. I believe these policies will potentially have empty shops on the High Street. As an example, Jon Fox Antiques on the High Street has just been sold subject to contract. The property comprises of a shop area, two further floors of shop space, a studio, a garage and land with development potential. This policy states, effectively this new owner will not be able to develop this site, even though it is far too large for most businesses these days. Is the purchaser expected to market the property (for an exorbitant price so it doesn't sell) for 12 months before being allowed to alter or just decide not purchase at all? Either way, the shop will potentially be empty. The Moreton Means Business event held 24th April 2019, also suggests restricting change of use may increase the number of empty spaces in the town.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 14 (a)	Commenting	This requirement is too specific and nowhere within any documentation has the specific requirement "around the Redesdale Hall" been detailed. I believe this requirement has been added by some in the council and should be removed. The potential for this "improvement" is included within the council's Transport Strategy document, but has yet to be agreed.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 14 (b)	Commenting	"Moreton-in-Marsh High Street Refurbishment Improvements", encompasses all of the High Street and not just "around the Redesdale Hall", therefore any funds could be directed to public realm improvement anywhere as part of the High Street. It must be noted that the Redesdale Hall is owned by a private charity, it has not provided any business case to the council or to the community and therefore altering the public realm to incorporate and assist a private business without a complete and thorough understanding is inappropriate.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 14 (c)	Commenting	"Remove long-stay parking from the town to a location close to the train and bus stations." This is inaccurate, Moreton Means Business Event 24th April 2019 and the Summary of feedback from 1st NDP Consultation 2nd February 2019 neither of which document the desire to move long-stay parking to the station. There were comments on how such a parking scheme would work, but this particular desire was not indicated. Once again, I believe this has been added by council to reflect the Transport Strategy document that is still to be agreed. It should also be noted that the planning application submitted on behalf of the council and GWR, only provides an additional 43 car parking spaces to those presently in place. Although not accepted, the council's Transport Strategy document has identified much higher numbers of parking spaces to be removed from the High Street, believed to be a potential deficit of approximately 100 spaces. The business Event 2019, and the NDP feedback 2019 recognise the need for car use and parking. The Residents Survey Report 2022 also requests additional parking in the town, all of which seem contrary to the planned council Strategy. The Community Aspiration 2, is also questionable, where is the evidence? The business Event 2019 recognised the need for parking for tourists and visitors alike and the business survey January 2022 identified 74% of businesses deemed tourism as very important to Moreton-in-Marsh. I.e. where do overnight visitors park? Residents have indicated the need for permits, but where has "preventing overnight parking" come from? No evidence has been presented to suggest this?		Noted	No action taken.

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			NBP Document	Commenting	Within much of the documentation, there appears to be an acknowledgement that Moreton-in-Marsh is lacking of "things-to-do" by business and the wider community, however, this policy provides no direction on how to enhance this. Leisure facilities and interests are seemingly ignored; no funding is requested for improvement. Interestingly the Redesdale MUGA is deemed worthy of protection, but it is in a dilapidated state and the council have no coherent plan for the area or its future use. How does this plan or a policy intend on improving or providing vibrant facilities? Is the council considering on providing "things-to-do" or is there a plan to encourage business to invest in the "interests" of the community? The Moreton Means Business Event 2019 highlighted tourism as important to Moreton-in-Marsh but it also highlighted the necessity to offer something to differentiate itself. Where is the differentiator in the plan?		Outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. Information to be passed onto Town Council	No action taken.
			Policy 15 LGS	Objecting	I do not agree with all of the LGS. No's #14, #15 & #16 are already developed and owned by the council. They should be removed from the list. The Bowls Club (#16) is developed and holds a 99 year lease from 2010. The Croquet Club (#15) holds a 50 year lease from 2020. Both clubs have a strong membership. The Redesdale MUGA (#14), is in a dilapidated condition and has not been repaired by the council for years, hence creating its own "eyesore". At the council meeting in August 2025, the council voted to approach the developers of the adjacent land to establish whether there would be any mutual benefit in working together regarding the MUGA area. Are the council now trying to reverse this decision? The 2022 Residents Survey Results Report- Natural and Built Environment, highlights "Play equipment and facilities for older children had the lowest ratings". Q47. Facilities for teenagers (13+) and Adult outdoor gym equipment were rated the lowest overall. LGS (#22) Glebe Field this field is owned by the diocese and in the past has been contacted by members of the council in trying to establish whether the area could be utilised as a carpark for Moreton-in-Marsh. As the Transport Hub development will under-deliver on the total additional carparking spaces with a maximum of 43 and with the council considering adopting its Transport Strategy document which potentially creates a deficit of 100 car parking spaces in the centre. It seems only logical to keep the options for this land open, especially as the business community and general community recognise the importance of tourism. Including it in the protected views (#7) is also somewhat erroneous, as the stated reason could apply to any field surrounding Moreton-in-Marsh. There are a couple of local spaces that have not been included as protected areas; There is a triangular area between 19-21 Sunderland Road and 19-21 Mosedale, this area was specified as an area for interesting species, it can be identified underneath the legend for "27- Moreton Park-2" on the South East map. The greens area the full length of Errington, between Errington and London Road, all of the trees in this area have individual Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's). Identified underneath the "25 - Buffer" of the legend "Buffer between Moreton Park & A44" on the South East map.		LGS 15/16 Developed in this context is referring to built development, not a green space which is 'managed'.	No action taken.
			Policy 18	Objecting	View #7, as above, and furthermore, I believe there may be opposition to development of the Glebe Field, as there may be a belief it potentially opens up further land behind Hospital Rd., however, the additional land is predominantly owned by the Dulverton estate, if they wished to develop this portion of land, there have been many opportunities to provide access, none of which have ever materialised. It is also worth noting that some of these views are visible from the Dulverton's manor house on the estate. View #9. This view cannot be deemed important because of the view when arriving. View #5 is only metres up the same road, and it has a much clearer view of St.David's Church than view #9. View #10. This view of the "footpath" is actually a road to a parking area. I cannot understand why anyone considers a road of this style an important view. There is no architecture or open green space. The field adjacent to it, maybe, but that is not the "important" view. It is my belief, this is just a way of preventing potential access to any development, not because of the view itself. Nimbyism, at its best. Views #11,#12,#13,#14,#16. Should be removed, these views have already changed. View#15, why would you want to include a view that already changed the "feel" of the approach, this is not a protected view. View #35, has already been reviewed by CDC planners and have concluded that a small development behind Aldi & Nursing home is acceptable, so it is not protected according to CDC. View #40, is of the southerly approach, but including it, may create issues with transport management plans for the future, as per the recommendations to GCC Highways in 2018.		Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken.
			East Moreton Greenaway	Commenting	The walking route has been determined and the signs are going to be placed. I am interested in establishing why a sign identifying the National Cycle Route will be placed to the end of the footpath. The spreadsheet provided in Appendix G "what3words location" as being "bench.shackles.subject" is at the point where the footpath meets London Road. The barrier at this point is damaged and GCC Highways have refused to repair it. The main point here is that this section is a footpath, not a cycle path. By including a cycle route sign, you are encouraging cyclists to incorrectly use the footpath.		Outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken.
			NBP Document	Commenting	Page 56 Para*100. mentions village. should this not be town? Page 67 (2.3). same as above? Page 70(2.14) maybe towns and villages?		Noted	Pg 56 ref to Village amended to Town.
			Business Survey	Commenting	The Business Survey Results Report January 2022, does not provide any "free text" detail or analysis from the survey.		Not related to Regulation 14.	No action taken
			V&O Survey	Commenting	I note the very last line of the summary document state " Create a more connected parish for residents and visitors alike, limiting the need for vehicular travel within the town and offering a genuine choice of transport" Limiting the need for vehicular travel will not happen by removing parking, or not offering enough spaces. Offering a genuine choice is not only walking or cycling, the plan does not address how the "genuine choice" will be achieved. Although it is government policy to encourage "active travel" the National Cycle routes that traverse Moreton do need upgrade and the local community recognise and understand the cycle routes in particular are hazardous for cyclists and certainly are not suitable for the uninitiated or children. The plan recognises the need for improvement, but the older established developments, especially those nearer the town centre at present cannot support active travel arrangements to the aspirational levels envisaged. The plan for future travel from additional surrounding developments, implies the connection and use of established routes, however, these routes cannot be regarded as safe for regular commuting. If the plan cannot address the limitations, then further additions are only likely to exacerbate the situation more. I find it inconceivable that any administration would consider promoting active travel with the knowledge that the present older, infrastructure is incapable of growth without dramatic change. Change, depending upon how it is implemented, may have negative consequences to the economy of Moreton-in-Marsh business.		noted	No action taken.
			Residents Survey Report	Commenting	Getting around Moreton-in-Marsh (Summary). The last item listed in the table states "There were over 220 suggested upgrades or new routes - see separate document" The document does not appear to be included. Interestingly, Q41, "Should parking facilities be improved in Moreton-in-Marsh?", 70% respondents answered "yes" to "in town", The Town Council's Transport Strategy document, aims to improve the layout, but by significantly reducing parking availability, which is in contradiction to the 338/337 responses received from the survey. The table of lacking facilities for future funding, in Q61, states Public footpaths/bridleways as 1st and Wildflower Meadow as 2nd, however, a standard weighting calculation, implies they are actually the opposite way around. Maybe the actual number of responses should be provided rather than percentages to clarify the results.		Not related to Regulation 14	No action taken
No			Theme 4, Active and Sustainable Travel	Commenting	1: Consider adding a cut through between Fosseyway Drive and Tinkers Close. 2: If possible the plan should consider extending the idea of walking and cycling paths beyond the boundaries of Moreton illustrated in the maps. Nearby amenities and landmarks such as Wofford Wood, The Four Shire Stone, Barton on Heath, Todenham Manor Farm Shop and Lemington Lakes, Cotswold Riding, PadeX, Old Farm, Muzzy's Kebab, The Arboretum, Bourton-on-the-Hill, Sezincote, Longborough Opera, Doninton, Broadwell, Evenlode and Chastleton are all nominally walkable from Moreton. They need decent paths that can be used year round that are preferably not along the main roads. As the crow flies for example, Chastleton National Trust is only 5km. A 50 minute walk or 30 min run on a nice day which currently takes an hour and a half on the A44 and country roads with no paths. Even the Rollright Stones and Whispering Knights and other directions Broadway and Shipston-on-Stour should be walkable and easily cycleable for a nice day out but there is no cohesive, marked and mapped, all weather footpath network, forcing you onto small fast roads and verges which puts people off. Isolating the many towns and villages of the area into remote islands with intertown transit almost exclusive dependent on cars. 3: A relief road round Moreton should be considered to take A44 and Roman Rd/Fosseyway through traffic out of central Moreton. A carpark could be considered near the existing caravan site to move parking out of the center to allow for better pedestrian access. With parking and through traffic removed Moreton could then implement a 20mph speed limit for pedestrian safety, pollution reduction, traffic noise reduction and beautification. A HGV and Coach restriction could then be imposed for all large vehicles that aren't explicitly engaged in activity within Moreton and directed round the relief road. 4: Long term, a county plan for a light rail should be devised. Modern APS Ground-Level Power Supply would allow for track that is sunk into the ground with no overhead cables. This could be further obscured with moss matting round the rails to prevent its visual impact on the landscape. Any embankments could be edged in Cotswold stone to ensure its in keeping and stations designed similarly. With step on step off trains requiring station platforms as low as 20 or 30 cm. This would allow the region to connect all the tourist hubs together, moving them from coaches and cars to a single centralized hub they could range out from. It would also allow the district to connect together otherwise disparate bits of infrastructure, such as Moreton's hospital, the secondary schools in Chipping Campden and Burton-on-the-water. The theater and cinema in Chipping Norton if you were to extend it that far (I appreciate that's Oxford not Cotswold district). The leisure centers in Chipping Norton, Burton, Northleach, Winchcombe and Shipston (again Warwickshire not Cotswolds) and Moreton fire center. Provide access to the many markets that run in the various towns and to mainline train stations at Moreton and potentially in Cirencester and Cheltenham if its run out that far. It would provide a huge amount of mobility and freedom to particularly the districts more elderly and younger populations who can or are reluctant to drive for whatever reason, who are otherwise isolated to their immediate town or village when they needn't be. Parking costs could be raised everywhere you don't want tourists to park to incentivize using park and tram hubs which residents provided with cards that provide steep discounts similar to systems already used in areas like Windsor and Maidenhead. One would hope a pleasant ride round the Cotswolds rolling hills would be a tourist draw in its own right rather than fighting the roads. Tram ticket pricing could be similarly priced to have tourists functionally subsidize locals. Correctly implemented this could substantially reduce traffic particularly from tourists. Improve inter town links and transit. Provide better access to amenities for all residents who will become less dependent on cars, provide a substantive quality of life improvement for those who are unable to or restricted to drive and be substantially cheaper than catching taxis. And in conjunction with a strong path network could vastly expand the walkable destinations throughout the Cotswolds' from any one point to any other for locals and tourists alike. A 50 min walk from Moreton to a national trust property with a 15-40 min tram ride from Broadway, Burton on the water, Northleach or even Cheltenham or Cirencester is a perfectly reasonable prospect for a nice summers day with an opportunity to leave the car at home even with fairly young children.		A Neighbourhood Plan is a Planning Policy document which can influence within the Parish Boundary of Moreton-in-Marsh.	No action taken.
No			All of it	Supporting	I have only read the summary document, but it seems excellent. Thank you for the time that has been invested in this detailed plan to try and best protect and enhance our beautiful town. Thank you!		Noted	No action taken.
No					Blank			
No					Blank			
No			Policy 8d and Policy 9c regarding infrastructure	Commenting	I think this should be changed in light of other recent developments such that there should be insistence for infrastructure to be in place before work starts rather than completes specifically regarding water and waste due to the existing sewage provision being over capacity and this having been previously ignored by developers.	Simply replace the word completion with commencement in each section	Not reasonable policy wording	no action taken
No			Policy 8 Hard infrastructure	Commenting	It is all very well and the plan sounds reasonable but when will people realise that the infrastructure must be in place before housing development takes place. We have seen many times companies not honouring their commitments once the houses are built. Sewage is a big problem around here as Moreton sewage works is at capacity, nothing gets done, more houses are built and the rivers and environment suffer.	Infrastructure first	Not reasonable policy wording	no action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
	No		Executive Summary	Objecting	Objecting.	Challenges There is no alternative to the private car and it is unrealistic to believe that there is. The centre of the town is where two A roads meet. A bypass is essential to allow through traffic in all directions to progress without further congestion and environmental damage to the town and its residents. A proper visitor car park needs to be built rather than the ridiculous extension to the "transport hub" which will only provide parking for the railway station. No more new housing before essential infrastructure is provided; bypass, centre town parking, revised visitor parking, flood and sewage renewal, secondary school, and any other public facilities that are inadequate.	Bypass outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. Transport hub comments noted. No more new housing not reasonable policy wording	no action taken
	No				Blank			
	No		Moreton-In-Marsh	Objecting	Too many new houses, being bought by non locals, cannot support infrastructure. Excuses say built affordable homes for locals. This untrue.	New township to be considered	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
	No		Policy 1	Objecting	The policy as currently written is quite rigid in that it is clearly based on the belief that the current government policy will survive both in construct and timetable. I believe this unlikely. Hence I believe that the policy should be re-worded to allow for greater flexibility. For example, it is commonly now accepted that electric vehicles (cars, buses and commercial vehicles) as the only solution to replace fossil fuels is both unsustainable (cost of battery production, commercial lifetime value etc) and foolish when other emerging technologies are probably offering better solutions (eg Hydrogen) at the current rate of progress towards the folly of Government ambition, the technologies noted in this policy are likely to be superceded. I would propose therefore to widen the scope of this policy by bringing sub para f to the fore, to encourage 'innovation and imagination' whilst making all other sub paras less specific ( ie remove the specifics around charging points - wireless charging is already being adopted by most motor vehicle manufacturers. This will require a different infrastructure to link into the national grid supply than charging points.)	Text could read "Only development proposals (new housing, extensions to dwellings or business premises) which show innovation and imagination in solutions to meet the agendas of enhancing carbon capture, ecological diversity and using current and emerging renewable technologies will be considered/favoured.	Not reasonable or definable policy wording	no action taken
	No				Blank			
	No		All of the plan	Commenting	While the Plan is to be welcomed there are significant issues to be raised in relation to it. The 'challenges' identified in the plan make no reference to retaining the current 'essence' of the town as a semi-rural community with a long history of tradition. While there is reference to 'integrating' strategic developments so that they do not function as separate from existing communities, the plan is not sufficiently explicit on how existing communities will be safeguarded and their environment looked after; the plan is active in its discussion of new developments but passive in what it says about protecting, ensuring existing communities thrive. Where is the policy to ensure that the environment and standards for existing communities is proactively safeguarded. Equally how will existing infrastructure - specifically water and sewage be enlarged and when.	Policy 15 - can this be reworded so it is clear that these local green spaces will not be sold off to developers and that there will be no development here. How can any proposal enhance an existing green space. Policy 13 - can there be active encouragement for local and independent retailers. Policy 7 - can 'brownfield first' be mandatory, not a choice? Policy 5 provision of new allotments to be welcomed but priority must be to encourage greater use of existing allotment space. Policy 4 - what percentage of affordable housing in any new development will be implemented?	Policy 15-Policy is worded as strongly as it can be. Policy 13-Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 7 no. Policy 5 encouragement to use existing allotments outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 4 not defined in Neighbourhood Plan.	no action taken
	No		Policy 8 Hard Infrastructure. As a Moreton resident we already experience extreme traffic congestion almost on a daily basis. The current levels make traveling in and out of Moreton extremely difficult and slow and unsafe. My concern is that increasing the households to the levels outlined only compounds the issues further and there isn't the adequate infrastructure in terms of road size, crossing points for pedestrians and adequate parking for residents in Moreton as it is. Any development needs to have very clear plans on how they will increase the infrastructure and support eg roads, doctors, dentists, for the increased population.	Objecting	Limit the number of new properties as the hard infrastructure of the town, street width, roads, parking, services is already overloaded. Just try and drive through Moreton regularly and park. The overdevelopment planned is spoiling the town and the traffic levels are unsafe already.	Reduce the number of homes planned. Increase parking just outside Moreton. Increase road crossing points for pedestrians.	Number of homes cannot be determined by Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plan can only influence within the Moreton-in-Marsh parish. Road Crossings outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Information passed onto Town Council	no action taken
	No		#8 There have already been several new homes built in MIM. There has been no additional provision made for schools, Drs and local services. The traffic congestion in MIM is not sustainable and no plans are in place to alleviate this. The addition of more homes would exacerbate this and would impact local high street businesses who will shop elsewhere	Objecting	New infrastructure is needed to support any new homes. The constant presence of traffic lights for underground work on the high street is a daily nuisance.	Plans to alleviate traffic congestion need to accompany any new homes built plan plus plans for local service improvements. More new homes creates demand on already stretched local services. Builders should provide funds for this also and not just benefit from building and selling more homes then move to the next project	Noted	no action taken
	No				Blank			
	No				Blank			
	No				Blank			
	No		General comment	Commenting	Overall I support growth for MIM, however this "must" be sustainable within the local resources that are made available. We will not achieve the stated desires of a thriving town shopping centre if there aren't enough people to sustain the shops, and if they cannot comfortably reach the town centre to use those shops. My further comments on the plan are made with this in mind.	Much of the wording of the plan is vague and woolly, expressed as 'desires' or 'aspirations'. This is a key document for the future of MIM, as such it should be far more concrete in its intentions and aims.	noted	no action taken
	No		Policies 3, 4, 8, 16	Objecting	There has been an excessive amount of building of new houses in Moreton-in-Marsh. I don't think there has been any infrastructure alongside this. The houses being built do not represent the needs of the people, ie affordable housing, houses for first time buyers. The heavy traffic in the town and on the A44 shows the need for a by-pass. I cannot leave my front windows open due to the fumes & dirt from the excessively large lorries passing. So imagine the impact on historical buildings in our beautiful town. More houses equals more traffic, with a road system that has not changed in centuries.	A by-pass to diverted large transport from the centre of the town and A44.	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
	No				Blank			
	No				Blank			
	No				Blank			
	No				Blank			
	No		Policies/Maps	Supporting	Overall I support the plan and have some comments in relation to "lifetime homes" and the green space map. Lifetime Homes can deliver poorly designed homes with compromised living spaces - more important than the square footage is the attention to detail in designing the spaces with 'living' in mind. The map on North East green spaces indicates that Moreton Park and the Avenue are access to each other along Wellesley Close - they are not and it is one of the failures of the planning process in delivery of the three newest estates that they are separated with long lengths of fencing creating artificial barriers between what should be neighbourhoods. To be avoided in any future developments.	Suggest that the policy 5 be extended to include a reference to new housing layouts being neighbourhoods with no artificial boundaries that prevent, particularly pedestrian access between the two. An example of how 'not to' is the Avenue which has on vehicular/pedestrian access and two pedestrian access points when the original plan permission included several more that were not secured through land ownership.	Noted	Additional bullet point added 'New housing developments must be well connected both within the site and with the wider area. Developers must demonstrate how they have had regard to movement (vehicular, pedestrian and cycle) and conform to Policy 20 Transport & Active Travel'.
	No		Town centre	Commenting	There needs to be 3 things done: 1. Remove the parking mayhem in the centre of town. 2. Give more incentive for tourists and visitors to want to come. Right now, moreton is a carpark with a few expensive restaurants. We need culture, leveraging the architecture, and more reason for people to come. 3. The prices of everything is obscene. We need cheaper options for people...	The plan kind of mentions the above, but I don't see any real actions to fix it. I think driving up the tourism will develop economy and jobs for locals too. The employment land you refer to relies on it being attractive for business owners to move in... Who will move in? It will be expensive land with sub par infrastructure and connections.	tourism outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
No			Infrastructure	Commenting	Two main points I want to make. 1. Nowhere in this document do you mention the need to address the additional provisions for schooling for all the new residents. The existing schools will/may not be able to accommodate any extra children which may force additional vehicle journeys taking them to schools in other villages. 2. I acknowledge the plan to extend the long stay car parking at the train station, which is good. However, I believe that the first field on the right opposite the playground opposite the Coop would provide a larger and more suitable space with access to the town via the park/playground.	Please see my comments above	Education outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No					Blank			
No			All	Commenting	If more houses are going to be built on our beautiful countryside the least that could be done is to provide more and better amenities and do something about the awful traffic issues and to protect nature that is being impeded on. All we have here now is charity shops, furniture shops, coffee shops and a couple of supermarkets. That's it!! Moreton high street is now a truck stop venue. There is no access to houses already built other than cramming traffic onto the high street when there are plenty of openings that could have been used to divert the enormous flow around the new estates. It's just a mess. No common sense seems to have been used and the residents of Moreton have to pay the price for that. Dog poo bins rarely emptied as no one seems to know who should do what. Dog poo bins removed because no one will take responsibility and empty them leading to residents being told 'take it home with you'?! The bin men refuse to take bins away with dog poo in them, both services that are already being paid for by residents and that's another staggeringly ridiculous situation. More houses, more people, more pets, more cars, no amenities to cope with, no roads to cope. It's just out of control. I've noticed an increase in police activity already. Does that not worry anyone else???? People's issues are heard, not listened to and filed away. It's a case of build, make money and get on with it people. That's my opinion in which I'm not alone I know.	To be honest it will make zero difference what anyone says. I wanted to say a few points of my views.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No			Overdevelopment of green space	Objecting	Overdevelopment of our lovely of our lovely town without any improvements to the infrastructure is killing the sole of this market town	Stop more building! I have two sons who have been born in breed in moreton. They are in their mid 20 and simply can't afford to buy a property here. If they are ever to move out of the family home they will be forced to move to a cheaper area thus moving them away from family and friends. Meanwhile we seem to get lots of families moving to the area to which they have no connection being offered subsidised accommodation.	noted	no action taken
No					Blank			
No			Green Spaces policy 15 and SE Map, Development Boundary policy 19, Protected Views policy 18	Commenting	I very much support the policies of the Plan but think that it is not sufficiently ambitious, realistic and forward looking when it comes to Green Spaces. Although loss of Green Space to Development is listed as a key challenge, when it comes to Objectives only EXISTING Green Spaces are to be protected and maintained. Given the extreme likelihood of further development along the London Road and down the Evenlode Road (developer scoping exercises are already published), the Neighbourhood Plan should insist upon ADDITIONAL Green Spaces being set aside, akin to the far-sighted policy that previously created those at Blenheim Meadow, Cotswold Gate, Moreton Park. Those at Blenheim Meadow/Caste Gate in particular were deliberately designed to provide a wildlife and green space corridor from the centre of town out to the countryside. The same is needed in the SE quadrant including outside the Development boundary - indeed the Green Space map SE should be extended south.	There are people more expert than me able to advise upon the optimum location/extent of Green Spaces for the SE quadrant, but the obvious strategy - to create a similar wildlife and greenery corridor stretching from the centre of town to the countryside as in the Blenheim Meadow/Cotswold Gate example - would be to protect the fields to the East of the railway line running southwards from the sewage works/Stockwell special habitat area, past the Croft Allotments, ideally all the way up to the public footpath/Dunstable Farm railway bridge and beyond: to be dedicated for wildlife and exercise, dog-walking, etc.	noted	no action taken
No					Blank			
No			Land to the South of London Road (A44) adjacent to Cotswold Business Village	Objecting	Objecting to the planning application by Bloor Homes currently under consideration by CDC which is clearly outside the Development Boundary		Development already underway outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No					Blank			
No			Land to the South of London Road (A44) adjacent to the Industrial Estate	Objecting	If the plan line is by the edge of the industrial Estate then why are Bloor Homes putting in for housing permission on the field beyond?	The plan cannot and should not proceed on land outside the building line - see local plan	Development already underway outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No					Blank			
No					Blank			
No			Infrastructure	Commenting	Improve the GP facilities. They are stretched! A virtually empty out patients department can be utilised as a new GP practice for new residents? Also, what about the primary school being expanded or an additional one? The speed on London Road, as a resident it is atrocious! Calming measures are needed by the football club.	As said above.	GP Surgeries, education outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. traffic comments passed onto Town Council	no action taken
No			Pre-Submission Regulation 14 Consultation	Commenting	Whilst the Plan covers environmental and infrastructure issues very well I consider that it overlooks CULTURAL aspects of the heritage, amenity and existing commercial assets of Moreton in Marsh within the North Cotswold's area. There is no mention that it is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with the possibility of it being designated as a National Park in the future. There are no pylons in the area in view of the importance of the surrounding countryside. Whilst there are two pictures of hotels there is no consideration of the importance to the town and residents of the local pubs and hotels and the employment that they provide. The town and area has long been a focus for the television and film industry, e.g. Father Brown etc. Sprawling development threatens to dilute or obliterate the essential character of the town and it's outskirts. In summary the report feels like a "tick boxing" exercise to allow for the extreme development that is proposed and much more weight needs to be given to the preservation of the cultural aspects listed above	I feel the plan should be more explicit in stating that the proposed expansion of housing, business and retail is beyond tolerable limits and needs to be curtailed so as not to lose the character of a nationally important Cotswold town which is an example of a culturally thriving community which is under threat	Cultural aspect outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Information passed on to Town Council	no action taken
No			Policy 20	Commenting	Yet more obsession with cycle paths and 'non car' infrastructure. Look at the utterly pointless cycle hub at MIM train station - always empty - people will NOT give up cars for cycling - and I am a regular cyclist!	Focus on restricting OVER development and traffic management and stop trying to create a dream option where everyone walks and/or cycles.	Neighbourhood Plan cannot restrict development	no action taken
No			Traffic / congestion/ infrastructure	Commenting	Heavy goods vehicles driving through our town are ruining the roads, blocking the high st., causing pollution and congestion. The mini roundabouts at The Swan crossroads and The Redesdale hall are inadequate and not fit for purpose. Heavy goods traffic should be diverted around our town.	All heavy goods vehicles should be diverted around our town centre and not straight through it.	District-wide traffic control outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No			Challenges	Commenting	The Challenges section correctly refers to Heavy Goods Traffic and congestion - but makes no meaningful proposal anywhere within the Plan to address either. The Challenges section misses that Moreton's social infrastructure - most notably schools - is already overwhelmed.	Include the school (and other infrastructure) issue as a Challenge - the whole Plan reads as though everything is fine and we want to make sure it stays that way. It isn't fine. And within the Plan, make some concrete proposals to deal with the volume of HGVs and traffic. Making it easier to cycle and walk are important and valuable and good to see them included but the vast majority of traffic is through-traffic and the most destructive traffic is HGVs.	schools and traffic control outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No			Policy 15, Glebe Land	Objecting	Under Local Green spaces (pg 15) I see the plan is proposing the Glebe Field is reserved as a Green space. I believe this is a mistake as the Glebe Field is clearly a good location for an out of town Car Park within a short walk of the town centre. The Town desperately needs an out of town Car Park and in my opinion this is the best available location.	The Car Park proposed by the Church on the Glebe Land several years ago was an excellent proposal and was well supported by the town in two separate democratic votes. Why the historic Town Council ignored that proposal will always be a mystery to me. My recommendation is to put a caveat in the NDP proposal that the Glebe field could be a future Car Park location for the benefit of the whole town. Clearly a sizable Car Park (150 to 250 spaces) is required to enable Town Centre AND connected side street parking management to be implemented. Measures could be: Initial free parking period in some areas of the High Street, followed by Pay and display thereafter; Parking permits in High Street and connected side streets to prevent commuter and all day parkers clogging up the town. None of this is rocket science. The small car park proposed in the so called 'Transport Hub' location is not big enough to solve any parking issues in the Town Centre and side streets. The Transport Hub development is a red herring and only supports the GWR business model on passenger growth in my opinion.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	no action taken
No					Blank			
No			Overall building proposals	Objecting	The planning proposals are totally unacceptable but despite residents and town council opposition, new estates will still go up. Those is ruining the community in Moreton, GP services will not be able to cope, traffic congestion will get worse. Before new building, improve infrastructure FIRST. Why can't CDC see this is a MUST before rubber stamping new estates. The new houses, such as Backhouse, weren't for locals nor Spittle, not at their prices. Who is fooling who?	Build new towns. New builds are on former farming sites, how will UK feed UK?	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
No			Page 13	Commenting	Re community aspiration on page 12 to introduce residential parking permits. I do not support or want this.	Currently it is easy to park in moreton as it is and I feel the yellow lines for Tuesday market day only work well	Information passed on to Town Council	no action taken
No			all	Supporting	I agree with the policies, especially the policies that are insisting on relevant infrastructure first.		noted	no action taken
Yes			dgfgfd	Supporting				
No					Blank			

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting?	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
	No		Theme 1	Objecting	I object mostly because it seems shoehorned in for political reasons rather than delivering anything of substance. Almost everything here could be moved to one of the other five points. I do not understand why a neighborhood development plan is talking about the national curriculum. Similarly, why is "switching off appliances" part of neighborhood plan. Unless Moreton is planning to begin seriously farming its allotments, "grow more of our own food" is a statement on national farming policy, not a neighborhood plan. Almost nothing here is individually actionable being far too broad or myopic in scope as to be functionally ignorable from a planning perspective (grow more of our own food and switch off appliances), aligns with current or incoming planning requirements anyway (net biodiversity, car chargers and solar panels), or is completely out of the scope of a neighborhood plan (the national curriculum). This plan is an opportunity to lay down potentially legally binding requirements developers and developments must follow. This opportunity should not be wasted on political posturing of unenforceable points or points which amount to "follow the legally required planning laws you have to follow any way".	As a standalone point this would be better focused on the expectations the town expects from developers. For example, the current laws state that new non-residential buildings with more than 10 parking spaces must have "at least one EV charge point" with cable route for 20%. We could stipulate that as an area of outstanding natural beauty and newly minted National Park, we expect this to be 60% with access to EV charges with 100% cabling access. As the promotion of electric vehicles will reduce engine noise and improve air quality. We could demand that again due to the previously mentioned designations that greater area is given out to parkland in any residential development than is typically required. With a focus on say, woodland of native trees and "eco" play areas which complement other play areas in the town (to ensure they don't all use the same copy paste design which doesn't actually add anything) We could demand a contribution to a pot to update the school to be a functioning "eco learning environment". IE, overhaul the school to have the latest and greatest environmental measures, implemented in such a way you can demonstrated the effects of grey water systems, air source heating and cooling, wildlife pond etc etc. While also saving them money they can then spend on better teaching materials and provisioning. Biggest issue here is its a CoE school and I'm not sure how their funding works how legal that is and if they'd actually get to keep the cash savings. Contribute to an investment pot to be held in trust for the town (with some suitably British company like Aviva), to guarantee in perpetuity the upkeep, maintenance and overhaul of the towns play areas and parks (which itself would help to manage flooding) To ensure sufficient steps are undertaken during development to not only mitigate increased risk of flooding from development but decrease the overall flood risk on the area. We could demand that for every X number of houses, a small area for commercial units for independent business is provided (have to decide how desirable that is as it may function to "split" the high-street. But with 500 more houses they want to give us we are going to need more high street and I'm not sure how to actually affect that). We could demand that business developments focuses on small commercial units which have to be available for sale not lease. To ensure that small local business can buy their own premises. We could demand covenants which functionally prevents rent seeking and prevents capture by large chains. Do we really want or need more large stores like Coop and Aldi? Do we want a second high street forming dominated by Greggs, a drive through Starbucks and and this years trendy bakery-cum-cafe or do we want to ensure we are a town that continues to be dominated by local independents. We should demand that any new commercial development is not designed solely for access via car. I have previously lived in a location where a small commercial zone was designated in the middle of our town, broadly supported, and the council preceded to approve the eyesore of a large central car park, surrounded by a large Lidl, a drive through Starbucks, an upmarket chain gym and a subway. It couldn't have been more designed for people "passing through" if they tried and ended up being largely useless to the locals. To add insult to injury they then tried to build a 5G mast on the local Common because the commercial zone was all owned by a developer who rented it out who wanted to charge so much for the 5G mast they couldn't put it there. With Moretons position on the A44 and Roman road this is a distinct risk. These are far more actionable steps developers could be held to which are not already law which could prevent developer misuse, materially improve the area and future proof developments. This entire section just needs to be rethought and really focus in on what developers and developments can offer and be held to. Demanding they change the national curriculum and farming policy is a waste.	Not reasonable policy wording	no action taken
	No		Policy 5 Well designed Housing	Commenting	Spiffire estate, lovely looking Cotswold houses. Backhouse Estate looks like student accommodation from the 1970's. Who polices these builders and makes sure things look nice.	More accountability from developers and building companies.	noted	no action taken
	No		The whole plan is vague on aspects that need urgent change (infrastructure) and is unrealistic in suggesting that residents cycle or walk rather than use their cars.	Commenting	Aspects of the plan are plainly unrealistic and wishful thinking.	Infrastructure before ANY further development. The existing public networks are already on the edge of chaos. Recommend practical solutions rather than vague wishes for cultural changes that will not happen.	Not reasonable policy wording	no action taken
	No		New estates	Objecting	Moreton-In-Marsh used to be a lovely place. It is in with CDC but Cirencester do not see impact of overstretched resources GP surgeries, pharmacy and local roads cannot cope now!	As above although expect no notice	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
	No		Policy 3	Commenting	It is essential in any development that a social housing provider/management company is contracted and in place before any development is approved. Many social housing providers are now unwilling to take on new developments as the developers take no responsibility for ensuring that the social housing provider takes over property suitable to be managed. For example, social housing providers are being asked to ensure the energy efficiency of properties they run (solar panels etc) whilst the developer has no obligation to provide properties with such facilities built in. The cost of retro fitting makes the commercial proposition for social housing providers untenable and hence they walk away. The developer, in the absence of a social housing provider, then applies to the planning authority to vary the planning permission retrospectively removing the requirement of making x% of the development available for social housing. The variation when given allows the developer to sell the houses previously allocated as social housing on the open market. By contracting with the social housing provider in advance of development beginning, this variation would be circumvented.	The principle is that the developer and the social housing provider both have skin in the same game as opposed to working independently.	noted	no action taken
	No		"Challenges", on P3 of the booklet	Objecting	Proposing alternatives to private cars is all very well, but in reality people will not walk or cycle long distances. If this aim results in anti-car measures, people will simply drive to neighbouring towns where they can park for free and walk short distances to shops, and this reality needs to be recognised.	The plan should clearly recognise the desire of people in the neighbourhood to use their own cars in their own town.	noted	no action taken
	No		Transport	Commenting	There was previous mention of a by-pass but nothing mentioned in this document	Moreton is on a main thoroughfare on the Fosseway but it constantly causes traffic jams and a wider view (as this impacts Stow on the Wold too) is required to relieve the traffic volumes and the impact it has/will have on the buildings, roads and environment.	A by-pass is a district (CDC/Gloucestershire) issue and outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan.	no action taken
	No				Blank			
	No		Policy 12/13	Commenting	The current high street is very limited in variety of businesses, surely challenging the rental costs to encourage more diverse range of business is necessary.		rental prices on High Street outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	no action taken
	No		Policy 5	Commenting	Should include reference to inclusion of sustainable transport and energy policies such as EV charging points and solar panels (these may be included within some of the standards set out of course, in which case, fine)	Either add sustainable transport and energy infrastructure goals to the policy or draw out if and where they are already included	noted	no action taken
	No				Blank			

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Supporting/ Objecting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
	No		Policy 8	Commenting	This is for many, the most important policy in the whole document as there is a well rehearsed and identified problem in this area regarding infrastructure. This is most obviously seen in water and sewage issues in the area, the over crowded roads, the energy infrastructure with its constant failures and the lack of internet capacity and speed. Firstly, we must adopt the Australian (and other country) system of only allowing development in two sections. Section one installs the infrastructure including roads, schools, power and cabling, drainage and sewage, health facilities, retail facilities etc. Only when they are complete and working are the residential developments allowed to start. Experience shows that assuming developers will do what they promised re infrastructure after the housing is built and sold just never works (see the problems on Moreton Park as one very local example). This can easily be built into the funding plan at planning permission stage. The current policy 8 has few teeth - it is no use having expectations of developers (see sub para d). They will ignore those expectations when it suits them. It is no use asking for developers to 'consider' or 'demonstrate' good intentions. They must have their feet held to the fire.		noted	no action taken
	No		P4, Affordable Housing	Commenting	Item a.i. says that affordable housing should be "built using the same materials and in the same style as any market housing on the site". This is impractical. Much of the more expensive housing in the Cotswolds, including new-builds, is built from local brick and stone, an expensive process. It is very desirable that all housing should have a common exterior look which fits with the "style" of the area, but much new affordable housing can be made from prefabricated wood and concrete sections which considerably reduce the cost. I would remove the suggestion that such homes be "built using the same materials" and replace it with more practical comment.	Suggest: "built using modern cost-effective and energy-efficient techniques and good quality materials which blend well with the style of any market housing on the site"	noted	no action taken
	No		The entire Plan	Supporting	The two comments that I have made aside, it is an excellent plan and I hope it is adopted and more importantly, constantly referred to in future CDC Planning discussions		noted	no action taken
	No		Policy 15	Objecting	This policy is too restrictive and gives very limited opportunity for the town to develop in areas which whilst being controversial may be necessary for the future. Obvious in this is the restriction on the Glebe Field which remains the key to sorting out many of Moreton in Marston's current traffic and parking issues. The current aspirational proposals published by the town council and the disaster that is the development of the old RBL site will not solve the difficulties for residents and visitors alike. I am not aware of the current occupation of allotments on two of the town sites (University Farm and Croft) but the potential to use spare land on those two sites should be kept as an asset for the town. ( As one of those originally leading the discussions with the Diocese of Gloucester on the development of the Glebe, the use of land at Croft allotments was a key negotiating point). To tie the list of 28 named sites to a no development for ever flag is both short sighted and foolish.	Remove policy 15 - there are other controls that can be used to the same effect of preserving green space.	noted	no action taken
	No		Policy 6: Parking in Residential Developments Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing Policy 15: Local Green Spaces Putting all comments on these sections here, because for some reason the survey form is broken if I go further, and it no longer asks if I want to make extra comments.	Commenting	Policy 6: Parking in Residential Developments One current problem, particularly with older affordable housing which does not have a dedicated driveway, is the provision of facilities for charging electric cars. Even if people can park directly outside their own home they cannot necessarily safely run a cable across a footpath or car park. I would like to see this addressed in any discussion of residential parking, particularly where one parking area serves multiple homes. I have no precise solution to offer, that will depend on the development, but the concern should be addressed in any planning. ---- Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure This is an example of my earlier comment about the plan being "wooly": "new development should not compromise", "providers to be consulted", "proposals for necessary mitigation", etc. As noted in the forward, MIM waste water treatment plan is at capacity, and yet development continues. We have a hosepipe ban because Thames Water can't supply enough water, etc. ---- Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing The policy aims to block new building that could be used as holiday- or second- homes. I believe that this could have severe unintended consequences. Many of the homes used for holiday accommodation, whether second homes or AirBnB types, are smaller older homes close to the High Street. These are exactly the types of affordable homes that lower-income families look for, they are cheaper and are closer to public transport. By blocking the use of new-builds as holiday accommodation, you will force the holiday market to consume the very affordable homes that the plan wants to make available to locals. Don't place a blanket ban on new-builds being second residences, but manage it better through planning rules. Holiday rentals can be managed via change-of-use planning decisions, and second home owners often bring a disproportionate amount of income to shops and hospitality outlets. Look at what has happened in Wales where a massive increase in council tax aimed at driving second-home owners to sell has had no effect at all. I suggest removing this policy. ---- Policy 15: Local Green Spaces I live in Nightingale Gardens, and see no reason why our private central garden should come under LGS regulations. This falls most of the tests set out in the planning policy for LGS: - It has no wider community benefit - It has no public accessibility, nor right-of-ways - It is already protected by the covenants of the properties surrounding it, which have the responsibility for maintenance - There is no gain to anyone in designating it an LGS	Policy 6/8/10 comments Noted	Nightingale Gardens removed from Local Green Space policy.	
	No		Policy 18	Commenting	The Protected Views Map in the printed booklet is unreadable	Upload a resizeable copy of the Map to the Documents Section of this website	Map available on NP website: <a href="http://www.moreton2031.com">www.moreton2031.com</a>	no action taken
	No		Policy 20	Objecting	Whilst much of the detail of the policy can be supported, it is naive in the extreme to assume that in this area, the motor vehicle will be replaced. I am an infrequent user of public transport, a sometime cyclist and a walker (and a pensioner). But to live a fulfilling and satisfying life access to a car is a necessity.	Pouring more money into cycle paths that are rarely used, and assuming these can be funded by CIL, money is both limiting and irrelevant to the vast majority of residents of the town who wish to be able to get to hospital appointments in Banbury, Cheltenham, Gloucester and elsewhere on time and for whom the bus and train service is a waste of time and who will not be riding a bike or walking. I understand the hatred of the car that many have but providing expensive alternatives is not a way to persuade anyone out of their own 4 wheeled chariot (please see the complete waste of money and effort that the bike shed at the station is. I pass it everyday at least twice and have never seen more than 6 bikes using it.	noted	no action taken
	No		Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure	Commenting	This is an example of my earlier comment about the plan being "wooly": "new development should not compromise", "providers to be consulted", "proposals for necessary mitigation", etc. As noted in the forward, MIM waste water treatment plan is at capacity, and yet development continues. We have a hosepipe ban because Thames Water can't supply enough water, etc. Councils and water companies have limited legal capacity today to prevent developers from overloading initial infrastructure, but more could be done. I would like to see a clear and definite commitment from the council to block final completion of sale on any houses which exceed the hard infrastructure capacity. - Developers must be "required" to commit to pay for any infrastructure upgrades before planning permission is granted. - If a developer should renege on that commitment, no matter what their excuse, the house should not be declared habitable and no-one should be permitted to move in. The council needs to hold developers' feet to the fire here, and not allow them to wriggle out using the small print.		Not reasonable policy wording	no action taken
	No		All	Commenting	I congratulate all those involved in putting this document together. I do not underestimate the amount of work that a few have put in to try and benefit the many - thank you. Again as one of the then Town Councillors who suggested that a Neighbourhood Plan was a necessity many years ago and co-chaired a first meeting to kick the whole thing off, I am delighted to see the work that others have taken on to progress it to a very good draft stage. Good luck to you all.		noted	no action taken
	No		Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing	Objecting	The policy aims to block new building that could be used as holiday- or second- homes. I believe that this could have severe unintended consequences. Many of the homes used for holiday accommodation, whether second homes or AirBnB types, are smaller older homes close to the High Street. These are exactly the types of affordable homes that lower-income families look for, they are cheaper and are closer to public transport. By blocking the use of new-builds as holiday accommodation, you will force the holiday market to consume the very affordable homes that the plan wants to make available to locals. Don't place a blanket ban on new-builds being second residences, but manage it better through planning rules. Holiday rentals can be managed via change-of-use planning decisions, and second home owners often bring a disproportionate amount of income to shops and hospitality outlets. Look at what has happened in Wales where a massive increase in council tax aimed at driving second-home owners to sell has had no effect at all.	Remove the policy.	noted	no action taken
	No		Policy 15: Local Green Spaces	Objecting	I live in Nightingale Gardens, and see no reason why our private central garden should come under LGS regulations. This falls most of the tests set out in the planning policy for LGS: - It has no wider community benefit - It has no public accessibility, nor right-of-ways - It is already protected by the covenants of the properties surrounding it, which have the responsibility for maintenance - There is no gain to anyone in designating it an LGS	Remove bullet 23.	noted	Nightingale Gardens removed from Local Green Space policy.
			Objective 5	Commenting	Doesn't the infrastructure need to be in place from the outset rather than 'prior to completion' of the project. It's not clear what 'infrastructure' covers nor how soon before its completion is meant here. For instance, the Spitfire development preparations started more than a year ago, but it may be some time before that project is completed.		It is considered unreasonable and not always possible for infrastructure to be in place before the commencement of development	no action taken
			Objective 10	Commenting	Please may the Council consider additional places for pedestrians to cross the A429 safely? Currently there is a long distance between the two safe crossing points I frequently use when walking into town, i.e. the zebra crossing by Inn on the Marsh and the traffic lights near Lloyds bank. You take your life in your hands crossing anywhere between these two. Fortunately I can still run, but many residents can't! Please can we have a Zebra crossing or at least bollards somewhere else between these two points?		Outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan. Information to be passed onto Town Council	no action taken
			Policy 4: Affordable Housing	Commenting	Provision of homes for rent is important, and I agree. However, Policy 10 (Principal Residence Housing) may be at odds with the provision of homes for rent unless it makes clear that potential landlords may buy a property to rent (not for holiday lets), which will not by definition be their principal residence. The detail in the full document may be clearer, but if you ban the purchase of any property that is not for occupancy as a principal residence by the owner, then you will have no additional properties to rent.		noted	no action taken
			Appendices	Commenting	Moreton's Neighbourhood Plan is a hugely impressive piece of work. Congratulations to everyone involved. The Appendices are lengthy but important. Please could they become more user-friendly, by linking them to relevant sections of the Plan. For example, Page 59 (Transport and Active Travel) could say To view the Greenway Documents, go to Appendix G of the Neighbourhood Plan, page 187. Likewise the Maps tab could have a copy of the map from page 189 and say To view the Greenway Documents, go to Appendix G of the Neighbourhood Plan, page 187. From the Themes tab, under Active and Sustainable Travel, please include To view the Greenway Documents, go to Appendix G of the Neighbourhood Plan, page 187.		noted	no action taken
			Protected views map	Commenting	I've just been looking at the protected views map with the corresponding view listing, and they don't align. Someone needs to look at the descriptions and where the view is actually located.		noted	all Important Views reviewed and refined
			All	Commenting	In response to the Neighbourhood Plan, first congratulations and thanks to those who created it. Secondly, the weak level of response I have seen reported may reflect my view - which is that it avoids the Elephant in the Room, perhaps because it is powerless to do otherwise, which is that many residents oppose all large scale (over 20 homes) developments in Moreton, as the road pattern, and facilities in general cannot accept them. Any District council plan to increase housing above this scale will spoil the Town, and a Plan which fails at least to acknowledge this can never be adequate.		noted	no action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
				Supporting	<p>I am writing to express my strong support for the inclusion of Redesdale Hall as a priority for investment in the Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is important for me to declare an interest as a volunteer Trustee of the Hall. However, it should be noted that the reason why I volunteered for this role is because of my concern that we have to travel out of Moreton for many cultural and business events and I am keen to help reignite the Hall as the beating heart of the town. 1. Historical and architectural importance: Redesdale Hall is one of the most significant heritage assets in the town. Designed by Sir Ernest George in 1887 and gifted by Lord Redesdale for the 'betterment of the local people,' the Hall is a Grade II listed building and remains an architectural landmark at the centre of the High Street. It is both a reminder of the town's Victorian civic heritage and a structure that continues to define the character of the market square today. 2. Community function: Beyond its historic status, Redesdale Hall plays a vital role in the day-to-day life of the community. It provides space for public meetings, antiques and craft fairs, cultural events, and civic gatherings, and was recognised in 2019 as the 'best-loved building in Moreton.' Its continued use demonstrates how historic buildings can also remain functional, adaptable community assets. 3. Current challenges: The Plan rightly identifies that the Hall requires considerable repairs, refurbishment and enhancements to meet modern accessibility standards and to provide facilities suited to today's community needs. Without such investment, there is a real risk that the building's fabric and its social value could decline. 4. Support for policy priorities: I therefore fully endorse the Neighbourhood Plan's identification of Redesdale Hall within its infrastructure investment priorities. Specifically, I support the principle that future developer contributions (CIL or Section 106) should, where appropriate, be directed towards the refurbishment and enhancement of Redesdale Hall, alongside improvements to its surrounding public realm. 5. Outcomes: By prioritising investment in the Hall, the Plan will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the preservation of a much-valued heritage asset,</li> <li>- the continued availability of a flexible and central community space, and</li> <li>- a visible symbol of civic pride for residents and visitors alike.</li> </ul> <p>Redesdale Hall is both the cultural heart and the civic landmark of Moreton-in-Marsh. I strongly support the Plan's commitment to its improvement and encourage Cotswold District Council and the Town Council to work together to both provide and secure funding and deliver the refurbishment works as a matter of priority. It should be noted also that I am very favourably disposed towards the provision of more affordable housing in the town. However, this is a personal view rather than representing those of the Trustees. I am not a member of the Moreton against overdevelopment campaign. I regret the ill feeling that the planning proposals and their responses, have generated in the town at both district and town levels.</p>		noted	no action taken
				Commenting	<p>I am writing in response to the draft Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Development Plan (Regulation 14 consultation). While I welcome the overall vision for sustainable growth and improved connectivity, I wish to raise specific concerns about the potential increase in traffic volumes along Todenham Road resulting from future development in the Fire Service College area and the proposed new link road between the A44 and Todenham Road. 1. Existing Traffic Conditions: Todenham Road already experiences significant traffic pressures, serving as a key access route for residents of the Cornflower Road and Windsor Road estates, and the village of Todenham to the town centre and routes to the north of the town. The road has limited width and, notably, a 420-yard section with no footway from Windsor Road to Cornflower Road. This creates safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly given the increasing population in nearby residential areas. The road also runs close to existing homes where traffic noise is a significant issue. Traffic already exceeds the speed limit along this dangerous section of road, and yet there are no plans to introduce speed cameras or traffic calming measure in the interests of public safety or to reduce the impact of traffic noise. 2. Likely Impact of New Developments: The Neighbourhood Plan and Cotswold District Local Plan both refer to further development potential at the Fire Service College site and the creation of a new link road connecting the A44 with Todenham Road. While the link road could provide some relief to the A429 through the town centre, it will also encourage additional vehicle movements along Todenham Road which will effectively become part of an Eastern bypass. The combination of new employment, housing, and through-traffic could substantially increase congestion, noise and road safety risks for local residents.</p>	<p>3. Need for Mitigation and Infrastructure Improvements. I urge the Town Council and Cotswold District Council to ensure that any further development in the Fire Service College area or construction of a new link road is supported by a full Transport Assessment and appropriate mitigation measures. These should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of continuous footways on Todenham Road;</li> <li>- Traffic calming measures to prevent excessive speeds and rat-running;</li> <li>- The re-routing of traffic away from existing Todenham Road homes via an extension of the proposed link road to a new junction with the A429 North of Moreton;</li> <li>- Integration of the proposed East Moreton Greenway to provide safe walking and cycling alternatives;</li> <li>- Phased occupation of new development until mitigation works are in place.</li> </ul> <p>4. Conclusion Without these measures, there is a serious risk that the proposed link road and associated development will lead to an unsustainable rise in vehicle traffic, detracting from the safety, character, and quality of life in the eastern part of Moreton-in-Marsh. I therefore ask that these concerns are fully considered as part of the ongoing consultation and incorporated into any revisions of the Plan.</p>	Link road is a district (CDC/Gloucestershire) issue and outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
				Commenting	<p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the pre-submission version of the Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan. We have previously been made aware of the Plan through a consultation in the spring from Cotswold District Council on the associated SEA Screening exercise. We confirmed then that on the basis of the draft Plan seen at that time there were no issues upon which we would feel the need to comment in detail. On examination of the version of the Plan which forms the basis of the current consultation we can confirm that our position remains unchanged. We welcome the policy provisions within the Plan for protecting and enhancing the area's distinctive historic character, and congratulate your community on its progress to date. We wish your community well in the making of its Plan.</p>		Noted	No action taken
	Yes		Policy 15-Local Green Spaces Nightingale Garden	Objecting	<p>We object to this proposed designation on the following practical and formal planning policy grounds: 1. Failure to meet the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraphs 106–108 of the NPPF (December 2024) specify that LGS designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance (e.g. beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, biodiversity) c) local in character and not an extensive tract of land. The shared garden fails to meet these criteria: • There is no wider community benefit. The land is in private joint ownership of 14 households and is maintained by us for our own use. It is not available for the wider public and therefore cannot be said to "serve" the local community beyond the immediate residents. • There is no demonstrable special value beyond private enjoyment: The garden has no particular beauty, biodiversity value, or recognised recreational role beyond to our small group of households. It has only existed since 2022 so has no historic significance. • There is no access for the public: It is noteworthy that our shared garden differs from the other proposed sites in that it is totally private. It appears that members of the public have the right to access all the other proposed sites either freely because they are open spaces, or by club or team membership or, in the case of allotments, by signed agreement. In addition, when the residents of Nightingale Gardens purchased their properties it was on the basis that the builder would provide a central shared garden area for the use and enjoyment of the residents, separated from the public highway and public access by electric gates. This was part of the deal. It is an enhancement to our houses and is seen as an extension to our gardens. All 14 households contribute to garden maintenance through a management company. Unlike public parks or community open spaces, there is no public access or right of way across this land. It cannot, therefore, fulfil a public recreational or community function. 2. Inappropriate use of LGS designation contrary to Planning practice guidance (PPG). The Government's Planning Practice Guidance: Open space, sports and recreation, public rights of way and local green space clarifies that LGS designation should be used only where it adds value to the local planning framework. Designating wholly private land with no community access undermines this purpose. The PPG also warns against using LGS simply to block development in principle. In our case, the land is already secured as a managed shared amenity for our households and does not require LGS protection. 3. Disproportionate restriction on private property rights. LGS designation has the same effect as Green Belt policy (NPPF para 108), imposing a strong presumption against development. Applying this level of restriction to privately-owned residential amenity land that is already protected by its ownership and covenants, is disproportionate and unnecessary. Furthermore, the land is situated within the Cotswolds National Landscape (previously AONB). This designation already provides strong statutory protection against inappropriate development. Adding an additional LGS designation to privately-owned residential amenity land that is already protected by its ownership and covenants is duplicative and unnecessary. 4. Unnecessary restriction on private property rights. Existing protections already safeguard the land: • The land is held in joint ownership of the 14 properties, meaning it cannot be sold or developed without the consent of all owners. • Any future development would require full planning permission, where its impact on local character and amenity would be assessed. As such, there is no risk of loss of public open space, since the land is not public in the first place. • The Nightingale Gardens development is equipped with a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) to manage rainfall and minimize flood risk. The shared garden is a key component of this, in particular there are 60m³ of storage tanks under the grass area (see attached plan). The area is therefore not available for development even without additional protections. 5. Lack of evidence and misapplication of policy. The NPPF (para 32) requires policies to be underpinned by a proportionate and robust evidence base. No evidence has been presented to demonstrate that our garden is "demonstrably special" to the wider community. Without clear evidence of public value or access, the proposed designation is unsound and contrary to national policy. 6. Risk of unintended consequences. Designating privately-owned residential amenity land as Local Green Space could create confusion about public access rights, increase the risk of trespass, and impose unnecessary restrictions on homeowners' ability to manage and enjoy their property. It would also set an undesirable precedent for other privately-owned gardens. Conclusion: For the reasons above, the proposed designation of our private shared garden as Local Green Space is: • Contrary to the criteria in the NPPF (para 106–108) • Inconsistent with the Government's Planning Practice Guidance • Unsupported by a proportionate evidence base (NPPF para 32) • Disproportionate and unnecessary given the private ownership, existing safeguards and existing infrastructure We therefore request that the Nightingale Gardens private shared garden be removed from the list of proposed Local Green Space designations.</p>		Noted	Nightingale Gardens removed from Local Green Space policy.

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
	Yes			Commenting	Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan - Pre-submission Regulation 14 Consultation Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 05 September 2025. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. <b>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</b> However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information. Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species. Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England's forestry Commission standing advice. We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary. Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.	Full Natural England Annex of issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan in Document Natural England 091025	Noted	No action taken.
	Yes			Commenting	The Trustees of The Redesdale Hall Trust are not empowered to comment on the Plan, as a whole, but warmly welcome and fully support the recognition it gives to the Hall's importance as both a heritage landmark and a vital community facility. The Redesdale Hall stands at the heart of Moreton-in-Marsh, both geographically and socially. Since its construction in 1887, it has served generations of residents by hosting markets, civic occasions and countless community gatherings. It remains a much-loved focal point of town life and was rightly voted Moreton's best-loved building in 2019. The Plan rightly recognises the historic and community value of The Redesdale Hall (its importance is emphasised even in the logo of the Plan which places the Hall at the centre of the design) and the Trustees share the Plan's assessment that substantial investment is now required to repair, refurbish and enhance the Hall so it can continue to serve the community for the next century. Initial estimates from our appointed architects indicate costs in the region of £1m for essential roof works alone. However, the Plan does not yet explicitly state that CIL funding should be used to deliver the essential capital improvements needed to meet the requirements of Moreton-in-Marsh's growing population. We are committed to working closely with Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council, Cotswold District Council and local partners to deliver a sustainable programme of restoration and improvement that respects the Hall's heritage while upgrading its facilities for modern use and ensuring full accessibility for all. The Hall was conceived as the centrepiece of a grand civic plan, which also included the planting of the avenues of trees along the High Street, features that still define Moreton-in-Marsh's distinctive leafy character today. The Trustees fully endorse Policy 15 of the Neighbourhood Plan, supporting the designation of green spaces and the protection afforded by the Cotswolds National Landscape. These natural and architectural elements together give Moreton-in-Marsh its unique identity and sense of place, which must be preserved for future generations. It is equally important that strategic planning for the town's future serves the benefit, not the detriment, of its existing community. While we welcome and recognise the value of the visitor economy, it must be managed sensitively and sustainably. Moreton-in-Marsh should learn from the experience of places such as Bourton-on-the-Water and Bibury, where unbalanced tourism pressures have at times eroded local character and community life. The goal must be a thriving town centre that remains first and foremost a place for local people to live, work and gather, supported rather than displaced by tourism. The Redesdale Hall was built for the betterment of the local people, a purpose that still guides our stewardship today. A revitalised, sustainable Hall and the surrounding public realm will also act as a catalyst for wider community and economic activity within the town centre, helping to strengthen Moreton's social and cultural life. We thank the Plan Team for recognising the value of The Redesdale Hall within its setting and place in Moreton and for supporting investment that will secure its future for the whole community.	The Trustees therefore suggest that the wording of Policy 14a be amended to read: "Refurbishment, including capital works, public realm improvements, and the delivery of community programming at The Redesdale Hall and its environs that contribute to the Hall's development and community purpose."	Noted	No action taken.
					See document 'CDC Response to Moreton NP Reg 14 091025'		See document 'CDC Response to Moreton NP Reg 14 091025'	
	Yes				See document 'GCC SFP Planning 091025'		See document 'GCC SFP Planning 091025'	
			Heavy Goods Traffic and Congestion P3		There is still no footpath from the town to the garden centre or a safe crossing.		outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Excessive Population Growth P3		Development must be appropriate for all needs, including those with disabilities. The houses need to be appropriate size and good use made of the land for the needs of residents.		Noted	No action taken
			Loss of Green Spaces to Development P3		I agree		Noted	No action taken
			Flooding and Water Management P3		The current water supply pipes are from 1935, and my recent experience is that the lead pipes are blistering and repairs cost me over £3000 to repair. I think the infrastructure of the water supply in the town needs major refurbishment before any further demand should be made on the water supply and sewer system. This would be hugely expensive		Noted	No action taken
			Economic Challenges P3		I agree, we need more than just coffee shops.		Noted	No action taken
			Objectives		1 - 16 Make sense with the following comments: 2 Properties are needed for single people, small families. 5 Infrastructure needs to be a priority 6 Limit second homes and Airbnb maybe via council tax or other taxes that benefit the town.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 1		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 2		Important and all makes sense to me. Having been flooded at a previous house I have no desire to be flooded again or to support neighbours who get flooded.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 3		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 4		Important and all makes sense to me: b property offered to local people first, and only to wider market after a period of 6 weeks or longer, as my house was before I bought it. d I think safeguarding properties from future sales is essential.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 5		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 6		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 7		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 8		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 9		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 10		Important and all makes sense to me. a Holiday accommodation and second homes must be limited. The effect of empty homes or occasional use homes on the community is huge.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 11		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 12		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 13		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 14		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 15		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 16		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 17		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 18		Important and all makes sense to me		Noted	No action taken
	yes				Introduction 1. This response to the Draft version of the Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 14 July 2025) (MNPP) is submitted on behalf of 2. has an interest in Land east of Evenlode Road (the Site). A Site Location Plan identifying the land is appended to these representations. 3. Neighbourhood Plans need to meet basic conditions to proceed to referendum. These are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The basic conditions that relate to neighbourhood plans are: a) Have regard to National Policy and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State b) The making of a neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development c) The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority d) The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations e) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal of the neighbourhood plan 4. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be in regard with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024), National Planning Policy Guidance and be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted Cotswolds District Local Plan 2011-2031 (CDLP adopted August 2018).		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 1		Policy One – Climate Adaptation and Energy Efficiency in Developments 5. Draft Submission Policy One seeks for new developments to be energy efficient and climate adaptive. 6. Criteria (d) details that an energy assessment which minimises carbon footprint and energy requirements should be conditioned for new developments this needs removing from the plan as it is considered to be unduly onerous. 7. Criterion (e) considers the impact of electric vehicles use, this is considered to be unnecessary given that it is now a requirement of building regulations for the provision of electric charging points with new residential properties. Therefore, this requirement should be removed from the policy.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 2		Draft Submission Policy Two of the MNPP seeks to minimise flooding events and investment in sewage capacity by ensuring that the capacity and capability to the local water management infrastructure is able to supply any new development. Catesby Estates agree with part (a) of Policy Two, which follows NPPF guidance in diverting development towards areas with lower probability of flooding. Catesby also agree with the majority of part (b) of the policy in stating where site-specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) are required. 10. However, they object to part of Policy Two part (b), which requires FRAs to use 'appropriate calculations based on the highest expected groundwater levels for the area (200 year maximum)'. There is no national policy behind this requirement, and it would be unreasonable to ask developers to assess on this basis. FRAs usually design around 100 year flood events, rather than 200 years. Moreover, groundwater data is not available for a 200 year period. 11. Catesby Estates therefore request the following text is removed from Policy Two part (b) of the MNPP: "using appropriate calculations based on the highest expected groundwater levels for the area (200 year maximum)."		See separate Developers Response Document	

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
	yes		Policy 3		The MMNP provides details of the housing needed in Moreton-in-Marsh in Policy Three. 13. Criterion (a) of Policy Three states that proposals for more than six dwellings should show how it meets needs in line with the Moreton-in-Marsh Housing Needs Analysis. The Moreton-in-Marsh Housing Needs Analysis was produced in May 2021. This is considered to be out of date by virtue of time and does not include the latest Official National Statistics. 14. The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) 'Neighbourhood Planning' also says that neighbourhood plans that contain policies relevant to housing supply should take account of the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need (Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211). Therefore, this policy is not in compliance with the basic condition (a) - to be in compliance with national policy and guidance. 15. Criterion (b) of the policy also states that at least 25% of dwellings should meet Lifetime Home Standards. Evidence will need to be provided to support this requirement, which there currently is not. 16. Criterion (c) of the policy details the types of houses that should be provided. There are 5 different types of housing detailed in this policy, of which none are evidenced for the need for. Therefore, robust evidence is needed to support the provided types of housing. 17. Therefore, the policy should be reviewed and amended to only include requirements where up-to-date evidence of needs to support those requirements is available and can be referenced, as per Paragraph 040 (Reference: Reference ID: 41-040-20160211) for the NPPG 'Neighbourhood Plans'.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 4		18. This policy sets out a local connection criterion to which affordable housing should be given, to meet local needs. The allocation of affordable housing should be made by the local authority as the housing authority. Therefore, this policy should be removed.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 5		19. This draft policy aims to ensure that housing meets local needs and that they are design to a high-quality. 20. Part (j) of this policy details the requirement for a minimum of 10% of new dwellings to provide space for allotments. There is no evidence or justification for this requirement. Therefore, this part of the policy needs to be reviewed and amended. It should be noted that Catesby ran a public consultation and feedback from locals suggested that there was a surplus of allotments.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 8		21. This draft policy aims to ensure appropriate hard infrastructure is in place to support new development prior to completion of the project. 22. Catesby object to criteria c and d of this policy. The delivery of certain infrastructure can sometimes be outside of a developer's control, such as works to the highway by the Highway Authority, funded by a developer through a Section 106 Agreement. As such, the requirement to ensure that the infrastructure is in place no later than the completion of the development is therefore considered unreasonable, and should be deleted		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 9		23. Policy Nine seeks to ensure appropriate soft infrastructure is in place to support new development. 24. Catesby object to part c of this policy. The delivery of certain infrastructure can sometimes be outside of a developer's control. The requirement to ensure that the infrastructure is in place no later than the completion of the development is therefore considered unreasonable.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 10		25. Policy Ten of the MMNP seeks to combat properties being bought as second homes in Moreton-in-Marsh. 26. This policy states that new open market will be supported where there is a restriction to ensure its occupancy as a principal residence and sets out some examples of what proof of entitlement would be. 27. It is considered that this policy is not in compliance with the NPPF. It does not meet paragraph 16 of the NPPF, as it has not been prepared positively in a way that is aspirational and deliverable and is ambiguous of what is considered appropriate evidence that can be used to demonstrate someone is a principal resident. 28. There is also no evidence to support or justify this policy as required in the NPPG 'Neighbourhood Planning' that neighbourhood plans that contain policies relevant to housing supply should take account of the latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need (Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211). Therefore, this policy is not in compliance with the basic condition as it does not comply with national policy and guidance. 29. This policy is also contrary to meeting the housing needs in the district and will restrict people being able to access housing when there is a significant need. Therefore, it should be removed.		See separate Developers Response Document	
	yes		Policy 18		30. Draft submission Policy Eighteen aims to preserve important views within the parish. Clarification is required on the inserts provided for this policy. As the list of proposed views does not match with the photos taken in the area. For example, view 18 on the list 'From Evenlode Road (National Cycle Network Route Number 48) NNE, is view 23 on the images. Therefore, making it hard to match up views. 31. Furthermore, the explanations given for the reasons for protecting these specific views is considered to not be robust and clear. Therefore, we object to policy eighteen because of the lack of clear reasoning and details.		See separate Developers Response Document	
					Thank you for doing much good work on this plan. Overall, I am very pleased to support it. It is a good vision with good objectives, with minor possible tweaks. - I encourage consideration of the suggestions relevant to objectives 11, 13, 14, and 15 from the cultivation of internal green spaces and their views, biodiversity, and access to nature for children and adults. - I also encourage consideration of the suggested practical approach to the town centre. I would understand that it would need to be translated into policy/objective speech and of course feasibility and detail, but it seemed the best way to get the point across. - The comments below are intended by way of recommendations that would I hope be helpful to the town. I remain committed to helping the town thrive and happy to collaborate with you.		Noted	No action taken
					1. The plan needs to accommodate development outside the current boundary, such as the recent one from Bloor Homes and the strategic intent of the Forward Planners. 2. The Vision (p5, 18) is generally good, with some points to consider: a. We have some classy businesses including producers, and "retail" and "services" might not include such as Cotswold Seeds, the UK leader, or Barn & Brook, or the Fire Service College. It also has events like the Annual CAMRA celebration and the Moreton Show, which you describe elsewhere. Perhaps "business, retail and service centre"? b. Can it also benefit from community and visitor "amenities", such as the green spaces, greenway walks, wetlands, community orchards, and more to be considered? c. Is it a rural market town? d. Cricket is another well-supported sport. 4. Across the county, younger people are declining. Not here. Generally, the introductory graphs (e.g. page 11-12) could do with a description indicating the significance. As an example, you might write: "MM rented household percentage is below Cotswold and national averages and [it should be increased]." It could be noted that the total percentage of rented property is higher than Cotswold, this is because the town has more socially rented. Does that reflect the state of the town or better policy that should be maintained? 5. Obviously, the local plan numbers will need changing. 6. "Excessive Population Growth" is not I think the most useful challenge. The plan endorses strategic development and integration is important. "Excessive" is a term that requires a comparative contextual explanation. If you used terms such as "Disproportionate" or "Unbalanced", then the text that follows would make sense and it would explain the description. 7. Objectives 11, 13, 14, and 15 form a related group where I suggest the interior of the town and the developing estates needs consideration. a. I question the 'challenge', 'Loss of Green Space to Development'. We have also created green spaces, see attachment, and this should be a goal. On the one hand I recognise that in the year 2000, the view to the east would've been of farmland, probably less rich than we have now. It would not have had the freedom of movement and play in large green spaces including substantial meadows and some good woodland in the heart of the town. As we expand, let us be internally green. b. Objective 11 "Protect and maintain existing public open green spaces" suggests they should be adopted by the town, maintained as connected key assets, their views and sights enhanced, and this to form a norm for green and blue spaces. The precept should cover this supported by developer contributions. They are as important iconic parts of the town as the Redesdale Hall, in their way. c. They could be even further improved as views (outlooks) and connected amenity green space resources. (Please see further illustrative images in attached pdf including suggested illustrations of promotion material as wallpapers for phones.) One key to this is the inclusion of trees in neighbourhoods (see illustration in attached pdf. "Submission to the NDP team.") d. It would also support Objective 13, enhance 14, and 15, noting that rural assets in the town are also important. 8. We need a coherent plan for the centre. "Ensuring additional footfall generated from new economic activity uses Moreton-in-Marsh town centre" is a good goal, but Moreton is a destination too and so it needs to attract visitors. In fact, in the internet age, retail is hard to sustain if it is not located in a destination space. That means restoring the centre of town is an attractive place and not as a car park and not as a major thoroughway for heavy goods vehicles and passing cars. The plan for this should be straightforward. a. The glebe land should be turned into a good-sized discreet car park. It's not good farmland land and it is next to a caravan site. Much longer stay parking can be encouraged there. Most parking should be removed from the centre of town except for a limited short stay and disabled parking. The former plant hire land by the Fosseway Business Park is another candidate for parking. It would encourage walking through the estate supporting the varied service and retail businesses there. b. The "transport hub" notion seems to be an expensive white elephant that attracts developers. It uses prime space in the centre of town for limited parking addition. If possible, under the legal situation, the space could be turned into a very useful building with several possible candidates such as: a) a business centre for "small business units/shared space," your suggestion as a hub for local business, home workers, and local conferences with some meeting rooms to support business tourism; b) oices; c) Community Centre. No doubt there are other options. c. The centre, now with reduced parking and with reduced traffic due to bypass, should then be remodelled and re-landscape to make it people- rather than car-friendly. Outdoor café space could be provided in the summer. More trees and the feeling of a Cotswold plaza 9. Encourage good use of listed heritage assets? I see empty spaces. 10. There is not a clear statement about tourism. It is clear that it is important to tourists and the things that they would like so would locals often. So perhaps managed ecotourism is to be encouraged? 11. There are 2 business parks: Cotswold Business Village and Fosseway Business Park. The Fosseway Business Park could be developed.		Noted	No action taken.
					I wish to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan. My wife and myself are members of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church. 1. There is no mention of inclusion that we can see for including provision for community buildings and specifically our concern is Places of Public Religious Worship which should be included. 2. The congregation residing in or near Moreton with the assistance of the Trustees of the nearby Stow Gospel Hall Trust have, in fact, been searching Moreton and the environs working with Estate Agents over 10 years for a small building to serve the Moreton residents without success. 3. As a community we provide considerable employment in the area. PBC-CC members in Moreton and others that would move here if suitable housing could be found. 4. Currently the local congregation has to travel to Stow being their nearest Church which means longer travel time and not allowing for walking or cycling. Objective numbered 10 recognises the traffic problems but does not highlight the chronic congestion of through traffic, impact on market days traffic, and environmental impact of the long queues frequently suffered both sides of the town. Obviously a by-pass is urgently needed to resolve most of any problems in the town. This provision is not, we realise, the main purpose of the document but could not this be given a strong mention.		Noted	No action taken
					Blank			

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities	Commenting	There is no evidence to suggest that residents want to remove long-stay parking from the town to a location close to the train station. There actually needs to be MORE parking in the town centre but residents should be given priority.	Introduce resident parking permits and parking metres in the town centre to bring in some revenue. Remove the proposed new Transport Hub from the Neighbourhood Plan as the majority of residents don't want it and it does not have secured funding. It is likely to take years to deliver and even if it is delivered, it will only add another 44 parking spaces to the town, so there will be a net loss of spaces.	Noted	Information re parking permits passed onto Town Council
			Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities	Commenting	The heavy goods traffic and congestion is a major problem in Moreton and in the short-term, I believe that creating a one-way system could improve the traffic flow and keep it moving. Longer-term, a ring road should be created around the town and a weight limit put on all vehicles coming into the centre of Moreton. Also, put speed cameras up on the high street.	As above	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Policy 20: Transport & Active Travel	Commenting	Whilst I support the aspiration that the primary focus for development should be through the provision of sustainable travel, this will never become a reality unless there is the creation of a comprehensive network of cycle paths and pedestrian footpaths which people can safely use to get from one village to another. Currently, no-one cycles in Moreton as it is just not safe to do so and the cycle parking unit at the train station is testament to this with only one or two bikes ever parked there. It should also be noted that the demographic of Moreton is primarily older people and retirees and it is highly unlikely that they will be persuaded to change the habit of a lifetime and stop driving. If we are going to promote sustainable travel, we need more buses and we should be offering people incentives to use public transport rather than drive. Could we also promote car-sharing schemes?	As above	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Policy 13: Retail provision	Commenting	We have a disproportionate number of cafes/tea shops and hairdressers/barbers in Moreton and we need to diversify our retail offer.	We should refuse to support proposals for any more tea shops and hairdressers, and prioritise proposals which bring something new to the town and make a positive contribution to its diversity.	Noted	No action taken
			Policy 14 & Local Green Space #22	Objecting	Policy 14 The NDP fails to register the residential element of the High Street, which accounts for approximately 35% occupancy by volume from The Old Police station at the Northern end to the Manor House Hotel at the Southern end. There has been no consideration to this large group of occupants, which includes young families and the elderly. The area of the High Street owned by the Town Council is historically very safe; there have been no accidents of note in this area in the past 20 years, mainly due to two-way traffic and people not wanting to damage their cars, so they proceed with caution. The plan is looking for an excuse to improve on this already safe area, which is tantamount to trying to re-invent the wheel. The unsafe element of the High Street is the A429 that runs through the centre of the town. In the past 5 years, there has been one pedestrian fatality, one motor cycle fatality, one accident resulting in life changing repercussions and a very recent (and serious) pedestrian accident. The full impact of which is not currently known. The majority of these incidents have involved articulated lorries, as their cabs are high and they do not see the pedestrians. I see no meaningful plan to address this serious issue. A one-way traffic system (point 1d) would cripple the town. Point 1d is an idea mooted in the last 10 years by a previous incarnation of the Town Council – and the town had no appetite for it – resulting in the then Chair of the Town Council standing down. The idea has never been discussed in public since. Point 2 refers to a transport hub, which the town already has. What the town really needs is a car park on available land such as the Glebe a short walk from town; this simple uncomplicated solution has been successful in settlements such as Burford, another ribbon settlement with one road running through it, as well as Stow on the Wold and Bourton on the Water. Bus services (the 801) to the existing transport centre of Moreton (at the rail station) are being cut because they are unsustainable, so why spend millions on a transport hub? Point 4 addresses the issue of making Moreton more accessible and suggests town-wide cycle lanes (point 4d), but there is no evidence that residents use bicycles to get around town – or to the rail station – as has been evidenced by the rarely used cycle shed at the rail station and the bike racks on the High Street. Local Green Space #22 The Glebe is a strategically located piece of land that could be very valuable from a community perspective if it were to be turned into a car park. The rural approach to Moreton (from Bourton on the Hill) ends at the entrance to the caravan park, so it is quite unfathomable why The Glebe has been designated as a Local Green Space that is 'demonstrably special to the local community', particularly given that it is privately owned and there is no public right of way over it.	Policy 14 A traffic flow improvement plan and the Transport Hub are not required - remove them from the NDP and stop wasting residents' money on these two white elephants. Local Green Space #22 - The Glebe should be removed from the list of local green spaces.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			ccc	Commenting	mmmm	mmmm		
			The policies	Commenting	commenting about lack of inclusion of allowance for places of public religious worship.	My wife and I and our two children are members of the plymouth brethren christian church. we have lived in Moreton for 2 years and are very settled, however we notice there is no provision in the plan for community buildings and as such concern about lack of places for public religious worship which should definitely be included in the plan. we would ask that there is kindly specific allowance made for this.	Noted	No action taken
			Objective 10.	Supporting	the objective 10 points to the transport situation but i would heavily suggest that a bypass is included in the plan before extra housing and development is commenced. Its a simple and clear need to help with the dire traffic situation.	the objective 10 points to the transport situation but i would heavily suggest that a bypass is included in the plan before extra housing and development is commenced. its a simple and clear need to help with the dire traffic situation.	Bypass outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Policy 15: Local Green Spaces	Objecting	My objection is to the proposed inclusion of the green at Nightingale Gardens as a LGS. The residents have already submitted a formal letter of objection to the Town Council setting out the reasons why it should not be included.	Please remove the green at Nightingale Gardens (item 23 of Policy 15) from the draft Plan.	Noted	Nightingale Gardens removed from Local Green Space policy.
			Policy 9: Soft Infrastructure	Commenting	In terms of the capacity of Moreton's doctors' surgeries, the dental practice and the local school can it not be established in advance what the maximum numbers in each case are that can be accommodated? So if a proposed development would have more residents than could be accommodated, the development should be a nonstarter. Re: the only dental practice in town, as this is private patients only and not one that everyone can afford, it would make sense to have an NHS dentist practice which could be housed in the Moreton hospital. Surely there would be enough room.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing	Supporting	Excellent idea for the reasons stated in the draft plan. Something has to be done about this. My only concern is how this can be enforced in the long run. If the property is let on a long lease this would not be a problem, but if it's freehold who would the 'legal agreement' be with and would they be interested in enforcing it if it meant resorting to court action? Alternatively, a planning condition would have to rely on someone tipping off the Planning dept and then the planners taking enforcement action. I think this needs a bit more consideration, but a great idea.		Noted	No action taken
			Policies 1-7	Supporting	Policies 1,2: Meeting the challenges the town faces. Policy 3: Re homes for older people, I don't think we need any more McCarthy and Stone type apartments with very high service charges, but freehold properties, including bungalows. Policy 4: Affordable homes for local people and also for skilled medical workers to support the hospital and GP surgeries. Policy 5: Quality design, materials and construction. I would support some more innovative and individual design to avoid the conformity of large estates. Policy 6: Support as parking on pavements is problematic for pedestrians and mobility scooters.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 20	Commenting	As a none car driver, I support reasonable improvements to the railway station, including extending the opening hours of the ticket office/waiting rooms/public conveniences. I do not think there needs to be many cycle racks as users of the railway from outside the town and people with luggage will not cycle. I support improvements to bus services including new routes (e.g. to Cirencester ) and shorter journey times (e.g. to Cheltenham).	change to paragraph 108 'Strategic' movement is mainly to areas outside the parish, principally the local market towns, more distant larger towns and the road network. The reason is that I think CDC and GCC do not fully appreciate the economic and social interdependency between the other similarly sized market towns in the North Cotswolds (e.g. Broadway, Shipston, Chipping Norton as well as Stow, Bourton, Campden)	Noted	No action taken
			Policy 15	Supporting	I especially support the inclusion of Croft Allotments and also the land adjoining it. Croft Holm was one of the worst affected roads during the 2007 floods.	I would support the use of the Glebe fields for parking as long as it was permeable.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			Policy 12	Supporting	I would especially support units that were used for local crafts people, e.g. traditional methods also 3D printing etc		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 8	Supporting	Effluent in River Evenlode, traffic congestion etc		Noted	No action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			14/15 and general	Supporting	Generally the plan is carefully considered and I commend the time and efforts of those that have contributed to its formulation over the many years its has taken to get to this stage.	Policy 14 With respect to Policy 14, I would suggest that the wording of part (a) be revised to read along the following lines: "Refurbishment, including capital works, public realm improvements, and the delivery of community programming at The Redesdale Hall and its environs that contribute to the Hall's development and community purpose." Rationale: In order to apply for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding, the relevant requirement must be explicitly mentioned within the Local Plan. The Redesdale Hall is an iconic building, regularly used to represent Moreton-in-Marsh and the wider North Cotswolds by local organisations and groups (including this NDP team) as well as by Cotswold District Council's Spacehive crowdfunding partner. It is a vital community asset, serving all members of the local community. If supported by the Plan, CIL funding could be sought to improve the Hall's accessibility, sustainability, and facilities to meet modern needs. A revitalised and sustainable Hall, together with enhancements to the surrounding public realm, could also act as a catalyst for wider community and economic activity in the town centre—strengthening Moreton's social, cultural, and civic life. Policy 15 I welcome and fully endorse the designated green spaces identified in Policy 15. It is imperative that the protections afforded to the town by designations such as the Cotswolds National Landscape (AONB) are not eroded—particularly by untested or speculative schemes that may cause more harm than good (for example, proposals to build a car park on The Glebe). Such developments risk setting a precedent for further encroachment and the gradual erosion of the town's green character. Green spaces and trees—our "natural architectural elements"—are integral to Moreton-in-Marsh's unique identity and sense of place. These must be safeguarded for future generations. Developers must be held accountable to ensure that any "green" interventions are fully considered, sustainable, and genuinely beneficial, while the long-term burden of maintenance should not fall unfairly on the town. Initiatives and approaches such as "Green to the Core" and "Infrastructure First" should demonstrate substance and commitment, rather than serve as mere political hyperbole. It is equally important that any Biodiversity Net Gain is tangible, visible, and delivered within Moreton-in-Marsh itself. Tourism While there do not appear to be any specific policies addressing tourism, the Plan should aim first and foremost to serve the needs of the local community before those of visitors and tourists. The visitor economy is undoubtedly valuable, but it must be managed sensitively and sustainably. Moreton-in-Marsh can learn from places such as Bourton-on-the-Water and Bibury, where unmanaged tourism pressures have at times undermined local character and community life. The goal should be a thriving town centre that remains primarily a place for local people to live, work, and gather—supported rather than displaced by tourism.	Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
			Policy 1: Climate Adaption and Energy Efficiency in Developments Policy 2: Managing Flood Risks Policy 3: Housing Mix Policy 4: Affordable Housing	Supporting	Policy 1: Climate Adaption and Energy Efficiency in Developments It is important to limit release of greenhouse gases wherever possible in order to slow the progression of climate change. Houses that use renewable energy systems will not contribute, or will contribute much less, to the problem. Greater availability of electric car charging points will be necessary in years to come to 'future proof' the houses. All the measures listed in this policy will future proof the housing. Policy 2: Managing Flood Risks Community anxiety about the potential for future flooding is high. To improve overall quality of life in Moreton, future developments must take clear and obvious measures to manage flood waters and reduce the risk of flooding. Future flooding could make it difficult to impossible for some people to insure their homes, so must be avoided at all costs. Policy 3: Housing Mix Agree that a variety of types of housing will be required, including social housing. Starter homes will be very valuable, but suitable homes to move onto once children arrive will also be needed. People should not have to relocate to another town once they have children. Policy 4: Affordable Housing Important that social housing is provided and integrated within developments. More properties for rent would support local people who cannot afford to buy - not just social housing, but general housing. A variety of property types in the rental bracket is required (see list in Policy 3 Housing Mix for examples).	Policy 3: Housing Mix Add social housing to this list. Limit the number of new big houses, i.e. 4+ bedrooms.	Noted	No action taken
			Policy 5: Well Designed housing and Places Policy 6: Parking in Residential Developments Policy 7: Brownfield First Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure	Supporting	Policy 5: Well Designed housing and Places Important that new buildings fit in with the aesthetics of the town and include local design features. Retention of trees and hedgerows is vital for retention of biodiversity. Adaptable spaces for home working are likely to become increasingly valuable. Provision of allotments important for residents' mental health, as are decent-sized gardens attached to the properties. Policy 6: Parking in Residential Developments Generally agree with the guidelines for parking. Would particularly recommend provision of accessible roof storage space so that garages remain empty and available for cars. Visitor parking for the town needs to be reviewed urgently. There will not be enough spaces available on the High Street once the number of residents increases. Pavements will need to be adequate to allow people to walk safely from any new car parks into town. Policy 7: Brownfield First Very strongly support the reuse of formerly developed land ahead of 'virgin' land. The land that is currently not built upon (virgin land) is really precious to the residents of the town, and should be kept free of development for as long as possible. Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure - COMMENTING Generally supportive of this policy, but concerned about: 1. Sewerage situation: current provision is not sufficient. Until it has been significantly upgraded, there should be a moratorium on new developments in the town, otherwise we risk serious public health issues through people and animals coming into contact with raw sewerage, as happens in third-world countries. Sewerage in rivers also reduces biodiversity. 2. Installation of services (electricity, water etc) for new developments: Moreton has suffered a year of significant delays to traffic on the A429 that were largely due to the Spitfire development installing services to houses. In future, installation of services must be much more joined up to minimise traffic issues. The road situation is already insufficient before extra difficulties are imposed by new developments during construction. 3. More public transport or cycle paths are needed to reduce car journeys into the town. Spaces for parking bicycles would be helpful on the High Street. 4. Traffic lights are required on the A429 between Fosseway Garden Centre and the Library to assist cars that wish to turn right onto the road during peak times. Waiting to get out can add 5-10 minutes to a journey, and will only get worse once the Spitfire development is complete.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 9: Soft Infrastructure Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing Policy 11: Employment Land Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities	Supporting	Policy 9: Soft Infrastructure I assume that provision of health services comes under this section. Expansion of provision of GP services is urgently required to accommodate any further increases in population. These are already stretched to breaking point. Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing Agree very strongly. Moreton has enough holiday lets already, we do not want to lose the sense of community any further. Policy 11: Employment Land Strongly support the requirements for inclusion of environmentally friendly measures in schemes. Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities Agree with all points. Point F: Additional retail on the East side of Moreton, is especially worthy of support. If we wish to ensure that people on the further reaches of the town shop in the town, then they need to live within easy reach of shops/facilities. Driving to the High Street, with the difficulties that exist with parking, will not be a viable option once the population increases, so new shops/facilities need to be developed on the east side.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 15: Local Green Spaces Policy 17: Enhance Biodiversity Policy 18: Protected Views Policy 19: Development Boundary Policy 20: Transport and Active Travel	Supporting	Policy 15: Local Green Spaces Helpful to have the green spaces listed. Agree that these spaces should only be developed as a last resort, and that if they are, provision of equivalent facilities should be obligatory. Policy 17: Enhance Biodiversity Strongly support these proposals. Very important to retain biodiversity. Our natural landscape contributes enormously to mental health and overall well-being. Policy 18: Protected Views Being able to see the horizon easily in Moreton is important for retaining the country town atmosphere and quality of life. If we lose these views, it will affect community mental health and well being. Policy 19: Development Boundary Strongly support the move to limit growth by more than the minimum number of dwellings required by the Cotswold District Local Plan. Policy 20: Transport and Active Travel Strongly support this policy. It is particularly important to ensure that safe cycle paths and footpaths connect new housing to the primary school. Current provision is not adequate.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 5: Well Designed housing and Places	Supporting	Important that new buildings fit in with the aesthetics of the town and include local design features. Retention of trees and hedgerows is vital for retention of biodiversity. Adaptable spaces for home working are likely to become increasingly valuable. Provision of allotments important for residents' mental health, as are decent-sized gardens attached to the properties.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 6: Parking in Residential Developments	Supporting	Generally agree with the guidelines for parking. Would particularly recommend provision of accessible roof storage space so that garages remain empty and available for cars. Visitor parking for the town needs to be reviewed urgently. There will not be enough spaces available on the High Street once the number of residents increases. Pavements will need to be adequate to allow people to walk safely from any new car parks into town.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 7: Brownfield First	Supporting	Very strongly support the reuse of formerly developed land ahead of 'virgin' land. The land that is currently not built upon (virgin land) is really precious to the residents of the town, and should be kept free of development for as long as possible.		Noted	No action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 8: Hard Infrastructure	Commenting	Generally supportive of this policy, but concerned about: 1. Sewerage situation: current provision is not sufficient. Until it has been significantly upgraded, there should be a moratorium on new developments in the town, otherwise we risk serious public health issues through people and animals coming into contact with raw sewerage, as happens in third-world countries. Sewerage in rivers also reduces biodiversity. 2. Installation of services (electricity, water etc) for new developments: Moreton has suffered a year of significant delays to traffic on the A429 that were largely due to the Spitfire development installing services to houses. In future, installation of services must be much more joined up to minimise traffic issues. The road situation is already insufficient before extra difficulties are imposed by new developments during construction. 3. More public transport or cycle paths are needed to reduce car journeys into the town. Spaces for parking bicycles would be helpful on the High Street. 4. Traffic lights are required on the A429 between Fosseyway Garden Centre and the Library to assist cars that wish to turn right onto the road during peak times. Waiting to get out can add 5-10 minutes to a journey, and will only get worse once the Spitfire development is complete.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 9: Soft Infrastructure	Supporting	I assume that provision of health services comes under this section. Expansion of provision of GP services is required to accommodate any further increases in population. They are already stretched to breaking point.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 10: Principal Residence Housing	Supporting	Agree very strongly. Moreton has enough holiday lets already.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 11: Employment Land	Supporting	Strongly support the requirements for inclusion of environmentally friendly measures in schemes.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities	Supporting	Agree with all points. Point f: Additional retail on the East side of Moreton, is especially worthy of support. If we wish to ensure that people on the further reaches of the town shop in the town, then they need to live within easy reach of shops/facilities. Driving to the High Street, with the difficulties that exist with parking, will not be a viable option once the population increases, so new shops/facilities need to be developed on the east side.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 15: Local Green Spaces	Supporting	Helpful to have the green spaces listed. Agree that these spaces should only be developed as a last resort, and that if they are, provision of equivalent facilities should be obligatory.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 17: Enhance Biodiversity	Supporting	Strongly support these proposals. Very important to retain biodiversity. Our natural landscape contributes enormously to mental health and overall well-being.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 18: Protected Views	Supporting	Being able to see the horizon easily in Moreton is important for retaining the country town atmosphere and quality of life. If we lose these views, it will affect community mental health and well being.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 19: Development Boundary	Supporting	Strongly support the move to limit growth by more than the minimum number of dwellings required by the Cotswold District Local Plan.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 20: Transport and Active Travel	Supporting	Strongly support this policy. It is particularly important to ensure that safe cycle paths and footpaths connect new housing to the primary school. Current provision is not adequate.		Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
			POLICY 15 - LOCAL GREEN SPACES Appendix B Policy 14 Infrastructure Investment Priorities These aspirations are taken from the interactions with the community. 1. A Thriving High Street (including a traffic flow improvement plan)	Objecting	I AM OBJECTING TO THE INCLUSION OF THE GLEBE FIELD - UNLIKE MOST (IF NOT ALL) THE OTHER LOCAL GREEN SPACES LISTED, THERE IS NO PUBLIC ACCESS. THIS IS A PRIVATELY-OWNED FIELD WITH NO RIGHT OF WAY. I CONSIDER IT A GROSS CASE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST TO INCLUDE IT, GIVEN THAT A MEMBER OF THE NDP STEERING GROUP LIVES ADJACENT TO IT AND HAS FOUGHT TO HAVE IT INCLUDED SIMPLY TO SAVE THE VIEW FROM HIS HOME. THIS FIELD HAS LONG BEEN IDENTIFIED AS THE BEST PLACE TO CREATE A LONG-STAY CAR PARK, WHICH COULD TAKE TRAFFIC AND CARS AWAY FROM THE HIGH STREET, AS ITS JUST A 5-MINUTE WALK FROM THE TOWN CENTRE. THIS DEVELOPMENT WOULD BENEFIT THE WHOLE COMMUNITY, WHILE INCLUDING IT AS A PROTECTED GREEN SPACE BENEFITS JUST ONE FAMILY. FURTHERMORE IT SITS OUTSIDE THE TOWN'S CONSERVATION AREA, SO HAS ALREADY BEEN EXCLUDED FROM PROTECTION WHEN THIS AREA WAS DESIGNATED AND SO I SEE NO VALID REASON FOR IT BE PROTECTED NOW. ADDITIONALLY, THE GLEBE IS INCLUDED IN A PROTECTED VIEW AS FOLLOWS "A44 from Evesham entrance to town by caravan park across Glebe field to church", BUT YOU DONT LOOK ACROSS THE GLEBE FIELD TO THE CHURCH FROM THE A44. IT'S A PHYSICAL IMPOSSIBILITY BECAUSE THE FIELD IS NORTH OF THE ROAD AND THE CHURCH IS SOUTH OF IT. THE SECOND ELEMENT OF THE NDP I AM OBJECTING TO IS THE CLAIM THAT THE PLANS FOR A THRIVING HIGH STREET HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM "INTERACTIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY" - THERE HAS BEEN NO PROPER CONSULTATION WITH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY - IN FACT THERE ARE MANY BUSINESSES ON THE HIGH STREET THAT AREN'T EVEN AWARE OF THE PLANS TO CHANGE THE HIGH STREET WITH ONE-WAY SYSTEMS ETC. ADDITIONALLY, THE CLAIM IN THIS SECTION THAT LONG STAY CAR PARKING WILL BE MOVED FROM THE HIGH STREET TO THE RAIL STATION NEGLECTS TO MENTION THERE MAY BE A NET LOSS OF CAR PARKING GIVEN THE DESIRE IN THIS SECTION TO PEDESTRIANISE MUCH OF THE HIGH STREET - SEE POINT ABOVE RE THE GLEBE PROVIDING A MUCH NEEDED LONG STAY CAR PARK.	I BELIEVE THE GLEBE LAND SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE LOCAL GREEN SPACES PROTECTION LIST. YOU COULD BUILD A LONG STAY CAR PARK ON PART OF THE GLEBE WHILE STILL MAINTAINING A RURAL SETTING BY ENSURING SOFT LANDSCAPING INCORPORATING A PERMEABLE MEMBRANE THAT WOULD BLEND INTO THE ENVIRONMENT AND OFFER ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS. RE MY SECOND OBJECTION TO THE HIGH STREET CHANGES, FOR THE PLAN TO PROCEED THERE NEEDS TO BE THOROUGH AND ROBUST CONSULTATION WITH ALL THE RESIDENTS AS WELL AS ALL THE BUSINESSES (PARTICULARLY THE ONES THAT LINE THE HIGH STREET).	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
					Blank			
			Policy 8	Commenting	Before any further housing developments being given permission to be built the current infrastructure or rather lack of needs to be addressed. There should be no further building until this has happened. The current capacity for sewage management is not suitable for the current number of houses never mind building more. This is evident in the quality of water and streams around Moreton in Marsh Using the term 'transport hub' needs to stop as this is a complete misnomer and is misleading to those who hear this and also allows over development of the town. Ultimately there will be additional parking places, a bike shed and a railway station which do not comprise a 'transport hub'		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 10	Commenting	Any occupancy of any new developments should be as a principal residence. Many recent new builds have been acquired as a business to run air bnb. This practice needs to stop as this is business development rather than housing development. It precludes any chance of local people being able to buy a home locally. Additionally those acquiring properties as second homes have the same effect for local people		Noted	No action taken
			Community aspiration on p13 about residential parking permits	Supporting	This is part of the wider issue of parking which needs to be addressed more fully than additional parking at the railway station. What has happened about the additional car park on Glebe Farm?		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 9	Commenting	Any developer should contribute to the town in some way apart from housing. A community hub providing services and amenities for all is needed		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 14	Commenting	Improving accessibility - people on the whole are sedentary beings so while walkways and cycle paths are very welcome as part of any new development they won't necessarily be used in the way that is envisaged		Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
			Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14	Commenting	I wish to comment on the Plan. My wife and myself are members of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church. 1. There is no mention of inclusion that we can see for including provision for community buildings and specifically our concern is Places of Public Religious Worship which should be included. 2. The congregation residing in or near Moreton with the assistance of the Trustees of the nearby Stow Gospel Hall Trust have, in fact been searching Moreton and the environs working with Estate Agents over 10 years for a small building to serve the Moreton residents without success. 3. As a community we provide considerable employment in the area. PBCCC members in Moreton and others that would move here if suitable housing could be found. 4. Currently the local congregation has to travel to Stow being their nearest Church which means longer travel time and not allowing for walking or cycling	Objective numbered 10 recognises the traffic problems but does not highlight the chronic congestion of through traffic, impact on market days traffic, and environmental impact of the long queues frequently suffered both sides of the town. Obviously a by-pass is urgently needed to resolve most of any problems in the town. This provision is not, we realise, the main purpose of the document but could not this be given a strong mention.	Noted	No action taken
			Policy 18 Protected views. Site 22	Objecting	I would strongly suggest that site 22 is not included in this policy, as I believe it to be the best site for a free car park in the future. A free car park close to the shops would be highly beneficial to businesses on the high street, and ease the many frustrations of resident parking, as many dwellings on the high street don't have off road parking. In my opinion it is shortsighted, and doesn't make sense to include it in this policy.	Please exclude site 22 from policy 18	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
					Blank			
					Blank			
			Policy 1, Climate adaptation.	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I overall oppose this policy. I oppose policies 1 a-d and f, but support policy 1e about electric vehicle charging. I think the most important climate benefits from new buildings are in enabling as many people as possible to live in a way that allows them to use sustainable transport, and live close to their work. This means doing whatever reduces housing costs as much as possible, especially in places with train stations like Moreton, and enables housing at higher density rather than very spread out. For policies 1a, b, c, d and f, I'm in principle in favor of these things being welcomed. However, I overall oppose the policy because I expect that in practice they will result in other proposals being rejected, and as such making housing slower and more expensive. I most notably oppose policy 1d requiring an additional energy assessment, because I think it will slow down and reduce development.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 2, Flood risk	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I am supportive of flood risk being managed. However, I expect that national regulation will be sufficient to manage flood risk appropriately, and so I do not support additional local requirements.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 3, Housing Mix	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy because I think that it's excessively specific and burdensome on developers, and will end up restricting housing growth and increasing housing costs.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 4, affordable housing	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy because I think that the best way to ensure housing is affordable is to ensure that the housing supply is large, so there is more supply to meet demand. My understanding is that the evidence shows that affordable housing requirements usually just result in making housing on average more expensive.		Noted	No action taken.

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 5, well-designed housing	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy because I think it is excessively burdensome and will end up reducing housing delivery. I would support a pared-down version of the policy that solely encourages the few most important things (and only those not covered by national or regional requirements), e.g. local architectural features.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 6, parking	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy because I think it is excessively burdensome and will end up reducing housing delivery. I do support the goal of reducing on-street parking, but I think that this can be adequately achieved through parking restrictions, permits, etc. rather than requiring all new houses to have lots of parking. Delivery of large amounts of parking spaces for houses simply encourages people to own more cars, which will increase congestion and reduce sustainability.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 7, brownfield first	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I don't support this overall. I am supportive of building on brownfield sites over greenfield, all else equal. However, I think the most important thing is reducing the barriers to construction at all. I think this means allowing both brownfield and greenfield sites and not declining any building just because it's greenfield.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 8, hard infrastructure	Supporting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I am supportive of this measure and agree that provision of infrastructure is important. I especially support the traffic and transport elements and would add that public transport is particularly important. I'm not supportive of the water and electricity elements because I would expect that national or regional regulation is sufficient. I am concerned that the hard requirement that infrastructure is in place prior to completion of the project will cause delays in housing being made available. I hope that in cases where an appropriate plan is made, but infrastructure for some reason is not actually delivered on time, this is not allowed to prevent the housing from being made available.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 9, soft infrastructure	Commenting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I'm supportive of the portion of this policy that applies only to large developments of 30 or more dwellings. I'm not supportive of the portions that apply to smaller developments because I think they will excessively slow down housing delivery.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 10 principal residence housing	Supporting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I'm supportive of this policy given the current environment. Ideally, I think it would be better to ensure this via simply placing much higher rates of council tax on non-permanent-resident housing, or having a tourist tax, because I think that will have fewer unintended consequences. However, since those options are not available, I'm happy with the proposed policy.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 11, employment land	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy because I think it will slow down or reduce housing delivery. Encouraging employment is good, but I think that a presumption against the loss of any location that provides any employment is an overly blunt and burdensome measure.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 12, small business units	Supporting	I support this policy.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 13, retail provision	Commenting	I have no strong view of this policy. On the one hand, it seems reasonable. On the other hand, having marketed for a whole year seems perhaps excessive.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 14, infrastructure investment priorities	Supporting	I strongly support this policy. The priorities all seem great to me. Additionally on 14c around removing long-stay parking from the town centre, I would go further. I think that all parking should be removed from the retail area in the town centre except for loading and accessible parking. For anyone not loading and not disabled, walking 10 minutes to access the town centre shop should be fine. This will allow the public realm in the town centre to be greatly more pleasant in a way that encourages shopping, walking around, relaxing, and generally makes it a nice place to be. It could enable much more planting/greenery, wider pavements. It could enable the area where the Tuesday market sits to be resurfaced to be something more attractive than asphalt. I think that the town centre of Moreton substantially suffers compared to other nearby towns due to the much greater presence of the main road and parking in the town centre.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 15 green spaces	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I don't support this policy. I do support ensuring that substantial and pleasant green spaces are available, including preferably maintaining all current parks, meadows and gardens that are currently entirely within the built-up area. However, especially regarding allotments and sporting facilities, I think requiring that we retain exactly the current ones is excessively burdensome – Instead, provision for such facilities should be ensured in a holistic way that is open to current sites being built on, as long as suitable replacements are provided within a reasonable walking distance. In particular, allowing housing close to the town centre and railway station is important, such that people don't have to travel as much and are more able to use sustainable methods of transportation. Building on existing allotments or sports facilities, where it enables such housing, should be supported, compensating by replacing the facilities with ones further out.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 16 heritage assets	Supporting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I am broadly supportive of this policy.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 17 biodiversity	Objecting	I don't support this policy. I think it will excessively slow down or restrict housing delivery. It is adequate to ensure that biodiversity net gain is provided via offsetting somewhere, whether that be inside or outside the parish. I think that the requirement to protect and enhance features of biodiversity on the site itself is particularly excessive and should instead be applied in a more targeted way, for example by identifying specific, unusually high-value pieces of biodiversity that must be maintained; And otherwise allowing biodiversity to be reduced as long as it's offset elsewhere.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 18	Objecting	I don't support this policy. I think it will excessively slow down or restrict housing delivery. It is adequate to ensure that biodiversity net gain is provided via offsetting somewhere, whether that be inside or outside the parish. I think that the requirement to protect and enhance features of biodiversity on the site itself is particularly excessive and should instead be applied in a more targeted way, for example by identifying specific, unusually high-value pieces of biodiversity that must be maintained; And otherwise allowing biodiversity to be reduced as long as it's offset elsewhere.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 19 development boundary	Objecting	(Initial context, copied to all my individual comments: while I support the desires behind most proposed measures, I believe that the best way to make housing affordable and sustainable is to facilitate a high speed and volume of housing delivery. I think the plan should seek to actively facilitate housing growth, keeping restrictions and requirements to just the minimal most important ones.) I object to this policy. In principle, I agree that development within the existing boundary (including densification where this can be done without undue heritage impact) is preferable to sprawl. However, I think that the delivery of substantial quantities of housing is important and will require growth outside the stated boundary. I especially object to Policy 19b, stating that development won't be supported if it leads to Moreton growing by more than the minimum required by the Cotswold Local Plan. I think the Plan should not seek to impose a cap on population growth and should instead simply ensure that building, where done, is done in a way that meets suitable standards; rather than reducing the amount of building. A large amount of building, alongside suitable infrastructure, is a good thing. My objection to Policy 19B is my strongest opinion about the whole plan. The whole plan seems to be framed in terms of seeing growth as a burden rather than an opportunity. I think that seeking for housing to be affordable and seeking to restrict housing growth are fundamentally in tension. Housing growth should be welcomed, and the plan's focus should be on positively facilitating growth.		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 20 transport and active travel	Commenting	I support this policy in general, in particular I support policies 20a-c, e, and f. I think 20d is excessive. I think public rights of way are important, but judgments around impact to them should be made on a case-by-case basis in light of how the proposed change affects the public footpath network around Moreton in general.		Noted	No action taken.

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 12, Policy 14 (c) Policy 15 (Z2), Policy 17 (f) Policy 19	Objecting	I am very grateful to everyone who has worked so hard to produce this important and thorough document on behalf of and for the residents of Moreton in Marsh. I fully support the NDP with the following exceptions: Policy 12 - Despite the huge increase in the town's population there are only 2 business parks located in Moreton in Marsh. The Cotswold Business Village (built in 2007) and the Fosseway Business Centre. Unfortunately, due to the relatively small number of employment opportunities in the town, existing and new residents are for the most part forced to seek employment outside of Moreton in Marsh. With the additional car ownership/usage (as identified in Policy 6) this will only continue to and indeed exacerbate the traffic chaos seen in the town centre particularly during peak commuting and school drop off times. To help manage this, additional employment opportunities/business parks are required and should therefore be an integral part of the NDP policy. Policy 14 (c) This does not reflect or address the current or future car parking requirements of the town's residents and tourists for long stay parking. Point (c) in its current format restricts additional long stay parking by specifically and only referring to provision being provided at the bus and train stations. The total additional number of car parking spaces to be created here under the Transport Hub banner will only create a further 43 car parking spaces which is not even adequate for the existing town 14(c) needs to include wording to allow for alternative sites for additional parking in the town over and above purely the train and bus stations. However I do support the Community Assessor's position of parking permits and would suggest this be added to with car parking fees in the town centre car parks after a period of 'free parking' - say first 2 hours free. This would alleviate the problem of people parking in the town centre car parks all day (eg those people commuting/ using the train station), and will free up the car parks for those wishing to use the shops and hospitality offered in the town or residents and tourists. This would have a positive impact in the retail and hospitality sectors in the town as more people would use the High Street if parking were easier. Policy 15 - I object to the inclusion of 22. Glebe Field as part of the proposed Green Spaces within Moreton in Marsh. This piece of land was the clear choice before 2020 to provide additional parking for the town. Whilst there is still debate and uncertainty as to where additional parking can be located in or near to the town centre, this piece of land should be kept as an option and therefore not be included in the NDP Local Green Spaces. (Refer to my point under policy 14). Policy 17 (f) - I am extremely concerned about the net loss of our biodiversity within the town of Moreton in Marsh. Currently and as confirmed in point 17 (f), schemes in exceptional circumstances will be able to offset net biodiversity not within the town but within BOA's. There is already a big problem with net gain not going to the area where the development is occurring experienced both within and outside Moreton. If net gain cannot be incorporated into the said development scheme then it should at least be implemented into an alternative location WITHIN THE TOWN BOUNDARY's. If 17 (f) remains in its current format, MIM will be losing biodiversity, without having any benefit of the required and due net gain!	Proposed policy wording Small business units 12 - Before (or by completion of) any proposed new residential development in the town, additional local employment opportunities must be identified AND realised, eg more more light industrial sites, shared office workspaces etc. Proposed policy wording Infrastructure investment Priorities 14- Remove long stay parking from the town to alternative locations in the town including - but not exclusively - the train and bus stations. Proposed policy wording Local Green Spaces 15 - Removal of site 22 (Glebe Field) from the Local Green Spaces Policy 15. Proposed policy wording Enhance Biodiversity 17 (f) REMOVE final sentence: Priority will be given to offsetting schemes within BOA's. REPLACE with: Priority will be given to offsetting schemes identified in other locations within the boundary of Moreton in Marsh.	Noted	No action taken.
			All	Commenting	I somewhat agree with the intentions of the plan, however I feel there is too little protection for many areas but too much for others.	I do not agree that the Glebe field is protected. I believe the field is an ideal possibility for community use. The District council plan may create a massive influx of people with vehicles and the new transport hub is contributing to the developers justification for building in Moreton.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			policy 12 policy 14 policy 15	Objecting	I support and appreciate all the hard work and effort that has been put into creating this NDP on behalf of and in the interests of the town's residents. I would like to raise the following points: policy 12. The NDP does not acknowledge the need for additional employment as a prerequisite for additional residential development in the town. Our road infrastructure and resultant air pollution will be put under more strain if additional employment is not achieved due to the need for new residents to travel (mainly by car) outside of the town to their place of employment. policy 14 (c) I strongly object to the removal of long stay parking from the town centre to be close to the train and bus stations! The proposed increase in car parking at this site is only for an additional 43 places! This does not and cannot alleviate the car parking issues of the town centre. Alternative and additional sites for extra parking are and will be required in the town. policy 15 I object to the inclusion of Glebe Field (22) in the NDP Local Green Spaces. This field was identified as a clear choice by MIM residents as a potential car park to alleviate the car parking issues in the town centre. An additional 43 new spaces proposed at the transport hub this will not alleviate the problem. I strongly propose that site 22 should be removed from the proposed NDP unless and until an agreed car parking strategy for the town has been agreed. must be identified and integrated into the planning application/permissions given to the aforementioned site, lease remove this from the Local Green Spaces list.	Proposed wording policy 12: Before or by completion date of any residential developments, additional employment opportunities (eg small business parks) must be identified and integrated into the planning application/permissions given to the aforementioned site. The number of new employment opportunities should be appropriate to the number of proposed dwellings. Proposed wording policy 14 (c) Removal of long stay car parking from the town centre to new locations to be considered, including but not exclusively to the train and bus stations. Proposed wording policy 15 - site 22 Glebe Field must be removed from the Local Green Spaces list	Policy 12 wording outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 14 suggestion to be passed onto Town Council. Policy 15 Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
					Blank			
			Challenges Policy 2 c	Objecting	I do not think addresses with sufficient rigour the plans under the CDC Local Plan to increase the number of houses in Moreton in Marsh. In Policy 2c it states "where appropriate" it should be mandatory that new developments incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems given the problem there has been with pollution and flooding.	The plan should state the maximum number of houses that can be built to ensure that there is not overdevelopment.	Neighbourhood Plans cannot set a limit on housing numbers	No action taken
			Page 3 - Challenges Heavy Goods Traffic and Congestion	Commenting	There is a major problem with heavy goods traffic through Moreton which causes congestion and noise and issues with vibrations to the buildings along the high street. I have recently moved into a second floor flat at University Farm and I can often feel the building "shake" as heavy goods vehicles constantly pass through the town. I cannot find anything specific in the plans to ensure heavy goods vehicles are diverted away from the centre. The car traffic is also heavy through the town making crossing the high street difficult.	Installation of narrowing bollards or other such structures to prevent heavy good vehicles passing through the centre. Another green light crossing at The Swan the end of the high street to aid pedestrian crossing.	Information passed onto Town Council to consider	No action taken
					Blank			
			The whole plan	Objecting	The plan will substantially increase the size of Moreton and an increase in traffic in a rapidly decreasing rural area. The scale of housing development is out of kilter in proportion with other areas of the Cotswolds.	Suggest growth over many years rather than a rapid increase within five years	speed of development outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
					Blank			
			Policy	Commenting	Parking and housing	Simple signage in the town saying resident parking and short term 2hour parking only to discourage people using the train station. Metered parking in the square like Chipping Campden. The cost is only £1 an hour and visitors pay but it is never policed so local workers and residents could still use it but revenue would come in from tourists. Get Highways to make out parking bays to increase parking capacity. Remove historic yellow lines by the old school/police station which prevents residents and visitors parking there on a Tuesday. Housing expansion is inevitable but if a development such as the proposed green village is to go ahead I can only see it working with a bypass. Not sure how realistic that is but it would make Moreton High Street a more appealing place to shop and take the excessive traffic off the A429.	Parking and bypass are outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			All of it	Objecting	The proposal would gridlock and damage this small town irrevocably and the recent over development has already impacted on day to day lives and resultant pressure on their amenities, doctors appointments, schools, road congestion and other negatives. The impact it will have on residents and visitors will be absolutely massively negative and detrimental in every aspect. It's well and truly overwhelming and to use the word that you don't seem to know the meaning of and yet use at every opportunity, what you propose is totally UNSUSTAINABLE.		Noted	No action taken
			Not sure, but related to over development in Moreton-in-Marsh	Commenting	Too many new developments springing up. No regard for supporting services, GP/Pharmacy & relevant shopping on high street- not least to say road traffic etc.	Stop adding extra estates, infrastructure cannot cope already. Extra housing has been sanctioned by UK govt and CDC do not take local opinion into consideration. Should build new towns with own infrastructure and support services, such as schools, GP ans pharmacy facilities.	Noted	No action taken
			As above	Commenting	Objecting and commenting	As above but CDC will rubber stamp new development as they have already	Noted	No action taken
			General	Commenting	I am a member of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church. We've noticed there is no mention or provision for community buildings or places of Public Religious Worship.	We would like a mention of the above to include consideration of the needs. We have a young family (children aged 4 and 2 years old) and currently have to travel for congregation, and obviously the current local traffic situation, particularly at weekends, provides a challenge! We have been actively searching Moreton for at least 10 years without success so any support is really appreciated. We love walking Moreton and it's surroundings and are looking to walking to a meeting place that is local.	Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
					Blank			
			all	Objecting	I am objecting to the plan as it is overdevelopment. The infrastructure is not in place to cope with the amount of people now. Moreton in Marsh, all the surrounding area and road network cannot cope with the volume of cars and people.	Do not proceed with the plan. All aspects of the plan are detrimental.	Noted	no action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Moreton in Marsh Today	Objecting	This section refers to the town sitting 'in a very rural setting, with attractive scenery'. However, it makes no mention of the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	Given the national importance of the CNL designation, this section should make explicit reference to the CNL, including the fact that most of the parish to the west of the train line, including the town centre, is located within the CNL, with the rest of the parish being located within the setting of the CNL. Explicit reference should also be made to the fact that this part of the CNL is located within Landscape Character Type 17 – Pastoral Lowland Vale. More specifically, it is located in Landscape Character Area 17 – Pastoral Lowland Vale (Vale of Moreton). Reference should also be made to the fact that the town of Moreton-in-Marsh and the rest of the parish can be seen from Landscape Character Type 5 (Farmed Slopes), to the west of the town (for example, from the public rights of way between Sezincote and Batsford). Please refer to Appendix A, below, which shows an extract from the CNL Interactive Landscape Character Map.	Noted	Wording added to reference CNL
			SECTION TWO – POLICY CONTEXT National and Regional Policy	Objecting	This section makes no reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL). This is a significant oversight given that most of the parish to the west of the train line, including the town centre, is located within the CNL and the rest of the parish is located within the setting of the CNL.	Given the national importance of the CNL designation and the extent to which it overlaps with the town and the parish, this section should make reference to the CNL and related national planning policy, particularly paragraphs 189 and 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in the context of the CNL. Specifically, it should mention that: •Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the CNL. •The scale and extent of development within the CNL should be limited. •Development within the setting of the CNL should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the CNL. •Permission should be refused for major development within the CNL other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. It would also be appropriate to explicitly refer to the fact that: (i)the statutory purpose of the CNL designation is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the CNL; (ii)relevant authorities, including local authorities and town / parish councils, have a statutory duty to seek to further the purpose of CNL designation. It would also be appropriate to explicitly refer to the CNL Management Plan, which is a statutory document that sets out policies for the management of the CNL.	Noted	Wording added to reference weight given to CNL in NPPF
			SECTION 3 – VISION AND OBJECTIVES Challenges for Moreton in Marsh	Objecting	This section makes no reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	Given the national importance of the CNL designation and the extent to which it overlaps with the town and the parish, this section should explicitly address the challenge of ensuring that development in Moreton in Marsh parish is delivered that is compatible with – and positively contributes to – the statutory purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the CNL.	National Landscapes are afforded protection through National Policy	No action taken
			SECTION 3 – VISION AND OBJECTIVES Objectives for Moreton in Marsh	Objecting	This section makes no reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	Given the national importance of the CNL designation and the extent to which it overlaps with the town and the parish, explicit reference should be made to the CNL. This could potentially be done by amending 'Objective c' as follows (N.B. New text is underlined and deleted text has a strike through): •Protect, conserve and enhance the sensitive natural environment and exceptional rural assets surrounding Moreton-in-Marsh, in particular, the Cotswolds National Landscape. With regards to 'Objective n', consideration should also be given to views outside the parish that could be adversely affected by development within the parish, for example, impacts on views from the public rights of way between Sezincote and Batsford. We suggest that the wording should be amended as follows (N.B. New text is underlined): •Preserve important views within the parish and important views that overlook the town and / or parish. With regards to 'Objective m', it is not clear what the objective is seeking to preserve. Presumably this should relate to all biodiversity assets and not just to the delivery of biodiversity net-gain. The aspiration should be to both conserve the existing biodiversity assets and to create coherent and resilient ecological networks. We suggest that the wording should be amended as follows (N.B. New text is underlined and deleted text has a strike through): •Preserve and increase opportunities for biodiversity net gain. Conserve existing biodiversity assets, create a coherent and resilient ecological network and ensure that development provides significant biodiversity net gains.	National Landscapes are afforded protection through National Policy	No action taken
			SECTION FOUR – POLICIES Approach to Sustainable Development	Objecting	This section makes no reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	Given the national importance of the CNL designation and the extent to which it overlaps with the town and the parish, explicit reference should be made to the CNL. In particular, we recommend the inclusion of the following text: •Development should be delivered in a way that is compatible with - and positively contributes to – the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Cotswolds National Landscape.	National Landscapes are afforded protection through National Policy	No action taken
			SECTION 4 - POLICIES Policies and Objectives Matrix	Objecting	This section makes no reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	The objectives wording should be amended as outlined in our comments on Section Three (Vision and Objectives).	Noted	No action taken
			SECTION 4 - POLICIES Policy Four – Affordable Housing	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy Four, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 205-2030 and with the Board's Housing Position Statement. In particular, the Board supports the requirement to prioritise households with a strong local connection.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION 4 - POLICIES Policy Five – Well Designed Housing and Places	Commenting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy Five, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030, subject to the recommendation below.	We recommend that the supporting text should make explicit reference to relevant guidance published by the Board, including the CNL Landscape Strategy & Guidelines for Landscape Character Type 17, particularly with regards to the guidelines for new development.	Noted	Reference added to para 31
			SECTION FOUR - POLICIES Policy Sixteen – Conserving Non-designated Heritage Assets	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy Ten, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION FOUR - POLICIES Policy Seventeen – Enhancing Biodiversity	Objecting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board broadly supports Policy Ten, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030. However, we consider that point d (Development proposals should result in a net gain for biodiversity within the parish) is not ambitious enough.	We recommend that Policy Seventeen should seek at least 20% biodiversity net gain, at least for any proposals within the CNL, in line with the relevant policies and guidance in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030. The use of the word 'Ecological', at the start of the policy, seems archaic. In the context of this policy, it would be more appropriate to use the phrase 'biodiversity and biodiversity assets'.	Noted	Policy 13 BP (a) wording change to 'Moreton-in-Marsh's biodiversity & biodiversity assets shall be maintained...'

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			SECTION FOUR - POLICIES Policy Eighteen – Important Views	Objecting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board broadly supports Policy Ten, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030. However, consideration should be given to the fact that development within the parish has the potential to adversely affect views outside of the parish, including views that are experienced within the CNL.	We recommend that consideration should be given to the views that are experienced from the public rights of way in Landscape Character Type 15 (Farmed Slope), Landscape Character Type 17 (Pastoral Vale) and Landscape Character Type 7 (High Wold), to the west of Moreton in Marsh. This should include explicitly identifying, as 'Important Views', the following views within the CNL: -views looking eastwards from the Heart of England Way between Sezincote and Batsford; -views looking north-east from the Diamond Way, between Longborough and Moreton in Marsh; -views looking south-east from the Monarch's Way between Batsford and Moreton in Marsh.	Noted	Descriptions of Important Views which include CNL to reference CNL.
			SECTION FOUR - POLICIES Policy Nineteen – Development Boundary	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board broadly supports Policy Nineteen, particularly part 'a' (i.e. focussing development within the development boundary). Focussing development within the development boundary would help to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the CNL as it would discourage encroachment of development into the CNL.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION FOUR Policy Twenty – Transport & Active Travel	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board broadly supports Policy Ten, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION ONE Moreton in Marsh Today	Objecting	This section refers to the town sitting 'in a very rural setting, with attractive scenery'. However, it makes no mention of the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL).	Given the national importance of the CNL designation, this section should make explicit reference to the CNL, including the fact that most of the parish to the west of the train line, including the town centre, is located within the CNL, with the rest of the parish being located within the setting of the CNL. Explicit reference should also be made to the fact that this part of the CNL is located within Landscape Character Type 17 – Pastoral Lowland Vale. More specifically, it is located in Landscape Character Area 17 – Pastoral Lowland Vale (Vale of Moreton). Reference should also be made to the fact that the town of Moreton-in-Marsh and the rest of the parish can be seen from Landscape Character Type 15 (Farmed Slopes) and Landscape Character Type 7 (High Wold), to the west of the town (for example, from the public rights of way between Sezincote and Batsford). Please refer to Appendix A, below, which shows an extract from the CNL Interactive Landscape Character Map.	Noted	No action taken
			Additional comments	Commenting	As outlined above, the draft Neighbourhood Plan makes very little reference to the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL). In particular, there is no policy level reference to the CNL. This is a significant oversight given the national importance of this designation and the extent to which it overlaps with the town of Moreton in Marsh and the wider parish. The Foreword to the Neighbourhood Plan states that 'a Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led initiative under the aegis of the Town Council'. Moreton in Marsh Town Council is a relevant authority under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Section 85 of the CROW Act states: -'to exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England, a relevant authority other than a devolved Welsh authority must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. This statutory requirement is referred to as the 'seek to further' duty. Given that the Neighbourhood Plan is under the aegis of the Town Council, this statutory requirement applies in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan in the context of the CNL. As such, the Neighbourhood Plan should explicitly articulate how it seeks to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the CNL. Further information on the 'seek to further' duty is provided in Appendix B, below. We acknowledge that the CNL is addressed at a policy level in the Cotswold District Local Plan. However, we consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should address the CNL at a more local level by providing a CNL policy that explicitly makes reference to relevant considerations. For example, as outlined above, explicit reference should be made to: -the potential impact of development within Moreton in Marsh parish on views from the CNL; -the CNL Landscape Strategy & Guidelines for Landscape Character Types 17 (Pastoral Vale) and 5 (Farmed Slopes); -the potential impact of development on the dark skies and relative tranquillity of the CNL. With regards to dark skies, which is one of the special qualities of the CNL, the map below shows that light pollution in Moreton-in-Marsh is already adversely affecting the dark skies of the CNL. The Neighbourhood Plan should require development to comply with relevant best practice lighting guidance, in this regard, including the Board's recently adopted Lighting Guidance. With regards to tranquillity, a key consideration is the extent to which new development would increase traffic movements on roads within and / or along the boundary of the CNL. As outlined in the Board's Tranquillity Position Statement, we consider that increases in traffic movements of 10% or more are likely to have a significant adverse effect on the relative tranquillity of the CNL. With this in mind, the Neighbourhood Plan should specify that development should not increase traffic movements by 10% or more. To make this specific to Moreton in Marsh, the policy should specify the roads that this applies to. This would include the A429 through the town centre and south of the town, the A44 west of the train line, the B4479 between Blockley and the A44 and other minor roads in the CNL. For reference, a template (Local Plan) CNL policy is provided in Appendix C, below.		CNL is afforded protection via National and Local Plan Policy. Due to MM parish only partially being in the CNL, MMNPSG have been advised that writing policy protecting National Landscape would not be appropriate.	No action taken
			SECTION FOUR - POLICIES Policy Ten – Principal Residence Housing	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy Ten, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 205-2030 and with the Board's Housing Position Statement.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION 4 - POLICIES Policy One – Climate Adaptation and Energy Efficiency in Developments	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy One, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030.		Noted	No action taken
			SECTION 4 - POLICIES Policy Three – Housing Mix	Supporting	The Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL) Board supports Policy Three, which is consistent with the relevant policies in the CNL Management Plan 2025-2030 and with the Board's Housing Position Statement. In particular, the Board supports the requirement to demonstrate how the applicant has sought to meet local needs in line with the Moreton-in-Marsh Housing Needs Analysis.		Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
					Blank			
					Blank			
					Blank			
			Don't know	Objecting	Unacceptable levels of housing with insufficient support for schooling, medical and car parking.	The Glebe field should be taken out of the 'preserved area to enable it to be used as a car park. It is the ONLY site suitable, is ideally placed and is much needed. The excuse that it would encourage the fields behind to be developed seems rather ironic considering what other planning developments are being considered. The transport hub is a white elephant apart from the fact that it is badly planned, probably by people who do not see how the area works. The council will bankrupt and kill the town.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			New housing	Objecting	The well meant provision of affordable housing should not be excessive. Experience has shown that if there is insufficient take up, then homes are offered to families from outside Moreton. This is when problem families are moved into this area.	Do your homework and identify a realistic number of affordable homes, not an excessive number.	Noted	No action taken
			New housing.	Objecting	Object to new housing until Thames Water have installed updates that can cope with the projected needs.	Insist on improvements to water treatment before permitting new homes.	Not reasonable policy wording	No action taken
			Policy 15, items 11 and 22.	Objecting	An area of the site 11 should be designated as exclusive affordable housing as previously discussed by the Town Council and the Gloucester Diocese.	Coff Allotments, Evenlode Road except for an element of the site to be leased to Gloucester Diocese for their building of affordable homes subject to them leasing the Glebe for a parking site.	Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
					Blank			
					Blank			
			Housing and local green spaces	Commenting	Keep open spaces with all 3 allotments as they are an asset to the town as well as beneficial to public's mental health. Moreton is already at full capacity with housing. No secondary school, patients suffering due to few GP appointments. Main hospital is at Gloucester. High Street needs more big name shops, no gym/leisure facilities. Major traffic congestion.	Invest in Leisure facility. Big name shops instead of cafes and charity shops. A lot of useful shops have disappeared from Moreton.	outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Excessive population growth in relation to poor infrastructure.	Supporting	Planning permission to be halted until essential infrastructure is dramatically improved, especially the outdated sewage system.		outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Inadequate infrastructure.	Supporting	Planning permission to be halted until poor infrastructure is dramatically improved.	Consider a small addition to list of green spaces:- Green in centre of Oriol Grove Duck pond/former Horse Pool in Parkers Lane (if considered a green space).	Noted	No action taken
			Inadequate infrastructure	Supporting	No planning permission to be given until the poor infrastructure is considerably improved, particularly the inadequate sewage system.		Noted	No action taken
			Inadequate infrastructure	Supporting	Plan very comprehensively compiled.	Possibly add these to the list of green spaces:- Green in centre of Oriol Grove Duck pond/former horse pool in Parkers Lane	Noted	No action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Policy 15 - Local Green Spaces (No. 9, 10 & 11) Viewpoints also	Supporting	I am particularly pleased to see listed under 'Local Green Spaces' the three allotment sites in Moreton (No. 9,10 & 11). These sites are a very important heritage feature of the town & considerably enhance its rural character. Of the 3 sites, Croft Allotments (No. 11) is the only designated allotment site in the Eastern District of the town - the side of the town where already a considerable amount of housing development has already taken place. It is even more important than that this site is retained for essential allotment purposes - for the benefit of both local residents and the increasing number of future generations who will reside on this side of the town. Viewpoints from the Everlode Road looking across the Croft Allotments towards the west provide, arguably, one of the best aspects of the town with the backdrop of Batsford Church & Bourton-on-the-Hill in the hills beyond. There is a public right of way across Croft Allotments which leads to a path which crosses over the 'youthful' River Everlode & then, eventually, crosses the railway track before reaching the housing estate beyond. As a former Site Representative of Croft Allotments (No.11) for many years, I can strongly support and vouch for the benefits this facility provides both for tenants & local residents. - Allotments benefit both plot holders & local community in more ways than just providing good quality, organic, locally grown food - with no packaging involved! They improve physical & mental health - meaning lower health costs - including reduced BMI, decreased stress & anxiety, decreased social isolation, increased mental health benefits as well - including promotion & protection of biodiversity, pollinator abundance & variety. A well-established Moreton in Marsh Allotment Association exists which is affiliated to the National Allotment Society(NAS) & local committee members meet together from all 3 sites at regular intervals to discuss & action matters affecting the routine running of the plots. Volunteers also assist with the maintenance of the sites on a regular basis. Regarding all of the above our allotments' heritage provides considerably more 'added value' to the townsfolk of Moreton than just a simple calculation of tenancy rents & I strongly support the continuation of their existence in their entirety		Noted	No action taken.
			Policy 2	Commenting	Policy 2 point b2. Need clarity and definition of 'safely managing' residual flood risk given the existing issues in MIM? Policy 4 point b - where is figure P4a? Policy 5 - the requirements of the development are listed ahead of the requirements of the area which are most important. Policy 6 item g. Not strong enough. Parking is an issue and will become worse with more development. Policy 8 generally needs to be more forceful on providing infrastructure to support development this is one of the biggest issues for MIM which can't cope with existing houses never mind new developments. For example, 'Consider water supply and wastewater treatment is insufficient. The Ellenbrook development has a 50% occupation limit as the system can't cope. Future development can't be allowed to exacerbate the situation for any of the issues, services, traffic, parking, etc. Policy 15 - Green space must be protected. The current wording in part a leaves the door open for building on green space. Policy 19 point a - not strong enough given current proposals to extend parish boundary on Toddennham road and incorporate Batsford parish land. Policy 20 point a. Moreton does not have a transport hub. This terminology must be removed since it is given developers a lever for large inappropriate developments. Moreton has a small single line railway station with the usual small number of facilities (some, parking, a few bike racks and a bus stop) found in any small town. That is not a transport hub.	Policy 2 - clearly define limits for safely managing residual flood risk Policy 4 - Add figure P4a not random street view photos Policy 5 - reword with statements e to k first followed by a to d. Policy 6 item g. Reward from 'provision of public car parking must be explored' to 'provision of public car parking must be provided' Policy 8 - needs rewording to be a 'must' part of any proposal. Policy 15 - reword part a to say 'Proposals for development on these local green spaces will not be permitted.' Policy 19 - reword to say 'New development must be within the development boundary.' Policy 20 - remove all references to transport hub.	Policy 2: Not reasonable policy wording. Policy 4: figure P4a is the outlined box entitled 'Local Connection Criteria'. Policy 5: no action taken. Policy 6/8/15/19: Not reasonable policy wording.	no action taken
					Blank			
			Policy 14c: Green Space No.22 Parking Strategy	Objecting	I am broadly supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan but wish to raise three significant concerns regarding parking policy and Local Green Space designations, where the plan contradicts community consultation evidence and lacks proportionate justification. 1. Policy 14(c) Contradicts Residents' Expressed Preferences on Parking. The 2021 Residents Survey (835 responses, 35% response rate) provides clear evidence that residents want MORE parking in the town centre, not less: "338 residents requested "Better design and use of existing parking spaces in town" "337 residents requested "More parking capacity in the town centre" Yet Policy 14(c) proposes to "Remove long-stay parking from the town to a location close to the train and bus stations." The survey asked no questions about: "Removing parking from the town centre "Relocating parking away from the High Street "Whether long-stay parking causes problems "Resident support for this relocation strategy Request: Remove or substantially revise Policy 14(c) to reflect actual community preferences, or provide robust evidence that removing town centre parking serves the community's needs. 2. Glebe Field (LGS #22) Designation Contradicts Documented Community Preferences and NPPF Criteria. The Glebe Field designation as Local Green Space falls the NPPF requirement that spaces be "demonstrably special to the local community" and appears to be a retrospective measure to block a community-supported car park. Evidence of overwhelming community support for alternative use: "2018 Public Consultation: 87% supported (183/210 respondents) a Glebe Field car park "2018 Annual Parish Meeting: Voted 76-18 to support "securing the lease or purchase of the glebe land" for parking "2019 Annual Parish Meeting: Voted 23-0 in favour of TRO process acknowledging Glebe as "a good option" "Diocese Offer: Agreed to build car park at no cost to the town (250 spaces) and lease land to council The Council itself formally agreed (May 2018) to "work together" with the Diocese to "identify a suitable business model" for Glebe Field car park use, yet this was subsequently abandoned without further community consultation. Weaknesses in the LGS designation: "Describes field primarily as a "buffer" between campsite and town (planning function, not community benefit) "Notes "stock can graze" suggesting private agricultural use "Provides no evidence of public access or community activities "Vague justification: "Historic connection to the Parish" without specifics This retrospective designation directly contradicts: "Three separate democratic votes supporting the car park "The plan's own survey showing residents want MORE town centre parking (338 responses) "The council's own 2018 resolution to work with Diocese on the site "CDC planning officer's positive pre-application assessment Request: Remove Glebe Field from Local Green Space designations. The documented evidence demonstrates this land is not "demonstrably special to the local community" as required by NPPF para 107, but rather that the community specifically supported its development for parking to address the town's most pressing concern (per survey: "HGV Traffic and congestion" - #1 concern). 3. Parking Strategy Lacks Proportionate Evidence Base and Realistic Delivery Plan The plan's parking policies fail to meet the "Basic Conditions" requirement for proportionate evidence and rely on an unfunded proposal: Missing evidence: "No parking capacity study or occupancy rates "No data on long-stay vs short-stay parking patterns "No traffic impact assessment of removing town centre parking "No economic impact assessment on retail/tourism "No viability study of alternative parking locations Unrealistic delivery assumptions: "The Transport Hub has no secured funding and will require at least two years of CIC contributions from CDC "Even if delivered, it provides only 44 additional spaces for town use (remainder being rail/EV provision) "The aspirational plan reduces town centre parking from 259 legal spaces (2013) to 132 spaces "Net impact: Loss of 83 town centre spaces with only 44 replacement spaces (and those unfunded) This means residents face: "Immediate loss of 127 spaces if/when town centre changes implemented "Uncertain timeline (minimum 2+ years) for any replacement provision "Significant risk the Transport Hub may never be delivered due to funding constraints The plan proposes removing parking capacity based on a replacement facility that has no funding commitment, contradicting resident requests for MORE parking capacity (337 survey responses). Request: 1.Remove Policy 14(c) until Transport Hub funding is secured, or 2.Explicitly state that no town centre parking reduction will occur until replacement capacity is delivered and operational, or 3.Commission a comprehensive parking study and revise strategy to align with community preferences for increased town centre capacity.		Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			A429/A44	Commenting	My main concern is the lack of pedestrian crossings on the main roads especially the town centre and the new estate opposite the hospital. I have seen people, the old and those with pushchairs especially dodging traffic to get to Aldi, hospital, garage and garden centre. I know it could hold up traffic for a short time but that already happens when vehicles need to turn right into the places named above and would be even longer if there was an accident or fatality.	Changes obviously would include new crossings on the London road and Fosseyway road to help access for pedestrians to move around Moreton safely.	Information passed onto Town Council to consider	No action taken
			Policy 6 and Policy 20	Commenting	Policies 6 and 20 counteract each other. You either need the off street parking, or you need the active travel proposals. I would comment that it will be many years before individual personal transport by car will be not a suitable way for people to get to work. All this talk about Transport Hubs is a load of tosh. Clearly no-one has a clue what to do with the white elephant that is the former British Legion!!		Noted	No action taken
					Blank			
			Theme 6 Health, Leisure and Well-being	Commenting	Generally support.	Consider changing the kissing gate at the start of the walk to the arboretum. Currently you cannot get a modern pram through it to walk to between Moreton and the arboretum. When planning new paths, consider wheelchair and pushchair access.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan. Information passed on to Town Council	No action taken
			Theme 5 An Enhanced Town Character	Commenting	Improve traffic calming through the town centre.	Extend the 20mph zone out to the Garden center in the south, the national speed limit sign in the north, the camp site in the west and the fire college in the east, with consideration to any new developments that will extend the town border. Consider reactive speed limit signs similar to north Oxfordshire if people are going too fast. Consider a speed camera on each town entry point to enforce. Moreton's not that big, people don't need to go fast to get through it.	Speed limits/cameras outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
					Blank			
			Policy 9 Soft Infrastructure	Commenting	It is disappointing that the plan does not give more weight to community and well-being.	It is disappointing that the plan does not give more weight to community and well-being. Please can policy nine be expanded to be more specific about listing the current community facilities and the need to protect them. Something along the lines - Proposals that will result in either the loss or erosion of existing community facilities or in significant harm to community facilities will be strongly resisted unless equivalent facilities are provided elsewhere capable of being accessed by all users including pedestrians and cyclists. Proposals that will enhance the viability of any community facility and which provide additional recreation and community facilities will be encouraged	Community & wellbeing cannot be controlled through Planning policy	No action taken
			Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities.	Commenting	Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities. The Redesdale Hall is the most prominent building in the town as well as being used by the community as a village hall. Can point a) be expanded to say - Refurbishment, including Public Realm improvements around the Redesdale Hall and restoration of the hall.	Policy 14: Infrastructure Investment Priorities. The Redesdale Hall is the most prominent building in the town as well as being used by the community as a village hall. Can point a) be expanded to say - Refurbishment, including Public Realm improvements around the Redesdale Hall and restoration of the hall.	Noted	No action taken.



Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Hard Infrastructure	Objecting	More detail is required on how the council will ensure that that any house building is infrastructure first approach rather than a creep in new developments pending an Infrastructure review. This included road(not just a cycle lane and a new bus stop), schools, water flooding. We keep hearing Infrastructure first but I take little comfort from the plan that this is being fully committed to.	More wording on the commitment and detail on how planning will be Infrastructure first.	Noted	No action taken.
			All	Commenting	The over development in Moreton-in-Marsh is unsustainable. Not objecting to new houses, as they are needed, providing they are for LOCALS. Recent houses are obviously attracting outsiders who can afford £600k-£1m price tags. No strategy for improving infrastructure, roads, green spaces, GP or other services. Despite any opposition, CDC will rubber stamp and give ok. Pointless making any objection.	Build new towns with own amenities and infrastructure, don't just build onto existing towns, you will spoil the whole environment and well-being of towns.	Noted	No action taken.
					Blank			
				Supporting				
				Supporting				
				Supporting				
				Supporting				
			Community Aspiration	commenting	If favour of residential permits could hospital road be considered as Keatley Place does not have sufficient parking for apartments and it is also impossible for residents to find a parking space near Keatley Place		Information re parking permits passed onto Town Council	No action taken
			Whole		Where's the plan of the areas which are potential development areas? How can we consider a plan, blind?		Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating any areas for development.	No action taken
			Objective 5, policies 2, 8 & 9	commenting	Not enough appropriate infrastructure in place to support proposed new development.		Noted	No action taken
			Objectives 9, 10, 11, Policies 13, 14, 15, 16, 17	commenting	The health needs of local people are not being met as it is, even BEFORE new development takes place. Moreton should be a walk into town but high level of traffic makes it impossible and unsafe		Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
			Objective 13, Policy 17	commenting	We have already lost skylarks from fields behind this town-development needs to be reduced no increased to protect the little left		Noted	No action taken
			Objective 14, Policy 18	commenting	The exceptional views within the Parish are NOT being maintained if this amount of development goes ahead. Tourists will not want to come -the town will lose out economically		Noted	No action taken
			Objective 16, Policy 20	commenting	The health benefits of Moreton's residents will be damaged by the loss of green spaces. There needs to be more cycle lanes and walking routes to enable children to walk to school. Children living as close of Bourton-on-the-Hill cannot walk to St David's School because there is no footpath and traffic makes it dangerous. There is space for a footpath. Why is no footpath being created. This is simply adding to the burden on the NHS. People would walk more between villages if they could. Instead the traffic around Moreton is so bad, these country roads are being used as rat runs. There should be more responsibility in the Neighbourhood Plan towards the health of local people, especially children.		Noted	No action taken
			Community Aspiration	commenting	Could it be considered that residents could have a parking permit outside keatley place? As the development doesn't have enough parking for residents and it has become almost impossible to park near Keatley Place due to other people parking, who have holiday lets and some leave their cars for days meaning some residents are forced to park on Batsford Road which isn't ideal for elderly people in the day or in the evening, which is unsatisfactory. Please could this be seriously considered. Hospital Road GL56 0DQ		Information re parking permits passed onto Town Council	No action taken
				commenting	Town has been allowed to get very scruffy. Good shops are leaving-we don't need anymore cafes!! Station used to be pretty (as it should for gateway to the Cotswolds)-now has turned into an eyesore of expensive unused bike rack & ugly waiting room and unpainted soffits fascias -used to have flower baskets!!! Way too much traffic (including heavy traffic) on high street. Nobody monitors car park-on Tuesdays people park on grass which is dangerous in a pedestrian area, never any ticket men around to deter bad parking!! Too much new housing being built without any infrastructure!!! Need: New car park; new primary school; more facilities for residents more care over towns appearance. (I realise that as always the council won't listen to residents and this is all for show, as on previous occasions-but I need to vent!!! I have lived here for 12 years and moved here as it was a lovely market town-I wouldn't have moved here if it was today)		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	NO new homes should be built until the infrastructure issues are dealt with. With a new primary school when we already have one, shouldn't it be a secondary school?		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	Local plan number of new homes proposed already well on the way to being fulfilled by 2026, give years easily.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	The local need for housing seems to be missing from existing developments, one of which advertises their new build in Surrey as 'second homes in the Cotswolds!' This can't be right.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	The design of new build need to be more tightly regulated, there are new houses which bear no resemblance as belonging in a Cotswold market town.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	The phrase 'Transport Hub' gives the wrong impression of what we should be trying to achieve, better parking alongside the station was the initial plan, freeing up the side streets of all day parkers using the train, or going on holiday for 2 weeks. The town parking need an immediate phase up.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	Overall I think it is an excellent Neighbourhood Plan and hope we can keep control without the government overriding locals decision, but using us as a place on the map which suits their plans and not those of the residents. We live in Moreton and bes know what we need.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	There are no cycleways at present, cycling in Moreton is dangerous. There seems to be no actual plan plan for cycleways on the plan and no diagram to show where they would go! The plan should show cycleways.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 8 & 9	commenting	Developers build where they like-usually greenfields. They NEVER provide schools, more Doctor surgeries and do not contribut at all to local infrastructure-just bring more people and more traffic!		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	The outdoor gym is not publicised by the Council-they promise to put up a notice on the road to make it clear its for public use and free-still no notice!		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	Brownfield land should be prioritised! All development I've seen is on Greenfields-we should be using greenfields for producing food-we need food security not more buildings.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	50% increase in growth of Moreton in 10 years has radically changed the character of what was an attractive market town-it is very noticeably much more urban and not so friendly because of the demographic changes.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	The huge increase in houses is spoiling the very nature of Moreton soon the pretty market town will be lost in a sea of new houses. Residents have had enough of new houses.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	Transport hub completely inadequate parking and bike racks that are hardly ever used.		Noted	No action taken
				commenting	We need a car park so the Glebe land must be used for this not a green space. We need a large car park. We need a large car park		Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			Vision & Objectives		Economic challenges-housing (Bloor Homes) development proposed for site adjacent to 'Cotswold Business Park' obvious location for business units. ASB & Crime: No police station since 2012. No regular 'police' office.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 6 Parking in Residential Developments	commenting	Garages: dimension given are not representative of increased/increasing size of 'cars' especially electric powered. Update based on each years best-selling car model.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 14 Infrastructure Investment Priorities	commenting	No mention of dangerous bridge (Fosseway over rail line) to north of town. Not fit-for-purpose, frequent repairs lead to town congestion. Pedestrian access/use does not meet latest 'highway Code'.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 15 Local Green Spaces	commenting	S. Buffer between Moreton Park and FSC: Nature Reserve has not been officially recognised, ownership unclear between Capita (FSC) and developers and their management companies. FSC originally conducted ecological survey and placed signage around the area. Now only one sign standing.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 19 Development Boundary	commenting	Map 2: Doesn't show GCN Nature Reserve or adjacent pathway.		Noted	No action taken
			Policy 20 Transport & Active travel	commenting	Moreton-in-Marsh is well served by pathways but routes need to be promoted to households and tourists. There's no need to walk along the London Road. London Road is unsafe due to traffic and speeding.		Noted	No action taken
			Appendix F Biodiversity data search	commenting	Walford Woods is a 'SSSI Site' adjacent to fire service college and with access within council boundary. Nature migrates through woodland into Moreton Park/Cotswold Gate developments e.g. Woodpeckers, Red Kites, Buzzards		Noted	No action taken
			Map	commenting	Distribution doesn't show the 'GCN of priority nature reserve' grasslands, habitats adjacent to FSC/Pathway		Noted	No action taken

Name (Redacted)	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details (Redacted)	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation Objecting/ Supporting/ Commenting	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here.	Please suggest any change(s) you consider necessary to enable the plan to proceed. Please say why you are suggesting this change. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.	SG response	Action taken
			Local Green Spaces	Objecting	I write on behalf of [redacted], the landowner of the site identified as Location 22 in the Moreton-in-Marsh Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) currently under Regulation 14 consultation. We wish to formally object to the proposed designation of this land as a Local Green Space (LGS). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that LGS designation is only appropriate where the land is: <i>In reasonable proximity to the community it serves. Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife. Local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</i> None of these criteria apply to the Glebe land in question. The site is not publicly accessible, nor does it possess any recognised ecological, recreational or heritage value that would justify such a designation. It is not demonstrably special to the local community in the sense required by the NPPF. Indeed, in 2018, GDBF facilitated a public consultation on a proposal to develop the sites as a car and coach park to address the town's well-document parking challenges. Of the 210 responses received, 87% supported the proposal. While the scheme did not proceed, the consultation results provide compelling evidence that the community does not view this land as a tranquil green space to be preserved, but rather as a site with potential to meet pressing local infrastructure needs. We are concerned that the proposed designation appears inconsistent with the evidence base and may undermine the ability of the town to respond flexibly to future development needs. The NPPF cautions against using LGS designation in a way that would unduly constrain sustainable development. GDBF reserves the right to make further representations as subsequent stages of the plan-making process, including at examination.	We therefore respectfully request that the proposed designation of Location 22 as a Local Green Space be withdrawn from the draft NDP.	Glebe Field has consistently been identified by the community as an important Local Green Space and has been included in the Neighbourhood Plan for this reason.	No action taken
			Ecology		Comments should be provided by the district ecologist. However, as the Responsible Authority for Gloucestershire's Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), GCC officers advise that any policies will need to consider the LNRS once adopted in January 2026 (expected date).		Noted	No action taken
			Planning		GCC officers welcome the draft plan's vision of creating a low-carbon and a safe town. In addition to priorities identified by colleagues in Transport Planning and Public Rights of Way (PROW) towards developer contributions, GCC officers also advise to consider how everyday activities such as education, recreation, and work can be accessible by a safe active travel network or a combination of active travel and public transportation network. This can contribute to reducing the community's carbon footprint and make the town more liveable.		Noted	No action taken
			Public Rights of Way		GCC officers welcome and support the aspirations outlined in Policy Twenty on Transport & Active Travel, particularly the emphasis on promoting safe, non vehicular routes and encouraging active travel. However, officers feel it is important to highlight some practical considerations to ensure proposals are both realistic and deliverable. A few examples are mentioned below. The Public Rights of Way (PROW) network around the Moreton-in-Marsh is predominantly made up of public footpaths. While these are legally accessible to pedestrians, they are not available for use by cyclists or horse riders. Despite this, we have noted frequent references to cycling and horse riding in relation to this network – this may inadvertently mislead developers and the public. The only bridleways in the area are located some distance from the Moreton-in-Marsh town centre and do not currently facilitate direct access into the town. GCC officers are increasingly seeing planning applications from developers proposing links from new estates to existing footpaths, often promoting cycling. While well-intentioned, these proposals can be problematic if they do not acknowledge the legal limitations of footpath use. There is a concern that such suggestions are being made to enhance the appeal of developments without a full understanding of the legal status of the routes. GCC officers fully support the development of multi-user paths that accommodate walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. However, it must be stressed that such routes can only be created with the agreement of landowners and must respect the legal status of existing paths. Upgrading footpaths to bridleways or creating new multiuser routes requires careful negotiation and planning.		Although routes for use by horse riders have been mentioned in the body of the plan and in Reasoned Justification, but have not been mentioned in policy wording. The MIMNSG recognise the limitations of PROW, but believe horse riders to be a reasonable consideration when planning movement routes throughout the parish.	No action taken
			Public Rights of Way		GCC officers also commend the ambition of the draft plan to provide safe routes to schools, including St. David's. However, it is important to consider the physical constraints of the area. For example, the railway line bordering St. David's School presents a significant barrier to east-west movement, requiring a lengthy detour south to access the school from the eastern side. These kinds of practical limitations should be considered to manage expectations and ensure proposals are feasible.		Noted	No action taken
			Public Rights of Way		Finally, GCC officers would welcome any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions that could support improvements to the existing PROW network. Officers are keen to work collaboratively with Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council to explore opportunities for enhancing connectivity and accessibility for all users.		Noted	Information passed on to Town Council
			Transport Planning		GCC officers welcome the variety of aspirations outlined in the draft Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Development Plan. The coherence of the document, between policies, projects, and funding will be critical for the plan's implementation. Our recommendations are laid out in themes as below:			
					A. Make policy ambitions more specific GCC officers feel, current ambitions could benefit from being more specific to support implementation and monitoring. For example, the draft plan should reference the Countywide Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) to: o Highlight strategic cycling corridors o Identify priority areas for improved access This will help align local goals with county-level strategies and funding opportunities.		Noted	Policy 20 (Transport & Active Travel) BP (e) reworded 'Proposals should seek, where possible, to create cycle paths so as to provide safe and effective routes across the Neighbourhood Area, and where possible join up with the Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and National Cycle Network Ways.'
					B. Highway Improvements and Developer Contributions On funding opportunities, where developer contributions are discussed in relation to local transport infrastructure, it is essential to make specific reference to the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2020-2041, and its strategic objectives. In particular, contributions should support schemes that address key pinch points and severance issues which hinder active travel and connectivity, to ensure that development supports wider transport and environmental goals. Two priority schemes identified within the LTP include: • A429/A44 Mini Roundabout Improvements: This junction is a known congestion hotspot and a barrier to safe pedestrian and cycle movement. • A429 Rail Bridge Pinch Point: This location presents a critical severance issue for active travel modes. Investment in improvements here would facilitate safer and more direct walking and cycling routes, supporting modal shift and reducing car dependency.		Noted	Wording added to objective explanation after Policy 20 (Transport & Active Travel) 'It is intended to build on the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan 2020-2041 at a more local level.'
					C. Consider practicalities of parking proposals The ambition to remove overnight parking from the town centre is reasonable, but is there a viable alternative location near the train or bus station for long-term parking? A few further suggestions: o Explore options for EV (electric vehicle) parking o Consider introducing car clubs to reduce reliance on private vehicles and support sustainable travel choices o Highlight the opportunity for Interchange Hubs such as at the rail station and on the high street		Noted	No action taken
					D. Improve linkage between Aspirations, Objectives, and Policies To enhance clarity and coherence, GCC officers recommend clarifying the connections between aspirations, objectives, and policies. For example, in the current draft - Objective P becomes Objective 16 under the Policy Twenty on Transport & Active Travel (page 58), which may confuse readers. • The Active Travel policy is followed by Aspiration 3, which relates to public transport, but there is no clear aspiration for active travel. With respect to the above, officers recommend to clearly identify the origin and purpose of each aspiration. Consider aligning the numbering and naming conventions to improve readability. Officers also suggest introducing a dedicated policy for public transport or referencing it in the active travel policy, especially if aspirations already support this		Noted	Objective references amended to all be numbered.