

Moreton in Marsh Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2043 Regulation 14 responses from Cotswold District Council			MiMNP Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan MiMNPSG Moreton-in-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group CDC Cotswold District Council MiM Moreton-in-Marsh	
Policy No.	Policy Name	CDC Comments	SG Comments	Amendments made to Neighbourhood Plan
	General Comment	For clarity include the Policy number, title and text within a single box, excluding the objective.	Noted	
	Housing Allocation	To note, the housing allocations in the supporting text are from the Local Plan – no new allocations are made. There is no requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to allocate housing sites.	Noted	
1	Climate Adaptation and Energy Efficiency in Developments <i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	<p>This policy is compatible with Local Plan Policy INF10. It introduces new criteria on topics such as householder/ domestic renewable energy generation, car charging and energy assessments, which makes it a useful addition in tandem with the Local Plan.</p> <p>i. At criterion (a) it refers to land allocations without making any. Proposals would be a more appropriate word, as they would refer to any planning applications/proposals.</p> <p>ii. Criterion (b) is set out in Local Plan Policy INF10 1(b) and duplication is not required.</p> <p>iii. Criteria (c) and (f) could be moved to supporting text. They express encouragement for such development</p>	<p>i. Noted</p> <p>ii. As CDC Local Plan is undergoing an update, MiMNPSG wish to keep this BP in the interest of longevity.</p> <p>iii. The MiMNPSG are keen to show they positively support steps being taken to achieve zero carbon and focus energy use from renewable sources.</p> <p>iv. Noted</p> <p>v. Noted</p> <p>vi. MiMNPSG believe this should be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>i. BP (a) reworded to ‘Land allocations and management proposals which..’</p> <p>ii. No action</p> <p>iii. No action</p> <p>iv. BP (d) reworded to: <i>Where relevant and appropriate, energy assessment showing how new developments minimises carbon footprint and energy requirements should be submitted as part of the planning application.</i></p> <p>vii. BP (e) reworded to: <i>Provision of electric vehicle charging, to account for current and projected future need, should be incorporated in relevant planning applications whether domestic, commercial or industrial uses.</i></p> <p>v. No action</p>

		<p>but do not effectively change policy position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Or they could be moved into the requirements of criterion (d); which should also be more specific on which new development this applies to, or state: where relevant or appropriate. In criterion (d) the term “conditional” should be changed and make it clear that an energy assessment should be submitted as part of a planning application. v. Criterion (e) could be worded more simply e.g. Provision of electric vehicle charging, to account for current and projected future need, should be incorporated in relevant planning applications whether domestic, commercial or industrial uses. vi. Consider whether there is evidence to make a requirement e.g. 10% or 20% of spaces. 		
2	<p>Managing Flood Risk</p> <p><i>Jo Corbett – Senior Planning Policy Officer has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This policy duplicates much of Local Plan Policy EN14 and the NPPF. It is suggested that this policy is deleted unless it can be enhanced by anything specific, particular to Moreton. ii. Criterion (a) should also refer to PPG as well as NPPF. ii. Criterion (b) should refer to current NPPF or future iterations otherwise this will become outdated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Community engagement showed very strong concern regarding flooding in MiM. Therefore the MiMNPSG want to keep this policy in. ii. Noted iii. Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. No action ii. BP (a) wording added: ‘..in accordance with NPPF and PPG guidance.’ iii. BP (b) wording added ‘..outlined in footnote 63 of paragraph 181 of the December 2024 NPPF (or subsequent NPPF iterations), will require a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)..’

	<i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>			
3	<p>Housing Mix</p> <p><i>Fin McEwan – Strategic Housing Specialist has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p> <p><i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The specific number of six dwellings in Criterion (a) is queried. Evidence would be required for this number. Suggest this is removed and all development delivering net new dwellings should show how they meet local need. ii. Alternatively, Local Plan Policy H2 Affordable Housing applies to 11 or more dwellings, or 6-10 in rural areas. iii. It is queried whether the Housing Needs Analysis was available for this consultation and if so, who it was prepared by? iv. Criterion (b) 25% Lifetime Home Standards – this has been superseded by M4(2) building regulations. Ideally all properties will be built to M4(2) standards to be accessible and adaptable. A criterion could be inserted to exclude developments where the applicant can provide viability evidence. v. To be more ambitious a certain proportion could be at M4(3) standard to be fully wheelchair accessible. However, 25% would seem high; query over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noted ii. Noted iii. Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) prepared by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) in 2021. iv. Noted v. MiMNPSG wish to keep this BP in the interest of longevity of the community. vi. SG wish to provide options for smaller homes and also those wishing to find a smaller number of bedrooms but retain reception rooms. vii. Due to BP (a) being amended as above, SG believe BP (B, 5) can remain as currently worded. viii. Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BP (a) Wording amended ‘Proposals for more than six dwellings Any proposal which results in a net gain in dwellings should demonstrate.’ ii. Wording amended as above. iii. HNA added as Appendix and reference to HNA added to BP (a). iv. BP (b) reference to Lifetime Home Standards removed. v. No action taken vi. No action taken vii. No action taken viii. BP (b) amended to reflect CDC comment (iv) above.

		<p>whether the Housing Needs Assessment provides evidence for this?</p> <p>vi. Criterion (c)(3) is this evidenced by the HNA in criterion (a). Could (c)(1) and (3) be merged?</p> <p>vii. Query over whether criterion (c)(5) could provide for “fully serviced” land? e.g. power grid, water, sewage connections. However, Local Plan Policy H1 requires 5% of plots are made available for custom build on developments of 20 dwellings or more. We understand the need to be satisfied by permissions district-wide. Is Moreton able to evidence a greater or unmet need at a local level to increase the % or lower the threshold?</p> <p>viii. Clarity between (b) and (c)[2] required.</p>		
4	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p><i>Fin McEwan – Strategic Housing Specialist has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded. Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on</i></p>	<p>i. Criterion (a)[2] could add that an affordable home should not be distinguishable from market homes in the same development i.e. “tenure blind”.</p> <p>ii. Criterion (b)– remove as follows: in all new housing developments providing affordable housing the first occupancy of all affordable homes will be prioritised for households with... This should refer to the HomeSeeker Plus (or any subsequent) policy. It should be clear that the Local Connection Criteria (white box) is supplementary to the HomeSeeker Plus policy enabled by para 34.1 of their policy document. As such, the white box should also indicate what</p>	<p>i. Noted</p> <p>ii. Noted</p> <p>iii. Noted</p> <p>iv. The aim of the BP is to ensure affordable homes remain ‘affordable’. Wording amended for clarity.</p>	<p>i. BP (a2) wording added ‘<i>tenure blind, i.e. built using the same materials and in the same style as any market housing on the site.</i></p> <p>ii. Wording removed from BP(b) as recommended, Reference to HomeSeeker Plus added to Local Connection Criteria (white box).</p> <p>iii. BP (C) wording added ‘<i>..Cotswold Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (or subsequent updates) or any local objectively assessed need.</i>’</p> <p>iv. BP wording amended ‘Development proposals which safeguard a proportion of the affordable homes</p>

	<i>this policy and comments embedded.</i>	<p>the ‘area’ constitutes and the ‘surrounding parishes’ mentioned in para 34.1.</p> <p>iii. Criterion (c) as written this applies to all proposals, should it be only proposals that include affordable housing? Add: ... Strategic Housing Market Assessment or any local objectively assessed need.</p> <p>iv. Criterion (d) our understanding is this would contradict national legislation. Could instead propose Discounted Market Sale (DMS) which can tie a perpetual discount to the land.</p>		<p>from future sale and maintain affordability of the homes in perpetuity will be supported.’</p>
5	<p>Well Designed Housing & Places</p> <p><i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<p>i. Criterion (b) seems superfluous to (a).</p> <p>ii. Criterion (c) - Appendix A is not a Design Guide, and is labelled a Community Design Statement. It largely contains information on the national context of design guidance. The rest is information on heritage assets which can be separated if relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>iii. Criterion (g) whilst earthwork barriers can be appropriate alongside busy/ main roads, it can segregate the development from the current built form and lose the opportunity of good streetscape.</p> <p>iv. Criterion (h) what proposals would be appropriate; examples could be made in the supporting text.</p> <p>v. Criterion (j) has an appraisal of allotment supply in Moreton been undertaken? Would extending current sites be better</p>	<p>i. Noted</p> <p>ii. Noted</p> <p>iii. Noted. It is felt that the wording ‘where these are in keeping with the existing streetscape. allows for interpretation to create a good streetscape.</p> <p>iv. Noted</p> <p>v. There is no space to expand current allotments. There are currently empty plots in the existing allotments. However, there are no allotments on east side of town.</p> <p>vi. Noted</p>	<p>i. BP (B) removed</p> <p>ii. BP (C) removed</p> <p>iii. No action taken</p> <p>iv. BP (h) now (f) ‘Where appropriate’ wording removed</p> <p>v. Wording added to BP (h) ‘<i>If the development site is not within a reasonable distance (3/4 mile) of existing allotments, sufficient space should be identified...</i>’</p> <p>vi. Wording added to BP (k) ‘<i>..open space with the opportunity for recreation and physical activity proportionate to the development is expected..</i>’</p>

		<p>than smaller allotments on each development site? What size of development triggers this requirement?</p> <p>vi. Criterion (k) best where these can be centralised to the development e.g. village green concept. Perhaps mention proportionate to the development.</p>																			
6	<p>Parking in Residential Developments</p> <p><i>Sarah Williams – Principal Transport Planner at Gloucestershire County Council has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p> <p><i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<p>i. Criterion (a) the current parking provision is set out in the Gloucestershire County Council Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (July 2020) (MFGS), page 48, see excerpt below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="472 646 965 740"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Urban (Rural)</th> <th colspan="5">No. of bedrooms</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Spaces</td> <td>1 (1)</td> <td>2 (1)</td> <td>2 (2)</td> <td>3 (2)</td> <td>3 (3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The policy proposes an additional space for 5+ bed houses. Is there justification or evidence e.g. surveys for this?</p> <p>ii. The MFGS also has different criteria for rural dwellings. Unsure why less spaces would be needed in more car-dependent rural areas. Nonetheless, should a distinction be made in this policy too e.g. inside or outside the development boundary?</p> <p>iii. Criterion (b) Query over whether the overall ratio needs to be maintained?</p> <p>iv. Criterion (d) as garages are often used for storage, our understanding is GCC Highways do not accept garages in the count parking spaces, even if built to</p>	Urban (Rural)	No. of bedrooms					1	2	3	4	5	Spaces	1 (1)	2 (1)	2 (2)	3 (2)	3 (3)	<p>i. As shown in the evidence, parking is an ongoing issue for MiM. The higher requirement reflects this and the concern for parking becoming worse in the future. SG understand MFGS gives recommendations and cross referencing against local evidence is encouraged.</p> <p>ii. Unable to find reference to rural dwellings in MFGS</p> <p>iii. Noted</p> <p>iv. Noted</p> <p>v. Due to MiM being a tourist destination, and the high number of holiday/short term lets, the SG believe the need for a higher ratio of visitor parking is needed to accommodate this.</p>	<p>i. No action taken</p> <p>ii. No action taken</p> <p>iii. BP (b) removed</p> <p>iv. BP (c) wording removed: ‘Where garages are to be counted as an off-street parking space the following minimum internal...’</p> <p>v. No action taken</p>
Urban (Rural)	No. of bedrooms																				
	1	2	3	4	5																
Spaces	1 (1)	2 (1)	2 (2)	3 (2)	3 (3)																

		<p>appropriate minimum internal standards.</p> <p>v. Criterion (e) MFGS states visitor parking should be at 1 space per 5 residential units. Is there evidence for a significantly more onerous 1:2 ratio.</p>		
7	<p>Brownfield First</p> <p><i>Fin McEwan – Strategic Housing Specialist has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<p>Whilst this is a good objective, the policy criteria would not make any change to the determination of planning applications. Are there any sites that could be identified which could add to this policy? Or could consideration be given to lowering the affordable housing contribution on brownfield sites to increase their viability.</p>	<p>MiMNPSG have chosen not to identify brownfield sites through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Affordable housing contribution is an important aspect of the MiMNP and therefore the SG do not want to decrease the contribution.</p>	No action taken
8	<p>Hard Infrastructure</p>	No Comment		
9	<p>Soft Infrastructure</p> <p><i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<p>Criterion (b) Advise adding: ‘or where capacity can be increased through the new development’. May need to consider how developers would contribute; is there a preference hierarchy e.g. on-site, s106 etc.?</p>	<p>The SG do not want to limit options for how the contributions can be made and would prefer the decision to be made on a case-by-case basis.</p>	No action taken
10	<p>Principle Residence Housing</p>	<p>i. Reasoned justification needs to be specific to Moreton and evidence should</p>	<p>i/ii/iii The MiMNPSG have asked CDC for information relating to MiM, but have been told there is no specific breakdown of numbers that are available. The TC and</p>	i/ii/iii No action taken.

	<i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	<p>show the % of households as second homes/ holiday lets.</p> <p>ii. Some authorities may have a minimum threshold of second/ holiday homes (e.g. 20%) before they would consider a principal residency policy. Cotswold District Council does not have such a threshold but the % should be evidenced as significant to take this policy forwards.</p> <p>iii. This restriction could also undermine viability and the delivery of affordable housing or local infrastructure.</p>	SG do not have the resources to acquire this information out themselves.	
11	Employment Land	Could the supporting text outline the largest employment locations in the parish please?	SG have been unable to find out this information, please could CDC assist?	No action taken
12	Small Business Units <i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	Query over what constitutes “small”? Does this apply up to a certain floorspace or number of employees?	Small businesses, which in turn refers to small floorspaces.	Wording added to reasoned justification for clarification
13	Retail Provision <i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on</i>	<p>i. Moreton is designated as a Key Retail Centre in the retail hierarchy of Local Plan Policy EC7.</p> <p>ii. The policy proposes a Core Retail Area. The Steering Group could propose to alter the Key Retail Centre boundary, which</p>	<p>i. Noted</p> <p>ii. SG believe the LP Key Retail Centre map does not include the entire retail area, and not wish to alter the Local Plan map.</p> <p>iii. Noted</p> <p>iv. Noted.</p>	<p>i. No action taken</p> <p>ii. No action taken</p> <p>iii. No action taken</p> <p>iv. No action taken</p>

	<i>this policy and comments embedded.</i>	would be clearer, and ensure LP Policy EC7 still applies. iii. However, there needs to be clear evidence for either and there is not enough justification for the location of the boundary. iv. Could also mention retaining a retail/ shopfront appearance even if e.g. converted to holiday let.		
14	Infrastructure Investment Priorities <i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	i. There is some overlap with Policy 9. These policies could be merged or at least ensure they are compatible. ii. For example, if viability only allows a certain amount, would the priorities of Policy 9 or 14 come first? How are these to be delivered, s106 or CIL? iii. As currently worded the policy implies that all developments of 10 or more are expected to contribute to this fixed list of infrastructure priorities, regardless of whether the development creates a need or is related to those improvements.	i. Policy 9 is aimed at housing infrastructure, Policy 14 is aimed at CIL/S106 contributions to benefit the community. ii. As above. iii. This is correct	i/ii/iii. No action taken.
15	Local Green Spaces <i>Lesley Davis – Planning Policy officer has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	i. A separate paper could be provided (to save making the NP too long), as more evidence is required to show how the proposed sites meet the high threshold for designation as Local Green Space; particularly around the special qualities: beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, richness of wildlife.	i. Noted ii. Thank you! iii. Noted iv. Noted v. This is an important part of the criteria for the MiMNPSG	i. Additional information added ii. advice taken from Mark Harrison (CDC) iii. No action taken iv. Meeting between Mark Harrison (CDC) & SG 07/11/2025 to discuss all LGS designations v. No action taken

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Cotswold District Council can support the production of this with methodologies, templates and advice. iii. Unable to support or resist designation of any of the proposed Local Green Spaces until more understanding of their qualities is brought forward. iv. Cotswold District Council to cooperate on Local Green Space prior to next consultation. v. Criterion (b) not required as all other relevant policies in the development framework would still apply? 		
16	<p>Non-designated Heritage Assets</p> <p><i>Danielle Berry – Natural, Built and Historic Environment Team Manager was consulted but opted to defer response to NP Officer Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Could remove criteria (b) and (c) as already set out in Local Plan Policy EN12. Neighbourhood Plans generally just identify which Non designated Heritage Assets apply to the Local Plan policy. ii. Criterion (c) should be more specific on the types of development e.g. changes of use with no physical alterations could apply to this policy as written. iii. A list of Non-designated Heritage Assets is provided in Appendix D but there is no justification/ evidence for each. iv. Cotswold District Council can support the production of this with methodologies, templates and advice. v. There is also a list of historic assets starting on page 71 of the Neighbourhood Plan document – can these be consolidated to one list? Listed buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noted ii. Noted iii. Noted iv. Noted v. Noted vi. Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. BP (B) & (C) removed & evidence referring to Local Plan & NPPF added ii. BP C removed. iii. No action taken iv. As above v. As above

	<i>comments embedded.</i>	do not need to be included as they have protection at a national level.		
17	Biodiversity <i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Policy numbering/ lettering needs reordering. ii. Generally supportive of this policy, but criteria could be streamlined, duplicate wording in many places. iii. Criterion (f) are any Biodiversity Opportunity Areas proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan or exist in the parish? Parts that are replicating Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) should be removed. iv. Criterion (h) other relevant policies in the development framework will apply regardless. v. Criterion (g) how would an applicant “ensure the viability of the surrounding Cotswold National Landscape”? Refers to both SLA and CNL in the same sentence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noted ii. Noted iii. No Biodiversity Opportunity Areas identified within the Parish. iv. MiMNPSG would like to keep this in. v. By producing reports showing how the surrounding CNL has been considered. SLA & CNL are equally important to the MiMNPSG, which is why they are both mentioned in the policy wording. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Numbering/lettering amended ii. Reword BP (f) (see below) iii. Reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas removed from BP (F). iv. No action taken v. No action taken
18	Important Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The policy text refers to Protected Views, whereas the policy title is Important Views. Suggest the use of Important or Key Views, as difficult to “protect” views in the English planning system. ii. Criterion (c) is too strong. See this adopted wording from Hauxley Neighbourhood Plan (Sep 2024): Development proposals throughout the Neighbourhood Area must be sensitive to the importance of maintaining key views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noted ii. Noted iii-iv MiMNPSG has reviewed and refined all Important Views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Amend policy wording to refer to Important Views ii. Amend BP (c) wording ‘Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on a Protected View will not be supported. <i>Development proposals throughout the Neighbourhood Area must be sensitive to the importance of maintaining key views.</i> The objective of this policy is to ensure that the

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Better where possible to consider how design policies on specific streets/buildings could be used to maintain the built form in a way that protects the key views in regards streetscape. iv. Or in more open settings, could a view form part of a Local Green Space or Protected Open Space designation, which would give stronger protection. v. For example, in Appendix D View #8 Western Entrance to Town Centre ... “demonstrating how important the trees and grass verges are”. Perhaps better to protect those verges and trees as Local Green Space, in turn protecting the view. 		<p>town maintains its links to the surrounding countryside which is important to its residents.</p> <p>iii-iv Important Views list condensed</p>
19	<p>Development Boundary</p> <p><i>Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The policy does not appear to alter the Development Boundary already set out in the Local Plan. ii. Criterion (b) is not positively worded and does not support the principle of sustainable development, suggest removing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The policy is not altering the development boundary; it is identifying it for the purpose of the policy. ii. Moreton on Marsh has accepted a lot of development and want to acknowledge this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. No action taken ii. BP (B) reworded: Additional development which would result in Moreton-in-Marsh growing by significantly more than the minimum number of dwellings required by the Cotswold District Local Plan over this period, will not be supported ‘Development within the development boundary which delivers the number of dwellings required by the Cotswold District Local Plan will be supported’
20	<p>Transport & Active Travel</p> <p><i>Sarah Williams – Principal</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Criterion (a) is compatible with the additional parking requirements of Policy 6, by taking parked cars off the street and making streets more accessible for non-car users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noted ii. Noted iii. Noted iv. Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. No action taken ii. BP (B) wording added: ‘Larger residential schemes (100 dwellings or more) should promote non-car use.’

	<p><i>Transport Planner at Gloucestershire County Council has been consulted on this policy and comments embedded. Harrison Bowley – Head of Planning Services was consulted on this policy and comments embedded.</i></p>	<p>ii. Criterion (b) clarification on what constitutes a larger residential scheme is required.</p> <p>iii. The numbered list in part (d) are the core design principles from the Cycle Infrastructure Guidance LTN1/20 However, 3 is Coherence and 5 is Comfort. This is also referenced by Active Travel England. 6 is superfluous and protection of trees/hedgerows are elsewhere both in the plan and the Local Plan.</p> <p>iv. Criterion (e) should also refer to the Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which has a corridor running north from Stow-on-the Wold to Moreton train station. Also, replace Ways with Network please.</p>		<p>iii. BP (C,6) removed</p> <p>iv. 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 <i>the Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and National Cycle Network Ways.</i>’</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Additional Amendments to Neighbourhood Plan

Reference	Amendment
Plan period	Amended from 2017-2031 to 2017-2043 as per recommendation from Mark Harrison, CDC
Policy 15-Local Green Space	LGS renumbered & maps amended for clarity
Policy 18-Important Views	Number of Important Views reduced from 40 to 12
Policy 13-Retail Provision	Objective 9 added to policy
Para 102, Pg 57	Sentence added at beginning of BP to explain development boundary: ‘Policy DS2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan defines a Development Boundary around the town, within which development will be permissible in principle’
Pg 26: Housing Allocations in Cotswold Local Plan	Wording added: <i>Note: The Cotswold District Local Plan Update Consultation¹ Moreton-in-Marsh is identified as a potential strategic growth area with a suggestion of 1,500 additional homes by 2041.</i>
References to Areas of Outstanding Beauty (AONB)	References amended to the Cotswold National Landscape to reflect National rebranding of AONB’s

¹ [Folder: Local Plan Update Consultation | Cotswold District Council](#)

