

Mr Geoff Tappern Support	Design Guide well produced and informative. To make certain that the information that is in the Design Guide is incorporated in new developments including those in the "pipeline", and in additions/upgrades to existing properties is a challenge. CDC planning section must be made aware of this document and work to it.
Mr Andrew Scarth Support	The new Design Guidance document is a very good piece of work. It has taken the old 1995 document and updated it for the 21st century. It should be shown to all developers and householders seeking to extend or modify their houses. The Plan itself has been amended slightly taking into account the comments and representations made on the first consultation and is now even better than the first.
Mr Nigel Head Support	
Mr Michael Bruce Support	Supported without reservation.
Mrs Christine Bruce Support	Congratulations on this excellent submission.

---

Mrs Sally Scarth Support	The Design Guidance and Codes document is an excellent, professional, well laid out document which has updated the old 1995 Design in Down Ampney. It is hoped that all future developments will respect and use the recommendations.
-----------------------------	---

---

Mrs Anna Tappern Support	A good clear vision for the future of our village. Now expect developers and CDC to support our vision.
-----------------------------	---

---

Mr Peter Armitage Support	No further comments.
------------------------------	----------------------

---

Mrs Liz Armitage Support	No additional comments.
-----------------------------	-------------------------

---

Councillor Brian Phillips Support	A clear policy, in conjunction with Highways , needs to be developed for parking at existing housing .. it should not be a Permitted Development decision for residents to knock down existing Cotswold walls and hedges and use their front gardens for parking
--------------------------------------	--

---

Mr Antony Matthews Support Organisation: Parish Councillor	As commented upon for the First Regulation, and at greater length, I consider this Second document is also a very thorough and detailed publication. I endorse it without hesitation.
---	---

---

John Allan Support	I am very happy with this latest version of the plan, especially the clear recognition and desire to maintain the meadow opposite the village hall entrance as a green space. This plan is a great piece of work and I congratulate the team for putting it together.
-----------------------	--

---

<p>MR Gareth Cope Support</p>	<p>What the revised amendments are trying to achieve, in particular the Design Code is to ensure that Down Ampney as a whole has set of standards that can be used and applied for all future activities in and around the village. In particular, ensuring that if we are to receive more housing that it caters and is sympathetic to the history of the village, not creating the same issues faced by North Swindon and Cirencester - in particular with regards to parking and that due consideration is given and greater protection for what is already an overdeveloped Village.</p> <p>I support the aims of having diverse building but maintaining the Cotswold Character that people love about Down Ampney, 60s/70s reconstitution stone should not be used and if building does take place on the main high street then parking should be set back far enough to cater for it.</p> <p>Many housing development use Cotswold stone walls and it creates a certain character for the village.</p> <p>During and after COVID, Down Ampney has become a haven for walkers and cyclist with many children playing on quiet lanes which are currently safe. we need to ensure that we protect these areas and not use them as an excuse to allow CDC and Developers to build on.</p> <p>The density of any development has to reduce as it comes to the edge of settlement and not increase as has happened with the proposed Dukes Field development.</p> <p>I agree with everything included in the Design Code.</p>
-----------------------------------	--

Mr. Chris Fleming Support with Change Organisation: McLoughlin Planning Ltd	<p>McLoughlin Planning is providing comment on the consultation on behalf of Cotswold Homes. As the comment system does not allow for the uploading of written feedback in a separate document, our statement has been sent directly to the Parish Council's email address.</p> <p>Confirmation that our comments have been received would be much appreciated.</p>
--	---

---

<p>Oliver Nichol Support</p>	<p>I fully support the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan. This is a high quality professional document that has done an excellent job of taking account of villagers views from the survey. It provides a clear framework for future development and priorities, and I am delighted that Down Ampney residents are being given the opportunity for their views to be “taken into account by the local planning authority, Cotswold District Council, and given the same weight as the Cotswold Local Plan.”</p> <p>In particular I fully support these recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• LP2 – designation as Local Green Space of Millenium field opposite the school. This would be an excellent outcome for this space, particularly given the recent rejection of the application for planning permission to develop this space. This would greatly help to maintain the rural character of the village.</li><li>• 5.3 Surface water drainage – from the amount of flooding in nearly 20 years we have lived in Down Ampney, it is a clear that effective maintenance of drainage ditches and pipes by landowners is crucial for avoiding further flooding to village properties in future. In addition, any new developments must have adequate soakaways and drainage that take account of the heavier storms likely with climate challenge</li><li>• 5.4 Foul drainage – it is clear that the sewage system is totally inadequate for the number of houses in the area. The deterioration of Down Ampney Brook due to regular overflow from Ampney St Peter sewage works and the regular pumping of sewage into trucks at the western end of Down Ampney provide ample evidence of this. This situation will only get worse with additional development, therefore the necessary increase in sewage capacity must be provided before further development is permitted.</li><li>• 6.5.4 Footpaths and cycle routes – as a regular user of both, I support the proposal for further improved maintenance and additional footpaths and bridleways especially circular</li><li>• 8.9.3 Green infrastructure - I support the proposals for enhancement of green infrastructure around the village. This is very appropriate for a village in a rural location, especially with the amount of development that's happened in the last 20 years and the significant additional development already in construction or proposed.</li></ul>
----------------------------------	---

<p>Mr Andrew Higson Support with Change</p>	<p>1) I am fully supportive of the plan however I feel an important element of "Infrastructure" could do with enhancement. This is in regard to footpaths; specifically lack of roadside footpaths and /or their condition. Today, following the C19 Pandemic the road traffic flow through the village seems to have increased markedly in volume, timespan each day, number and size of lorries and, particularly speed and danger presented to pedestrians and cyclists. This remains a significant risk through the village.</p> <p>2) The potential introduction of a 20 mph limit and speed deterrent devices may mitigate some of this risk however this remains to be achieved and demonstrated. In the meantime there is a clear lack of amenity and safety at either end of the village settlement boundary on the main road where it is necessary to "run the gauntlet" when walking the short sections necessary to reach:</p> <p>a) The Ampney Brook Bridge and beyond from the Meeting Cross to the two PRW, one turning North to Home Farm on Ermin St and the second turning South to Latton.</p> <p>b) From the Poulton turn at Linden Lea east past Rooktree Farm and beyond to the Marston Meysey turning and routes beyond; Castle Hill Farm included.</p> <p>Both stretches of road are intrinsic to being able to achieve circular routes and safety and amenity are currently almost completely lacking due to lack of pavement, damaged gully carriageway, proximity to deep drainage ditches and speeding traffic on roads which incorporate bends and obstructed views. The route beyond the first bridge after the Meeting Cross also has an "unlimited" speed limit.</p> <p>3) In respect of the foundations for the above comments a further point about the responses to the village questionnaire on Infrastructure, Section 6.5.3. also needs qualifying. The results showed a response of 68% Yes vs 26% No when questioned about sufficient access to the countryside. The reality is that we already live in a small village in the middle of the countryside and from where we live are able to stand in the countryside, in many cases on a public footpath with countryside views by moving at most 100 m. Accordingly some respondents may have answered this question from that perspective, others, due to overwhelming need to drive or cycle anywhere significant in the district, may have answered from a different perspective. This response may therefore not be an accurate reflection of some people's views w.r.t. Access to the Countryside. The fact that 18 out of 59% ticked Lack of Circular Footpaths and 13 of 59% ticked State of Condition of Paths may also be an underestimate for the same reasons of perspective.</p>
---	---

	<p>4) It should be noted that some of the existing roadside footpaths through the centre of the village are inadequate and deserve mentioning. This is particularly noteworthy where the road runs from the Charlham Lane turning to the Meeting Cross on the LHS where the pathway is very narrow, in place overstepped by stone walls and a risk to pedestrians, blind persons with assistance dogs and young mothers with push chairs due to speeding traffic on the inside of the bend and attempting to exit the village.</p> <p>5) Accordingly, if an opportunity to reinforce and further justify Recommendation IR1 and particularly Recommendation CR1 in respect of Objectives LO3e) and IO1a) and CO2 is possible to reflect the above observations, I believe this would increase the value of the DANP.</p> <p>Respectfully Andrew J Higson MSc. C.Eng. C. Mar. Eng, MIMarEST</p>
--	--

---

Mr Ray Jenkins Support	I would like to add my total support to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, in particular the reference to sewage matters, design implications for any new development within the Parish Boundary and include traffic control through the village.
---------------------------	---

---

Mr Mark Wiliams Support	
----------------------------	--

---

Mrs Linda Williams Support	
-------------------------------	--

---