

<p>Mrs Ann Higson Support</p>	<p>I support this plan in full but would offer the following comment:</p> <p>With regard to the provision of additional footpaths and cycle, reference Policy C02, it would be useful to illustrate primary examples of these. This should include the need to ensure better connection of footpaths and cycle paths with adjacent parishes in order to improve the circularity of routes available (including for traffic safety reasons) . A good example to include would be, the provision of footpaths/ footway & cycleway at both ends of the village, in particular, a) from the Poulton Road junction of Down Ampney Road to a point east concluding at the Marston Meysey turning beyond the dangerous bends bounding Rooktree Farm and b) from the junction of Church Lane with the Down Ampney Road, west along Down Ampney Road and the dangerous bends and bridges to a point where the bridleway crosses North-South, from Manor Farm to Latton (both in Wiltshire). Item b) would offer the additional benefit of reducing the extreme danger that the “blind-bend” nature of Down Ampney Brook bridge presents to pedestrians and cyclist alike if a dedicated footbridge linked the footways.</p>
-----------------------------------	---

<p>Mr Andrew Higson Support</p>	<p>I fully support the DANP as published and, in particular, the objective of maintaining a small rural village location for local people; especially those families that live and work locally and local key workers. It is important that any social housing is appropriate and spaciouly located in the the style defined by all extant Down Ampney Design documents. For any future additional development the adequacy of surface and foul drainage must be fully assured before occupancy is commenced AND measures taken to reduce average road speeds within a 20 mph limit. Maintenance of the village green spaces and vistas must also be assured to avoid any further encroachment on the beauty and visual amenity of the village; especially at its centre. Andrew Higson MSc C.Eng C.Mar. Eng. MIMarEST</p>
-------------------------------------	--

Mr Nigel Head Support	Well considered plan.
--------------------------	-----------------------

Mrs Elizabeth Bellamy Support	Excellent plan and proposals
----------------------------------	------------------------------

Mr David Reinger Support	<p>I would fully support the DANP, which is an extremely comprehensive and well researched document. In particular I support all of the objectives, policies and recommendations listed in summary 8 contained in pages 53, 54,55 & 56. I would comment specifically that objective L.02. is extremely important and the open nature of the centre of the village played a big part in our selection of it as place to live. It follows that I would fully support policy LP2 page 19 in order to preserve the essential character of Down Ampney by the proposed local green space designations. I would also wish to specifically support policy IP2. Thames Water's illegal dumping of sewage into the Ampney Brook , 2316 hours in 2020, is disgraceful. My understanding is that planned increase in capacity at Ampney St Peter may not be completed until the end of 2025 and is still in the design stage. It is not at all clear whether the planned upgrade will deal with the pollution issues, which in the meantime will continue particularly when the water table is high. Given the works is currently serving a population equivalent of twice its current capacity it is difficult to believe that planning officers will continue to grant permissions in Down Ampney that compound and exacerbate this continued pollution by Thames Water. Policy IP2 is an essential requirement and should be adopted by Cotswold District Council with immediate effect. Policies IP1 & IP3 are also specifically supported.</p> <p>In conclusion, I would hope that recommendation HR1, page 56 is fully considered and implemented by all parties involved in this process.</p>
-----------------------------	---

Mr Christian Campbell Support	I particularly support policies LP2, HP2 and HP5. At Paragraph 2.3 I oppose any further development, but should it happen, it must conform with the Down Ampney Design Guide.
----------------------------------	---

Mrs Julia Campbell Support	I particularly support policies LP2, HP2 and HP5. At Paragraph 2.3 I oppose any further development, but should it happen, it must conform with the Down Ampney Design Guide.
-------------------------------	---

Mr Michael Bruce Support	Particular support for policies LP2, HP2 and HP5. In addition, support Para 2.3 of Appendix 1.
-----------------------------	--

Mr Andrew Scarth Support	<p>I fully support all the Policies and Recommendations within the Plan. In particular I highlight the following: Down Ampney is a rural village with its roots in agriculture. Fields do penetrate into the heart of the village. To maintain and protect this character, Green Space within and close to the village must be designated. I fully support Policies LP1 and LP2.</p> <p>Some recent developments, for example, Linden Lea, have no public green areas incorporated. In addition to Green Space, any new development must incorporate green infrastructure and the housing density must not be more than the average existing village density. Consequently, I support Policies HP5 and HP2 and back the sentiments of paragraph 2.3 in Appendix 1 – the Down Ampney Design Guide.</p> <p>Infrastructure has not kept pace with developments within the village.</p> <p>a) Localised flooding is a problem in several areas and is likely to increase with the increasing storminess associated with climate change. Following Policies IP1 and IP3 is vital in mitigating this risk. Recommendation IR3 is also important.</p> <p>b) The sewerage system is becoming overloaded not just within the village but in the area sewage treatment works at Ampney St Peter. I fully support the provisions in Policy IP2.</p> <p>c) Speeding of vehicles within the village is a problem, not just near the school but also around the bend from Honeysuckle Cottage to Lark's Hey at the eastern end and at the western end from The Red House around the bend to the entry into the Old Estate Yard. Enforcement and traffic calming measures are needed. I endorse Recommendation IR1.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Mr Jonathan Campbell Support Organisation: N/A	<p>I wish to emphasise full support for all proposed aspects in the DA NP. In particular LP2, HP2 and HP5. In respect of Paragraph 2.3 of Appendix 1 – the Down Ampney Design Guide. Whilst I am against block development above 2 residences, I strongly wish that all new development and modifications to existing structures conform to the village design statement, which properly reflects the historical context of DA.</p>
--	---

Mrs Christine Bruce Support	Specifically support LP2, HP2 and HP5. Also Appendix 1, para 2.3
--------------------------------	---

Mr Geoff Tappern Support	<p>General support for all policies but especially:-</p> <p>3.6. Green space is very important as the village increases in the number of dwellings. As developments have been added to the village, e.g. Linden Lea, Broadlease there have been no green space areas incorporated that can be used by residents. Fully support LP1 and LP2. Areas proposed are a minimum required.</p> <p>4.1. Speeding in the village is a problem but is not just in the centre. I cannot understand why the police with a radar gun cannot visit the village say once a month for 30 minutes in random areas.</p> <p>4.3. Local flooding of fields and roads is a problem during heavy rain. Ditches must be maintained better than they are at the moment.</p> <p>4.4. Sewage problems are only going to get worse as more and more developments are added to the village. Fully support IP1, IP2, and IP3.</p> <p>4.7. Fully support recommendations IR1 to IR3.</p> <p>5.4. Fully support CO1, CO2 & 5R1.</p> <p>6.3. Fully support EO1, EO2,</p> <p>6.4. Fully support ER1, & ER2.</p> <p>7.7. The constraints on development listed in 7.7 is well known and until solved any further development must be very limited. Fully support HP1 to HP5 and HR1.</p> <p>8.3. Fully support HR1.</p> <p>Appendix 1. Fully support and encourage the use of Down Ampney Design Guide.</p> <p>Annexe C. Fully support the work done so far on surface water drainage. Must be continued to the boundaries of the parish.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Mr Peter Armitage Support	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan is clearly a comprehensive and well thought out document. As can be seen from the above tick box I support this plan. I have the following comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I agree with both Policies LP1 and LP2 with regards to Identified Key Vistas and Local Green Spaces2. Section 4 on Infrastructure identifies several key areas. Speed through the village has always been a problem and I would support the use of speed cameras. Pedestrian safety is paramount and my view is that the state of the pavements is inadequate. Public Transport should be available as an alternative to car usage and linked to affordable housing. Surface water drainage in the village is inadequate especially Millennium Field which regularly accumulates surface water. The Foul drainage is appalling. I fully support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3,3. As to section 5 Community and Leisure, the Current Community and Leisure facilities need to be supported as do the footpaths and cycle ways.4. I am unsure whether EO1 policy would enhance the village.5. If the village is to remain a " rural village" the population growth should be more akin to the Gloucestershire and English average than the 3.4% seen in the last 20 years.
------------------------------	---

Mrs Fiona Jesson Support	<p>It is an excellent document - thank you to all that have worked so hard on it's development. I confirm that I support the principles and objectives therein.</p>
-----------------------------	---

Miss Emily Campbell Support	
--------------------------------	--

Mr Peter Baillie Support	<p>DA is a very linear village, not being designed around any central 'focus' area, and as it grows, it could become very urbanised without retaining green spaces.</p> <p>I therefore strongly support policies LP1 & LP2</p> <p>I support the need for more public transport (101b) to encourage people out of cars,</p> <p>Drainage is clearly unsatisfactory, judging by the flooding and pumping that occurs, so I support objectives IP1, IP2 & IP3.</p> <p>I accept the need for DA to include a share of new housing demand, but it must be appropriately sited and designed, and to meet local needs.</p> <p>I support policies HP1 to HP5.</p>
-----------------------------	--

Mr Paul Norris Support Organisation: Finance / Insurance sector	<p>I am broadly supportive of the village plan and thank everyone across the village for all their effort and hard work in bringing what is a challenging document together. I believe there is a carefully struck balance between retaining the heart of the village and its current values and culture with the need to support a growing population and changing demographic as we move through the 21st century. Thanks. Paul</p>
--	---

MS Helen Wright Support	
----------------------------	--

Mr John Allan Support	<p>I strongly support the proposals documented within this draft plan and how they will benefit the long term evolution of the village whilst also maintaining its character as a pleasant rural community.</p> <p>In particular I very much welcome the concept of identifying and protecting green spaces within the village (in policies LP1 & 2) to ensure the 'open feel' is maintained and natural spaces are available to enhance the wellbeing of the inhabitants. Open green spaces in numbers 1 & 2, and open accessible woodland in numbers 3a & b. I am particularly concerned that area 1 in the centre of the village could be lost as it falls within the current settlement boundary.</p> <p>Additionally regarding footpaths, I would like to see a specific recommendation about new circular walks being established around the airfield after the planned gravel extraction is completed – perhaps added to the example in appendix 3. This is proposed in the airfield quarry planning application (drawing no. 21_0032_CWMAJM_PLN_215_V1.0) and it might be nice to “lock it in” the DA plan.</p>
--------------------------	---

Mr John Dangerfield Support	<p>I support the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Policy LP1 and LP24.1 roads4.2 Public transport4.3 Surface water drainage4.4 Foul drainage and support policies IP1, IP2 & IP35.4 Footpaths and cycle routes and support CO1 & CO27.3.2 Population growth7.4 Housing density7.6 Housing needs7.7 Constraints on development and support policies HP1 to HP5 <p>A lot of hours and work has gone into this plan - well done</p>
--------------------------------	---

Mrs Karen Dangerfield Support	<p>Having read the Development Plan at some length, I support the following:</p> <p>Policy LP1 and LP2</p> <p>4.1 roads</p> <p>4.2 Public transport</p> <p>4.3 Surface water drainage</p> <p>4.4 Foul drainage and support policies IP1, IP2 & IP3</p> <p>5.4 Footpaths and cycle routes and support CO1 & CO2</p> <p>7.3.2 Population growth</p> <p>7.4 Housing density</p> <p>7.6 Housing needs</p> <p>7.7 Constraints on development and support policies HP1 to HP5</p> <p>May I say this is a very comprehensive and well thought out plan which hopefully will safeguard and guide our village and its future</p>
----------------------------------	---

Mr Antony Matthews Support Organisation: Down Ampney Parish Council	<p>I commend those who have contributed to this thorough plan and I give it my wholehearted approval. In summary, I give particular endorsement to the Design Guide Appendix 1 para 2.3 related to housing density and the following policies:</p> <p>LP1 and LP2 on Green Spaces; IP1, IP2 and IP3 on surface water and drainage; objectives CO1 and CO2; the development constraints and associated policies HP1, HP2, HP3, HP4 and HP5.</p>
--	--

Mrs Anna Tappern Support	Green open spaces and buffer zones for walking and wildlife are very important. I fully support LP1 & LP2. There have been several periods of flooding in the Broadway Farm field, and many other areas in the village. Surface water ditches must be properly maintained. Sewage discharges into Ampney Brook must stop. CDC must stop giving building permission until this issue has been solved. Down Ampney has taken more than its fair share of affordable housing.
-----------------------------	--

Mr and Mrs Ian and Elaine Eddy Support	We support Policy LP1LP2 We support Policy IP1 IP2 and IP3 We would prefer that apart from the housing development already approved no further development takes place in the village.If further houses are built we support HP1 HP2 HP3 HP4 and HP5 we support IR1 IR2 and IR3.
--	---

<p>Mrs Sally Scarth Support</p>	<p>I am in complete agreement with all the Policies and Recommendations contained in this important Plan. In particular, I highlight the following areas.</p> <p>Down Ampney is a small village with a long history of rural connections. Agricultural fields surround and in some notable areas come into the village. To maintain and protect this character, Green Space within and close to the village must be designated. I fully support Policies LP1 and LP2.</p> <p>To protect the open aspects and rural ambience of the village, to allow public access, and to maintain wildlife corridors any new development must incorporate green infrastructure. A small village has a much lower density than a town or urban setting. I support Policies HP5 and HP2 and back the ideas of paragraph 2.3 in Appendix 1 – the Down Ampney Design Guide.</p> <p>The many housing developments within the village over the last twenty years have outstripped improvements in the infrastructure.</p> <p>The Environment Select Committee has just reported on the poor state of the UK’s rivers. Ampney Brook, an important feature close to the village, is no exception. It is essential that Policy IP2 is followed to prevent these problems getting worse with more development.</p> <p>There are a few areas within the village where some flooding has occurred. With climate change this is very likely to increase. Policies IP1 and IP3 are vital in mitigating this risk.</p> <p>Traffic volume and particularly speed is a real problem through the village. This is not just the main road past the school but at either end and into the village from Poulton. Traffic calming measures and effective enforcement are badly needed. I endorse Recommendation IR1.</p>
-------------------------------------	--

Mr Malcolm Bevan Support	In my opinion the village has been developed to its maximum capacity. I support the village retaining the local green spaces mentioned to preserve the integrity of the village.
-----------------------------	---

Mrs Deborah Chesworth Support	I particularly support the policies where the residents comments made at meetings and via questionnaires have been supported and in particular the local green spaces being retained
----------------------------------	--

Mr Clive Stocken Support	
-----------------------------	--

Ms Elaine Cooper Support	
-----------------------------	--

<p>Dr Mike Freeman Support</p>	<p>This is an outstanding, professionally presented Plan that provides a clear and robust framework for the future of the village. Those who have inputted should be congratulated for their efforts.</p> <p>I support the Plan and all its recommendations. The Vision set out on Page iii is well articulated as is the village's rich history which provides essential context.</p> <p>In particular, I fully support the objectives & recommendations to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Preserve the character of Down Ampney through the preservation, protection and enhancement of the green spaces and open aspects within the village, the use of vernacular building styles and a sympathetic density of development (LO1, HO2 and implicit in L01)2. Development proposals should take account of the identified key vistas (LP1)3. The designation of the areas in Figure 3.7 as Local Green Spaces (LP2)4. The need to reduce speeding traffic through the village (IR1)5. The need to improve the quality of footpaths (I01a / CO2)6. The need for improved maintenance of existing drainage ditches (IR3)7. The need to stop discharge of sewage into Ampney Brook (IP2 and implicit in I01e) <p>I wonder whether the issue of housing density could be more explicitly incorporated into the recommendations. I would also suggest that, whilst not a planning matter as accepted by section 5.6, alongside the recommendation (5R1) to encourage landowners to create more permissive footpaths and bridleways. there continues to be engagement with existing landowners to undertake more maintenance of some of their land. In particular, the land shown as 3b shown in Figure 3.7 is a valuable asset to the village but has been left to become overgrown and unkempt in the last few years.</p>
<p>Mr David Gardner Support</p>	<p>I should like my support for policies LP2, HP2, HP5 and the aspect of housing density covered in the Down Ampney Design Guide to be noted in particular</p>

Mrs Sian Gardner Support	In particular I should like my support for policies LP2, HP2, HP5 and the aspect of housing density covered in the Down Ampney Design Guide to be noted. Thank you.
-----------------------------	---

Mrs Linda Matthews Support Organisation: -	In particular, I endorse LP1 and LP2. Green space within the village is very important.
--	---

Mr Peter Sillett Support	
-----------------------------	--

Mr Michael Mills Support	I support the L p1 Lp2 There is a problem with water surface drainage in lots of the village after heavy rain ,
-----------------------------	--

Mrs Rosemary Houston Support	I support LP1 & LP2 4.3 4.1 4.2 5.4
---------------------------------	--

Mrs Susan Mills Support	I totally agree with the support of support LP1 LP2 green spaces are so important to us as individuals and as a village , also the water is really bad at Broadleaze , I understand houses need to be built but , we have had our fair share as a village.
----------------------------	--

Helen Baillie Support	<p>I support the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Down Ampney is a friendly rural Cotswold village. It enjoys lovely countryside but has very little green space within the centre of the village.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the three issues that I consider most important for the village: the importance of maintaining the existing green space in the centre of the village; the lack of green transport alternatives to car usage ie very poor public transport and inadequate recognition of the needs of cyclists; poor drainage and sewerage serving the village.</p>
--------------------------	---

Mr Gareth Cope Support	I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan - it clearly lays out the needs of the Village, what issues are important to the residents and will deliver a significant improvement over the coming years. In particular, the Village Needs more Local Green Space as laid out in LP1 and LP2 under Paragraph 3.6 of the Plan, the preservation of cycle routes and footpaths as described in paragraph 5.4 and finally the Housing Density maintained for any future development. We are a rural location with no employment, public services and minimal facilities.
---------------------------	---

Mrs Edyta Winkler-Cope Support	I fully support the Down Ampney Neighbourhood plan, in particular the call for more Green Space, less housing density and for Thames Water to invest in resolving the issues around sewage and drainage.
-----------------------------------	--

Mrs Marilyn Robson Support	<p>Roads: The speed limit through the village is 30, this is too high, it is hazardous to cross the road at any point through the middle of the village. Particularly by the war Memorial.</p> <p>Footpaths: There are too few footpaths and those there are are not well maintained.</p> <p>Population and Housing: We have lived in this village for 42 years, we moved here because it was a farming village, rural and small enough to know the neighbours. It has doubled in size and become a suburban village with commuters to London and Swindon, consequently far more traffic through the village and little community spirit left. The character of the village has changed and with more development will just get worse.</p> <p>Could I add that there are fewer children in the village now than in the 1980's and 90's. No children in The Pheantry or The old Estate Yard or Suffolk Place etc.etc. The village does not need large 4/5 bedroom houses that families cannot afford, if we must have development it should be small areas of semidetached houses for families and downsizers.</p>
-------------------------------	---

Mr Tom Newton Support	This is a well structured and articulate document that outlines the vision of the residents of Down Ampney. I support it in full. In terms of governance and execution, I noted that the village falls outside the Cotswold AONB. I am sure that this has been considered but if we were able to change this, would this facilitate our vision to be realised?
--------------------------	--

Mrs Lynne Reinger Support	I fully support the policies, aims and aspirations of this comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan, in particular I support LP1 and LP2. Green space within the village is one of the reasons we came to live in Down Ampney. I support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3 on surface water and sewage. Also support 7.4 Housing Density. Down Ampney is a rural village and its inhabitants want it to remain as one.
------------------------------	--

<p>Mrs Avril Swainsbury Support</p>	<p>Overall the presented plan reflects my views on how our village can grow and evolve over time with a good balance of expansion and necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>My particular concerns for safeguarding the essence of the village over and above the general design as set out is over development and the strain that will place on utilities and health. It seems nothing is sacred when it comes to commercial opportunities. We understand the need for more housing but the march for development is relentless and could overwhelm us.</p> <p>Open spaces are an important part of the plan and we have noticed barriers appearing on public footpaths especially over the last 2 years, there seems to be an over zealous creep of land grab whether it be for house building or access to public paths and open spaces.</p> <p>We have personal experience of blocked drains and foul smells through no fault of our own so the safeguards as set out are crucial to avoid disastrous results from ignoring these points.</p> <p>Traffic is becoming more and more of an issue and since the survey have become even more pressing.</p> <p>I fully support the plan and hope it will be successful</p>
---	--

Anne Jenkins Support	<p>I whole-heartedly support the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan, and in particular with the following comments</p> <p>3.6 Green space within and around the village: essential for our wellbeing, they bring feelings of pleasure and calm and fulfil our need to live in a rural village. Support policies LP1 and LP2.</p> <p>4.1-4.4 Roads, surface and foul drainage: we know the problems we have with flooding and an antiquated drainage system. The road outside our home floods badly, the water has been known to cover the whole road and footpaths with prolonged or heavy rain. We have personally suffered a raw sewage flood on our property when the drainage system blocked, high pressure was used to unblock, and it blew the top off a manhole cover in our garden. Support policies IP1, IP2, IP3</p> <p>5.4 Footpaths & cycle routes: post Covid, the local population is continuing walking and cycling more than they used to. Essential to maintain this outdoor exercise for the general health of us all. Support objectives CO1 & CO2</p> <p>7.3.2-7.7. New housing and development: I feel that Down Ampney has enough projected growth of new housing. I know that we are considered to be a "sustainable settlement", however we have very little infrastructure to support further development. Any further development must be curbed, and existing projected development should be kept to a small scale. Electric car charging points, green heating methods, grey water tanks, full insulation should be mandatory for all new developments. All new building should be in a sympathetic style to the vernacular of this village to maintain its character and individuality (very important), there are too many new-builds by developers which are bland and oh so boring. Support policies HP1 to HP5</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan produced by Down Ampney is a very important and excellent document which should be used as a template by all small villages! I take this opportunity of congratulating the authors and hope that CDC will take full note of all the work by the Steering Group and their support by the people of this village.</p>
-------------------------	--

Mr. Darrell Warner Support	<p>I fully support all the policies and recommendations within the plan. It must be acknowledged that Down Ampney is a rural village , whereupon arable pasture both sits and penetrates the village boundaries maintaining the sense of open 'Green' space, thus promoting a sense of well being for residents.</p> <p>Therefore policies LP1 and LP2 alongside HP5 and HP2 married with the sentiments of Paragraph 2.3 in Appendix 1 should not only be maintained and enforced but are vital in retaining the heart and soul of the village.</p>
Mrs Elizabeth Frost Support	<p>I support the plan overall.</p> <p>In particular I feel strongly that the prerequisite for any development must be the improvement of the existing infrastructure. The drainage system is barely adequate for the existing village. I would support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3 linked to policies HP1 and HP5.</p> <p>Down Ampney is a rural village not a dormitory suburb and as such it is important to keep the number and size of any development in proportion and to maintain green spaces within the village as outlined in policies LP1 and LP2.</p> <p>Being a daily user of footpaths in and around the village I would support objects gives CO1 and CO2.</p>
Mrs Victoria Hunter Support	<p>It is essential we retain the integrity of this country village. The new housing additions have not been in keeping with the Plan and definitely jar when you come into the village. Tetbury is a good example of how they have expanded but the stone used and the style of housing has remained sympathetic to the town.</p> <p>The creation and protection of green spaces is essential, to ensure the nature of the village and its surroundings isn't changed, and that all of the necessary housing needs, drainage, facilities are created sympathetically.</p>

Mrs Elizabeth Armitage Support	An excellent document which I fully support. In particular LP1 and LP2. Support traffic calming measures which need to include lower speed limit, ie 20mph. Additionally surface water and sewage discharges should be given high priority. There is clearly a need to improve the quality of the footpaths.
MR Geoffrey Bull Support	4.3 & 4.4 Drainage may be unglamorous but attention here is vital. 3.6 LP1 & LP2 reflect on 7.3.2 , 7.4 and 7.6. There is already more than enough envisaged in current planning permissions and applications to cover natural growth. Local employment opportunities (and other facilities) probably do not support any real increase in local population beyond (if indeed at) natural growth levels.
James Swainsbury Support	Very detailed and easy to understand. Will support fully.
Mr Brian Phillips Support, Support with Change	A very comprehensive and well thought through plan. Whilst this gives us a platform to resist future development we found that in Cricklade who also had a well developed Neighbourhood Plan that Wiltshire CC just overrode it - I hope CDC don't do the same ! With regard to local facilities we need to push for better telecoms- local reception is awful- where is the nearest mast ? An extensive local off road cycling route would be beneficial. The numerous cyclists who pour through the village are a hazard and an accident waiting to happen

Mr Rupert Hunter Support	<p>In broad terms, I am very supportive of the DANP.</p> <p>Specifically, I support LP1 and LP2 in relation to Green Space within the village.</p> <p>I also agree that the volume and speed of traffic through the village needs to be addressed, with appropriate speed limiting solutions adopted as recommended in the plan. Ideally, consideration would be given to reducing the significant volume of through traffic through the village to create a safer and more peaceful environment.</p> <p>I am supportive of the objectives outlined in relation to footpaths and cycle paths - CO1 and CO2</p> <p>In relation to constraints on housing development, I am supportive of the policies outlined in HP1 to HP5</p>
-----------------------------	---

Mr Nathan Barnett Support	<p>I broadly support the plan, with particular reference to LP1, LP2, 5R1, HP2 and HP5. The protection of, maintained use of and continued access to those areas noted as key vistas being of particular concern.</p>
------------------------------	---

Emily Meredith Support	<p>Support Green Space LP1 and LP2</p> <p>Strongly support 7.4 housing densities - Down Ampney is a rural village and its inhabitants want it to remain so.</p> <p>Support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3 relating to surface water and sewage</p>
---------------------------	---

Mr Mark Williams Support	
-----------------------------	--

Mr. Robert Poole Support	
-----------------------------	--

Mrs Marcia Poole Support	
-----------------------------	--

Dr Matthew Robson Support	<p>Considering the village plan for Down Ampney, I would like to emphasize the ecosystem services and biodiversity value provided by local green spaces within the village and encourage their conservation rather than infilling with developments. The transitional areas between gardens and farmland area valuable in providing habitat supporting biodiversity and corridors for wildlife.</p> <p>Field margins, hedgerows, and lowland meadows are identified as “priority habitats” for conservation in the UK government’s Biodiversity 2020 Action Plan. Small field’s such as those between housing estates in Down Ampney have high conservation priority because of the patchwork of habitats held within their small areas. These fields are particularly valuable in promoting diversity as a transition zone alongside woodland and hedgerows. Specialist hedgerow-living species, such as hedgehogs and hares (both on the UK endangered species list) and many birds including yellowhammer, marsh tit, and nightingale (also in the endangered species list) which require this habitat. Spring grazing and summer hay-cutting of fields maintains high plant diversity in lowland meadow communities, which are under national and global threat through land-use change. For example Duke’s Field is a relatively unfertile meadow for the area and with underlying clay in places that provides year round marshy area, it supports a disproportionately large diversity of habitat for plant, invertebrate, and animal life, including marsh vegetation. Seasonally-flooded wet hay-meadows if well managed have the potential to nurture rare plant communities, as is the case in the nearby North Meadow in Cricklade, which has National Nature Reserve SSSI Status providing habitat for its <i>Fritillaria meleagris</i> community.</p>
------------------------------	---

Mr Robert Stevens Support	
------------------------------	--

Mrs Lilian Stevens Support	
-------------------------------	--

<p>Mrs Christine Allan Support</p>	<p>Over recent years, particularly the last 20, infilling and new developments in the village have eroded the open green spaces and threatened the unimpeded views across the village. It is important that these are protected for future enjoyment and wellbeing of the residents as proposed in policies LP1 and LP2 which I fully support.</p> <p>With more traffic through the village, speed reduction measures should be given priority to safeguard the growing numbers of pedestrians and cyclists arising from the increasing village population and visitors. Traffic calming has been talked about for years, but easier and cheaper measures such as speed limit reductions are easy given political will. Important roads for lowered speed limits being Church Lane and Oak Road. The intentions outlined in IO1 are important in this regard.</p> <p>Increasing population and development is putting a strain on surface water drainage and sewerage capacity, both which continue to be long standing issues in the village. I strongly support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3 which are aimed at addressing these problems.</p> <p>Walking and cycling are popular past-times in the village for both residents and visitors and I strongly support measures to increase the number of safe places to walk and cycle, especially paths which provide circular walks around the village with minimal need to use roads as part of the routes.</p> <p>I recognise there is a continuous need for additional housing in the Cotswolds and the village should be expected to take a part in accepting new developments, but these should be within areas agreed by the village and not to the detriment of green spaces that the village wants to preserve. Policies LP1 and LP2 are critical in this regard. Furthermore, new parcels of land should be identified to provide future green infrastructure around the village and protected from future development – I support the proposals shown in figure 7.9. Recent developments have generally followed the village design code for appearance but care should also be taken to maintain appropriate housing density and the mix of family and affordable homes. Policies HP1 to 5 address this well.</p> <p>Overall, this is an excellent plan document which I believe reflects the desire to sympathetically develop our village in a controlled and appropriate way – I strongly support this plan.</p>
--	--

Mrs Kate Ringshaw Support	
------------------------------	--

Mr Keith Ringshaw Support	
------------------------------	--

<p>Mr Richard Busby Support</p>	<p>3.6 Green Space: with the amount of planned development in and around the village, there is a real danger of our losing access (both visually and physically) to adequate green spaces. The latest planning application by CWS to develop the field opposite the village school is a prime example of profit over social awareness and real engagement with the community.</p> <p>4.1 Roads: Living on the main road that runs through the village, I am acutely aware of both the speed and the volume of traffic passing through, I would welcome either a reduction in the speed limit through the village to 20mph or, the installation of chicanes. I also believe that with the exception of HGVs and agricultural vehicles that require access, a weight limit of 7.5 tonnes should be sought and implemented.</p> <p>4.3 Surface Water Drainage: There appears to be little or no maintenance of either the road gullies or the ditches around the field and this has undoubtedly contributed to the surface water flooding at either end of the village in periods of heavy rainfall. It has been particularly noted that little evidence exists of local landowners clearing and maintain roadside ditches, that are an important and critical part of the infrastructure designed to disperse surface water</p> <p>4.4 Foul Drainage: It would be nice to have the whole village connected to an adequate and modern main drainage system and no new developments should be allowed to be connected to the existing infrastructure without the aforementioned upgrade. In a modern age, the use of septic tanks should be discouraged.</p> <p>7. Housing and design: Down Ampney is a village and its character and attraction as a place to live can only be maintained with 'sympathetic' development, controlled population growth and a recognition that the infrastructure (particularly sewage) will not support unbridled expansion. The lack of public transport will also dramatically increase the ownership of cars for any planned developments and given the drive to migrate to electric powered cars, every new property must have access to at least one vehicle charging point. If we are to avoid the sight, common on many new developments, of numerous cars being parked on the road due to the lack of adequate parking provision, each new property should have adequate parking for two vehicles.</p> <p>Given the Government's drive to encourage walking and cycling, as both a means of exercise and commuting, every effort should be made to upgrade local footpaths and bridleways to encourage and accommodate such activities.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the lack of local employment dictates that Down Ampney is effectively a commuter village. It would be nice to see the development of business hubs, such as the one in Poulton.</p> <p>Finally, and perhaps a forlorn wish, is for the establishment of a restaurant/public house that would be a social hub for the village, whilst at the same time encouraging visitors and create employment opportunities.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Mr Miles Banks Support	
---------------------------	--

<p>Mr 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">• 3.6 LP1 & LP2 – designation as Local Green Spaces of Millenium field opposite the school, the woodland areas of Scrubs Copse / Oak Wood and behind the Old Estate Yard, and Down Ampney football pitch. Protection of the first 3 areas from development would greatly help to maintain the rural character of the village, and continuity for the football club is an important local amenity for many residents.• 4.3 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• 4.4 Foul drainage – it is clear that the sewage system is already inadequate, the deterioration of Down Ampney Brook and the regular pumping of sewage into trucks at the western end of the village 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• 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• 7. I support the proposals for a mix of housing types, ensuring any new development is appropriate to the rural context, ensuring all new housing takes account of climate change and is environmentally sustainable, and policies HP1 to HP5 on size of dwelling, following CDC design code and Down Ampney design guide, affordable housing and green infrastructure.
-------------------------------------	--

Dr Alison Nichol Support	I fully support Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan. In particular I am strongly in favour of the recommendations for: designation as Local Green Spaces of Millenium field, the two woodland areas and Down Ampney football pitch; the need to properly maintain surface water drainage ditches and pipes to minimise the risk of future flooding; the need to improve the capacity of the sewage system before additional development adds to the problem; improved footpaths and cycle routes; and the need for new housing developments to be appropriate to the rural context of the village, adhere to the design guides, take account of climate change and be environmentally sustainable
-----------------------------	--

Mrs Patricia Kiernan Support	
---------------------------------	--

Mr John Kiernan Support	I completely oppose all additional building in the village. We simply don't have the infrastructure to support extra homes, either above or below ground.
----------------------------	--

<p>Dr Ray Singleton Support</p>	<p>I support all the recommendations and proposed policies in the plan. In particular, LO2 is essential to maintain the rural character of the village. Also, the maximum number of new build houses should be limited to the numbers in the CDC 2011-2031 local plan and these must maintain the character of the village in terms of density and materials of construction. I strongly support HP1-HP5, which address these issues. Some system of traffic calming is essential, particularly in the proximity of the school, before a devastating accident occurs. This may deter some traffic passing through the village thereby improving road safety. The flood risks in the future, exacerbated by climate change, are understated in the document. There is a serious risk of flooding in the village. Existing infrastructure dealing with storm water and sewerage is totally inadequate. Policies IP1, IP2 and IP3 are to be supported as they aim to mitigate these.</p> <p>This is a thoroughly researched document and provides constructive solutions to address the future development of the Down Ampney Neighbourhood.</p>
<p>Mr Keith Cook Support</p>	<p>LP1&LP2 - Strongly agree. Existing green spaces must remain.</p> <p>4.1 - Village used as a 'rat run' Vehicles speed and lorries ignore weight limit. Living near a bend with limited site lines increases dangers for family and myself as near accidents have occurred due to speeding vehicles.</p> <p>4.2 - Usage may not sufficient to support regular bus timetable.</p> <p>4.3 - Ditches need ongoing maintenance to minimize flood risks</p> <p>4.4 - Needs upgrading - cannot fully support use by current households.</p> <p>IP1,IP2,IP3 - Agree proposals made in plan</p> <p>5.4 - Agree, but extra facilities mean extra maintenance costs</p> <p>7.3.2 - Infrastructure definitely needs overall improvement</p> <p>7.3.2 - We are a village and this fact should mean a strict limit of future developments.</p> <p>7.6 - Many residents commute to elsewhere. Do we need more such residents and the increased traffic they will bring?</p> <p>7.7 - Agree with recommendations.</p>

Mrs Isabelle Erskine Support Organisation: n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Maintain green space in village centre, particularly field opposite Down Ampney Village School.- Access to public footpaths, circular walks and woodland access. Encourage wildlife corridors with hedgerows which will benefit wildlife habitats.- Reduce speed and volume of traffic through the village centre.- Introduce a daily bus service to Cirencester/Swindon.- Manage surface/foul water drainage more effectively.- Introduce/encourage local business, e.g. office space for local business, professional services, gardening service/retail, taxi service..etc.- Encourage tourism: introduce pub/small hotel [there is nowhere locally for people to stay when visiting local friends/families if they cannot be accommodated in their houses] or just wish to enjoy the local environment. This would also provide local employment.- Encourage tourism in the village; develop a programme to promote the historical significance of the village, e.g. RVW, All Saints Church, the airfield [RAF & battle of Arnhem], etc.- New housing proposals to take account of limited road access, be in keeping with the rural and historical aspects of the village.
--	---

Mr Christopher Barnes Support	A well thought out plan for the village
----------------------------------	---

Mr Raymond Charman Support	<p>I wish to record my total support for this excellent plan and to offer my sincere congratulations to all members of the Steering Group for their hard work and professionalism in producing this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I am certain that all villagers who have read this Plan in detail, as I have done, will have gained knowledge and insight into the past of the village and it's future needs.</p> <p>Whilst working for the National Health Service I was responsible for some years for Strategic Planning for four Counties . With that background and experience I can support all the objectives to be satisfied and the policies set out, drawn as they have been from thoroughly researched evidence.</p> <p>I commend the Plan in it's entirety. I only wish that The Co-operative Society gave as much consideration to the present and future needs of the village inhabitants instead of merely attempting to maximise financial gain from their land holdings.</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>Mrs Paula Pearce Support</p>	<p>I would firstly like to commend the work of the steering group for putting together a very comprehensive neighbourhood plan in which the vision and areas of concern to the residents are clearly itemized and recommendations made. I am happy to confirm agreement to the overall plan but in particular to the following points:</p> <p>Section 3 Landscape. 3.4.2 Greenspaces & 7.7.1 Green Infrastructure Ref figs 3.7. areas 1,2 3a,3b & 7.9 Support – Objectives to be Satisfied pt 3.5. and Policies to be Followed pt3.6 4 Infrastructure – roads, transport and drainage.</p> <p>With the prospect of further housing developments within the village (ref 7.7).I feel strongly that the surface water and foul water drainage system is in urgent need of attention. In The Old Estate Yard alone there has been the need on more than one occasion to call out Thames Water to deal with mains drainage ‘backup’.</p> <p>Pt 7.3.2 states that: 'With the addition of Duke’s Field extension and Rooktree Farm which are going through planning applications at the present time this will result in a population increase in Down Ampney of approximately 3.4% over 20 years (See Figure 7.3). This compares with Gloucestershire as a whole at 1.35% and England of 1.4%. There has been no improvement in the road system or sewerage infrastructure in spite of the large population increase in the last two decades.'</p> <p>I therefore support the plan as stated at points 4.5. Objectives; 4.6 Policies to be followed and 4.7. Recommendations Surface Water Drainage pt 4.3.</p> <p>With regard to ditches leading into and around the village adequate clearance by local authorities or land owners is sadly lacking.</p> <p>Mrs Paula Pearce</p>
-------------------------------------	---

Mr Peter Mullen Support	<p>This is a helpful, well-prepared Plan. It is balanced and, while perhaps not representing my first preference in all instances (I would prefer no more bungalows but I accept there may be a need for some), I believe it represents the interests of the village.</p> <p>While I support the whole of the plan I would highlight the following for my particular support: LP1 and LP2. I believe it is essential that key vistas and green spaces are protected.</p> <p>IP1, IP2 and IP3. Drainage of surface water and foul water must be adequately considered before development is permitted.</p> <p>HP1,2,3,4 and 5. These are sensible proposals to achieve a good level of quality, sustainable, development.</p> <p>I support Recommendation HR1</p>
----------------------------	--

Mrs Elizabeth Hedges Support	<p>I fully support our Neighbourhood Plan. There are too many proposals for future development in the village. We cannot support further development as we already have serious problems with surface water drainage and the foul drainage system which is continually causing blockages. There is no public transport available and the roads are narrow in places. Traffic passing through are often well above the 30mph speed limit making it difficult for cars coming out of the road to the shop and village hall. This will be made worse by the proposed development of the field opposite the turning for the shop. This field is the only green space in the middle of the village and it is very important to us all.</p>
---------------------------------	---

<p>Mr Nick Fouracre Support</p>	<p>The Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan is a well-researched and expertly presented document.</p> <p>I support the following objectives, policies and recommendations outlined within the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policies LP1 and LP2. <p>Development proposals must take account of the key vistas identified in figure 3.6. I would add to vista no. 2 which looks south-east across Millennium Field. The south westerly view across Millennium Field to the Church is equally as important. The existing Duke’s Field development layout was specifically designed with open green space to allow this view to be preserved.</p> <p>Our local green spaces are a fundamental part of the village’s identity. Those areas that have been identified in figure 3.7 must be designated as green space and kept free from any development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policies IP1, IP2 and IP3. <p>Developers must be required to demonstrate that they have considered and adequately catered for increased run-off drainage from new housing. This must include provision for extreme weather events and climate change.</p> <p>Developers and the relevant water company must demonstrate that the increased sewerage load from any new housing can be catered for. It is high time that our rivers and seas are completely protected from raw sewage outflow.</p> <p>All new housing developments must make use of Sustainable Drainage System technology (SuDS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objectives IO1a and IO1b <p>Road safety measures need to be improved within the village.</p> <p>More Public transport needs to be promoted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recommendation IR3
-------------------------------------	---

	<p>The ditches forming the main drains around the village must be adequately maintained by the respective responsible landowners and authorities. We cannot have a repeat of the great flood of 2007.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objectives CO1 and CO2 <p>The current Community and Leisure facilities must continue to be well maintained.</p> <p>Existing footpaths and cycle ways must be well maintained. As a regular user of the village’s footpaths, I note that some are not as well maintained as others.</p> <p>Recommendation 5R1 should be explored to encourage landowners to create more permissive footpaths and bridleways as suggested in appendix 4. Circular routes would be appreciated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objective EO1 and Recommendation ER1 <p>New business units on suitable land within the parish is a good idea if they are small and environmentally sustainable. A business centre at Castle Hill Farm would be worth investigating especially if it is used by skilled crafts people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policies HP1, HP2, HP3, HP4 and HP5 <p>Generally, I agree with these policies with the following reservations:</p> <p>In HP1 the phrase “up to 65%” is rather vague and non-specific. Is this deliberate?</p> <p>In HP2 the design codes seem to rigidly adhere to an historic architectural context. I am keen that this remains paramount but surely there is room for more modern designs that have architectural merit, sit well within the landscape and still make use of local materials such as Cotswold stone in their construction.</p> <p>I would like to see all new housing developments in the village make use of efficient green technology. For instance, gas boilers should not be used unless they are forward compatible with hydrogen. Also provision for</p>
--	---

	<p>EV car charging should be fitted as standard. Is this covered by policy HP5?</p> <p>Very little is mentioned about wildlife and biodiversity in the village and its surrounds. We should be actively encouraging the wellbeing of our wildlife. When it comes to housing development, does policy HP5 offer our wildlife any protection?</p> <p>Finally I have not seen any objective, policy or recommendation that seeks to have ultrafast broadband made available to villagers as soon as possible. Is anyone actively looking into what Openreach or Gigaclear have planned for our village?</p>
--	--

Mrs Hilary Phillips Support	I support the Neighbourhood plan.
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Mr Anthony Peel Support	<p>DA is a rural village and keeping some open green spaces is important.</p> <p>Any development requires improvement to existing infrastructure especially drainage which is at present inadequate.</p> <p>I support the policies ,objectives and recommendations in the plan</p>
----------------------------	--

<p>Mrs Julia Job Support, Support with Change</p>	<p>I strongly support the following :</p> <p>3.6 the open green spaces are retained especially the Dukes Field paddock (Coop name Millennium) opposite the school. This has important vistas and connects the centre of village to the church spire. This is stated in Down Ampney Design Statement document.</p> <p>4.1 I think a 20 mph speed restriction might reduce traffic through the village from neighbouring conurbations</p> <p>4.3 Agree but also landowner needs to ensure ditches to the west of the village are regularly cleared to take excess surface water from village roads</p> <p>4.4 No more housing should be considered by CDC without considerable investment by Thames Water on the existing foul water sewage system and subsequent treatment works. I support policies IP1, IP2 and IP3</p> <p>4.7 20mph through the centre of the village is needed. I STRONGLY DISAGREE regarding the 7.5 tonne weight limit as this would open up the centre of the village to large agricultural vehicles going through the village to the Farmcare facilities on the old Airfield. Currently they have to access this area off the Kempsford Road as they cannot legally cross our current 18 tonne limit to access the airfield lane which is 7.5 tonne limit.</p> <p>5.4 I support objective</p> <p>5.5 I support objective CO1 and CO2</p> <p>5.6 I support recommendation 5R1</p> <p>6.4 Recommendations ER1- Castle Hill Farm is a suitable place for a business centre but it would increase traffic through the village as did the Poulton Priory business centre. the Vehicle Traffic Movement from the Traffic Survey in September 2019 supports this as high volume of traffic in a morning going west to east then returning numbers in an afternoon from east to west. Majority of employees access Poulton Priory business centre from the A419 .. I support Recommendations ER2 The village hall houses a considerable amount of historical data from WWII and over the years have produced a booklet for villagers and visitors.</p> <p>7.3 Housing and Population Growth - any new Housing should follow Down Ampney's Design Statement which is a "live" document on CDC Planning Website. Population Growth over the las 20 years has not increased the numbers of volunteers especially younger and middle aged people coming forward to run the village facilities such as the community run shop, hall and church. Our volunteers are mostly over 60 and many over 80 and committees are loosing people every year. If volunteers do not come forward these facilities are in grave danger of closing and therefore Down Ampney is not a sustainable parish and cannot accommodate more development in areas not in the District Local Plan.</p> <p>7.4 Housing density should be medium to low with</p> <p>7.6 Smaller two bedroomed properties and bungalow for elderly villagers who wish to stay in the village and release family sized homes to new residents.</p>
---	---

	7.7 I agree with all the listed reasons a to g for putting constraints of future developments I agree and support Policies HP1, HP2, HP3, HP4 and HP5 I also support Recommendations HR1
--	--

Mr Dominic McGlynn Support	
-------------------------------	--

Mrs Elizabeth McGlynn Support	
----------------------------------	--

Mrs Mary Mullen Support	<p>This thoroughly researched and well presented Neighbourhood Development Plan has my full support.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Maintaining the rural character of our village (policies LP1 and LP2)-4.3 Surface Water Drainage and 4.4 Foul Drainage. I very much support policies IP1,IP2 and IP3. Regarding IP2, I feel it is incredibly important to prevent further spills of untreated sewage into Ampney Brook and to ensure that further proposed development won't put a strain on an already overloaded system. In my view, it makes no sense to increase development in the village when the drainage infrastructure is hardly fit for purpose.-Very strongly support policies HP2 and HP5 with regards to Constraints on Developments.
----------------------------	---

<p>Mrs Melanie Fouracre Support Organisation: n/a</p>	<p>I am advised that more than one expression of support for Down Ampney’s Neighbourhood Plan per household would be beneficial. As I am broadly in agreement with all the points already made by my husband in his response to the Plan, I will not reiterate them here but point you in the direction of his response.</p> <p>However, I would like to add the following:</p> <p>Reading the document, I learned a lot about the parish outside of the immediate village and I would wholeheartedly recommend that all residents and potential developers should try to read the Neighbourhood Plan in full as it puts the village into context. The plan is well researched and well presented.</p> <p>I support the following objectives, policies and recommendations:</p> <p>Policies LP1 and LP2</p> <p>Policies IP1, IP2, IP3</p> <p>There needs to be some vision about not only the number and kind of dwellings the village requires for the future, but how a sense of place and environment that is beneficial to residents and wildlife alike can be achieved and how the village can maintain its ‘linear’ characteristic that is interlinked by green spaces, which provide valuable wildlife corridors and bridges between cultivated, built on land and open countryside.</p> <p>Objectives IO1a and IO1b</p> <p>Recommendation IR3</p> <p>Objectives CO1 and CO2</p> <p>Recommendation 5R1</p> <p>Objective EO1 and recommendation ER1</p> <p>Any new business facilities created in the parish should be small and environmentally sustainable. For preference such businesses should be skills based and offer apprenticeship opportunities. Down Ampney once had a blacksmiths, why not set up a forge, encourage farriers, and decorative metalworkers, offer space to stone</p>
---	---

	<p>masons, dry stonewallers, expert ecological services organisations, other rural crafts professionals such as hurdle makers, skilled woodworkers and furniture makers. Down Ampney Parish could have a unique selling point (USP) as a local centre for those with rural skills and craftsmanship and ecological and environmental respect. Links could be forged with the Royal Agricultural University perhaps, to offer small workspaces to rural graduate start up businesses that fitted with the parish's USP.</p> <p>It seems to me that a business centre at Castle Hill Farm, in restored and renovated buildings that could be available there, offering space to the above types of enterprise would fit well and help distinguish Down Ampney in a positive way from the other principle settlements listed in Cotswold District Council's Local Plan. This might actually stop Down Ampney entirely becoming yet another dormitory village.</p> <p>Ultrafast broadband to the Castle Hill Farm site is essential and for all properties in the village. This needs to be investigated and providers actively encouraged to put the village high on their installation schedule.</p> <p>Policies HP1, HP2, HP3, HP4 and HP5 HP2 - I too would like to see room made in the design code for more modern designs of building that have architectural merit, sit well within the landscape but still make use of local materials such as Cotswold stone and use local skills and craftsmanship in their construction. (This would link well with the parish's USP as provided by the Castle Hill Farm Centre for Rural Skills and Craftsmanship.)</p>
--	--

<p>Mr David JOB Support Organisation: N/A</p>	<p>Overall I commend the Authors of the document in producing practical and achievable Objectives to meet the overall Vision especially the sentence : The vibrant community spirit of the parish will remain an important attribute.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>3.6 -It is important that rural aspects of the village are retained especially those that link the parts of the "Old "and "established central part" of the Village near the school notably Duke's Field. I strongly support this and think it should be emphasised more strongly in the document..</p> <p>4.1-I think that the amount of traffic through the Village should be reduced so the roads through the Village do not become shortcuts. Consequently I would suggest that a 20 mph speed limit should be introduced as a priority.</p> <p>4.2 -As people are living longer and I strongly support the need for more regular bus services .</p> <p>4.3 -Having experienced first hand the storms of 2017 and coupled with the increasing amount of new houses and roadways that are planned I believe that all ditches should be regularly inspected by the owners and cleared to ensure flooding from heavy rainfall does no happen.</p> <p>4.4-I strongly support the Policies IP1,IP2 and IP3 as expressed to the extreme and therefore would propose that CDC should put a hold any plans they have for building new buildings until there is substantial investment by Thames Water to improve the very old foul water sewage system that causes the repetitive problems that villages have to cope with .</p> <p>4.7 - I am concerned that the introduction of a 7.5 tonne weight limit would in fact increase the number of large agricultural vehicles travelling through the Village to the Farmcare infrastructure built on the Airfield.</p> <p>5.5 Objectives : I support the objectives as stated in C01/ C.O2 and the recommendation made in 5.6</p> <p>6.3 I support the Objectives covered in this section. I agree there are existing booklets which with better funding could be used to encourage visitors to the Village and support the Village Shop and other village facilities.</p> <p>7.3.2 Housing and Population Growth: This is the most complicated aspect of the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan and although I support the " objectives to be satisfied" it should be recognised as the most volatile aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan. Accordingly there should be more direct regular contact and involvement with current and " new" villagers to ensure the Policies match the current needs.</p>
---	---

Mrs Nicola Spice Support	
-----------------------------	--

Mr Phillip Spice Support Organisation: Swast	
--	--

Anne and John Nicholls Support	We fully support the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan and all the policies within which we consider is a well thought out and comprehensive document. In particular we endorse and fully support the following policies LP1 and LP2 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4 5.4 footpaths and cycle routes 7.4 and 7.6
-----------------------------------	---

Mr John Hartley Support	The plan is clearly thoroughly researched and considered. I believe it to be vital that any further development in the village must take full account of constraining factors and due consideration of these is clear in the document. In particular, comments relating to existing and potential further problems with surface water and sewerage are of primary importance. I would also strongly support the views expressed in relation to maintaining the rural and open nature of the village by preserving existing green spaces present and limiting the size of proposed housing development sites.
----------------------------	---

Mrs Janet Hartley Support	
Mr Andrew Hartley Support	
Mr R G Jenkins Support	
Mr Nigel Musgrove Support	
Mrs Maureen Gregory Support	It's crucial that the rural aspects of this village are preserved. There are a number of developments in the pipeline over the next 1 to 2 years inc. a large housing development of 42 houses behind Linden Lea.
Mr Spencer Hurley Support	Additional development should be considered only after serious consideration to water & foul water drainage so as not to exacerbate existing issues raised in the development plan. Keeping new developments in character and at existing densities would be crucial to keeping support to further development

Mrs Caroline Sandercock Support	Nothing to add.
Mr Maurice Voaden Support	
Mr Charles Radford Support	
Mrs Gaby Radford Support	
Mrs Sandra Ashurst Support	<p>This document speaks for me, clearly laying out Down Ampney's needs and assets. Ahead lies a pivotable community transition with the development of 50 plus dwellings at Broadway Farm and Duke's Field. However, Down Ampney suffers with two outstanding serious problems: traffic flow/speed; and malfunctioning water drainage systems, each requiring urgent attention.</p> <p>I strongly support: Open space LP1 and LP2, and HP2 and HP5 and note that Linden Lea was built without its own open space; Drainage IR3 and IP2. I note 4.3 and 4.4.; sewerage IO1.d and IO1.e, paragraph 8.2.2 and policies IP1, IP2, and IP3.</p>

<p>Mr Robert Niblett Organisation: Gloucestershire CC</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) on the draft Down Ampney Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). I have the following officer comments to make.</p> <p>Response from GCC Libraries and Information Services</p> <p>Comment on Section 5: ‘Infrastructure – Community and Leisure’</p> <p>GCC (‘the Library Authority’) operates local library services that will attract users from new housing developments in the Neighbourhood Planning Area (NPA). New users in the NPA will place additional pressure on these services, and this in turn could require mitigation in some form, proportionate to the scale of growth proposed.</p> <p>The Library Authority therefore requests that the impact of new housing development on existing community infrastructure outside the NPA, including libraries, is also addressed in the NDP. Specifically, the Library Authority recommends that reference is made at Section 5 of the NDP to the need for new housing development to comply with Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 Policy INF1 (‘Infrastructure Delivery’), the first paragraph of which states the following: ‘Development will be permitted where infrastructure requirements identified to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms can be met. Provision of infrastructure will be secured having regard to regulatory and national policy requirements relating to developer contributions...’.</p> <p>Ecology (Biodiversity) Comments</p> <p>SEA/HRA Screening advice for the Plan</p> <p>In October officers informed Cotswold District Council that in taking the topic of biodiversity (ecology) alone the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Neighbourhood Plan appeared unnecessary. This accorded with the Screening Report conclusion. Natural England and the Environment Agency should be able to give a definitive view on these matters if not already.</p> <p>The Plan Content</p> <p>Section 3.3.1 identifies the main designated sites just beyond the parish which have some relevance to the plan. Figure 3.7 on Local Green Spaces shows some ‘designated’ woodland areas. Section 7.7.1 on Green Infrastructure makes brief reference to wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The objectives and resulting policies of the plan (summarised at Section 8) make no direct reference to the conservation and enhancement of local biodiversity. Such policy cover is not essential as the District, Waste and Minerals Local Plans cover such matters sufficiently. Overall, there are no compelling ecological reasons to recommend any change to the wording of the NDP policies.</p>
---	---

Mr Robert Niblett Organisation: Gloucestershire CC	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>Further to my last email, I have received the following additional officer comments relating to the Historic Environment.</p> <p>Our only comment is that the NDP should include information from the Historic Environment Record in section 3.3.4 Other Historic Sites and Non-Designated Heritage Assets. There are many more non-designated heritage assets with archaeological interest on the Historic Environment Record that should be included and details about requesting HER for data can be found in this link https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/archaeology/request-archaeological-data-from-gloucestershires-historic-environment-record-her/.</p> <p>Historic England provide general guidance on the historic environment and neighbourhood planning https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planning-and-the-historic-environment/.</p> <p>Rob Niblett Senior Planning Officer</p>
--	--

Mr Dennis Quittenton Support	Support LP1/2 4/2 7/4 4/4
---------------------------------	---------------------------

Mrs Susan Quittenton Support	Support LP 1 &2 4/2 4/3 4/4 IP1 IP2 IP3 7.4/ 7.6/ 7.7 Support with change 4.1 HP1 HP5
---------------------------------	--

Mrs Julia Kilminster Support	Local Green Spaces - I completely support and feel there is a large area within the the area that has already been granted permission The speed of traffic through the village needs to be restricted asap Public transport for the village should be essential supporting the environment and enabling travel for those without transport. I have first hand knowledge of flooding, this also needs addressing asap for the surface water and drainage for new developments
---------------------------------	---

Ms Jade Hicks-Williams Support	I fully support everything in the NHDP 2022- 31
-----------------------------------	---

Mrs Beryl Jones Support	The designated green spaces must be protected I support policies IP1 /2/ 3 I support objectives C01 / 2 I support policies HP1 TO 5
----------------------------	--

Mr & Mrs Jackie and Terry Ormerod Support	<p>4.3. Nationally there have been many problems with houses being built on water meadows, flood plains etc. We see the pools of water on Millennium Field and feel that it is totally unsuitable for building. We note that on your map it is not designated for development.</p> <p>4.4 The many foul drainage problems which we experienced were, we think, due to the poor workmanship of the previous owners. However we are concerned that with more houses to be built there is every possibility that problems will occur.</p> <p>5.2 We love living in this attractive village, and whilst I have walked several of the scenic footpaths, Terry, due to his strokes, has not been able to. The lack of a path beside the road from Down Ampney to Latton junction has not stopped some people walking on the road - sometimes with dogs. We are concerned about this danger, particularly at the bridge pinch point. More houses mean more traffic. Could a footbridge be made to the left of the bridge? Is there a sign that could be erected asking cyclists to ride in single file at this point?</p> <p>Tree planting is very much on today's agenda. We would be very happy to sponsor the cost of buying and planting a few trees should the committee know of a suitable location within the village.</p>
---	--

Mr David Stuart Organisation: Historic England	<p>Dear Down Ampney Parish Council</p> <p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the Pre-Submission version of the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I can confirm that there are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we wish to comment.</p> <p>Our congratulations to your community on its progress to date, and our best wishes for the eventual making of its Plan.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>David</p>
--	--

Mrs Valerie Strange Support	Comprehensive and well-thought out plan which I endorse
--------------------------------	---

Mr Robert Goode Support	
----------------------------	--

Mr Roy Fleming Support	Full support the neighbourhood plan. Sewage, where is the water going with all the new houses. Down Ampney Brook has raw sewage floating in it so children and dogs can't go in. Traffic is bad now, but it will get worse with the new houses and we should have additional services and require regular bus service. Too many houses being built and green spaces need to be kept for locals.
---------------------------	---

Mrs Judith Fleming Support	I full support the policies and recommendations in the Plan. My main concerns are sewage, with raw sewage in the Brook, flooding in local fields, speeding vehicles through the village, ditches need maintaining, green spaces needed for locals, additional services, doctors, dentists, schools etc.
-------------------------------	---

Alison Wicks Support with Change	I do not agree that the village should be a primary site category as it is not sustainable (no more than Poulton or Maisey Hampton) the only reason DA was forced into the category was purely the influence the co-op has over the CDC as the co-op needs to sell off all its land surrounding the village for development, with maximum number of units on each site. We do not have the infrastructure, the shop is run by volunteers. We have no industry and the drains cannot cope now. The plan is very well written and thanks to all who contributed.
-------------------------------------	--

Mrs June Freeman Support	This is an outstanding piece of work and recognises how passionately DA residents feel about their villate and the development of. Whilst I'm sure we acknowledge the need for housing, the approach must be fair and considerate taking into account particularly S 3.6, 4.1, 4.,2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4, 7, 3.2, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 of the Development Plan. Above all preserving the character and charm of the village which has attracted residents to go above and beyond in their community support.
-----------------------------	---

Mr Colin Berry Support	4.2:- Any new developments risks putting extra private vehicle usage on to already crowded roads used by existing residents. Commuter traffic using the village as a rat run, plus cyclists and walkers. Adding to this is the extreme shortage of public transport supporting the village and surrounding area.4.3 & 4.4:- Again new development is only going to add to existing surface water and foul drainage problems experienced within the whole village. Something that needs to be addressed before any further developments are considered and the developer must be held accountable to sort drainage issues before building.
---------------------------	---

Mr Martin Holding Support	Future development is inevitable but we need to protect green and open spaces around the village. The field where Broadway Farm development will be built frequently floods/standing water in the winter. Adequate drainage and run off is essential. Improve main road through village to meet increased traffioc and introduce traffic calming features. Public transport should be available. Emphasis on affordable housing to encourage families to move to the village.
------------------------------	---

Mrs Karen Holding Support	I would like to put forward the following:- 1). Drainage be carefully looked at as Thames Water are called regularly as drains are blocked. 2). Public transport needs to be improved especially with more people in the village as the majority need to use cars due to the inadequate number of buses. 3). Road safety especially around the school/shop area as the speed of motorists can be excessive. 4). I understand that housing needs to be extended but the infrastructure of the village needs to be able to take these new developments without taking away the good community feel.
------------------------------	---

Mrs Jeanette Berry Support	My main areas of concern with reference to any and all further developments in Down Ampney are the following:- 4.1. Road access through our village runs past the school/elderly people bungalows, extra traffic speeding through the village will impact the safety of most vulnerable residents. 5.4. Footpath and cycle routes at a time when we are actively being encouraged to walk/cycle. Proposed access to developments would impact directly on pavements and footpaths endangering children and vulnerable adults who regularly use these to access the school, village hub, play/sports facilities.
-------------------------------	---
