



APPENDIX 1 –

RESPONSES AND STATEMENTS FROM RESIDENTS, TOWNS & PARISH COUNCILS AND OTHER COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS RE: HOUSING TARGET FOR COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Introduction

Over the last three months, Cotswold District Council has received a huge amount of feedback about the government's housing targets and the council's proposed development options in response to those targets.

This document, an appendix to a letter sent to Matthew Pennycook, Minister for Housing and Planning, is intended to show the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government the sense of anger, frustration and opposition that residents up and down the Cotswold district have expressed. It comprises a non-exhaustive cross-section of statements shared with the council during and after the Regulation 18 consultation.

Town and parish councils, residents, organisations, and even schoolchildren, have expressed strong and consistent opposition to the Government-imposed housing targets and the ways in which the Council is having to consider meeting those targets.

Below is a summary of the comments and statements in this document:

- The target is far too high for a rural, heavily protected district and would massively overexpand small villages.
- Local infrastructure can't cope — roads, schools, healthcare, sewage, water, and public transport are already at capacity.
- Development is being pushed into the wrong places, far from jobs and services, increasing car dependency and contradicting sustainability goals.
- Affordable housing needs aren't being met — new homes are likely to be expensive and attractive to second-home buyers, not local people.
- Landscape, heritage, and tourism would be damaged, threatening the area's character and economy and causing irreversible harm.
- The Government's housing formula is seen as flawed, outdated, and unfair to constrained rural areas:
 - It uses outdated 2014 household projections.
 - The affordability uplift penalises rural areas with high house prices.
 - The formula does not account for protected landscapes or physical constraints.



- As a result, Cotswold District is being asked to deliver far more homes per capita than major cities.
- Community identity and wellbeing is at risk, with residents expressing anxiety, frustration, sadness and a fear of being unheard.
- There is a strong call for Cotswold DC to challenge the targets, using planning policy exemptions or legal routes if needed.

The Government's stated aims at the Election were to change the planning system to facilitate the building of vital national infrastructure projects and to increase the housing stock, particularly 'affordable' homes, by using brownfield sites to cover the higher building targets. It was not to put unreasonable building demands on rural villages that would have the potential to damage community spirit, the beauty of the natural landscape and heritage features.

Down Ampney has doubled in size over the last twenty-five years to over 250 properties, and it has taken considerable effort to integrate so many new people. However, development must be at a suitable scale. The Local Plan revisions, unless modified, could give rise to the village becoming two and a half times larger, with up to 420 new properties, including about 60 currently being completed and sold. This would cause significant and irreversible loss to the village character. The scale and housing density of any development would not be in keeping with the historic layout, architectural style, and rural setting that define our Cotswold village. Many people choose life in a town or city, but others prefer a village community and contribute to its sense of place, one of the key reasons residents choose to live in Down Ampney. This should not be put at risk.

Any revised targets from Government must consider the nature of Cotswold District. The southeast part, in which our village is sited, has many attractive villages and towns of historic interest and the landscape is rural; however, it is outside the AONB that covers 80% of the district. One obvious change is for the Cotswold target to be reduced to 20% of the current figure, and more in line with the pre 2024 expectations. In this way, if building in the AONB must be very low, the remaining fifth of the area is not expected to take the whole load for the Cotswold District that is currently pushed by Government.

Down Ampney Parish Council

I wish to add my own deep reservations at the imposition of blanket housing targets. I have no objection to additional housing per se, but it has been only too apparent in recent years that developers have been slow to accommodate enough affordable housing into schemes (when the North Cotswolds is an expensive area for local people to afford housing), and that there has also



been little thought given to the additional infrastructure required – schools, GP surgeries, public transport etc.

Simply adding housing without these wider considerations risks storing up further problems for our local communities.

Rev'd Dr Stephen Blake, Evenlode

I sympathise with CDC in trying to come up with a housing solution which addresses the housing targets being imposed top down by the government and I also support the communications CDC have had with central government about the allocated housing numbers for the district and pleading a special case.

While I understand the rationale for each of the scenarios listed, they would all cause problems not only for the towns and villages affected, but also for the district in general.

I can only speak for the town I live in, Moreton-in-Marsh, but suspect that the issues below would be fairly common for the rest of the district. The issues I see are:

1) Economy

The Cotswolds has a general appeal because it is a different and special place. A large part of the economy of the Cotswolds is based around tourism and if the special character of the area is adversely affected by development then this key part of the economy would be damaged. So we need to be very careful to understand what makes the Cotswolds special and protect or even enhance these aspects. In my view, housing development on the scale proposed over this relatively short time period would place this special character in jeopardy.

2) Housing Need

There seems to be a large discrepancy between what housing the local population needs and what the developers want to build. Many local residents are having to move away from the area because they cannot afford a home locally - and also they find it difficult to find jobs locally. So many housing developments are for expensive, executive style homes so that developers can maximise the profit they make on each house they build and this meets only a small section of the local need.

3) Second Homes

This means that there is a real danger that many of the new housing will not meet the perceived housing shortage, but rather it will fuel people's desire to own a second home - thereby denying locals in need of housing the chance to stay local and degrading the communities as second home ownership increases.

4) Infrastructure

In Moreton-in-Marsh the housing and population growth between the 2011 and 2021 censuses was very high with an almost 50% increase in both. The town is struggling to absorb this dramatic



change and is in danger of losing its identity and culture. This growth of course has put the infrastructure under great strain.

4) Jobs

If the projected number of houses are built, where would the people living in them work? I know work patterns have changed particularly with more people working from home post COVID, however, a large number of people would still need to travel to work (on foot, by bike, by car, by public transport). I am told that currently,

- (a) mainline trains are full and people struggle to find places to park.
- (b) land allocated for employment in Moreton in the past 10 years has not been developed - so I am not sure what the expectation would be for any land to be developed to provide local employment

I understand the need to update the local plan (as a minimum so that 5 years of housing land is allocated) but we really do have to be careful about enabling growth to the extent that it affects the special character of the district and endanger a major sector of its economy.

On a final note, I know you can't argue the figures with central government, but people do struggle to understand why such a large increase in housing is thought to be necessary. The natural population figures (births minus deaths) are set to decline between now and at least 2050. So what is fuelling the need for this housing development?

Peter Richardson, Moreton in Marsh

Ampney Crucis is one of the most historically intact villages in the Cotswolds, with 53 listed buildings and a designated Conservation Area at its heart. It is a village of just 246 homes. The proposal to impose a 660-home urban extension on this small rural community represents a fundamental failure to understand place, scale and consequence.

Such a development would cause irreversible harm to a heritage landscape that cannot be recreated once it is lost. This is not opposition to housing in principle; it is opposition to reckless over development in a location entirely unsuited to it.

The proposal would result in a dormitory town, with increased dependency on cars because of lack of jobs and amenities. It would utterly fail the Government's targets for reducing the number and length of car journeys and fail to meet the need for single occupancy dwelling and affordable housing.

Residents are angry and frustrated because this approach feels imposed, disproportionate and dismissive of local realities. Planning decisions of this nature will fundamentally alter not only Ampney Crucis, but neighbouring villages and Cirencester itself, creating long-term harm for short-term numerical compliance.

The consequences extend beyond housing and infrastructure. The Cotswolds' villages underpin a tourism economy that supports thousands of jobs and local businesses. Visitors come precisely because places like Ampney Crucis remain historic, rural and distinct — not because they resemble



urban extensions. Large-scale development of this kind risks undermining the very character and landscape that attract visitors, damaging tourism, local employment and the wider rural economy.

The government's housing targets, as currently applied, are driving councils towards planning mistakes that will permanently scar the countryside. The villages and landscapes of the Cotswolds are not expendable obstacles to be concreted over; they are nationally significant assets that contribute profoundly to the area's heritage, economy, identity and public mental health and well-being.

Ampney Crucis recognises the need for new homes, but housing delivery must be proportionate, evidence-led and equitably distributed across the district. A one-size-fits-all target that ignores heritage, infrastructure capacity and economic consequences is not good planning — it is policy failure.

CDC are custodians of the whole of the Cotswolds and have a duty to challenge Government where national policies cause local harm. We therefore urge the Council to ask Government to reconsider both the methodology, scale of the housing target and the way it is being enforced, and to engage meaningfully with councils and communities before irreversible damage is done. As it stands, our communities are being subjected to a mandatory housing target based on property values for the whole district, yet all housing development is being forced into just 21% of the district that sits outside the protected Cotswolds National Landscape. This means concreting over swathes of the open countryside that is the very essence of the South Cotswolds, its villages and hamlets. This is so wrong.

Importantly, those in need of single occupancy or affordable housing are unlikely to have sufficient funds to properly run a motor vehicle, and so that means the houses need to be on good public transport links to centres of employment. This generally does not exist in rural areas, and if it does, then often needs external funding support from local or central government or these services cease completely. A policy that directs large-scale housing development on rural areas is clearly at odds with sustainable-led development.

I hope the Council and Government will listen to the voice of the community they serve and amend the policy to properly respond to local housing need and circumstances rather than based on a formula that takes no account of the reality on the ground.

Ampney Crucis Residents Action Group

I wish share two responses that I've received from members of our community which encapsulate between them the full spectrum of comments expressed to me since the bombshell of CDC's proposals was revealed.

The first is:

"We love Siddington. It is our home. We love its rural character and identity, our community with its village hall, the local shop and the pub, our connection to the countryside. We have never



experienced anything like the bombshell which hit us in October with the horrific news that our village of 340 homes is targetted for 1100 extra homes.

A public meeting was called in response and the community turned out in strength at short notice. The village hall was literally packed out, standing room only at the back as details were shared. There was a huge sense of unfairness. Why so much housing in such a small area? I have lost count of how many times I have heard the word bonkers. We face losing everything we love about our village. Making Siddington four times bigger will mean concreting fields around the edge of the village, bulldozing our countryside, trashing our heritage and our values. We have heard similar reactions from other villages nearby – Preston, Ampney Crucis, Down Ampney, Kemble - a huge sense of anger and frustration and deep unfairness.

And what is it for? We won't have any say in what gets built. We have no protection from the whim of developers and landowners who can decide what to build and where. Will we get the social housing all our communities need. No. Of course not. Greed and profit will drive the developments. There will be plenty of 5-bedroom homes, attractive to second home owners. It is so depressingly obvious when you live here and have seen it happen time and again. The prices are way beyond the reach of any normal family so that the affordability subsidies are of no help except for the lucky few who also have access to the bank of Mum and Dad.

My friends are even more depressed by it. They live on one of the roads in Siddington that was flooded (again!) in December 2020. Floodwaters are contaminated by sewage discharges making it all the more gruelling. They can't move because they can't sell their home. And they can't get insurance. More development is now planned and threatened in the catchment and the fear and expectation is that will inevitably mean more frequent flooding, more sewage contamination and more misery.

The normal safeguards to ensure development goes in the right place have been thrown out of the window because of the pressure to build so much in so small an area. It is a nightmare."

The second, is:

"One of the key issues for residents of Siddington has been the preservation of a small rural community with a separate identity to the nearby town of Cirencester. Siddington has always been a distinct village with its own identity, history and character. The proposed scale of development (a 316% increase in houses) would fundamentally erode this separation and would turn Siddington into a suburb of "Greater Cirencester".

The proposed development raises serious and unresolved concerns about infrastructure and community services. At the public meeting held to discuss the proposals, residents repeatedly highlighted issues that the proposals appear to ignore: transport and road capacity, flood risk and drainage, sewage, water supply, schools and healthcare.

When assessing strategic development sites, the Local Plan Review fails to address the cumulative effect of co-located strategic sites on the infrastructure required to support them (sewage treatment, water supply, road networks etc). If all the strategic sites to the immediate south of Cirencester were



developed in accordance with the existing and proposed new Local Plan, the number of new dwellings in the period 2027 to 2043 would be 4877 homes, a 53% increase in the size of Cirencester.

Building more houses in the Cotswolds to make them more affordable won't work and there is no evidence that mandating an over-supply of housing in the Cotswold District will bring down prices.

The need for new housing, in particular affordable social housing, is understood. However, development must be proportionate, sustainable and respectful of existing communities. The proposal to build 1,100 new homes in Siddington fails on all counts. It threatens the village's existing clear separation from Cirencester and would destroy the rural character of the village, undermine the existing community and place demands on already stretched infrastructure and services that are beyond the realistic ability of any development to meet, whatever the aspirations of the strategy. Cotswold District Council are therefore strongly urged to read the detailed, fact-based reasons submitted by Siddington Parish Council and residents to understand why CDC must reconsider their proposals and explore alternative approaches."

John Hayward, Chair, Siddington Parish Council

The proposed housing target poses one of the biggest threats to the parish of Preston in its 1,000-year history. To its residents, it is nothing short of calamitous. We are a distinctly rural community on the outskirts of Cirencester. Preston village is made up of around 90 homes with a Conservation Area covering the historic core. There's a thriving business park on Village Farm and the small village hall is a hub for the friendly and close-knit community. We are faced with 170 new dwellings within the existing settlement plus the prospect of an additional 960 dwellings on fields to the south of Preston by 2043 and a further 1,550 thereafter. This would engulf the village and obliterate its unique identity.

These figures are on top of a development of 280 new dwellings on fields on the western edge of the village, which was granted outline consent in 2025. People move to Preston - and stay here - because it feels safe, connected and human. We greet each other on the lanes, we support our local groups and we look out for our neighbours. The proposals dictated by the housing targets would create a settlement so large and disconnected from the existing village that it risks becoming a separate town in all but name. Instead of strengthening our community, it would divide it. Residents are already expressing fear, frustration and a sense of powerlessness. Many feel unheard. Many feel that the character of their community is being sacrificed.

The emotional toll is real: anxiety about the future, sadness at the potential loss of our village identity and anger that the Preston Village Neighbourhood Plan - created by the community, for the community - is being disregarded. That plan was meant to protect us and to ensure that any growth would be modest, sustainable and respectful of the place we love. The target proposal does the opposite.



The practical consequences are just as alarming. Adding thousands of extra cars to our narrow rural roads will bring congestion, noise, pollution and a serious risk to safety. Parents worry about their children walking or cycling. Older residents fear losing the peace and security they rely on. With no clear, guaranteed investment in schools, healthcare, public transport, or utilities, the existing minimal infrastructure simply cannot cope. This is not about resisting change. Preston has always welcomed new neighbours. But growth must be fair, proportionate and rooted in the needs and wishes of the people who live here.

A housing target on this scale is none of those things. It is overwhelming, inappropriate and fundamentally out of step with the community's vision for its own future.

The people of Preston care about our village, our landscape, our safety, our wellbeing and our identity. We care about the generations who came before us and the generations who will come after. Preston deserves thoughtful planning, not reckless expansion.

Preston Parish Council

Fairford Town Council wish to express our frustration that Cotswold District Council's efforts to argue for a lower Housing Requirement figure have so far been rejected by Government without adequate consideration of the particular circumstances of the District within what is effectively the overlap of a number of separate labour and housing market areas (including a National/International one) and without due allowance for the constraints imposed by National policies both within and outside the Cotswolds National Landscape area. With a high level of out-commuting to jobs elsewhere, the District is effectively being asked to provide – by default – for part of the housing need which is actually related to the economy in these other areas. This is clearly in conflict with the Government's objective of moving towards larger combined authorities for strategic planning and is simply unreasonable in the present circumstances with Local Government reorganisation impending. It is simply likely to result in a large number of the wrong type of homes being built in what will turn out to be the wrong places, to suit large housebuilders' profits rather than meet actual housing needs. This will also be extremely damaging to the local environment in areas that are supposed to be covered by a nature improvement plan.

Because Cotswold District is geographically extensive and in general terms poorly connected, with an economy which is supposedly based on 'tourism' and agriculture (relatively low wage industries), housing in one part of the District is in many cases wholly unsuited for accessing employment in another. This is particularly the case for those on lower incomes. E.g. Housing for carers in Stow-on-the-Wold needs to be in Stow-on-the-Wold, not Fairford or the Ampneys. This is a different situation to that in large Metropolitan areas which are generally self-contained and well-connected by public transport.

The communities outside the CNL area, which comprise roughly half the existing housing and population, have already suffered from significant major housing development over the last 12+ years, which has been imposed without commensurate local infrastructure/service improvements including for roads, sewage treatment systems, employment, healthcare and public transport. On top



of this – as the result of a further multiplier (x2+) which results from National policy to protect rural areas and flaws in the workplace-based earnings affordability measure – we are now apparently expected to accommodate another similar increase which will add further to the existing problems.

Based on past experience, we have zero confidence that this new development would be made to contribute adequately to meeting these infrastructure needs (These 'external' costs of developing here are unavoidably higher). This would further impact living conditions for existing communities and damage the attractiveness for the important visitor economy in the Cotswold Water Park (aka Cotswold Lakes) area in the south of the District, which is already suffering from the widespread effects of sewage pollution and other service deficiencies – or indeed for other new economic development which could help to raise wages/salaries and hence improve affordability in the area. The on-going precarious financial situation of Thames Water does not help to provide certainty.

Moreover, without this infrastructure, which will be inevitably costly, the housing target is most unlikely to be deliverable in practice and this would simply put us back into the situation of more unplanned development with insufficient supporting infrastructure

Fairford Town Council

We find it confusing why Central Government is allocating more housing to those areas where we have a shrinking local population.

We have an ageing population, overall deaths are higher than births, so the natural population will reduce. In addition to this as more elderly die more housing stock will become available.

The lack of supply of housing is caused by the difficulty and cost of buying and selling I.e stamp duty and the ever increasing bureaucracy and regulations being placed on homeowners and landlords. The more liquid a market the more prices come down as more property comes on the market. Much of our housing is poor quality planning is excessively expensive and complicated.

There needs to be an automatic right to demolish and replace any house (outside conservation areas and excluding listed properties) with a similar one of the similar size but built to modern insulation standards.

We do not need new housing in areas where there is no local employment. New housing development should only be allowed near to new employment I.e in major cities and towns.

Where for example will all the all the occupiers of the new houses in Moreton in Marsh and Cirencester work – certainly not in those towns but they will commute to Swindon from Cirencester and to the Midlands or Oxford from Moreton in Marsh. Social housing in those areas is not bought by local associations to house local people but to relocate tenants from other cities. This is not to the advantage of Local Authorities or the local area. Social Housing should only be provided to Local families living and working in the locality.



Harry Acland, Chairman – Notgrove Village Meeting

CDC should not be locating development in locations that are considered unsustainable just to meet government housing targets.

The government's standard method housing target, when applied to Cotswold District, produces perverse outcomes; it pressures the council to consider development in locations it itself defines as unsustainable, thereby undermining national objectives on climate change, sustainable transport and protection of valued landscapes.

Rather than promoting genuinely sustainable development, the current housing target risks forcing growth into unsuitable locations, increasing car dependency, infrastructure strain, and community opposition.

A housing target that can only be met by building in locations deemed unsustainable by the council itself, is not fit for purpose.

Penny Lillie, Fairford

The Cotswold District is heavily constrained by the Cotswolds National Landscape designation, heritage assets, flood zones and limited transport corridors. However, the development strategy does not sufficiently account for the comparative lack of unconstrained land in the district relative to counties with larger available developable areas. Applying the same government housing requirement to a district where over half the land is nationally protected places an unreasonable pressure on the remaining rural areas. This disconnect means the proposed level of growth is not proportionate or environmentally sustainable. The Council should make a stronger case to the government regarding local constraints and the need for a reduced housing requirement.

Douglas Moule, Chair of the Ampney St Mary Parish Meeting

The Government's national ambition of around 300,000 homes per year equates to roughly 5 homes per 1,000 residents per year if spread evenly across England.

By contrast, the standard-method calculation currently gives Cotswold District a local housing need of about 1,036 homes per year (18,650 over the plan period) for a population of roughly 91,000 – around 11.4 homes per 1,000 residents per year, more than double the implied national benchmark. For a largely rural district with limited employment centres and 80% of its land within the Cotswolds National Landscape, that outcome is plainly disproportionate.

Another way to frame this absurdity is that Cotswold District is expected to deliver proportionately (number of homes per 1,000 residents per year) more than Manchester (4.2), Bristol (7.2), Birmingham (6.3), Oxford (6.5) and Liverpool (4.5). All much larger economies, cities with appropriate infrastructure, employment opportunities and not constrained by AONB land.



In our view, this reflects structural problems in the formula:

- It is still based on 2014 household projections, which do not reflect more recent demographic and migration trends.
- The affordability uplift heavily penalises rural areas in the South without asking whether extra supply in those precise locations will be affordable to local people, or simply draw in higher-income households from elsewhere.
- It takes no account of real-world constraints, including the fact that most of some districts lie within a National Park or National Landscape, and the strengthened statutory duty to "seek to further" the purposes of those protected landscapes.

We are not arguing that protected landscapes should be treated as blanket "no-build" zones – that would be contrary to the NPPF and recent case law, a point that Kemble and Ewen Council have made as part of the Council's Local Plan Consultation (Reg 18), targeted, small-scale growth within these areas to meet local needs can be appropriate. Our concern is that the standard method, as presently framed, generates unrealistic numbers for highly constrained rural authorities and then leaves councils and communities to wrestle with the consequences.

In Cotswold District, around 80% of the land lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape. The current figure effectively forces the Council either to:

- Plan for substantial "major development" within the National Landscape itself; or
- Try to hit the target by "dumping" a disproportionate share of growth into the remaining 20% of land outside the designation, particularly a small number of villages.

Neither outcome sits comfortably with the Government's own policy tests. The first raises obvious questions about whether the strengthened duty to *seek to further* the conservation and enhancement of National Landscapes is really being respected. The second produces highly unbalanced patterns of growth, where a handful of non-AONB settlements are asked to absorb far more than their fair share, with all the knock-on effects for landscape, infrastructure, education and community character.

From our perspective, the standard method in a place like the Cotswolds is not simply "ambitious": it is distorting local plan-making, pushing decision-makers towards spatial strategies that are neither locally supported nor obviously consistent with the spirit of national policy.

Kemble & Ewen Parish Council

Coates Parish Council is very concerned about the number of houses being dictated by central government to be built in the Cotswold District. The government's calculation does not reflect local need nor the fact that most of the area is within the Cotswolds National Landscape. Coates Parish Council prefers either Scenario 3, apart from service centres which 'lie within the Cotswolds National Landscape', or Scenario 5 apart from supporting 'Rural Exception Sites in Rural Settlements.' It doesn't make sense to build affordable housing in rural areas where residents need to rely heavily on a car. There is also considerable concern about the proliferation of the village of Kemble because of



the impact such development would have on the main access routes serving nearby villages which are already under great strain.

Cllr Jacqueline Brown, on behalf of Coates Parish Council

Based on the background of Government pressure upon Local Authorities, I would fully support CDC's assertion that the imposed housing targets for the district are unsupportable, given the sensitive nature of a vast amount of land coverage of the district. A national housing shortage is evident (the analysis of the reasons for that is hugely complicated and controversial), but broad-brush targets across all districts in England, debases the huge effort that has gone on in the post-war period to ensure housing is sited in the right places to safeguard environmental balance. That balance affects all human beings at a fundamental level and is in my opinion, inviolable.

David Hunt, Upper Rissington

The Cotswolds is amongst the Top 10 global tourist destinations for its quintessentially English charm of rolling hills, honey-coloured market towns and villages with "chocolate box" cottages. It has been a slowly and discreetly evolving landscape over centuries shaped by the wool industry and the naturally available stone building material.

In the last 25 years the town of Moreton-in-Marsh (Moreton) has seen a 100% growth in its number of houses with no investment in road, rail, water or sewage infrastructure which has resulted in catastrophic flooding in 2007 and 2014, persistent raw sewage discharges into the River Evenlode, and chronic traffic congestion.

The Town was already threatened with continued over-development in Cotswold District Council's (CDC) original update to its Local Plan but the new Government's change to the National Planning Policy Framework and its abandonment of the urban uplift, designed to put people where the jobs and services are, has given both CDC and the Town a simply ludicrous number of houses to be built.

The predicted growth of Moreton does not take into account the "soft" infrastructure requirements of attracting healthcare, teaching, and training positions to the town as even "affordable" houses (80% of open market house prices) are still too expensive for people to move to the area. Our existing GP surgeries cannot attract GPs themselves because of the price of housing. Even with the number of houses predicted, any small change in pricing will have little overall effect on "affordability".

The Government's stipulated number of houses for the CDC geographic area is a wanton act of vandalism and fundamentally risks the economy and livelihood of all those living in the Cotswolds. The building of inappropriately designed, poorly located, un-affordable houses will destroy the very essence of what attracts people from all over the world to the Cotswolds. If that happens then the economy of the Cotswolds collapses. All we will have are poorly serviced, anonymous, rural dormitory towns, far from employment and social support.



It is recognised that CDC has around 1600 people on its housing waiting list and it is only appropriate that provision is made to provide appropriate housing for these people. That would mean Moreton having around 35 affordable/ social housing homes built which is consistent with the last Housing Needs Assessment. It is also recognised that Moreton would need to provide around 5% of CDC's housing targets, based on its current relative size. This would be around 450-600 additional houses. The 4000 houses the town is currently threatened with represents the annihilation of a North Cotswolds Market Town and the creation of another Oxford/London dormitory blob.

1. Top 10 Global Trending Destination: Expedia named the Cotswolds one of the top 10 trending destinations in the world for 2026, citing a 39% increase in international search interest since 2025.
2. Global Overlooked Gem: Cirencester, the "Capital of the Cotswolds," was ranked 7th on Time Out's 2026 list of the best places to visit in the world. It was the only UK location to make this global top-tier list.
3. Most Beautiful Village in the World: In recent global evaluations, Bibury (specifically Arlington Row) has been crowned the "most beautiful village in the world" by outlets such as Forbes.

Moreton Against Over Development

The dramatic increase in numbers of new homes in CDC (an area of only 16% developable land) with an emphasis on Moreton in Marsh because of its railway station, will have numerous impacts on our, and surrounding, villages.

The network of little lanes which lead off the main Fosse Way A429 is a particular characteristic of the area. Within moments of coming off the main road, the glory of the Cotswold countryside and its views are revealed. To fill the land leading from the main road towards these villages will inevitably spoil the simple beauty of Cotswold farmland, by creating ribbon development. This would effectively join villages to the larger towns and villages on the A429 and completely destroy the charm of the rural areas.

More traffic would use the network of narrow lanes. They have no pavements, no central white line and no lighting. An increase in traffic resulting from increased development would effectively disenfranchise its many non-vehicular users - walkers, riders, dog walkers. It would become more risky for cyclists who have responded to the call for more exercise and greener travel. The lanes would become positively dangerous.

The quieter pace of life of the villages in the Cotswolds would be destroyed by more traffic and more development.

The reality is that the numbers of homes required around Moreton in Marsh is wholly disproportionate. The railway station with a train once an hour cannot be considered a transport hub



as it could not cope with any large-scale increase in users - even if it went to all the local urban centres of employment, which it doesn't.

Destroying the very nature of the Cotswolds by over development will kill a golden goose - for those who live here and those who visit.

Jan Lesser, Evenlode

I am a long term resident (25years) in the village of Nether Westcote and would like to point out a few negatives to further major housing plans.

This village , along with at least three others are linked along narrow lanes running parallel to the busy A424 Burford to Stow-on-the-Wold for three to four miles. Problems include the use of the village lanes as a "rat run" whenever there is a hold-up, accident /roadworks which frustrated drivers including HGV's use as a high speed alternative.

These villages have never been built to take either further major housing projects or heavier concentrations of traffic. Any further increases will also harm this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and make the lanes even more hazardous for cyclists pedestrians and horse riders who all try to avoid as much traffic as possible.

Dinah Nicholson, Nether Westcote

The proposed allocation of 660 new houses in Ampney Crucis is causing significant concern among existing residents and is already having measurable negative effects on the village and surrounding communities.

The scale of this proposal is unprecedented for a rural parish of this size, and its implications, both current and future, are substantial. Ampney Crucis is a small rural village with limited infrastructure, and it is fundamentally unsuitable as a location for the proposed allocation of approximately 660 new homes in the Cotswold District Council Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation. The scale of development being considered is wholly disproportionate to the character, capacity, and sustainability of the settlement.

The existing road network consists almost entirely of narrow single-track or single-carriageway lanes, with limited passing places and no scope for meaningful widening without causing severe harm to the village's historic and rural environment. These roads already experience congestion and safety issues, and they are not capable of accommodating the dramatic increase in traffic that a development of this magnitude would inevitably generate.

Local services and facilities are extremely limited. Ampney Crucis has no shops, no healthcare facilities, no significant employment opportunities, and only very limited public transport provision, with infrequent bus services that do not support daily travel for work, school, or essential activities. Residents are already dependent on private car use for almost all needs, and adding hundreds of new homes would intensify this unsustainable pattern.



The village primary school is small, at capacity, and physically constrained by its historic setting. It cannot expand to meet the demands of a major new housing development without substantial and harmful alteration, if expansion is even possible at all. Taken together, these factors clearly demonstrate that Ampney Crucis is an unsustainable rural location and has always been recognised as such by Cotswold District Council (CDC).

Nothing has materially changed to justify CDC redesignating Ampney Crucis as a strategic site: It lacks the fundamental social, economic, and transport infrastructure required to support large-scale development, and the village's constrained setting means such infrastructure cannot realistically be delivered. Placing 660 new houses here would create severe and irreversible pressures on roads, services, the local environment, and destroy forever the character of the village.

Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Developing the Cotswolds to the extent proposed by the Government would be counterproductive. The area's popularity as a tourist destination stems from its rich history, historic buildings, and farmed countryside, which have been cultivated over centuries. The Government's plan to wipe out this heritage in less than twenty years would create an urban landscape that would not attract tourists and significantly reduce foreign income. While the area has a diverse range of businesses, many of which rely directly or indirectly on tourism, the proposed level of urbanisation would destroy the goose that lays this golden egg of tourism, not just for the Cotswolds but for the entire country. It's important to remember that tourism is the UK's second-largest source of income, after financial services.

Lynne Wainwright, Moreton in Marsh

Mickleton Parish Council (MPC) is struggling to understand the rationale behind both the government's figure for an increase in house building and the subsequent CDC Planning Proposal based on that plan – that such a large number of homes are needed in the Cotswold District. MPC has now held four public consultations to allow villagers to express their own views about the four planning applications (1 now removed) that have assaulted the village over the last few months.

These consultations have shown conclusively that there is no demand for the volume of houses that the CDC revised Plan has allocated to Mickleton. There is some demand, but from no more than 20–30 people, and the majority of this is for 'affordable' housing, including from people who have had to leave the village they were born in on account of the high prices of the houses that have been built here over the last 10–15 years.

The vast majority of people who we have been speaking to are against further building in the village until such time as the infrastructure is in place to support it.



One of the major concerns is traffic flow which is already at a critical level through the village, as we lie on the main route into the Cotswolds from the north. Five roads lead into the village bringing traffic from Long Marston, Ilmington and Stratford in the north; Broad Marston to the Northwest; and Broadway, Chipping Campden and Hidcote to the south.

The traffic flow we already have is causing much distress in the village, and there is no easy way of improving the situation, as many of the buildings lining the road through the village are listed. Mickleton is already struggling to cope with the through traffic from large building developments in Warwickshire, just over a mile away, that have hugely increased traffic volumes through the village.

We find it unacceptable that we are being considered a Principal Settlement in the Cotswold District, as we do not have the facilities within the village to achieve this rating. The nearest meaningful centres of employment are around 10 miles away at Stratford and Evesham. We have no doctor or dentist surgeries, no post office, no supermarket, a poor bus service and no quick access to the railway system. Our Primary School is full, as is the Secondary School in Chipping Campden. Other amenities are already struggling to cope with the existing population. Ambulance, Fire and Police services are, at best, 30 minutes away. All this means is that the people of Mickleton have to rely on using their cars, How can anyone consider adding further population to a village that is already overstretched from overdevelopment without expansion of required infrastructure?

The government should understand that the Cotswolds is a special case in that much of the District is under National Landscape (AONB) protection, which means that any new housing must be squeezed into a very small area. This will completely alter the structure and contribution that villages such as Mickleton make to the beauty of our countryside, countryside which is actually producing the food the country needs.

Mickleton Parish Council

CDC finds itself in a difficult position trying to meet the growing demand for houses set by the government targets. With this in mind, Scenario 5 appears to be the best scenario from all those suggested, as it includes the building of better amenities and infrastructure, while also adding to the property numbers. However, Scenario 5 fails to take into consideration the imbalance created by not building in the CNL. This has led to a total disproportionate weighing of where these properties will be located and little consideration to the cultural, history and biodiversity which would be destroyed in the affected locations. Preserving the National Landscape is important, but the social and economic polarization between the areas of the Cotswold's within the National Landscape and the rest of the district, which will be forced to take the brunt of the planned housing is unacceptable.

All of the proposed scenarios do little to comfort the small village of Preston that has existed for over 1000 years and runs the risk of being completely overwhelmed and annihilated by any of these proposals. To consider these proposals, it is impossible to see which one would not totally destroy a historical village of less than 90 homes, with the construction of nearly 3000 new build houses in the surrounding fields. Any new development should be separate and detached from the existing village, with a significant buffer and no access to the village from any future development.



While the village of Preston is not part of the CNL, it does have a history, community, significant conservation area, and listed buildings, while being surrounded by green agricultural land and wildlife, which would be destroyed by this development.

The Local Authority needs to be challenging the government, with legal proceedings, to oppose these figures, given that most of the area (80%) is within the National Landscape. This is unduly prejudiced and biased on the rest of the Cotswolds, and will cause massive wealth and societal imbalances.

Steve Rawlinson, Preston

Westcote Parish Meeting is appalled at the new housing targets imposed by the Government on the Cotswold District and this apparent lack of regard for the integrity of the Cotswolds which is a national and internationally known area of outstanding beauty.

The Cotswolds is visited by over 25 million tourists each year attracted by quintessential English countryside, historic market towns, picturesque villages and numerous walking trails.

For those who live in the district tourism is essential for employment in an area with little industry and for those visiting it provides tangible and intangible benefits to their physical and mental health.

We are custodians of this beautiful asset and it is our responsibility to hand this on undamaged to future generations for their health and benefit.

It is our wish that the Cotswold District Council continues to engage with the Government to make them aware of the unique nature of the Cotswolds and that the imposition of national targets without due consideration would cause lasting harm to the beauty of the Cotswolds.

Westcote Parish Meeting

The Council should not consider locating any developments in unsustainable locations in order to meet the centrally imposed housing target. The figure of 18665 takes no account of the environmental sensitivities that pervade the vast majority of the District, whilst simultaneously allowing the 35 per cent urban increase target to fall by the wayside. This is nonsensical, as it effectively redirects housing development away from the most sustainable urban locations into rural areas which cannot provide the requisite infrastructure, and whose unique historic and environmental characteristics are very much under threat of being irreversibly harmed.

I therefore urge Cotswold District Council to redouble efforts to resist the unrealistic targets set by the Government, by relying on Paragraph 11b of the latest iteration of the NPPF, which states that there are some exemptions to the requirement for local plans having to meet objectively assessed needs in full, including where the application of NPPF policies relating to the national landscape provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type of, or distribution of development in the plan area. I suggest that this would cover the present position in which the Council is effectively



concentrating the majority of future development in just 16 per cent of the District in order to protect the National Landscape and SSSIs. As I will argue under Q4, the disproportionate imbalance created, will lead to the 16 per cent being extensively overdeveloped and ruined for present and future generations and result, in "the paving over of paradise", as District Councillor Lisa Spivey remarked recently. That would surely represent a poor legacy from CDC as it exits the stage to give way to the new unitary authority in 2028.

Andy Crump, Mickleton

The Cotswolds is renowned for its towns and villages that are set in a rural and agricultural landscape - that is what attracts tourists from across the world.

Developing significant new settlements and village extensions is not the sustainable way forward - on the contrary, it will set precedents across the Cotswolds for further large scale and inappropriate development.

Development that is sensitive in design, pricing and economic accessibility in towns and villages across the Cotswolds will not harm the National Landscape - on the contrary, it will help support and develop healthy communities.

Dumping 660 houses on the edge of a village with 250 homes will destroy that community.

Dumping 2,100 houses on the edge of 2 villages that are little more than hamlets will destroy those communities. Such proposals may go a long way towards giving the numbers that the government has imposed, but it is simply unsustainable. Governments come and go - the Cotswolds will be living with the consequences forever of this, all based on an arbitrary allocation of housing numbers.

Neil Holt, Ampney Crucis

The majority of people in Mickleton are angry.

- They are angry because 250 houses have been built in the village over the last 10 years despite preparation for the former Local Plan recommending no more than 80; and all with no investment in required infrastructure.
- They are angry because the most recent Local Plan, that recommended no further development for Mickleton as it would be unsustainable, lies in tatters following allocation of the Government's new housing targets. How can sustainability alter just by changing a housing target number?
- They are angry because there is a need for a limited number of affordable homes, but they will only be built if a profit-motivated developer is allowed to build unnecessary market housing, and



even then, any affordable housing built is likely to be allocated to people with no connection to the village.

The village is not against all development. It is opposed to being a dumping ground for large numbers of new houses, the scale of which is based on a highly questionable formula, and the location of which is dictated solely because parts of Mickleton lie outside of the National Landscape.

How does placing all these houses in Mickleton equate to building where there is need?

Since the nullification of the Local Plan the village has already been assaulted with 4 opportunistic development applications for over 400 houses; representing a population expansion of almost 50%. Employment is limited unless travelling in excess of 10 miles. Healthcare facilities are remote and have capacity challenges. The village Primary School is full, as are Primary Schools in surrounding villages, and so is the nearest Secondary School. The nearest sizeable Supermarkets, general shopping, and full-service Leisure facilities are 10 miles away. Utilities infrastructure, particularly water and sewerage, are reported to be at capacity. Emergency services have demonstrated extended response times to attend the village.

It is essential that any further development in Mickleton is integrated with infrastructure planning and coordinated with neighbouring authorities (e.g. South Warwickshire and Gloucester for transport), neither of which appear to be happening.

People who grow up in villages like Mickleton, or who choose to live here, accept that access to facilities and services enjoyed by urban areas is likely to involve travel. This requires effective public transport and / or a good road network. The reality for Mickleton is an infrequent bus service of restricted operating times, and not travelling to important destinations (e.g. Evesham, or the nearest train station at Honeybourne). Traffic volumes through the village have grown dramatically for both cars and HGVs. This is partly from in-village expansion but mostly from large development close to Mickleton, at Meon Vale / Long Marston Airfield. Mickleton is the "gateway to the Cotswolds" for all traffic coming from the North. Streets are narrow, winding, and congested with parked cars; many do not have footpaths. This makes both walking and cycling hazardous activities in the village.

The reason people choose to live in a village like Mickleton should be because it is a beautiful, peaceful location with a strong sense of community. Inappropriate development is putting both of these under threat.

MAID exists to support the village in addressing all the issues covered above. If house building across the country has to happen at this pace then it must be located where there is real need and existing infrastructure, rather than based on spurious mathematics.

No development should be approved without a viable, integrated, and fully funded plan for all the associated infrastructure.

Mickleton Against Inappropriate Development



Cirencester Town Council has serious concerns about the Government's new mandatory housing targets, which require the district to deliver more than double the number of homes it had previously planned for. Given the unique characteristics of this area, this obviously presents a major challenge with around 84% of the district designated as National Landscape, meaning only 16% of the land is available for all new development, making it extremely difficult to find suitable and sustainable locations for the number of homes now being required.

We are also very mindful of the impact this level of growth would have on the town of Cirencester, as any increase in housing must be supported by the right infrastructure to ensure that new development is properly integrated and does not place additional pressure on existing services.

Cirencester Town Council will continue to make the case to Government for a more realistic and locally appropriate approach to housing numbers, one that meets immediate housing needs, respects our environmental constraints and ensures the long-term well-being of our community.

Cllr Jenny Hincks, lead member for planning at Cirencester Town Council

While the residents of Blockley want more affordable local homes, they also wish for Blockley's unique character to be respected. As things stand, they believe that the scale of Blockley's target in the Local Plan update would come with unacceptable costs; the belief is widespread that 130 new homes can only be delivered by compromising the Blockley Conservation Area, and by using high-quality farmland and highly valued green spaces, and that cost is simply not worth paying!

The following quotes, from a recent parish-wide survey, capture the mood well:

"Blockley is a wonderful place to live, but we are on the verge of losing what makes it so special – housing on the scale envisaged will lead to overcrowding and dangerous volumes of traffic. It will destroy everything that makes Blockley special."

"Blockley is a small rural community, unique amongst many others in the area. Our community benefits from many visitors and sustains a café, community shop and two pubs - planning needs to be mindful of over-development's impact on Blockley's appeal as a place to live, and as a place to visit! The damage to local businesses of overdevelopment would be crippling!"

"Look what's happening in Moreton! Densely packed housing estates without the infrastructure to cope. Traffic is a nightmare, and the town's character has been ruined. Development here should be minimal, or we risk the same. Build houses where they are needed, not just to satisfy a government-imposed quota!"

Please note that these views are not simple-minded nimbysim; Blockley Parish Council continue to explore sites that could potentially be developed with limited impact on the conservation area and local green spaces, but we also cannot see a clear path to the scale of new builds required. Based on the 2021 SHELAA and subsequent legislation providing additional environmental protection, adding 130 homes in Blockley would almost certainly require the use of currently protected land.



Moreover, development on the scale envisaged would require the demonstration of a clear public interest, and based on what residents have told us, that's a very hard case to make: Like many other parts of the Cotswolds, Blockley contains a large number of second homes and profitable holiday lets and while the latter contribute positively to local businesses like the cafe, shop and pubs, they also contribute to elevated house prices, pushing both private rental and home purchases beyond the reach of full-time residents on low or even average incomes. In consequence, it's unlikely that additional homes will improve affordability for local people; in fact, it is more likely that new housing developments on land allocated through the Local Plan will see the number of second homes and holiday lets grow, thereby contributing to the existing problem, not solving it!

In our view, arbitrarily imposing development on rural areas that lack public transport and employment opportunities does not create sustainable communities, and the financial and environmental cost of addressing these shortfalls is disproportionately expensive. For example, parts of our parish still lack reliable broadband suitable for home working or operating a business, and there are extremely limited bus services to access employment in neighbouring towns. Additionally, many people rely on third-sector organisations to access essential health care services as a result of the closure of the doctor's surgery in Blockley, and the lack of public transport to reach surgeries elsewhere. Unfortunately, development on a scale that is sympathetic to the rural character of our parish villages would not generate sufficient developer contributions to fund better local services or improved transport links.

Unfortunately, there would simply be no net gain for the community as a whole, just the potentially accelerated loss of what residents value most - the character of the places they live.

Blockley Parish Council

Broadwell is a parish that engages actively in national planning processes and where development has over modern times been well accommodated, keeping pace with local needs. There is deep concern amongst our residents regarding the new housing allocation for the district and how it sits with maintaining the Cotswold National Landscape, in which the village is located, and the impact on the heritage, environment and features which make this landscape special. We are concerned the plans will negate the existence of the National Landscape and the quotas for housing do not take into account the fact that the majority of the district is protected landscape, and the surroundings also have rural beauty and little in the way of services. There is also concern over the use of national-level data to target development numbers to one small settlement, rather than using these as general to a district as intended. There is further concern over the sustainability of development at this scale and how it will impact daily life. Without significant infrastructure improvements (healthcare, roads, public transport, employment opportunities, communications, services) the district cannot support population growth at scale.

A focus on our parish and growth at a higher rate in our boundaries is not sustainable, where there is no access to public transport, no shop, school, healthcare facility, or other essential amenities. The majority of those who work do so out of the area and must travel to find adequate employment to support them. Residents are reliant on car travel to meet daily needs. They feel daily the pressures of



accessing healthcare, transport issues and insufficiency of services such as water, sewerage, power and communications networks.

We also note that the speed of this process nationally has put pressure on the district council and they have not been able to approach the task appropriately. It has led to errors in the production of plans. Our village (Broadwell) has been incorrectly identified as having services which it does not: a school and a post office are named as village amenities, and charity or community provisions are billed as amenities and services. The stakeholder consultation by CDC did not involve any identification of stakeholders or attempt to consult with partners. Necessary research, such as employment opportunities to support development, has not occurred. We suggest that national policy's forcing council to act in a hasty manner and react to national level quotas is leading to potentially harmful decisions in terms of planning.

Broadwell Parish Council

The Parish Council believe that the current development proposal is fundamentally flawed. Area 19, and specifically the Parishes of Driffield and Harnhill, is already prone to severe flooding, has failing sewerage infrastructure and is served by narrow rural lanes that are regularly impassable. Adding a new settlement locally would be reckless, unsafe and damaging to historic villages and the Cotswolds landscape. This is not sustainable development — it is the wrong development in the wrong place.

Tony Norris, Chair of Driffield & Harnhill Parish Council

Cotswolds district council is a beautiful place that is far from traditional urban centres so attracts wealthy retirees that want to live in the countryside. Hence high prices and low incomes. This gives a false signal for housing need in the central government's housing algorithm. There is low employment growth and low birth rate. There is a need for more housing, but it is for low-cost housing rather than housing in general.

Not adjusting the algorithm to reflect the ANOB makes no sense. It means nearly all the housing growth has to go in the areas that are not protected leading to some crazy community-destroying outcomes such as more than doubling the size of Moreton in the Marsh in a generation.

In the case of Moreton in marsh its site as a proposed site for more than doubling is misguided. For two reasons:

It has been chosen because it has a train station. Who uses the train station? Very few people from Moreton in Marsh - it is served by mainly wealthy types and students that have study and jobs in London and Oxford. Low paid workers cannot afford commutes that expensive. Building houses for the low paid in Moreton for a train service they wont use doesn't make any sense. Housing by the empty bicycle racks and my local knowledge it is not mainly used by people in Moreton in



Marsh. Has the council done a survey of where people come and what their incomes are who use the train?

Moreton's infrastructure is already stretched. The roads are full, sewage systems not fit for purpose, there is a capacity constrained bridge over the Fosseway and medical facilities at capacity. A near doubling of the size in its tiny high street would result in a permanent traffic jam.

Were extra infrastructure to be built it would just lead to more clogging of roads in the ANOB in places like Stow. Adding all the proposed housing in the N Cotswolds when the A44 and A429 are already clogged and notoriously dangerous will just lead to more road deaths unless dual carriage ways are made possible in an ANOB.

Where will all the extra people in Moreton work? Is the proposal to build business parks to create jobs. If not they will need to drive. Only wealthy types outside Moreton can afford a daily commute to employment hubs like Oxford Reading and London. So the 'environmental' credentials of Moreton just don't make sense. If the business parks are built it means more commercial vehicles in the ANOB. Better to build where are motorways, dual carriageways or in towns which have train stations that are closer to cities with jobs.

Michael Rawlinson, Aston Magna

Central Government must urgently rethink both the housing allocation and the strategy that sits behind it. The current approach prioritises building on open fields and countryside land before fully exhausting the enormous potential of empty retail space and brownfield sites across the country. This is not only environmentally damaging, it is also illogical when so many town centres already contain vacant buildings and underused land that could be repurposed quickly into homes. If the stated goal is genuinely affordable housing, then it must be delivered where people can live without needing a car for every journey, in places that already have transport links, shops, schools, and essential amenities. Concentrating development in existing towns and urban centres, where infrastructure is already in place, is a far more sustainable and financially responsible solution than sprawling estate building that erodes the countryside and leaves communities with years of congestion, service pressure and environmental loss.

Clare McDougall, Ampney St Mary

It is vital that an infrastructure first approach is taken to any site for development in Tetbury and throughout the district. Tetbury's capacity to absorb significant growth is primarily constrained by the availability of social rented/truly affordable homes for local people, limited public transport, healthcare provision, employment opportunities - light industry/office space.

Tetbury Town Council



School Children from Ampney Crucis

Oliver (age 11)

My name is Oliver I am writing to share how I feel about the development in Ampney Crucis.

I love living here because it is quiet and feels safe. I go to school on my scooter and often see friends along the way.

We often go on family walks with our dogs and enjoy seeing wildlife like rabbits and deer and listening to the birds, if a large development is built I am worried that there will be many more cars and noise I don't think it will be safe or enjoyable to walk or scooter any more.

I am concerned about the disruption building work will cause. The noise, dust, crowds would change how Ampney Crucis feels. I don't want a place where I am growing up to become full of rush, stress and confusion.

Please this about this development could effect children who live here now. We enjoy the peace, the green spaces and the sense of safety. I hope you will help protect our village so it stays a kind and quite place for children to grow up.

Thank you for taking your time to read my letter.

Hugo, age 8

My name is Hugo and I am writing because I am worried about the big development that might be built in Ampney Crucis.

I love living here because it is quiet and safe. The roads are calm and I can ride my bike without being scared of lots of cars when I walk to school or go out with my family, I like hearing birds instead of horns and engines.

One of my favourite things to do is picking blackberries with my mum, dad, brother and grandparents along the lanes. We talk, laugh and fill our buckets without rushing.

If there are lots of new houses, I think there will be much more traffic, and those peaceful walks will disappear. Cars will go faster and more often, and it won't feel safe anymore.

I am also worried about the chaos a big development could bring. There will be noise from building work, crowded roads and people that don't know each other yet.

Ampney Crucis feels friendly and calm, I don't want to turn into a busy place in a hurry. Please help protect so it can stay a peaceful place to grow up.

Thank you for reading,