

Edited Transcript – Reg 18 Consultation meeting

November 15, 2025, 9:15AM

In attendance

ACPC

Cllr Jan Mills (JM), Cllr R Leadbeater, Cllr J Leadbeater, Cllr N Wright, Cllr C Grimmer, Cllr Courtown, Cllr Benham.

CDC

District Cllr Lisa Spivey (LS)

District Cllr Juliet Leyton (JL)

Head of Planning Policy, Jo Symonds (JS)

Head of Communications (Matt Abbott)

Representatives from Driffield & Harnhill Parish Council, Preston Parish Council, Poulton Parish Council & Members of the Public

NOTE: this transcript is AI generated. It has been edited to remove sections that were not intelligible.

JM: The meeting has been convened so that all the local residents have a chance to question directly CDC about the proposals for the housing development in this area, not just here in Ampney Crucis but also in Driffield.

I would ask you that if you have a question, please raise your hand. I will then point and say yes please and you could then say who you are and which village you're from. That would be very helpful.

LS: morning everybody. I just want to say as well that we are recording the meeting. It's not an official kind of amazing set up, but Roz has got her laptop set up here, so I don't know what the quality will be like, but we are attempting to record it for those that aren't here and maybe would want to see it later. So I am Councillor Lisa Spivey. I am your representative at Cotswold District Council. I'm also your representative at Gloucestershire County Council, where I am also the leader of the council. But I'm here today in my capacity as your District Councillor for Cotswold District.

We are here today to give you as much information as we can about the proposed Local Plan consultation and to answer any questions that you have. Our job here is to do that in a cordial and civil manner.

I know that this is an anxious time when we talk about planning and building and

development in your homes around where you live. I also live near here. I'm in Preston Village. There's 2500 houses proposed for around there. So I'm just going to give a little bit of context about why we're doing this, and for the purposes of this, I will assume no knowledge. So if you know lots about this already, forgive me, but I know there are lots that don't.

So why are we doing a local plan and then therefore consulting on it? So what happens is, Government has told us how many houses they want us to build in our districts. So as you know, this Government has a very ambitious target of building 1.5 million homes and what they have done is, not the way I would have done it, is they have a formula and they have told district and areas across England by a formula, rather than looking individually at the areas, how many houses you need to build in your area.

And Cotswold District Council have been told by Government that we now need to provide over 1000 homes every single year for the next 20 years till 2043. So that means with our area that 84% of the Cotswold District is in the Cotswold natural landscape. That's what we used to call the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). It is very, very, very, very difficult to build even one home.

In the AONB, never mind 18,000. That means that in the Cotswold District we have to fit all of those houses into 16% of our land area.

So we have a choice.

We could not do a local plan and we could not allocate sites. So what happens is, we need to, as a district, tell the government that we have allocated enough land in order to meet the housing target, set by government for the next five years. At the moment, CDC is not in that position. We only have enough land allocated to meet the supply for 1.8 years.

That means that when we get planning applications in speculatively, it's very difficult for us to refuse those because the developer says, well, you haven't got enough land allocated for your five-year land supply, so you have to let me build this.

So our choices are literally a rock and a hard place. So we either do the plan and we allocate land and it's plan-led development and that means that we're in charge of where those sites are. We can also ask developers for infrastructure for contributions towards infrastructure. Or we have no plan. And then we're exposed to developers coming forward and aggressively wanting to build in our beautiful Cotswolds area. Because let's face it, it's a fabulous place to live. Who wouldn't want to build homes here? Developers know that they build them, they will sell them. It is pure economics.

So we decided, Juliet and all of our councillors actually at CDC, we've debated this and we decided that it would be better for us to make a plan and to try to plan for the development rather than leaving ourselves exposed.

Now this this is the first part of this. Now the other thing I think you should really all bear in mind is that Cotswold District Council does not own this land. We do not look at a map and go right there, there, there and there. And that's where we want to put it and go out and ask people that own land. What we do is we ask people who own land to come forward and so therefore land that is coming forward is owned by somebody. It is not Cotswold District Council who owns that land. We're not proactively going out and knocking on doors and asking people, you know, would you like to build 100 houses here, 300 houses here? So we have to then take on board only the land that comes forward to us.

So just bear that in mind. So right now what we've done is we've looked at all the land that's come forward and we are trying to look at various scenarios of how we can meet government's target to build all those houses in 16% of our district till 2043. One of those places is here in Ampney Crucis. Now you know, I have been already on the public record saying I think it's absolutely ridiculous.

So this process now is for us to consult with you, the public, from now until the end of the consultation period and for you to come forward and say what you think about these proposals.

I certainly will be putting in my comments. I'll be talking about the character and the landscape, just because it's not the national landscape, that doesn't mean that it doesn't have value, that it doesn't have the character.

So we'll go through all of that today, but I just wanted to give you some context about why this is and also just to reassure you, also to reassure you that this is not a *fait accompli*. This is not because this land has been put forward that it's decided.

This is the whole point of the consultation process.

It's an iterative process. What will happen here is things will come forward that you will say, oh, there's a pipe there, didn't you know that that's that tree's got a TPO on it? Don't you know that there's some overhead cable there? There's a bit of ancient monument lying under there.

Then our excellent planners will look through all of that and they will then say, well actually, do you know what this site isn't viable? It may also be that the landowners have put that that land forward withdraw it. So it is an iterative process. It's not a *fait accompli*. So I think that's really important for you to recognise

JS: Thank you, Lisa. So Lisa's done a really good overview to start with. So I'm just going to really try and explain a bit more of the background in detail as to why we're doing what we're doing.

I'm just going to start by saying, by talking about what's changed and why, you know, why you're doing this. So in December 2024 The government released new planning policy guidance and that set out a new method for calculating housing targets and that was based on affordability. So in the Cotswolds, as we all know, we have very high house prices, so that means that it's a new method for calculating housing requirements and the number has doubled. So previously it was all about population growth, population projections, now it's about affordability. And this is why in some cities, their housing targets have gone down, whereas in rural areas' housing targets have gone up. So, this is why our number for Cotswolds has doubled, and it means that we no longer have a five-year housing land supply, which is what Lisa spoke about.

And we have to have a five year housing land supply, which is a five year supply of land that we know can be developed, that needs to be developed to meet our targets every year .So previously we had a seven-year supply because we had all the allocations set out in our local plan, but now with the government target doubling to 1036 a year we need to provide, we only have a 1.8.

So this means that developers can come forward and basically say that, we will make an application here, there, wherever, and national policy will apply. And if it is then considered sustainable development, then that planning application will be approved, whereas previously it would not have been approved. This means that you are getting piecemeal development. When you allocate the site in a plan, you have to allocate and provide the infrastructure for the community. But if you don't do that and it comes forward like it is now and you don't get the infrastructure.

Which means that schools, public services are all stretched further, which is why we need to update our local plan to try and meet the new targets and get our five year housing lands back.

So what are we doing about this? In July, because of what happened, the council committed to progress a local plan at pace. We are already in the process of reviewing our local plan and you will have seen consultations come out on our redevelopment policy.

And so we have quite a lot of evidence. More recently, we have been doing evidence which includes a broad location study. What we want to do through this, is make sure that communities like yourselves get the say to ensure that we have the appropriate infrastructure that is required.

For the new development, we also want to ensure that we have a plan in place when we go into the new unitary authority. So as you may know.

Local government reorganisation where the district councils will merge and we're looking at that now and that will be that will happen by 2028. We need to have a local plan in place before then. Because if we have an adopted local plan, the UA have to take that forward and that means that we will be protected from speculative developments going forward.

So, as I said, we've been reviewing the plan from 2020, we've already done quite a lot of evidence and you will see that through the consultation. So we now have a Regulation 18 that sets out seven option scenarios for growth with our preferred option (5).

It is an iterative process.

We have set out indicative numbers, indicative areas of development, including Ampney Crucis. If the evidence comes forward that this is not an appropriate development, then this site and other sites will drop away.

But equally, we are also doing another call for site. So we are asking developers, landowners to come forward with additional sites if they're available, to help us meet our housing targets.

So what I would say to you is this consultation is really important to you just to give us any evidence, and I will come on to what evidence we're looking for, that may affect the viability and development. But what we have to do, going forward, we have to make sure for example that the site is viable, we have to make sure that it works transport wise with the road network, and we have to make sure to deliver the appropriate infrastructure.

And that goes for all of our sites. So as we go forward, we will get to the next stage in the process will be the regulation 19 consultation stage and that is where we'll come out to our confirmed site once we have all of our evidence and our draft plan with all of our policies.

At that point, again, you will be asked, you know, if you want to make a representation, and you can only make a representation at that point on the soundness and legality of the plan.

The soundness of the plan is all about whether we have objectively assessed the need and infrastructure, whether we have taken account of all reasonable alternatives and whether our sites are deliverable over the plan period and whether we have conformed to national policy and the legality, whether we have followed the project. Now when we move forward, we will go into, when we submit our plan to the planning Inspectorate, we will have a public hearing.

If you want to speak at that hearing and have your views heard by the inspector, you have to make representations at the Regulation 19 stage.

So that is taking place next year in the summer. So as I say, we're looking to make our plans for planning inspectorate in December 2026.

Then we will have a public hearing parties may be invited to speak by the inspector, and then the inspector will then write a report. And that inspector will be the one to decide whether any of the sites stay in or go out. This is our final document, our final plan with all of our sites, and then they will issue their final report and the council can then adopt the plan.

We have seven strategy options to meet our target figure of 18,650 homes. We already have 6,150 homes in the pipeline and that is from allocated sites in our current plan, current planning permissions, and windfall sites that are likely to come forward. So windfall sites are, we have a figure of windfall sites which are sites that come forward outside of the local plan. We base our windfall figure on the past historic delivery.

So overall, our preferred option, which basically looks at allocating sites in our principal settlements, our non-principal settlements, village clusters, rural exception sites and new settlements or extension to existing settlements. That only gives us 14,660 homes. That's 79% of our target. And that is because, we are severely constrained by the national landscape, which takes up 80%

So if you have a site, in your area, for an estimated 660 new dwellings. So this site has been put forward to us by landowners. It is outside of the national landscape. It obviously goes up to the national landscape. So that would mean if this site was developed, that you would look to concentrate development closer to Ampney Crucis and as you move towards the national landscape you would have to make it so that the density of the site gets less because you need to mitigate the impact. other sites on the National Landscape. So what I would say to you is that if this site

does come forward, you may object to this site, but you know I think it's important that you also say that if it does come forward, what you want it to be and in terms of infrastructure, in terms of the road network, in terms of design, how it integrates every community with that new process.

So obviously we've got Driffield here as well, again, outside the national landscape. It's land that has previously indicated that is available, as was Ampney Crucis. Again, the new settlement, the new settlement west of Driffield is approximately 800 new dwellings. Now this site overall is proposed with 1260 more beyond 2043. Now these larger sites, they take much longer to come forward because they take longer to plan. But also in terms of phasing, the builder can only build so many houses in a year, it just takes longer, takes longer to build the infrastructure. Why these sites go beyond 2043 and we can't put them in our plan because the government says in national policy that you know if they are larger sites, you have to plan for at least 30 years or more for sites like that.

Again, you'll see that all of these sites are outside of the national landscape. Obviously, most of the districts that is south and is outside of the national landscape, which is why we're suggesting this proportion development. Obviously we have Morton -in-Marsh, which is one of our most sustainable settlements due to the railway, and that is obviously having a larger extension as well. These numbers are indicative at this stage, we have to do a lot more work evidence to really find out whether these sites are deliverable, and you know there are lots of crucial parts of that, including the transport evidence, the viability evidence, if we have to provide for affordable housing, infrastructure for these sites,

What that means? Are these sites viable or not? That's those are the questions that need to be asked.

I said previously, we are not meeting the targets the government has set us. So what we are doing is we are also having to go to our neighbouring authorities to ask them to help us meet the target that we've been set.

But also, if we aren't able to meet the target, what we have to show is we have done everything we can to meet whatever figure we've come to. We have to demonstrate that to government and the inspector or the inspector will find the plan not sound or

they will allocate by themselves, through developers who may put their sites forward.

So just .3 to emphasise here. Again, these numbers are indicative. They are not confirmed at this stage. There is further evidence work that needs to be confirmed. So these sites, as I say, remain subject to consultation, so your feedback, evidence gathering, and feasibility of the infrastructure that will be required to make these sites happen. You need to be saying to us, what does that mean? What would we want? Is it a shop? How do we want the roads to work? Does the school have capacity? These are all the questions that we will be asking.

In the meantime, the council can't control where developers apply to build, but until we have a local plan in place, developers can come forward outside of the plan process to apply for planning permission. So every plan application is consulted on, but despite the tilted balance where we generally should be approving site.

We aren't afraid to recommend the committee refuses unsuitable development and we are doing that. But that means that that if you do refuse developments, they can then go to appeal and again and the inspector then decides whether that site is appropriate.

We will continue to rigorously assess every application on its merit.

So as I said, throughout consultations, it's really important you have your say. You can view all the documents in your local library. We've also got consultation exhibitions happening.

But I would say if you could put your representations online, that will really help us in processing the responses.

So it's important that you make your representation count. We can't take count as a representation if you just say we object to this because we don't like it. We have to have evidence to show this isn't possible.

Comment on if it has an impact on amenities, highway safety and traffic, sign and appearance, has an environment impact, economic benefits, social considerations and planning history.

JL: We've written to Angela Rayner and we got a letter back saying crack on. So we thought, right, let's write to Steve Reed, her replacement. We've not yet got a reply from that. But the slight difference was that we actually put on, it was signed by all

the leaders of the council, so our independent, our green Conservative leader and Mike Evemy, our Lib Dem leader. And so it showed the unanimous feeling of the council and we're waiting for a letter from him on that, but we will continue that campaign in one way or another.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS:

Q: Looking on your comments form on your site, it says that all comments have to be received by 11:59 on the 18th of December. Is that correct?

A: No, that's a change. So that was we'll make sure that that's sorted. Matt will take that one away. So in fact we've extended the consultation. I think it's 11:59 on the 2nd January.

Q: Is the council is going to be closed over Christmas and New Year. So how do we speak to someone in that time if we need to?

A: (JL)The council will be closed I mean not entirely, but I mean try and do that before. I know that people are saying, oh, you've done it and now we've got over Christmas. What we have to do, and is absolutely vital, we have to get our Reg 19, which is that final paper that you will be asked to consult on over summer. We have to get that submitted by December 2026 and we have to have everything in place. And so we're on an absolute really tight timeline.

Because we've got to do all that viability study for all those development sites and then we've got to go out to consultation again in in June, I think next year for to ask you again. So that's why we've got a seven week period. We've extended by a week. We've got to think what our children and what our children's children are going to want. It's not just us now, it's we're looking in the future, the plan to 2043.

LS: I'm here over Christmas. If you desperately want to speak to somebody, well, got my e-mail address, my home phone number is there.

Q: What are you going to do when the government fails and falls.

A: We can only deal with the facts as they are right now. So I think, I think we've explained today that we did have a choice to do nothing, but that would have made us very, very exposed to speculative development, which is why we decided to crack

on and get on with a plan because we feel it's better to have a plan than let inspectors in or in Bristol and Whitehall in Westminster decide for us.

Q: The current site of the proposed Drifffield village is actually at the moment an organic regenerative farm and it's actually more of a plea to everybody in this room to go and look at Ampney Brook Farm. They've got a great website, they do veg boxes, they do meat boxes.

Let's support them and make sure they don't want to become available for development and to take that off the plan. So just think we support local farms so they don't want to put that forward.

Q: You say 8% of this is not there. What was the AONB? Why are you excluding that? This is actually quite fundamental. It's the basic principles of how baseline data will be put together. So you straight away said you can't develop in the national landscape. NPPF Paragraph 190 talks about major development and exceptional circumstances. One of the exceptional circumstances with national considerations also includes public invest, also include impact on local economy, all those sorts of things.

So I don't see it's a constraint. I see it's more of an opportunity to say, actually, there's an opportunity here to say the government forcing us to do this, there's an opportunity to explore. I'm not saying we have to, but it's still an option.

I think if you get these fundamentals wrong, that affects the whole spatial structure of the district. Straight away you're pushing things down to the South, pushing to North, but you can have a lot more evenly better distributed housing throughout the district. But they should at least be considered as part of the initial process.

A: (JS) So you're absolutely right. It does say that in the national planning policy framework. So if you look one of our options, I think options six or seven talks about building the national landscape.

And it's about having strategic development in the National Landscape. Now strategic development is sites for 500 or more housing. So that option is the only option that meets our housing target figure.

Sites in the national landscape have been put forward and you will see that there is development put forward in the national landscape but just not sites of 500 or more homes because it's about having that balancing act to protect the national landscape

but providing the target. Now the government in the inspection may say actually I think we should build all the developments as well as national landscapes.. Sorry, I'd just like to add to that because that was very good is that whatever happens in the national landscape, we decide to put some more housing in there.

We're we are 4000 short of the number that we've been asked to do. So it's not going to take away. We still have these other numbers that we've got here. We would just be getting closer to the target that's been set for us.

Comment: We've done development in the national landscape. It's always been CDC way. You provide these bigger sites, but I think it's just worth considering. That's all I'm saying.

Q: I am a professional consultant who has worked on local plan inquiries, both sides of the fence and I'd like to add to what been said. This is a fundamental shift in national policy, that there needs to be a fundamental shift in how you assess the sites. And in all of your previous work plans, you talk about sustainable development. And I've designed cities all over the world, so I understand what sustainable development is. Sustainable development is a balance of all of those things, social, environmental and economic. So to start your assessment based on we can't build in the beautiful landscape, I consider wrong. We have to balance all of those things. You mentioned viability. This is a huge one. If the developer builds here, he's got to pay for roads, he's got to pay for sewage, he's got to contribute to the transport policy of the council. I would say that would be unviable. It will never happen and therefore he would cut corners on other things. I know how to do it because I've been on the inside too, right? I agree with everything you said, Jo.

Except one thing. You said it's out of our hands. I understand the national policy is out of your hands, but all of these ladies and gentlemen rely on you as a council to fight these people. We have to fight these people.

At the local plan enquiry based on sustainability, because the Labour government is also shouting off about sustainability, right?

A: That's exactly the kind of thing that we would want people to come back with and why we have this consultation.

Q: Has CDC ruled out taking or questioning the government and taking legal advice on the numbers that have been brought forward and the algorithm that has been used to produce these numbers?

A: Taking legal action now when we don't know what sites we're actually looking at, I think would be a waste of money because we'd have to have consultants looking at those sites and it costs a huge amount of money when we get to Reg 19.

We are, we are talking to the government, talking to other councils, seeing how other people are dealing with this because we're not alone.

But actually taking legal action about, you know, what our numbers have been given. It's too early to do that, I think, or too early for the sites to do that.

Comment: I think you should deploy the best QC in London to fight for us.

A: We will be going to Counsel and we will be going to Counsel throughout the whole of the process.

I think once we know what figure we can meet, particularly if we can't meet the housing target figure, which may well be likely, then we will need to have strong Counsel advice to advise us on why we can't meet the figure and why we are justified in our approach.

(MA) Now just to say East Hampshire District Council have taken legal advice because they're in a similar position to us.

They have been asked to take on the National Park figure which sits within their area and their KC has given them advice to say they should have reduced targets because of that and they have actually given a calculation for that, which I've yet to go into and explore, but I would say we are very similar here because national parks and national landscapes have the same status of protection in the national planning policy. And so I think, you know, if that goes through there ahead of us, it'd be really interesting to watch how they do.

Again, that's something that's quite recent and something we're looking into. We should sit back, wait, watch.

The advice they've had from the KC is that they need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. So they've had a figure which has been drawn up by a KC. But in effect what they now need to do is this. They've got to go through this process and a part of the reason that we are taking this process on is to demonstrate that we can't do it. So the figures are all indicative and I know they're emotional and I know that they're awful. You know, you know, there's no, there's no one in this room, officer,

members, parish council, residents. I think we're all in agreement. But part of the way that we are working as a council to demonstrate that we can't do this is to go through the process. We have to demonstrate. There's no point of just sitting here saying, no, sorry, we can't do this in the Cotswolds. We've got to prove it and the local plan process is the part of the proof. We're going to speak to East Hampshire because we're not 100% sure what they're doing with that legal advice. We think they're updating their local plan. But we're not sure. So Councillor Every, the leader, he reached out to the leader at East Hants. There's going to be a meeting to discuss that. So we're looking into that, I promise, but for us to mount a really good legal challenge, we need to work on the evidence and this is the evidence and the comments that you give us will form part of that evidence. So please take part in the consultation. Just lastly on the point, the MP isn't here to defend herself. It's not my job to defend her. But what I will say is that we are working with the MP. I've had a call with their office to discuss how we might be able to work together to take a message to government. We've asked for a meeting with Steve Reed MP. We're optimistic that that that might happen. We've not had any signal that it will, but we're but we're trying to get Mike and the Council in front. So this is a big part of the overall processes.

I can completely understand. I mean my job is to work in Comms. I'm head of Comms at Cotswold District Council. And as I've sort of thought about all of this, I thought, well, residents are going to look at this and think it's a done deal. It's not, it's absolutely not. But it's in these are indicative numbers and we're trying to prove to the government that as part of this process that we don't think those numbers are achievable, but we need the evidence to do it. And that's part of what we're trying to do.

Q: So I just want to know what you mean by affordable housing.

Because developers come in, affordable housing. Yeah, OK, we'll build our houses. We won't build the roads. We won't build the doctors surgeries. We won't build the schools. And what do the Cotswold District Council do?

A: (LS) I do not believe the government strategy on building 1.5 million homes in this way is going to deliver affordable homes. Unless the unless the government funds local councils to build all good old fashioned council housing, we will not get affordability by this. So I totally agree with you. We know that the market.

Does not deliver genuinely affordable homes and that in Cotswolds. When you look

at an average wage of around £30k and somebody lending you five times that, that means you need to have houses that are £150k. I don't know where you can find a garage in the Cotswolds for £150k. So you know I would talk to you that this is not going to deliver affordable homes if you ask me.

Q: Just your comment about having our comments. I tried using that document yesterday. I can read other people's comments. It's virtually impossible to have a comment myself. It goes tiny. It shoots out into the most ridiculously small option. It's really difficult to use. I'm fairly I'm literate and I struggle to make comments. There are a lot of people who have given up already. My parents can't access it. So can we do something to make you have more accessible?

A: Thanks for raising that really important. So thank you and we'll look at that ASAP.

ACTION: MA to check usability of online comment form.

Q: I'd just like to say I we get what you're doing with the consultation, but I would like to reiterate that it's really important to get any kind of legal stuff lined up now. The algorithm is clearly not suited for the Cotswold area because it will take into account the value of all the houses in the Cotswolds, including the multi-million pound houses in the areas of national landscape. It will take into consideration the income of people in those areas and yet they are not being included in the development area, so there's obviously a fault in the algorithm and that needs to be challenged legally.

Q: The Ampney Crucis sites and the Driffield sites, has that land been put forward by the land owners or is it just speculation?

A: Yes, it has been put forward by the landowner. I know there's a lot of controversy about who owns that land. But until we have absolute proof, and we haven't had that yet, we're very aware of what people are telling us in Driffield.

Q: What I would like, therefore, is you to go back to your slide, probably elaborate on making it count and actually give us more detail on how to respond.

A: (LS) Yeah, that's a really good point. And that's something that I think certainly I can work with Juliet, Matt and the team and via, our network here by the parish councils, make sure that I can help you to get stuff out there.

ACTION: LS to draft response comments for general use.

Q: I wasn't sure if I understood what you said, but you can't put an objection in in writing.

A: You can, it's just we'd rather you didn't because it just means we then have to put it and it just takes time and it could then delay the plan. If that's the only thing you can do, then do it.

Q: The language in the meeting is we have to do this. It's enforced on us. All you have to do is represent us, right? That's what you have to do as part of your job. You have to come up with a plan which is a robust rebuttal to whatever it is. So I don't understand why you're not starting. You already know it doesn't fit.

A: (LS) As your representative that is what I am doing. I've already spoken out very, very strongly against this at 2 overview and scrutiny meetings. And I'm already on the public record, you can look at those if you want to. I'll be making my comments. I'll be doing everything that I can as your representative. It's why I'm here today. But what the District Council has to do is respond to the Government request to do this and as we said throughout, we could do nothing. And as a council, as 34 members of Cotswold District Council, we did debate this and we decided that it would be better to do something and go through this process. We're constantly lobbying government. We'll be using all of our channels to fight this, but if we did nothing, then we would be then open to that speculative development and the landowners could come forward right now and put in an application.

Q: I think in the village we feel that this has all been done on the sly. We've only found out about this four weeks ago. There's a lot of information in your in your publication about assessments that's already taken.

Anybody just needs to look at the areas and consideration and see it's not suitable. So to see it's in a local plan, it's just demoralising. You've already looked at it once and it's come out. What do we need to do?

A: to say that we've done it on the sly, I think it's a little unfair. The Ampney Crucis site was put forward in previous call for sites, but we rejected it then because we didn't need it but we have to explore all of our options now.

Q: So you've never looked at it in terms of viability, though.

A: No.

Q: Why not?

A: Because, because it wasn't in our previous strategy, so that's why that site wasn't considered because this isn't one of our main settlements, but because this new target, we have to explore all of our options.

I had a very brief look at West Oxford because we share our border with them. They take a slightly different approach in that they've set out some strategic aims. No village can grow by more than 10%.

So I don't understand why your strategy, and this is your strategy. Your preferred strategy is to whack large numbers into very small populations straight away. You could constrain this and say this goes out to 2043. In any year period, five year period, nobody grows by more than X.

A: I think they were looking and they've had an increase of their last local plan, their local plan of 549 houses. So doing 10% over West Oxford, you know, making that a policy is probably quite easy. Our increases - we've doubled.

Q: So today CDC has about 43,000 homes, about 43,000 homes and the plan is to put on just over 18,000. So very round figures, 40,000 homes today the plan is to add 20,000 homes in over the next 20 years.

Q: Is it better to build on brownfield land and extend the existing settlement or dump it all in in completely rural settings? It's a fundamental principle here is to do sustainable development. In existing areas that have existing a highway network, infrastructure, community facilities, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Not to put it in rural virgin land.

A: Exactly and that is what you want to write.

Q: You should be asking the Parish council first where do they think are suitable sites of development not going behind their backs asking landowners can we develop a full site. I've lived there for 44 years. I talked to people in the village. I know people who told me they wouldn't mind having a small development on their field.

A: Tell them to put their land in as the Call for Sites is open.

I think it's a bit of a misconception with the selection, Yes, it is about what land has been put forward. It is about looking at the constraints in the area, and that includes landscape, flooding, sewerage, etc. So it's all a balancing act.

We've got sites brought to us and we've now got to find the evidence about whether or not any of those sites can be developed. What we know is some of those will go away because they can't for various reasons and that is what this consultation is for.

Q: As a unitary authority moving forward, would this requirement be spread across the whole authority and therefore we get rid of this problem because we're spreading it over Gloucester and we're spreading it over other areas possibly.

A: The problem is timing because the new authority or authorities wouldn't even come into existence until 2028.

And then if we don't have a local plan, then they need to start the process of doing a strategic local plan for the entirety of that region. That could mean that it would be another 3-5 years. So we would be looking at being planless potentially in this area for potentially the next eight years if we didn't do that.

And it means that when we all don't have the five year land supply for the next eight years, we're just very, very vulnerable.

We are asking all of our partners to help us provide our housing target figure. That's all of the nine adjoining authority. I formally approached them to say that we it looks like we can't meet our target figure. Can you help us? So the issue we've got is that other authorities also can't meet their figures. They've been asked by other authorities who can't meet their figures. So in Gloucestershire, for example, you've got the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury partnership. Tewkesbury is having to take on all of quite a lot of Gloucester and Cheltenham's needs. We're asking them as well. We're also asking the Forest of Dean, which is constrained. Stroud is constrained. They just had a plan failed.

They've got issues on the M5 junction, so everybody's got issues and it it's just not easy. Even though we're trying to work in partnership.

Q: Could you be forward thinking and create a future looking plan.

A: We are doing that as well. Yeah, I mean as leader of Gloucestershire County Council and I can tell you we are already doing that. You mentioned that there is already Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester are working on a strategic plan for example, Tewkesbury's building a whole entire new Garden village, 10,000 homes,

Golden Valley and the Cheltenham one that is 15,000 homes, but we're waiting to see whether we can get junction improvements, junction 10. So there is that that work is already happening.

Q: Have you rejected any landowners that came forward or outside the AONB or is it everybody who's come forward with a land?

Q: We understand we need to build new houses. You expect a bit of growth. 200 to 800 clearly isn't that. And it fundamentally impacts the reason why people live here. That's why it's mainly their life savings and their mental well-being. And does that get taken into account? Because this isn't a there's a few new houses. This is fundamental.

A: So we have had large sites that have come forward that we have rejected and that is because as I said, we've had to look at all constraints. There are a lot of constrained areas around here, the North Meadows, the River Severn Estuary, and we've had to reject quite a lot of sites and that may be other landscape issues as well outside of the National landscape, so they're just lots of things we have to take into consideration.

Q: You rejected 80% of the area to build on. Can you not put 10 here, 50 there?

A: So we've actually done that with our figures. We have got 50 here, 100 there, 20 there in the national landscape. Bourton on the Water has 230 houses there. In Chipping Campden there's 230 houses.

If you have more questions, please e-mail me directly. Lisa.spivey@cotswold.gov.uk

Thank you.