

Organisation	Main comments	Action
WODC	Overall comments	
	• Inconsistent policy wording – some read as objectives, not policies	
	• Key issues identified	
	• Focus on statutory purposes, little on social and economic issues	
	• Little said about housing development	
	• NP status – more evidence/justification needed. Concern re NP status.	
	Main detailed comments	
	1. Introduction. What consideration has MP made of other statutory plans?	MP about delivering statutory purposes AONB's e.e. conserving & enhancing - MP focuses on this, but need to be set in context and making links as necessary with other strategies & plans affecting the area. As plan for nationally designated protected lanscapes. MP's should be seen as overarching plans taking precedent
	2. Spatial portrait. Welcome emphasis on natural capital and eco-system services	
	3. Spatial portrait. Add section on housing as hook into development and transport policies	Not Incorporated. This is covered in preceding paragraph re 2nd draft
	4. Ambitions. 2. How would this be funded?	This is yet to be decided post Brexit etc.
	5. Partnership. P1. Objective, not a policy.	Comments below iro. 2nd draft. Changed in 2nd draft MP
	6. Natural Capital. NECS 1. Demonstrate market/non-market benefits – what does this mean?	
	7. Rural Land Management. RLMP2. Vague.	Incorporated. Changed policy in 2nd Draft
	8. Rural Land Management. KI x. Agree, but include other species and couple with climate change issues.	See Provenance & Species Position Statement
	9. Rural Land Management. RLMP6. Local guidance prepared by Board would be useful.	Incorporated in 2nd Draft
	10. Historic Environment. KI i. change 'finite'	Not Incorporated. Listed therefore it's a finite resource. Event sift listed no from 1950's / 60's are still a finite resource. Barrows, hillforts, ridge & furrow
11. Historic Environment. HE4. Not all development in/near existing settlement. Change to include countryside.	Not Incorporated. Policy states 'including' thereby implying existing settlements & open countryside	
12. Dev & transport. KI i. Define community viability. Rephrase to refer to balance between statutory purposes and duty.		
13. Dev & transport. Policy DTP1. Long, complex policy – split. Further clarification needed at f) and i).		
14. Dev & transport. Policy DTP2. Welcome positive policy		
15. Dev & transport. KI vi. Need policy for Gypsy and Traveller sites	Incorporated. Additional text added to DTP3	
16. Dev & transport. Policy DTP6. With ref to 'maintained' – local plan can't maintain NHS services. Highlights importance of partnership working. More clarity on infrastructure provision needed.	Incorporated in 2nd Draft	
17. Tourism, access & rec. KI viii and Policy TAR 5. Should this be in MP? And why in TAR section. Policy=contentious		

Organisation	Main comments	Action
Cotswold DC	Overall comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covers key issues but needs to address demographic/social issues in spatial portrait 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repetition between spatial portrait and policy sections 	Spatial Portrait currently in text format, but once designed will be more pictorial therefore un-repetitive
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to improve design, order and referencing 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More clarity re function of policies. Some policies more like outcomes or objectives rather than policies 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency of policy wording. Some focus on the work of CCB, some 'tell' partner organisations what they should be doing e.g. compare BP1 and RLMP2. 	No AONB MP is for whole AONB and CCB can't deliver in isolation therefore mix of policies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify key differences between draft plan and previous plan 	This hasn't been done. Therefore no data except that in SofC 2017. Has led to rethink in current draft MP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What monitoring results from previous plan? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NP – contentious issue. Further explanation needs to be provided on why national park status would provide additional financial resources, particularly if government priorities alter 	
	Main detailed comments	
	p.2 para 1	
	The text states that the Management Plan “should” be recognised as a material consideration and quotes s.85 of the CROW Act; however the Act does not state that the management plan is a material consideration, simply that Local Planning Authorities (and others) should have “regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing ...”.	As the LPA's endorsed (although they don't adopt) the AONB MP then it is seen as a material consideration. Assuming revised MP is endorsed by LPA's then if this will continue
	p.5	
	“Special qualities” have been amended slightly from the previous management plan – it is now clearer.	Comment noted
	p.6 para 1	
Description of the “strong images” of the Cotswolds misses out on the importance of the settlements within the AONB. The “chocolate box” image of the area is usually a Cotswold stone cottage or village set in the fields and woodlands of the Cotswolds. (in CDC’s emerging plan we highlight the “considerable interrelationship and interplay between the build, natural and historic environment “. (para 10.1.4)	Incorporated	
p.7 para 5		
There are also additional impacts, particularly on road verges from the increasing size of vehicles, both commercial and agricultural.	Incorporated	
p.8 paras 2-3		
Combine these two paragraphs, slightly confusing as is.	Keep separate. They are distinctive - request further feedback comments from MC. L&W and @Exec	
p.8 para 4		

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	<p>This section seems to be very negative on what can be achieved to help address climate change within the AONB. It may be challenging to install large wind turbines or solar farms, but there are real opportunities to look at the way that soil management and other land management options can play a role in carbon management and sequestration.</p>	
	<p>p.10 para 5</p>	
	<p>There seems to be some overlap between the sections under this heading and their policies with the policies later in the document, for example natural capital is covered here and under Conserving and Enhancing.</p>	<p>Altered through previous comments, and also changed order of paragraph sentences to include some possible solutions towards end of paragraph</p>
	<p>p.11 policy P1</p>	
	<p>This policy is very much about what other partners will be doing, rather than the CCB and appears to provide more detail on the outcome rather than being a policy (as mentioned above). To turn this into a policy it might read – “The CCB will provide support to partners to ensure that” Or if the intention is that it should be a policy for those partners (which is problematic in itself since it is the CCB’s management plan not that of the partners) – “The need to conserve.... should be included in ...”</p>	<p>Altered via previous comments which address this point</p>
	<p>Policies NCES 1-3.</p>	
	<p>I assume that the first two policies are to be delivered through work undertaken by the CCB. The third policy is for other partners, although as stated above it is not their plan, but that of the CCB.</p>	<p>Policies have been altered. Re-iterate point that MP is for the whole of AONB and guide Board & Partners alike</p>
	<p>p.13 – Landscape</p>	
	<p>The policies in this section sound much more like DM policies, however this is not an LPA document; although obviously the scope of their implementation is much wider than just new developments. Unclear how the policies will be implemented in the planning context. (compare policy HE2 which clearly outlines the CCB’s role).</p>	<p>MP is for whole of AONB, sets out CCB vision etc. Policies' there to guide Board & others on how to achieve vision</p>
	<p>p.18 Policy HE4</p>	
	<p>Interested to hear the CCB’s feedback as to whether they consider that our new design code (within the emerging local plan) meets this policy.</p>	<p>Provide feedback</p>
	<p>p.18 The previous management plan included a list of important species and habitats and this has not been carried forward into the new plan. This was useful information and its inclusion warrants consideration.</p>	<p>Following workshops/further discussion decided to remove in interest of brevity</p>
	<p>p.19. Policy BP3</p>	
	<p>Typo in line 3, “by”.</p>	<p>Changed</p>
	<p>(Please note that discussions are underway on how we can provide better guidance to neighbourhood plan groups on incorporating GI and similar into their NDPs, this work is initially being co-ordinated by the Gloucestershire LNP)</p>	
	<p>p.19 development and transport outcome</p>	
	<p>Unclear what transport outcome is sought.</p>	<p>Outcome is general to both development & transport</p>

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	p.20 para 1	
	This does not make sense.	Wording changed to make clearer, i.e. about conserving & enhancing the special qualities
	Policy DTP1	
	This policy repeats much of what is said under the landscape policies, although it is stronger. It is very focused on what partners will do, not what the CCB will do (unlike policy DTP2 which makes roles very clear). It also repeats some of what is in the NPPF.	See previous comments re AONB MP as plan for area
	p.21 Key issue x	
	It would be useful to add that this % is likely to increase markedly as the population ages. No mention is made of the use of modern technology to help address transport issues through car sharing, call-up public transport systems etc.	Incorporated - new key issue added
	p.22 Natural Capital and ecosystems services	
	This repeats some of p.11, it might be better to combine them. The same issue for climate change.	Raise as issue with MC, L&W & Exec
	p.24	
	Are these policies on climate change included within the Cotswolds Climate Change Strategy (see p.12).	Yes, in accordance with numerous strategies in Climate Change Strategies e.g. DT1, HR1, E1, E2
	p.25	
	Policy TAR1. This overlaps with policies in the transport section - and the synergies between providing public transport for visitors and residents could be more clearly addressed.	Seen as a follow on from the transport policies in DT section
	p.26. National Park	
	This is a contentious matter. The key issue states that it is difficult to deliver the AONB's statutory purpose, but it does not say for whom it is difficult. Partners may feel that they are doing this work effectively. Further explanation needs to be provided on why national park status would provide additional financial resources, particularly if government priorities alter.	This has also been included as an ambition & further explanation given there which addresses this
	We welcome the opportunity to find out more about the advantages and disadvantages of the National Park proposal but would not support it at present, nor would the Council be likely to provide any funds towards investigation into this proposal.	
	p.26 Policy TAR7	
	This policy talks about the larger urban areas, but there are also areas of social deprivation within the AONB and in the smaller towns around the AONB.	Not incorporated. Already refers to 'in & around the AONB'. So not incorporated
	Overall comments	
OCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify who policies directed at – AONB to implement or for others? Compare NCES1 with NCES3. 	Change to NECS1
	Main detailed comments	

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	p6 Ecosystem Services: whilst this gets covered elsewhere it would be useful to mention health and wellbeing as part of the services we receive from natural capital.	Incorporated
	P10 Ambition 1: Is there background evidence that can be highlighted or linked to in the Plan that justify why this is a realistic ambition? There may be other protected landscape areas that could make a similar claim.	Comment only
	Policy NCES1: clarify the wording, are you using NatCap and ES to demonstrate the benefits and values or just wanting to demonstrate the benefits of NC and ES?	Policy clear – no action taken. NB NCES1 now NCES2
	Policy NCES2: Whilst OCC is in the early stages of considering natural capital valuation I do not yet think the organisation is at a point where it could sign-up to this in the full sense of natural capital accounts. Therefore the policy would need to be focused to something that the Conservation Board seeks to do rather than requiring its partners to comply with.	Policy changed. NB now NCES3
	Policy NCES3: Too much of a blanket statement. It is hard to see how some developments and major infrastructure can sign-up to protecting Nat Cap when by definition some of the capital e.g. soils, is effectively lost as a result of the action of developing.	No action taken. Current wording used to ensure developers take NC into full consideration
	Policy LP2: Hard to see schemes being ‘landscape led’. They are led by the infrastructure need which they seek to address. There is a need for landscape to feature more significantly in the initial planning and design but this is still mitigation.	Comment only. Board role to push for schemes to consider landscape
	Policy LP6: clarify that the behavioural change is in a direction that enhances the AONB.	Policy changed
	Policy RLMP1: Prefer the wording in Ambition 2 of a ‘Cotswolds specific menu’. As written it sounds like you expect the policies to be developed just to benefit the AONB. What do you mean by ‘delivered locally’ and by whom?	Purposely not identified a particular body. Delivered locally = in the Cotswolds for the Cotswolds
	P16 Key issue vi): Agree problem with the extent of unmanaged woodlands. However it shouldn’t necessarily follow that planting new woodlands increases the amount of woodland in poor management. The logical conclusion of the statement as written is don’t plant new woodlands.	Changed
	Policy RLMP5: would it be appropriate to refer to UKWS as well. As management is an acknowledged issue should you be including a policy about promoting improved levels of management?	UKWAS=woodland mgmt. (quality mark scheme). Policy more related to landscape.
	Policy RLMP5 (2): Suggest that there is firstly support for squirrel and deer control. As a separate sentence there is support for greater co-ordination. [Note: this is one of the policies that I use relatively frequently when responding to queries about deer and squirrel culling, therefore it needs to be unequivocal.]	NB now RLMP6
	Policy HE4: will the Board go further than just encouraging and support the production of guidance. Given the lack of resources generally the LAs are likely to look to the Board for specialist input (and this is likely across sectors not just Heritage).	No changes made. Board already provides evidence

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	Policy BP2: clarify is this central government support? Re. previous points need consistency in how phrased – this one works quite well.	Support could be wider than central govt. Therefore no changes made
	Policy BP3: this would benefit from re-wording to clarify its intentions. Like to see reference to biodiversity accounting and metrics as a tool to help understand whether net gain is being achieved, in addition to biodiversity offsetting.	Check with SS
	Policy DTP1	
	h) see earlier comments about being ‘landscape led’. What is meant by wider mitigation in this context?	No changes made – refer to LSG
	i) not clear what is meant by a ‘sustainable pattern of development’. Reducing dependency on car travel seems to all-encompassing.	Retained from previous MP
	Policy DTP3: noting the need to house key workers who maintain the landscape, should the policy be more specific on this? How would that play out in your support, for example, for an affordable housing scheme in a not so good landscape location? How will you respond to the specific needs of travellers and showpeople.	No changes made – refer to LSG
	Policy DTP7: the issue of energy use and food is complex. Promotion of local food might not always be the most energy efficient response, does that need a slight qualification?.	Changed to include ‘where appropriate’
	P23 ii) How does ‘over abstraction’, as opposed to abstraction produce a positive river flow outcome. Over implies it is done to excess.	Check with MC
	Policy NCES3: there seems a potential conflict here with the desire to reduce car use as improving traffic flow often increases car usage. This seems a policy that could have many unintended consequences. A policy that supports diverse solutions to the issue of traffic generated air pollution that are compliant with landscape guidelines etc could encourage more innovative solutions.	Included ‘diverse and innovative’ into policy
	P23 Climate Change. There is much cross-over with the Development and Transport policies.	Comment only
	Policy TAR3: clarify somewhere nearby what Caring for the Cotswolds is.	Explanation incorporated
	Policy TAR7: ‘all transport providers’ is a very wide net. Can this be made more specific?	No changes made. Purposely kept wide
	Policy TAR8: More clarity needed. On the policy itself as written it suggests that the entire PROW network will be ‘available to all’, which is not realistic given even simple considerations of path surfaces and slopes.	Check with SS
S Glos	Overall comments	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> document is clear, well-structured and succinctly sets out what objectives the Cotswolds Board has for the AONB 	

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would be helpful to include a general 'flavour' of business plan direction, potentially including bullet points of the Board's intended actions and priorities. Also helpful to highlight issues such as the actions for promoting the area for visitors and business, and what is being done to support business in the AONB. 	Not Included (see opposite) after speaking to SS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many policies – over 50 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are issues/aims presented as policies where it is not clear how their effectiveness can be assessed, or how the management plan contributes (/ can contribute) to addressing the policy as presented. More effective to include fewer policies – possibly one overarching policy per section, and alongside this the aims that the policy seeks to address, how it can be achieved and performance measured. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a few occasions where policies cross refer to other policies e.g. Policy P1. In these instances, there may be scope to condense policies down and reduce the overall number. 	
	Main detailed comments	
	Special qualities of the Cotswolds. No reference to dominant land uses in the Cotswolds – e.g. active agriculture uses, which have made a significant contribution to the landscape surrounding the settlements, hamlets and agricultural buildings.	Included & Added
	Provide more examples of the social, economic and cultural features referred to, e.g. events held, traditional local businesses, rural economy etc. At present list focussed on built and natural environment.	Included & Added
	Spatial Portrait of the Cotswolds AONB	
	The ' development ' section highlights the challenge of the pressure for growth, but doesn't say what the Board's approach to growth is beyond that it is a concern, and has the potential for both positive and negative effects. It might be helpful to list examples of these impacts, as this could be used to guide development.	Section is just a brief overview. Not meant to go into any further detail
	Amend final sentence on page 8 to read: "...The expansion of these businesses will be appropriately managed through development decisions in line with national and local (including neighbourhood) planning policies relating to the AONB."	Included
	Landscape	
	Could issue covered in Policy LP4 would be better promoted in the front sections of the report, and also how performance against this policy will be monitored.	Not Moved - Appropriate place
	Support the aim of policy LP5 . There may be other areas for economic growth with potential, e.g. traditional craft/traditional skills businesses, other agri-businesses.	Note, but not included
	Historic Environment	
	Reference to 'buildings' and 'sites' could be added to the first sentence of Policy HE4 , to add further clarity, e.g. "New development, conversions and extensions should respect historical features, buildings, sites, layout and context..."	Not Included . Covered by 'features' & 'layout'

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	Development and Transport	
	Welcome the Board's commitment to working with LPAs in developing their local plans and with communities through the neighbourhood planning process. Also welcome the acknowledgement of the importance of providing housing to meet local needs within the AONB.	
	Reference to conserving the historic environment should be added to Policy DTP1 , potentially at part c , e.g. "c) Be designed to conserve the historic environment and respect local settlement patterns, building styles, scale and materials;"	Included
	DTP1 include ref to NIAs	Not Included
	Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services	
	Policy NCE3 would benefit from further explanation, as at present the intended effect is not clear.	Included
	Climate Change	
	Reference to protection of the historic environment should be inserted into Policy CC2 , to read: "Small scale renewable energy technology compatible with the AONB landscape and protection of the historic environment is encouraged and promoted where they have been informed by relevant guidance documents from the Board."	Included
	Policy CC5 should highlight the importance of ensuring that traditional materials and methods of construction are maintained and the intended performance of the building is not compromised.	Included
	Tourism, access and recreation	
	National Park status. Interested to see the outputs of the Board's engagement with its stakeholders in due course.	Noted
	Policy TAR 7 and 8 are important for the access network which includes the PROW network. Include aspiration for further engagement with landowners or land managers to encourage enhancement of network by provision of accessible furniture within their control. The provision of downloadable routes for mobile mapping apps would reach the growing market using technology.	Included
	Health and Wellbeing	
	Partnership between the Wardens and the Health Walk officers in Local authorities might help increase the coverage across the AONB, whether this be by direct led walks or referral on from health walks to wardens.	Feel already included
	The developments in technology have led to great increases in downloadable routes to mobile mapping apps. The provision of all the routes in suitable electronic form would benefit those with the technology to enjoy the access network including those who would benefit from increased activity.	
BANES	Overall comments	
	None	
	Main detailed comments	

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	Spatial Portrait of the Cotswolds AONB	
	Text changes across all sections.	
	P10. Ambitions. Text changes to Ambition 1.	
	P12. Natural Capital Outcomes. More clarity required re asset or ecosystem service	Incorporated
	Landscape	
	P12. Policy NCES1. Reword to make into stronger policy.	Not Incorporated
	P14. Policy LP1. Should reference local and national planning policy	Incorporated
	P14. Policy LP2 (3). Include re to conserve 'and enhance' and ecosystem services	
	P14. Policy LP3. Should reference local and national planning policy	
	P15. Policy LP6. Clarify what's meant by behavioural change and management	Changed
	Rural Land Management	
	P15. Outcome. Include ref to retaining natural capital and include ecosystem services	
	P16. RLMP1. Text changes to last sentence	Incorporated
	P16. KI iii. Reword for clarity	Incorporated
	P16. RLMP3. Include 'retaining natural capital and landscape character'.	Not incorporated - Addressed in RLMP2
	P16. RLMP4. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P16. KI vi. How is creating new woodland a problem?	Addressed through other changes
	P16. Policy RLMP5. No reference to mgmt. of woodlands, although listed as an issue (KI vi)	Included 'management'
	** Two Policy RLMP5's. Check numbering	
	P17. Policy RLMP5. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P17. Policy RLMP6. Include additional text re removal or planning of new trees	Incorporated
	Historic Environment	
	P17. Outcome. Text changes for clarity	Incorporated
	P17. KI ii. Include ref setting. Delete ref to HLC.	Settings as part of' included but deletion of 'and Historic...' Not included
	P18. Policy HE1. Delete ref to 'impacts'. Change to 'The historic environment ...'	Incorporated
	P18. KI iii. Delete 'more accessible' re HER as they are accessible anyway.	Incorporated
	P18. Policy HE2. Reword for clarity.	Incorporated
	P18. KI v. and vi. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P18. Policy HE4. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	Biodiversity	
	P19. KI ii & iv. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P19. Policy BP2. Include ref to 'coordinated programme of schemes' eg Bathscapes, Back from the Brink	Too specific - No examples needed. Not incorporated
	P20. Policy BP3. Text changes	Incorporated - more positively worded than current version
	Development and Transport	
	P20. Outcome. Text changes for consistency with Special Qualities	Incorporated but page reference not included as no ref needed
	P20. KI i, ii, iii). Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P20. Policy DTP1. 3rd bullet. Delete 'issued by the Board' as docs may be produced/issued by others e.g. Bathscapes	Not Incorporated - This is about Board Docs

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	P21. KI viii, x. Minor text changes.	Incorporated
	P22. DTP5. Change text for clarity	Incorporated - more positively worded than current version
	P22. DTP7. Delete 'to'.	Changes already made
	Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services	
	P23. Confusing – already have section on this (pgs11/12)	
	P23. Outcome. Check consistency of definition with pgs 11/12	
	P23. Policy NCES1. Repeats from pg 12, but wording slightly different. Also very similar to Policy RLMP3. Should cross ref?	
	P23. Policy NCES2. Same policy ref no as on pg 12	
	P24. Policy NCES3. Same policy ref no as on pg 12	
	Climate Change	
	P24. Section seems to repeat earlier section pg 23	
	P24. Policy CC1. Very similar to DTP7 (pg22) is it needed?	
	P24. Policy CC2 and CC3. Both very similar to DTP8 (pg 22) is it needed?	
	P24. Policy CC4. Insert 'sustainability guidance (national/local/Board?) that includes..'	
	P24. Policy CC5. Very similar to DTP 9 (pg 22) is it needed?	
	Tourism, access, recreation	
	P25. KI i. Text changes	
	P26. KI v, vi. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P26. Policy TAR3. Insert 'increased'	Incorporated
	P26. KI vii. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P26. KI viii. Minor text changes	Not Incorporated. No clearer than existing
	P26. Policy TAR5. Text changes. Also noted that AONB/NP = status re landscape and protection	Incorporated
	P26. KI ix. Insert 'long term commitment'	Incorporated
	P26. Policy TAR6. Text changes	Not Included. Implies reliance on schemes with other NT's
	P27. KI x, xi. Include suggested reasons for people to enjoy AONB and other minor text changes	Incorporated
	P27. Policy TAR 7 and 8. Minor text changes.	Incorporated
	Health and Wellbeing	
	P27. Outcome. Minor text changes	Incorporated
	P27. Policy HAW1. Minor text changes	
	P28. KI iv. Insert 'widely'	
	P28. Policy HAW2. Text changes.	
	Overall comments	
	Following issues could be explored further	
	Green Infrastructure and Ecological Networks	
Tewks BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition what is meant by 'Green Infrastructure' and 'Ecological Networks' in the context of the AONB and its setting. 	Not Included. Too much detail requested for a MP

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing information regarding the adopted Green Infrastructure strategies and Ecological Networks policy framework within the AONB and its setting 	Not included. If di so would have to list too many including other types of strategies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further detail on how development proposals that incorporate green infrastructure and ecological networks proposals contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural and built environment of the AONB. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information showing how this has been used (perhaps by reference to case study examples) 	Too much detail
	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information showing how CIL has been used (perhaps through case study examples) to secure green infrastructure and a landscape led approach that conserves and enhances the AONB. 	Too much detail for MP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing links to relevant CIL policies from the local planning authorities within the AONB and its setting 	Too much detail
	Rural Tranquillity mapping	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Campaign to Protect Rural England (and other studies) have been carried out regarding tranquillity mapping (also including AONB's) and the issue of light pollution. 	Included & Position Statement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recognised that light pollution has the potential to detrimentally affect and to urbanise the rural character of the AONB; an issue that is frequently underplayed within development proposals. 	Included & Position Statement
	NPPF	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of paragraphs 115 and 116 should be further explained and the role of the AONB Management plan in providing great weight and material considerations in the 'planning balance' 	Guidance is not to repeat National Policy therefore not included
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of development plan strategic allocations in adopted development plans should be further highlighted, along with the importance of Neighbourhood plans within the AONB. 	Neighbourhood plans already included. See policy DTP1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging NDP's are also important indicators, as they highlight environmental issues that are important to local people and the management plan should include more information on this. 	See policy BP3, DTP2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further reference should be made to section 109 of the NPPF, that sets out the principle that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. 	Included ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cotswold Conservation Board Position Statement, Development in the Setting of the Cotswold AONB, is referred to in the consultation draft, but there should be further explanation regarding the factors that come into play in conserving and enhancing the natural and built environment of the AONB and its foreground setting. Of particular interest is the potential vulnerability of Special Landscape Areas to 'development pressure' as these locally valued landscapes provide the important foreground setting to the AONB. More amplification of this issue would be beneficial. 	Not included - reference to P.S & LSG. Don't want to repeat themes

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	Highways and Transportation working in the highway Corridor within the Cotswold AONB	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering improvements and the negative impact of lighting and signage, and other 'safety' measures have the potential to negatively impact on the setting of the AONB. 	Included
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing links to adopted Highways Corridor best practice working guidelines should be included from the AONB local authority area, as this promotes best practice and higher quality design. 	Too detailed level. Ref already in LSG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such best practice demonstrates how the highways design and engineering issues can be sympathetically managed in terms of the landscape setting. 	Ref already in LSG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In parallel there are also local authority Residential Housing Estate Design Guides that are not prescriptive, but set out the general principles that should be followed to achieve landscape led and high quality developments 	Too much detail
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information should be provided within the management plan to draw attention to the relevant local authority best practice guidance that encompasses both landscape and urban design issues 	Too much detail - refer to LSG
	Protecting hedges and TPO trees within the countryside and within the built environment	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These features contribute to the scenic appearance of the landscape setting and provide biodiversity habitats (and contribute to Biodiversity Action Plan Targets) within the AONB, and need to be taken account of within development proposals, in order to conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB. 	Refer to LSG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This also includes protecting existing landscape features and providing street trees within the adopted highway as part of development proposals 	Refer to LSG
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Landscape Characterisations and Landscape and Sensitivity Analysis 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference is made within the plan to the Landscape Characterisation Assessments at a national, county and AONB level. It is also appropriate to explain the role of historic landscape characterisation studies and landscape sensitivity assessments and how this information can be used along with the landscape character assessments to conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB. 	Already ref
	Registered Historic Parks and Gardens	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape and historic built environment and its setting, are jointly important issues to be taken into account within development proposals within the AONB 	Already ref
	Community and Partnership Projects within the AONB	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information on the Cotswold Conservation Board profile of completed community and partnership projects (through reference to case studies) would demonstrate what has been achieved and illustrate visions for the future 	Not included. Could refer to State of the Cotswolds
	Public Rights of Way, long distance footpaths and cycle paths	

Organisation	Main comments	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A key objective of the management plan is to promote countryside access and public enjoyment of the scenic beauty of the AONB. There should be further maps within the management plan showing the public access linkages within the AONB area. 	Too much detail
	<p>Local Nature Partnerships and Local Enterprise Partnerships</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The role of the above should be promoted in the management plan linked to the management plan objectives, ideally through case studies or project work examples. 	Not included
	<p>Natural Capital and Ecosystems Services Approach</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above form the core of a holistic environmentally led approach. Should there be case study examples or statistics demonstrating the benefits then this helps to promote the best practice approach 	refer to Natural Capital report