

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
COMMENT				RESPONSE		
153	JBB Clee	(JBB Clee) Planning Officer, Bulford Parish Council. (Tel: 01980-632363)	Bulford Parish Council		22/02/2014	E
<p>1. It is submitted that the entries in the green box on page 26 of the consultation paper "Composite Feedback and Assessment of Recommended Sites" to the effect that Bulford 6 & 16 are "Supported by Bulford Parish Council" are misleading as to the Council's true position in the matter.</p> <p>2. The Council's position is as stated in its original Response (paras 5c(1)&(2)), specifically that the support is for only the northern portions of these two areas. The reasons given for this are explained fully in the same paragraph and a copy of this Council's Response is attached for ease of reference.</p> <p>3. To further illustrate Council's position, a map is attached to this e-mail on which the approximate size of the new estate (based to scale upon the amount of land already occupied by the recently completed and similarly sized Canadian Estate) is shown lightly shaded in lime green. This does not attempt to show the proposed exact position and layout of the new estate (in fact the expectation would be for it to be set back from the Bulford Road towards Double Hedges), but it is included to show the preferred orientation and approximate preferred position of the development.</p> <p>4. This amplification is considered important, since Council would support a location for the estate running alongside the Bulford Road in areas B16, B7, or B24 only as a fallback location should the preferred locations prove impossible for as yet unseen reasons the prime considerations for this being :-</p> <p>a. An estate in these areas, running parallel to the Bulford Road, would only allow for entry/exit points onto one Highway (Bulford Road), thereby adding to the additional vehicular traffic already generated by the newly completed Canadian Estate.</p> <p>b. An estate in these areas would tend to perpetuate the present separation between Camp and Village, whereas to lay the new estate alongside the existing civilian development within the Parish would do much to encourage integration between the civilian and military populations. Since the civilian population of Bulford Parish is shortly to be substantially out-numbered by its military counterpart, any measure that fosters integration between the two communities is considered important.</p> <p>5. Lastly, Appendices 1 to 15 appear to be missing from this document, as it is published on the website; may these be supplied?</p>				<p>The Council's position is acknowledged and noted.</p> <p>Traffic studies and assessments were carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the Outline Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (22 May 2014).</p> <p>Appendices 1-15 were sent directly to the consultee.</p>		
154	Dave Nicholls	46A High Street Bulford Wiltshire SP4 9DS	Resident		21/02/2014	E
<p>I am a resident of Bulford and am trying to read the details of your plans for your Army Basing Plans. The most information seems to be in your Planning Context Report Consultation Draft Phase 3 Report available on the internet. However, when referring to planned sites for building it refers to, for example, "Bulford 6". There does not appear to be any information about what sites are where. I can only assume that this information is contained within the 15 appendices that are listed in the index but appear to be missing from the document. Could you please either send me the appendices or let me know where they can be obtained?</p>				Appendices 1-15 were sent directly to the consultee		
155	Andrew Dobson	Bulford	Resident/Homeowner		19/02/2014	E
<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>I own property in Bulford and having reviewed the Consultation For A Master Plan document I have the following points:</p> <p>I'm concerned that the local road network will struggle to cope with the additional traffic.</p> <p>With the significant increase in SFA what provision is being made to upscale schooling to match demand?</p> <p>The woodland to the south of Bulford (the area surrounding the Officers SFA, the area between New Ward Road and Bulford Droveaway) is very popular with local families who walk there and developing this area would not be a popular move.</p> <p>Old Carter barracks is also used by locals walking there and is frequently used by the military for driver training.</p>				<p>Traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Appendices 1-15 were sent directly to the consultee.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council and DIO have been working together since the the basing plans were announced to ensure that the right level of infrastructure will be provided (including school facilities). DIO has gained a much better understanding of capacity of existing infrastructure. Baseline capacity and projected demand were assessed during the preparation of the final Masterplan. Upgrades to existing infrastructure and key items of new infrastructure required to support the incoming population will be considered in the Masterplan document. DIO will continue to work closely with Wiltshire Council during the planning application stage to plan for the required additional infrastructure.</p> <p>The woodland to the south of Bulford, and between New Ward Road and Bulford Droveaway is to be retained.</p>		
156	Anthony Cummins	Bulford	Resident		19/02/2014	E
<p>Hello</p> <p>I have been led to believe that the army is to build new SFA directly behind my house on Churchill Avenue, Bulford. Presently there is a steep bank at the top of which there is a wooded area running the length of the fields adjacent to Churchill Avenue. If you are building in this area is it your intention to remove the trees as this causes me two areas of concern. Firstly due to the raised height my upper windows will be able to be looked directly into and secondly if the trees are removed will this not weaken the bank.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>				The strip of woodland serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the , and will be retained.		
157	John & Rosemary Ellis	Durrington	Resident		19/02/2014	E
<p>I have just seen the proposed site plan for the new married quarters at Larkhill. I cannot believe that yet again the wishes of the residents of Durrington have been ignored. Why is English Heritage allowed to dictate where these buildings are to go. They have caused enough problems for the residents of the surrounding villages already with their I KNOW BEST ATTITUDE to the layout and positioning of the new Stonehenge Site. Is it not about time that the people that actually live in these areas are heard and English Heritage told that they do not rule the roost, or is someone getting a backhand from them. I thought that the residents of Durrington made it perfectly clear that they did not want houses built along the A345. This piece of green belt was required to keep our individual identity. Otherwise are you going to rename us Larkington. The families that move into these new dwellings will be eligible to visit Stonehenge free of charge anyway, so what difference does it make if the Stones can be seen from the new dwellings.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the distance that personnel will have to travel to get to work, school and shops. The amount of traffic heading towards the Countess Roundabout, especially at bank holidays and in the Summer when it becomes a car park and forces traffic through villages, not suitable for the size and volume of lorries and cars, this includes Larkhill but of course I forgot people running English Heritage do not live here.</p>				<p>The final Masterplan includes a large green buffer so that SFA will not serve to conjoin the two settlements. They will remain distinct and separate from one another.</p> <p>DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable.</p> <p>However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage.</p> <p>To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.</p> <p>Traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.</p>		
158	Dawn Taylor-Cox	25, Newman's Way Bulford, Wiltshire SP4 9HT	Resident		23/02/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
159	Phillip Piper	Unstated	Unstated		18/02/2014	E
160	Guy Lawrence	60 Countess Road Amesbury SP4 7AT	Unstated		26/02/2014	E
161	Claire Curry	Unstated	Unstated		27/02/2014	E
162	Richard Horner	Figheldean	Resident		03/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
163	Clive Gutteridge	Shrewton, SALISBURY, Wiltshire, SP3 4HL	Appleford Ltd		05/03/2014	E
164	Spencer Bridewell	Unstated	Figheledean Parish Council		05/03/2014	E
165	Mr Jan Belza	Unstated	Resident		05/03/2014	E
166	Karen Campbell	Tidworth	Resident		06/03/2014	E
167	Graham Russell	28 Kingfisher Drive, Durrington, Salisbury, Wiltshire	Resident		11/03/2014	P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code			
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box			
						As an ex military family we understand the need to accommodate returning units from Germany on Salisbury Plain but do not believe that your plans for Larkhill and Bulford take sufficient notice of the impact on local villages and the visual and cultural changes that will result. We are particularly concerned that your plans for unit moves and the required associated SFA will essentially result in the villages of Durrington and Bulford becoming part of a military garrison. Durrington and Bulford villages are distinct and separate at the moment from the garrison in the area and should remain so. Everyone we speak to on this area are concerned that the rural and civilian nature of these villages will be compromised by the MoD proposals. I will ask you to consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place less units in Larkfield – why is it necessary to create such a large concentration of artillery units? Surely it would be better to locate units of artillery with the supported aims of the formation of which they will operate? • If the MoD is adamant that it wishes to create this unnecessary artillery super-garrison then every effort should be made to restrict the impact, visually and culturally, on the surrounding villages. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Provide the infrastructure of medical, educational, recreational etc facilities that ensure no adverse affect on provision to the local community by placing greater burden on the existing facilities. o Reconsider the siting of the SFA at Larkfield to ensure Durrington remains separate and does not just become part of Larkhill garrison. (Has consideration been given to using the land between areas L15b and L17a instead of using L15b?), or indeed other areas within and surrounding the existing garrison? 			Comment noted. The final Masterplan includes a large green buffer so that SFA will not serve to conjoin the two settlements. They will remain distinct and separate from one another. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre will also be used for housing.
168	Steven Gill	1 Furze Drive Perham Down	Resident		09/03/2014	E			
						Firstly I would like to point out that I 100% support our Armed Forces I was a serving soldier my brother is a serving Officer and my Father was a career Soldier. Please see the attached links which point out where the MOD intend to build houses. Can someone please clarify if the houses that are adjacent to 1 Furze Drive (PL10 & 11) will be built? From the links below there seems to be 2 different messages and clarity is needed. For the record I, nor any of my neighbours have received any communication about this. It is only upon watching a recent news article that this has come to light. I am 100% against these houses being built and would like some confirmation as to what is happening and why I have not been contacted. Along with this I understand that up to 4000 soldiers are to be redeployed from Germany to the Tidworth Area? Can you confirm what infrastructure improvements will be put in place to accommodate this? There will need to be more schools, GP surgeries and roads at least as the current ones struggle to cope as it is. With a conservative estimate of 15000 (including families) people coming to the area by 2020 I am very concerned that the infrastructure will not be able to cope. Furthermore can you confirm what is being done to appease the current civilian residents as at this moment in time it seems that if you are a civilian living in the Tidworth Area you are nothing but a 2nd class citizen. Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the Special Landscape Area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Garrison will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall.			
169	Thomas Phillips	Bulford Village Wilts SP4 9HS 16 Swattons Close	Resident		10/03/2014	E			
						Paraphrased. Original saved as Thomas Phillips - Resident Concerned with the preferred site B23. Access and exit to and from this site will substantially increase the volume of traffic using the Quebec T Junction at Bulford Camp and the two crossroads one at Double Hedges and the other at Salisbury road in the village. There would be increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists using the crossing on the corner opposite Watergate Lane and the Chapel. There is only one Petrol Filling Station/shopping facility situated in Salisbury Road the increase in traffic would cause congestion on this road and make it difficult to access and exit the forecourt and junctions at St Leonards Close, Churchill Avenue and Crescent Road that lead into Salisbury Road. Site B23 will be hemmed in by three roads around its perimeter. It will be difficult and more dangerous for children of all ages who wish to use the facilities either in the village or the Camp outside the estate area as in all cases they will have to cross at least one of the roads at any one time. General concern for wildlife and habitat. Increase in road and air traffic will impact detrimentally on air and noise pollution levels. Propose Site B 19 as an option: Would provide easy access to the Bulford Drove way which would route traffic along the bottom of the Camp and Village would also provide direct access to the roads going towards Milston and Netheravon taking the traffic completely away from the centre of the village all-together. Site 19 would provide easy walking access for children going to the KIWI school thus reducing the need to use transport. Site 19 would be within a 10 minute walking distance from the farthest locations in the Camp making work places, leisure and shopping facilities all within easy reach. Proposed Sites B21 and B22 as an option: Both these sites would provide all the above mentioned advantages of site 19 with the added merit of previously having been used for accommodation so that there is probably some water and sewage facilities already in place. Land between site 22, the Carter Barracks site, and Bulford Village which runs alongside the Drove way as a housing option: There are no woods and few hedgerows between the village and Site 22 to have much effect on wildlife habitat. Similar advantages in respect of traffic/congestion as per site 19. Safer for children walking to St Leonards School and Durrington Schools. Access to water and sewage facilities for this site would be easier with the recent completion of the Canadian Housing Estate which is less than 100 metres up the road.			
170	Mr & Mrs Barry Whelan	Unstated	Unstated		10/03/2014	E			
						We think the new Army Housing should be near to the Army camp to allow personal to travel to work easily to help the environment, and to be near shops and leisure facility's. The area B23 would change the village character and way of life, and also affect the wild life. If B23 is to be used the coppice bordering Newmans Way, Swattons Close and Churchill Avenue should not be disturbed or removed.			
171	Richard Bennett	23 Newman's Way Bulford Salisbury SP4 9HT	Resident		10/03/2014	E			
						The strip of woodland serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the , and will be retained. The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points.			

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
		Paraphrased. Original saved as Richard Bennett Email - Resident				
		Housing development specifically in B23 & B30 would severely affect the village's unique personality and. The small strip of woods sandwiched between the two estates would become a children's playground attracting further anti-social behaviour				
		Areas B12, B19 and B20 seem far more geographically adequate to enable the military's desire of being close enough for soldiers to forgo the need to drive to Picton and Ward Barracks thus lessening future environmental impact. The "ten minute walk to camp" as suggested by the military would simply not be achieved from B23 and B30 to the current barracks access points				
		The retail and infrastructure needs of soldiers and their families will be far better accommodated from areas B12, B19 and B20 given the proximity for families to the shops (in Bulford Camp Square), the Gym, the Medical Centre and Kivi School				
		The military community is comparably young against the civilian community and therefore we can expect to see a disproportionate increase in children into the local area. There is no social infrastructure to accommodate children which may result in a significant increase in anti-social behaviour that may directly impact on the village.				
		Ref A Para 5c4 states that the 'SFA dwellings in this area would facilitate social interaction between military families and those in the civilian housing estate'. I would be interested to hear what social interaction the council is referring to and why it cannot be achieved a little further out as the two communities have always existed happily together in its current configuration. I would also be interested to hear whether any of the councillors or those that have made this the council's location preference reside on Churchill Avenue, Newman's Way or Swattons Close.				
		The fact that local residents have not been directly canvassed for their opinions via a comprehensive leaflet campaign is outrageous. I fear that the majority of other local residents are also unaware and, as a result, will miss the opportunity to voice their views prior to the conclusion of the consultation period.				
		I would be obliged if you would provide an explanation as to why those of us whom this development affects the most were not directly consulted for their opinion. I cannot help feel that the situation has been handled by the council in an underhand and suspicious manner.				
				The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).		
				Two periods of public consultation have been held on the 'Emerging Masterplan' and 'Preferred SFA Options' respectively. A third four-week period for final comments on the final Masterplan, will take place between 20th May and 17th June 2014 giving local residents, statutory consultees and other interested parties another opportunity to engage in the planning process. Comments received during this period will be addressed at planning application stage.		
				----- Response from Bulford Parish Council:		
				Dear Mr Bennett,		
				1. I have carefully read your submission (attached).		
				2. I am sure that you will understand when I say that, whilst individuals like yourself (naturally enough) take a personal view, the Parish Council has to regard the matter as a Parish whole; wherever we recommend that these houses go, there are going to be dissatisfied individual parishioners.		
				3. You have already accessed the Parish Website, so you will have seen the Council's reasons for its recommendations and you will have read that one of the reasons is integration of the civilian and military communities (please note that co-existing and integrating are not the same thing). However, perhaps what is not made clear is the Army "New Employment Model" under which Units will be permanent in their new locations and this means that military families will be no more mobile than their purely civilian counterparts; the old attitudes towards military families have got to change and "transient communities" and "temporary bonds with the civilian communities" will just no longer apply. These Army families (not to mention their soldier husbands) are ordinary people like you and me and they cannot just be pushed to areas that are out of sight and out of mind. I would also like to emphasise that military families (as well as their uniformed husbands) are just as much Bulford Parishioners as you are and they deserve the same degree of consideration as you do.		
				4. You have placed emphasis upon other factors, which I deal with below :- a. Roads. "Yes", our roads are, at present not fit for purpose, and, "Yes" these new families will place an additional strain upon them, wherever they are put. However, this is a County matter and, although we complain constantly about their condition we have little influence where roads are concerned. b. Children. Your para 3e. Wherever there are families, there will be children and I have to say that children are not a valid reason for objecting to house building under any circumstances! I would personally agree with you that the young people of today are not as disciplined and well-behaved as they used to be in our youth and that they are a public nuisance very much more often than they used to be. However, I will stick my neck out and say that, not only is it my experience that the children of military families are usually better behaved than their civilian counterparts (since their Fathers, by definition know what discipline actually means), but also that, if absolutely need be, the Army can bring pressure to bear to sort out persistently bad behaviour; as Council knows only too well, there is not a lot that can be done about persistent offenders from civilian families (presumably your patio windows were not broken by the children of military families). As far as Tipping goes, as Council knows to its cost, this is endemic County wide and is not limited to the military and their families. Above all, if you ever have a specific complaint, come and voice it (or write) to the Council; how to do this is transparent enough. c. "In Ref B the military expressed a preference for areas B17, B24, B7 and B16" (your words). I just don't know where you got this from. "Preferred Area" and "Potential Area" are, at this stage, no more than an initial, tentative narrowing of all the areas of land that are owned by MOD. The basic military criteria are simply put as :- (1) That the families should be located in the same general area in which their husbands are employed (i.e. in the same Parish). This is entirely sensible and is an over-riding consideration with which Council would not quarrel. (The "10 minute walk" has never been more than idle conversation and has never been considered to be a practicality; in any case, 10 minute walk or no, our experience is that soldiers will drive when they can!) (2) That the houses should be on one estate. Clearly anything else would be an expensive and administrative nightmare and no sensible person would want to argue against it - certainly Council would not wish to dispute it - indeed we would support it, since the alternatives would be far worse from the Parish point of view. (3) That, in Bulford Parish, the houses should be reasonably close to the existing Canadian Estate to ease costs and administration. Council would not wish to quarrel with this (particularly in the light of the recent and on-going financial cuts to the Armed Forces) and Council's recommendations meet this requirement. (4) That, as far as possible, amenities should be accessible and that, as far as possible, there should be employment opportunities for the wives. These are matters that lie outside the Parish Council's control; in any case, where Bulford Parish is concerned, this clashes with (1) above which is the over-riding principle. The facilities that exist within the Camp are comparatively rudimentary in the extreme (and likely to remain so in the foreseeable future) and, in any case, are not what is meant by the criteria.		
				5. Lastly, I would like to address your para 4 (I stress, at the outset, that I mean no personal offence, even though what I am about to say may be unpalatable to you). Firstly, you should be aware that Parish Councils were not given any information prior to the matter being put in the public domain and the Council recommendations had to be submitted to the authorities by a date which (within the Council schedule) resulted in a tight time scale. Secondly, Council, although the matter was debated, never Resolved to arrange a Leaflet Drop until the Meeting of 10 March, by which time it had become apparent that public ignorance of the matter was so great (as a direct result of an endemic lack of interest, on the part of members of the public, in Parish affairs) that some sort of Leaflet Drop was desirable; therefore, in its Meeting on 10 Mar, Council authorised a Leaflet Drop (at the taxpayers' not inconsiderable expense). It is your privilege to ignore what is going on in the Parish and in the Area Board, but don't complain about lack of knowledge afterwards! Every single thing concerning the matter of Army Re-basing and the SFAs, has been in the public domain on the Parish Notice Boards and on the Parish Website as soon as the Council was made aware of it. Thirdly, the civilian population of Bulford is approximately 2,500 souls, everyone of those affected (understandably enough), if consulted, would have come to fight his or her own particular individual corner (as you have done in your submission) and none of this would have helped the Council reach an all-embracing view of the Parish as a whole. All our Councillors live in this Parish, most of us for a very long time; we do not live in an Ivory Tower and there is nothing in your submission, other than your personal opinions, that the Members of the Council are unaware of or which was not thought of when Council was considering its recommendations; in any case, you and everyone else, far from being disenfranchised, is free to make your personal and individual submissions directly to the authorities; I am happy that you have exercised your right to do so.		
				6. I have devoted a great deal of my (unpaid!!) time to answering your letter and I hope that you now have a better understanding of Council's position. However, like all my colleagues on Council, I am always available and, if you wish to do so, I hope that you will feel free to either e-mail me or telephone to discuss the matter further; we are all always available.		
				Yours sincerely, (JBB Clew) Planning Officer, Bulford Parish Council. 14/3/14		
172	David Jackson	21 Newmans way Bulford, Salisbury Wiltshire	Resident		10/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>Paraphrased - Original saved as David Jackson Email - Resident</p> <p>RE: proposed sites B23 and B30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to development on these sites as this area is widely used for biking, rambling, dog walking and promoting nature conservation. No opposition to the re-housing and relocating of the military to this area but object to development in principle of any kind. <p>RE: proposed sites B17, B24 and B16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The woods that lie to the south of Newmans Way are already becoming a prime spot for fly tipping at the eastern end directly opposite the Canadian estate, further development would further accentuate this. <p>Areas B12, B19 and B20 would suit the military's requirements far more than the ones currently preferred by the council for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These areas would lead to a safer pedestrian route to both of the camps and the local shops etc. as they are closer and there are already established crossing points on the main route as well as a slower speed limit through the garrison area. It would also allow better access to the main route to Tidworth for those service personnel who need to commute to this part of the Tidworth Netheravon Bulford Garrison as it is a possibility that personnel from this area may be housed there. These areas would be better for families to access the medical centre and vitally Kiwi school which allows for more places for service children that Bulford Primary School. As the surrounding area has very little to offer young people in the way of social amenities it would be ideal for the SFA to be closer to the garrison so that the military can provide for teenagers during weekends and more importantly during deployments whether operational or training. Access routes in and out of the garrison area from these locations would be easier on the local infrastructure as there is direct access to the A303 transiting east and west, and then to the north via Tidworth and Ludgershall. <p>Concerned that many local residents are only just finding out about these plans leaving them very little time to express their views on this development. There must be further discussion between local residents, military representatives and council officials and to claim that these plans are unopposed is simply not true.</p>
173	JBB Clee	(JBB Clee) Planning Officer, Bulford Parish Council. (Tel: 01980-632363)	Bulford Parish Council		27/02/2014	E
						<p>Dear Steve,</p> <p>Thank you for your two e-mails of 26 Feb to our Parish Clerk, in response to my mine of 222047 (Feb), .</p> <p>The reason for not including the Appendices in the first place is now clear, as I had no idea that they were so large; nevertheless they are informative and helpful to an overall grasp of what is happening, and reference to them does save some time that otherwise has to be spent reading and searching through pages of closely packed text. Thank you for going to the trouble of sending them (more to follow ?).</p> <p>In passing, although knowledge of exactly what is going on behind the wire is helpful towards comprehension of the overall size of the Project, the Council interest in this respect is limited in reality to trying to ensure that the design and layout of buildings is good and in keeping with surrounding; in other words, that Bulford does not become, by default, another Aldershot ! However, this detail should not arise until things reach the planning stage, some time ahead.</p> <p>My military contacts tell me that the intention is to build a training road, directly from the Camp to the Training Area, in the vicinity of the bend in the Bulford Drove at Sheepbridge (approximately due North of the junction with the Tidworth Road), in order to facilitate the passage of Warrior from Camp to Training Area. This, of course, would be welcomed by the Council, as it would help a great deal to keep the passage of track laying vehicles to a minimum on the public roads. Is there yet any planning afoot as to where/how this road/track might run ? It does need to be born in mind that the Bulford Drove itself is not adopted and is still a "Training Road", not a properly marked and maintained Highway; nevertheless, largely in response to the closure of the A344, it has become a busy commuting road carrying a weight of fast moving civilian traffic and any armoured crossing over it will have to be carefully controlled and planned.</p> <p>In response to your query, my MODEM is on cable at 60Mbt and there is no restriction on file size. Again, thank you for your help and prompt reply to my e-mail. Yours sincerely, (JBB Clee) Bulford Parish Council.</p>
174	Tracy Webster	Swattons Close Bulford Village	Resident	?	12/03/2014	E
						<p>Good Afternoon</p> <p>My name is Mrs Tracy Webster and I own a property with my husband in Swattons Close Bulford Village. I am writing this email to object and write my concerns for the preferred site for the development of 277 military houses in the field that is at the front of our property (site B23).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Woodland and Wildlife. Decrease the value in our/all property/s in the village. Spoil the unique character and charm to the village. <p>We have lived in this property for over 11 years and the main reason for us buying this property was the location, the fact that we are both locals, and the fact that we did not have any houses at the front of the property which overlooks the old train line bank and the beautiful woodland above, and lots of wildlife. If this development went ahead we would lose the woodland and the wildlife and the most unsightly houses above us. This will also change the whole look of the village enormously.</p> <p>Both myself and husband (and the street including Newmans Way) have great concerns on the proposed development site and object to this taking place on this site, why can the development not be in the Army area and not the actual village itself; i.e. the Canadian estate field opposite Dorset, Hampshire Close, up by the Hive. This would be more beneficial to the service personnel as it would be within walking distance to the Army Barracks, Doctors and Dental Centre, shops in the square and the swimming pool and facilities, and Kiwi School. Surely there is more appropriate sites near the barracks itself without bringing into the village itself. The village welcome and has welcomed service personnel into the community, but we do not want their properties so close to the village itself, it would definitely decrease the value in our/surrounding properties due to the fact that we have a massive building development right above us and who in there right mind would want to live there. I would seriously consider selling our property if this development went ahead, which would be very unfair to my teenage children as they have been brought up in this unique and beautiful village.</p> <p>One last thing if the Army can afford to develop 277 houses, surely they can afford to have the road repaired along the new Canadian estate which has serious potholes.</p> <p>Kind Regards Tracy Webster</p>
175	Peter Wickes	6 Newmans Way Bulford Wilts SP4 9HT	Resident		12/03/2014	P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 **PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES**

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code	
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box	
		Transcribed - Original scanned and saved as PJ Wicks					
		New build must not be imposed upon existing residents, but must be sensitive to their needs. Influence of families will be as important as the private sector to provide shops and eating facilities, all of which should be planned into the new housing areas and not be ad-hoc. Obviously more school spaces and medical facilities will be required and these must be planned in. Specific areas: I understand that areas that B23 and B30 and area immediately west are under consideration. If these areas are to be used it would be a shame to lose the agricultural land. The new build should be outside of the copse that runs along the back of Newmans Way, and not include the copse area. If the copse is removed there would be a perception of overbearing/overlooking, given the difference in elevation. Further – I have heard rumours that access to that site would be made through Newmans Way. That would be unacceptable as our roads could not provide for that volume of traffic.					
		New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.					
		Site B23 has been included in the final Masterplan. The strip of woodland serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the proposed SFA site, and will be retained.					
		Site B30 has been omitted from the final Masterplan					
		New development will be served by an access off Bulford Road. An option to create an access from Double Hedges is also being explored. The site will not be accessed through Newmans Way.					
176	Unstated (OAP)	Unstated	Unstated	Unstated	12/03/2013	P	
		Transcribed - Original letter scanned and saved as OAP Scan Letter					
		Just a line about the new army housing proposal in Bulford at the back of Churchill Avenue South. I don't know if you know that that field intended for housing was once an Army Tank Training Area in the war. I think they used grenades (PEAAT) and phosphorous bombs.					
		They may have cleared it up but I am uncertain about that.					
177	Roger Green	Unstated	Resident		16/03/2013	E	
		The refined sifting for The Army Basing Programme has labelled Site L13b at Larkhill as a potential site for Service Family Accommodation (SFA). This site runs along the southern edge of The Packway until it reaches Wood Rd where it turns south along the western edge of Wood Rd. It is therefore positioned on the north eastern corner of what was once the Larkhill Flying Ground established here between 1908 and 1914.					
		This Flying Ground saw the very earliest of aviation pioneers manufacture and fly their aeroplanes and resulted in a series of flying sheds being built, five of which remain today at the lower end of Wood Rd. These early aviators included Horatio Barber, Charles Rolls, George Cockburn, John Fulton and Samuel Cody. Their names are legendary and by 1911 the first military aeroplane formation in this country was established at Larkhill as No.2 Company of the Air Battalion. This became No.3 Sqn RFC in 1912 where it resided until the airfield closed in 1914. The Bristol and Colonial Aeroplane Company set up it's Flying School and also assembled many of its early aeroplanes here and Larkhill became one of the most active and important aviation centres of its time.					
		This immensely historic flying ground is now to be threatened by the proposal to build SFA on Site L13b. If this proceeds it will result in the loss of unique heritage forever. There will no longer be the view of the airfield and the rolling Stonehenge landscape that the early aviators experienced over 100 years ago. The importance of this site is well known and it seems inconceivable that it should be chosen for building construction of any type.					
		To reinforce this, in 1970 a Concordat was drawn up between the MOD and the Ministry of Public Building and Works to ensure that no construction above a certain height should take place in this area. I am not aware that this agreement has lapsed in any way.					
		The National Trust recognise the historic value of the Larkhill Landing Ground and for several years have sponsored the Wings Over Stonehenge Group to conduct guided walks to explain and illustrate the significance of the area and it's aviation past. The SFA proposal would almost certainly bring this activity to an end since the landscape that provides so much of the subject interest for these walks would no longer exist.					
		In respect to early British aviation history and it's pioneers, I strongly urge the reconsideration of this site for possible building purposes, and the abandonment of the L13b proposal.					
178	Peter Wicks	6 Newmans Way Bulford Wilts SP4 9HS	Resident		16/03/2013	E	
		I have sent in a written contribution to the consultation. This is to underline 2 aspects, and add a further point.					
		1. If plots B23 & B30 are to be used, then the copse should be left as is and not be felled. This would allow privacy between the existing and new estates, and prevent overlooking/overbearing given the difference in height. 2. Access to B23/30 via Newmans Way is UNACCEPTABLE to residents of Newmans Way. The road is not designed to be a thoroughfare. 3. New build to go on brownfield, not on greenfield (e.g. _not_ on areas used currently for agriculture).					
		The strip of woodland north of Site B23 will be retained. Site B30 has been omitted from the final Masterplan.					
		The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).					
		New development will be served by an access off Bulford Road. An option to create an access from Double Hedges is also being explored. The site will not be accessed through Newmans Way.					
179	Timothy Brown	23 Swan Drive Staverton Trowbridge Wilts BA14 8UN			18/03/2013	E	
		Paraphrased - Original saved as Timothy Brown Objection					
		Specific concerns relate to the construction of Service Family Accommodation (SFA) on parcels of land owned by the MOD south of The Packway, in an area that lies within the designated Stonehenge World Heritage Site.					
		Stonehenge is a beloved national icon and one of the country's most visited tourist attractions and I would advocate preservation of the open vistas enjoyed by visitors today.					
		The English Heritage WHS Management Plan 2009 states the site is, '...globally important not just for Stonehenge, but for its unique and dense concentration of outstanding prehistoric monuments and sites, which together form a landscape without parallel.'					
		The MOD previously agreed it 'would take no action which would increase the obtrusion of existing buildings and structures on the landscape seen from Stonehenge'					
		The surviving flying sheds are 'among the most historically significant structures associated with the pioneering phase of powered flight					
		Preservation of the view from Stonehenge, by restricting or stopping all development across the WHS, is not only important for the conservation of the ancient aspect of Stonehenge, its associated prehistoric features and the flora and fauna of a invaluable and rare chalk downland environment; but is also helping preserve a key aviation heritage site.					
		General objection to further development at Larkhill south of The Packway as described in the Army Basing Plan on the grounds it would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding WHS and the visual amenity of views of and from the Stonehenge Landscape. Furthermore, such development would intrude on the existing open spaces that house a key site in our nation's aviation and military heritage. A site would be lost forever should Larkhill follow other early aviation sites across the country and disappear underneath a mass of modern development.					
		Proposed potential sites L13b, L2 and L18, which are located south of the Packway, have not been included in the Masterplan.					
		The consultation is for the Masterplan, so at this stage we are not carrying out the design of detailed layouts, which will be done some time in the future. For information, if the areas being considered for housing development North East of Stonehenge were to be selected, the detailed designs would ensure that there was no adverse impact on the view of the sunrise at the stone circle. We are consulting with English Heritage, they are advising on the approach UNESCO would be likely to take (as they designate World Heritage sites) to ensure that there was no impact on the World Heritage Site.					
		Furthermore, the MOD is working with Wiltshire Council, English Heritage and other key stakeholders to ensure that through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and 'appropriate assessments' under the Habitats Regulations, the development proposals mitigate any effects on these features of acknowledged importance. An Outline Environmental Appraisal (OEA) is being produced in support of the Masterplan. The OEA will evaluate any potential effects the proposed development may have on the environment and on features of acknowledged importance such as Stonehenge.					

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 **PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES**

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
180	Paul Labbett (Record of conversations at consultation event)		WYG Head of Building Design Cardiff		19/03/2013	P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box Other (Consultation conversations)
Paraphrased. Original saved as Paul Labbett Consultation				Comments noted.		
<p>General issues raised at exhibition:</p> <p>Positive comments about the work being done.</p> <p>Questions around medical and dental care in Larkhill. It was explained at the time that healthcare was one of the areas being discussed between DIO/MOD and Wiltshire Council</p> <p>Query regarding the position of sites relative to Durrington Walls. It was shown on a map at the time that the preferred sites were not over the Durrington Walls, but North of the Packway.</p> <p>Question regarding the number of houses. It was confirmed at the time the circa 1200 figure for the number of new SFA and not 4000 as represented incorrectly in the recent press.</p> <p>Arthur Pendragon raised the issue of the sun-gap and the view from Stonehenge.</p> <p>General queries on Larkhill facilities, archaeology, and military archaeology, training levels on the plain, employment opportunities.</p>						
181	Gordon Lewis (Record of conversations at Durrington Exhibition)		WYG Director		19/03/2014	Other (Consultation conversations)
Paraphrased - Original saved as Gordon Lewis Durrington Exhibition				Comments noted.		
<p>Only one person attended the exhibition. He wanted to reiterate the comments on Bulford that he has already made in a response form. He was concerned with traffic issues and where a road access might be located and the effect this would have on existing junctions.</p> <p>The following comments were made in turn by 6 attending library volunteers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not join Durrington to Larkhill, they are separate villages, the space should not be filled with housing. 2. Retain open space between Durrington and Larkhill. She took away a form to return later in the day 3. Durrington Town Council is organising petition against site L15b 4. Substantial concern in Durrington over the proposals to join the village to Larkhill. There has also been little advanced information about the consultation. They do not believe that the responses will be properly considered. 5. Believes that DIO and the Army have already made up their mind and that no one will listen to local concerns in Durrington. Too much weight is being given to the WHS Designation and not enough consideration to the views of local people in Durrington and Larkhill. If housing is located away from the base it will cause substantial traffic generation on an already congested network. 6. Does not understand why there is the strong local feeling for the need for separation between Durrington and Larkhill, as the two are joined as one community council. Believes that the WHS issues are being over emphasised and that DIO are doing a good job on reviewing all the issues. <p>All those who raised issues/objections were informed that their comments would be considered and were directed to gov.uk website for further information</p>						
182	Unstated	SP4 8HZ	Health Care Professional (otherwise unstated)		18/03/2013	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as Green-Moss Amesbury Library				Concerns noted, through discussions with Wiltshire Council, DIO gained a much better understanding of capacity of existing infrastructure, including healthcare infrastructure. Baseline capacity and projected demand were assessed during the preparation of the final Masterplan. Upgrades to existing infrastructure and key items of new infrastructure required to support the incoming population will be considered in the Masterplan document. DIO will continue to work closely with Wiltshire Council during the planning application stage to plan for and provide the required additional infrastructure.		
<p>Concerned, as a health care professional, that there isn't the capacity to cope with the size of the community we serve now. The extra influx of patients this will exacerbate an already dire situation. The health profession in the area is already at breaking point as the government has cut the public to the bone already and there is no flexibility left.</p> <p>At present GP waiting time is 3 weeks</p> <p>NHS Dentist capacity is full with waiting lists</p> <p>Hospital beds – availability stretched to the limit with even the overflow wards at full capacity.</p> <p>Finally, the roads at rush hour in the area are already swamped e.g. at peak traffic travel time to Salisbury from SP4 area averages between 60-75 minutes.</p> <p>Why not instead set aside a piece of training ground in the plain and build a new Garrison town or home all the troops in one place with new infrastructure built in?</p>				<p>traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.</p>		
183	Jackie Clark	16 Churchill Avenue Bulford Village SP4 9HE	Resident		20/02/2014	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as Jackie Clark Amesbury Library				Comment noted. Part of B6 has been included in the final Masterplan. B16 has been omitted as it is used as an attenuation pond to serve Canadian Estate. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points.		
<p>Preferred site B16 & 6 would be ideal for the SFA's. The site should not interfere with the 2 houses set in a rural setting but be big enough for the numbers required.</p> <p>Advise against building more shops and playgrounds. There are adequate facilities already and not building would ensure integration and economic survival for the garage/supermarket and pub already in the village.</p> <p>The village playground could also do with an upgrade and this could come out of building contributions.</p>						
184	J&S Parker	2 Sunnyside Water Lane Enford Wilts SN9 6AP	Resident		27/02/2014	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as J&S Parker Amesbury Library				No military housing is proposed at Enford. The intention is for new homes to be located close to existing bases to minimise travel time for personnel. The key unit locations for incoming units as set out in the Regular Army Basing Plan are Perham Down, Larkhill, Bulford and Tidworth. Consequently the areas of search for potential housing sites have been centred around these 4 bases.		
<p>On board 3, you show in blue the MCA area around Enford. These are totally unsuitable due to recent flooding in Longstreet from underground springs. Also, Water Lane is a single lane outside of my property with no area for widening.</p> <p>Badendown Farm is isolated and is outside existing development areas.</p> <p>You should keep existing behind the wire sites.</p>				<p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
185	Lt Col JG Dunstone	Unstated	Unstated (MoD)		04/03/2014	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as JG Dunstone Amesbury Library				traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.		
<p>A345 will need upgrading - 8,000 extra cars plus two distribution centres. Castle Road will not cope.</p>						
186	Nigel Way	Fittleton House Fittleton Salisbury SP4 9QA	Resident		18/03/2014	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as Nigel Way Amesbury Library				The intention is for new homes to be located close to existing bases to minimise travel time for personnel. The key unit locations for incoming units as set out in the Regular Army Basing Plan are, Larkhill, Bulford and Ludgershall. Consequently the areas of search for potential housing sites have been centred around these bases.		
<p>Given that houses/accommodation have got to be built, has thought been given to using the old "Support Weapons Wing" (Avon Camp)? The camp is only used on occasion, but it is a horrid, derelict site which, given that it is behind the wire, might be much improved by the construction of family quarters - especially as the basics (electric/water/drains) are still there.</p> <p>I believe that it would really enhance the area if some of the old camp was used again as it would give the area some purpose.</p> <p>In addition/alternatively, how about some of the Airfield Camp at Netheravon?</p>						
187	Nicholas & Jane Tuck	Orchard End House Bulford Village SP4 9EA	Resident		18/03/2014	C (Amesbury)

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
Transcribed - Original form saved as N&J Tuck Amesbury Library				The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points.		
Bulford Village is very much a rural community and any major building development is likely to transform it into a military township. This is not acceptable. The SFA dwelling numbers projected for the Bulford Area should be confined to areas B19, B7, B16 and B6 The roads leading from Bulford Camp through Bulford Village are already over used. As part of the SFA build, a new road should be built to ease pressure on the existing network. Community facilities such as schools and shops should be confined to the Bulford Camp Area.				Preferred Site B6 has been included in the final Masterplan. Sites B16, B19 and B7 have been omitted from the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan. Through discussions with Wiltshire Council, DIO gained a much better understanding of capacity of existing infrastructure. Baseline capacity and projected demand were assessed during the preparation of the final Masterplan. Upgrades to existing infrastructure and key items of new infrastructure required to support the incoming population will be considered in the Masterplan document. DIO will continue to work closely with Wiltshire Council during the planning application stage to plan for and provide the required additional infrastructure.		
188	R Atwood	740 Netheravon Rd Durrington Salisbury SP4 8AX	Resident		21/02/2014	C (Amesbury)
Transcribed - Original form saved as R Atwood Amesbury Library				Land at site L17a and land east of L17a (to the north of Stonehenge Golf Centre) have been included in the final Masterplan.		
Can you tell me why the area between 15b & 17a is not a consideration for building on. This will move any new housing away from the A345, following the wishes of the majority of Durrington Villagers. This would also enlarge the area around 17a, allowing the houses to be built in one area near the Larkhill Camp.				Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill which will mitigate potential coalescence.		
189	Record of Conversations at Amesbury Consultation 18/3/14				18/03/2014	Other (Consultation conversations at Amesbury)
Two members of "Army Welfare from Bulford". Requested more information on family numbers. Advised to contact Army basing team - contact details provided for Lt Col Jon Fox. 2 (Wilts) Councillor David Pollitt asked for more information. Advised what was on the Gov.Uk website and given a leaflet with the web address. As he is a Wiltshire Councillor also advised to contact Kevin Ladner, phone number provided. 3 Unknown lady - discussion on school numbers and the need for additional schools. Advised that we are liaising with Wilts Council who have the responsibility for providing additional schools. Military dependent children numbers will drop initially before increasing in 2017/19 and potential funding issues on school numbers are being looked into by WC. 4 Unknown lady - Bulford resident. Location of sites in Bulford discussed, appeared to be relatively content with preferred sites. Provided explanation of potential size of the SFA estate relative to the site areas. 5 Governor of Amesbury CE Primary School - school numbers discussed and Wilts Council activity on numbers. I mentioned the schools consultation that had been held, she said that she had been told by the school that they had not been invited. I showed her the invitation email dated 14th Feb with their admin address on it - she departed, I think to see the school secretary. 6 Unknown lady - queried what was being done at Upavon as there were not sites shown. Explained that the number of military personnel moving in was matching the number moving out and there was no need for SFA at the site. Also given the army need for SFA to be near their place of work it was too far for the other camps. 7 Nigel Way - Queried why the existing airfield at Netheravon and the adjacent "Support Weapons Wing", which was very run down and industrial but would have services to it, could not be used. Showed him the heat maps and explained that the area scored quite low on the initial site sift, location relative to camps and potential problem with the road in the narrow valley. Asked for a contact at DIO for land disposals (provided later by email). 8 Unknown gentleman - interested in the Tidworth area and queried if we would be using any sites around Tidworth House, I explained that these had been deleted at an early stage.				Record of conversations noted.		
190	Colonel N. Channing Williams	Orchard Cottage Salisbury Road Bulford SP4 9DF			19/03/2014	Other Consultation conversations at Tidworth (With Alice Broomfield)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wanted to know why site B22 in Bulford has now been omitted. This is a Brownfield site with existing infrastructure which would be ideal for one major unit. Why is site T19 potential and not preferred? There is no mention of playgroups - they should be custom made for new housing and not simply rented. Provision of medical and dental facilities will need to be increased, no dental services in Amesbury. Wanted to know where each specific unit coming to Salisbury Plain and where exactly they would be located. Mentioned that there is tension between Hampshire and Wiltshire as Hampshire children take the bus to school for free. 				<p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on unit locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>DIO has gained a much better understanding of capacity of existing infrastructure. Baseline capacity and projected demand were assessed during the preparation of the final Masterplan. Upgrades to existing infrastructure and key items of new infrastructure required to support the incoming population will be considered in the Masterplan document. DIO will continue to work closely with Wiltshire Council during the planning application stage to plan for and provide the required additional infrastructure.</p>		
191	Martin Romilly (Retired Officer)	Tel 01980633553	Retired Officer (otherwise unstated)		19/03/2014	Other Consultation conversations at Tidworth (With Alice Broomfield)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gave order of preference for sites in Bulford: 1) B19, 2) B16 and B7 3) B6 and B23. B9 not a good site for development. Wanted to know whether officer's houses would be planned for same area or different area to soldier accommodation. In terms of existing infrastructure, the GPs and dentist are at capacity and there are only two little shops in Bulford. The road infrastructure is an issue - avoid vehicles driving through the village. Would like to have data for actual population - split by area. How many soldiers, spouses and children coming in to each area. Gave order of importance for his concerns: 1) road infrastructure 2) order of sites 3) medical facilities 4) schools provision 				<p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p>		
192	Peter	Tidworth	Resident		19/03/2014	C (Tidworth)
Bulford Road is extremely busy; the current VCP (vehicle check point) is not fit for purpose. There should be a new, additional VCP on the western edge of the camp to stop tracked vehicles coming through the village and traffic jams on the main road.				Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the Special Landscape Area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Garrison will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall.		
193	Unstated				19/03/2014	Other Consultation conversations at Tidworth (With Alice Broomfield)

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>• How will the army integrate with the civilian population?</p> <p>• The communities coming into Salisbury Plain – how can they benefit us, what skills do they have? What jobs will the rebasing provide for locals?</p> <p>• Would it be possible to develop a specialist industry for the area in line with the skills of the local area and new incoming population, for example, medical research.</p>
						<p>A key objective of the ABP is to deliver balanced and sustainable communities. This is especially important in the context of the 'New Employment Model' which will offer greater domestic stability to army personnel and their dependants. It is envisioned that personnel will be stationed in the Salisbury Plain area for longer periods of time than was previously the case, thus allowing the incoming population better opportunities to integrate with existing communities. The purpose of the Masterplan is to provide the framework to facilitate the delivery of balanced and sustainable communities.</p> <p>In the delivery of the works, both behind the wire and within the broader communities a range of Contractors will be required. DIO have yet to fully identify a commercial strategy to deliver these works however we anticipate that the local economies will benefit from the money planned to be spent in the area. National Government guidance will be followed on awarding these contracts. That guidance addresses issues such as local sourcing.</p> <p>As the Army presence grows there will inevitably need to be an increase to the current level of civilian personnel required to service their needs. There is a study currently being carried out which addresses specifically this matter. It is not a part of the Army Basing programme of works however therefore we are unsighted as to when the report will be completed.</p>
194	Peter Casson-Crook	Bulford Road Tidworth	Resident		19/03/2014	E
						<p>Please accept the following comments regarding Army Rebasing Consultations. Tidworth.</p> <p>I live on Bulford Road in Tidworth, we have lived here for over 30 years. It is a residential C Class road. Unfortunately, when Tidworth Camp was much smaller, and with far fewer Mil & Civ pers working within, a Main Entrance Vehicle Check Point (VCP) was established at the Southern end of Bulford Road. Prior to that it was an open camp with many entrances (pre IRA activity late 80s). Therefore, Bulford road became the main feeder road to the entrance to the camp. That decision (without consultation) caused Bulford Road to become much busier. We have, therefore, suffered increasing volumes of traffic as the Garrison has gradually increased in size.</p> <p>Since then, the Garrison has grown massively in size, both geographically and with the number of Mil/Civ personnel who need access and egress from the Camp. Now, with the further increase in the size of the Garrison, due to the Army Rebasing Plans, the problems of excessive traffic trying to get into the one existing main and 2 smaller VCPs will become untenable. It should be noted that the problem is not confined to the morning and evening 'rush hour'. All manner of journeys are made by hundreds of personnel, along with civilian contractors and deliveries throughout the day.</p> <p>I have spoken to other residents along the Bulford Road and it is our seriously considered opinion that the existing VCP No 2 - the main one, is no longer fit for purpose. To solve the problem, which will get worse unless action is taken, please accept the following proposal.</p> <p>Within the overall plans for the Rebasing programme, a new Main Camp Entrance should be planned and constructed to the West of the Garrison boundary along the 'concrete road'. A fit and proper 'super' entrance to facilitate the traffic levels commensurate with a modern 'super' Garrison. The benefits would be self evident:</p> <p>All traffic coming from the south (Bulford/Larkhill camps etc) along the C11 could then turn left into VCP 1 or a now smaller downgraded VCP 2. Traffic from the North on the A338 would use the new VCP and thus would not need to enter the town of Tidworth. Perhaps Wiltshire Council could be persuaded to build a roundabout at the A338 Junction.</p> <p>Traffic from Ludgershall would use the new (Persimmon) link road to also get to the new VCP. Again, not entering Tidworth town. Traffic from the South on the A338 would continue North to the new VCP. This traffic remains on the main A class road through the town. Traffic exiting the camp to visit the town centre could then use VCP 3 as a convenient short cut.</p> <p>A logical, pragmatic, efficient system for access to / from the Super Garrison from all directions and the residential stretch of Bulford road would see traffic levels return to a more acceptable level.</p> <p>There is one other urgent comment to make. Class A (Tracked) Mil vehicles should not have to travel along the residential stretch of Bulford Road. There are many alternative routes that could be taken without undue inconvenience in the process of driver training.</p>
195	Samantha Considine	Tyrone Avenue Bulford Barracks	Resident		20/03/2014	E
						<p>Hi I live on Tyrone avenue, Bulford barracks, I have noticed a lot of people picking up after their dogs but leaving it on the floor in a bag, maybe more bins around the estates for people to put their dog poo in might help this. Thank you.</p> <p>The consultee was provided with a direct response on 21 March 2014, text below:</p> <p>----- Samantha</p> <p>I can understand your concerns but as a subject it does not really come under the remit of our master planning for the Army Basing developments.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council have a website for reporting such matters, including dog mess and probably requests for dog mess disposal bins: http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/parkingtransportandstreets/roadshighwaysstreetcare/mywiltshirereport.htm#Roads-what-can-I-report-report-Anchor</p>
196	Melanie Beardsly	4 Maple Way Durrington SP4 8RJ	Resident		13/03/2014	P
						<p>Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments</p> <p>I feel the proposal for siting the houses within Larkhill is the best as families will be able to walk to the existing amenities. My main concern is the introduction of a primary school to accommodate the rising numbers of children including nursery provision as otherwise all local schools will be full of classes of 30+ which would impact on the quality of education for all concerned.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council have confirmed that local primary schools in Larkhill will be unable to sustain much development beyond 150 homes. If a large level of development were to be located at the settlement, a new two form entry school would be required. In addition to this capital requirement, some 1.8 hectares would be needed. An indicative location for a new school is identified in the Masterplan.</p>
197	Bird	35 Newman Way Bulford	Resident		19/03/2014	P
						<p>Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments</p> <p>Bulford Village should remain a village. The proposal to build SFA on site B23 would affect peace and tranquility of the area. The woods on this site have become a haven for birds and wildlife which would be destroyed - presumably no Parish Councillor lives next to the woods otherwise they would not be recommending it!!</p> <p>The area by the Canadian estate would be the ideal location, there are at least facilities for families near the camp, there are none in the village.</p> <p>I have worked for the military for 30+ years and welcome them back home, but to relocate them so close to the 'old village' would be an infrastructure nightmare.</p> <p>Preferred site B23 has been included in the final Masterplan, however, the strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Canadian Estate are noted. It is preferential for new military families to be located in proximity to existing military families so as to foster integration.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points.</p>
198	Mrs Wynne McGawn	16 Newmans Way Bulford SP4 9HT	Resident		03/03/2014	P
						<p>Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments</p> <p>As a resident of Newmans Way Bulford I will be affected by the proposal to build houses on the site B23. I have really no objection to the building of the houses on the area as an ex army wife, I would be a bit hypocritical to do so. My only reservations are that I would object to the removal of the band of woodland which lies between Newmans Way and the proposed building site. The removal of the woodland would, in my opinion, result in the loss of a pleasant outlook and amenity space for both the villagers and our new neighbours.</p> <p>The strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p>

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
199	Williams	8 Newmans Way, Bulford Village, SP4 9HT	Resident		13/03/2014	P P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>I have lived in Newmans Way, Bulford since 1972 and have worked as a Civil Servant most of my working life. Without the Military in Salisbury Plain where would we be?</p> <p>No houses should be built within the centre of the 'old village', it would ruin what is left of its look.</p> <p>I think the Army's plan to develop the estate opposite the Canadian Estate is the correct one. It is nearer the camp area to all the amenities there. Other sites could be along the centre barracks and the old Sling site?</p> <p>I do not know why the Parish Council prefers the field next to Swattons Close and Newmans Way, they are not informing us residents so we need to take some action about that.</p> <p>We have been hearing that the trees would be removed, if that is the case we would be extremely unhappy about how that would affect the wildlife. We would have no birds in our garden!!</p> <p>Other points..volume of traffic, no shops in the village, schools, doctors?</p> <p>I hope you push for your site because whatever the agenda of the Parish Council...not thinking about residents of the village.</p>				<p>The strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p> <p>The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Canadian Estate are noted. It is preferential for new military families to be located in proximity to existing military families so as to foster integration.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p>		
200	Whelan	29 Newmans Way Bulford Village SP4 9HT	Resident		?	P
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>In respect to the question on the comments form;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Protection of the quality of rural life 2) A Rural Village atmosphere with flora and fauna conservation 3) Protection of wildlife & flora & fauna 4) Over development of rural way of life 5) Sites B7, B16, B17 & B24 are near an existent army estate and nearer to army base and shops. No to site B23 because of the copice which needs to remain because of wildlife. No to B30, village not big enough for more houses under Parish Council. 6) More shops will be needed and a new school 				<p>Site B23 has been included in the final Masterplan, however, the strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p> <p>Proposed potential site B30 has not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Canadian Estate are noted. It is preferential for new military families to be located in proximity to existing military families so as to foster integration.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p> <p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p>		
201	??	22 Churchill Ave Bulford Village	Resident	Unstated	?	P
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>Regarding the questions on the comments form;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Larger school, shops, dentist, doctors, playing fields 2) Being able to walk over the ranges - watching wildlife flowers and grasses. The field proposed in High Street Bulford Village has a public footpath and it floods a lot. Also, the land by the driveway floods. The trees bordering Newmans Way and Swattons Close are full of wildlife and are play dens for children. The field could be built on without destroying the trees, there are public footpaths into these fields which are walked frequently. <p>Carter Barracks was a small village when I was a child (70 years ago) and would be adjacent to Bulford Camp.</p>				<p>Site B23 has been included in the final Masterplan, however, the strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p> <p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p>		
202	Unstated	Churchill Avenue, Bulford	Resident	Unstated	26/02/2014	P
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>Myself and my family have lived in Bulford all of our lives. We work for the MoD and have chosen to live closely with the Army. The fact that the military own the plain has kept it free of buildings. The green surroundings are what makes the village an enjoyable place to live, freedom for the children and our pets, dogs and horses. Build on it by all means but sympathetically to everyone in the area.</p> <p>I do ask that you leave the green ribbon of trees that run parrallel to Churchill Ave alone. It is only small but brimming with the most fabulous wild life, provides shelter from the worst winds for our homes and gives us all the feeling of well being. You are swallowing up the village, taken over the village school and dictate our movements to a certain level. We live with this, but start taking away the things that make this place lovable and you loose the trust, respect and compliance of the village folk. Really is that little wood worth the trouble its destruction is going to cause?? Please don't make me chain myself to those beautiful trees, i'm too old!!</p>				<p>The strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.</p>		
203	Peter & Monika Bakor	2 Newmans Way Bulford Village SP4 9HT	Resident	Unstated	24/02/2014	P
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>The army quarters should be built by the existing camps i.e Larkhill/Tidworth. Please leave Tidworth as it is. That is why we choose to live here, because its a village not a camp.</p> <p>Also, object to the trees being cut down losing wildlife and birds.</p>				<p>Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the Special Landscape Area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Garrison will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall.</p>		
204	Mr Scammeth	36 Churchill Ave Bulford Village SP4 9HE	Resident		25/02/2014	P
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments						
<p>Bulford Village is a lovely peaceful place. Why spoil the environment and views with more houses for army. Larkhill and the surrounding area has more than enough land to put the houses in. Durrington to Larkhill have plenty of land opposite the garrisons, all the land in which you need.</p> <p>If houses go into Bulford Village i.e. camp of the back off the field by Newmans Way and Swattons...increase in traffic levels. You will need a bigger school and shops. It would spoil the barely walk public byeways.</p> <p>Therefore I think it would be most appropriate to put the housing over to Larkhill or to the back of the Bulford Camp (Center Barracks) in which was used by the army many many years ago.</p> <p>Please do not spoil Bulford Village with more houses.</p>				<p>The intention is for new homes to be located close to existing bases to minimise travel time for personnel. The key unit locations for incoming units as set out in the Regular Army Basing Plan are, Larkhill, Bulford and Ludgershall. Consequently the areas of search for potential housing sites have been centred around these bases.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>Further information on final SFA locations can be found in the Masterplan and Planning Context Report.</p>		
205	Mrs M Baggott	10 Newmans Way, Bulford SP4 9HT	Resident	Unstated	19/03/2014	P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
Transcribed - Original saved as Posted Comments				The strip of woodland south of Bulford serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close and the preferred SFA sites, and will be retained.		
206	Mrs J. White (Clerk)	22 High Street Ludgershall Andover Hants Sp11 9PZ	Ludgershall Town Council		20/03/2014	E
Dear Sir Madam, Army Basing Salisbury Plain, Ludgershall Town Council will be happy to work with the Military DIO and Wiltshire Council for the army basing programme in our area and trust we will be fully consulted before final decisions are made on housing, infrastructure (including additional provision for local schools and upgrading of access road to existing Castle Primary School) and the transport plan for the whole area. The Town Council would also be interested in discussing further the release of potential MoD land for additional allotment site as we already have military families as allotment tenants.				Noted. DIO met with Ludgershall Town Council on the 8th May 2014 to discuss the emerging Masterplan. Further details can be found in the Statement of Community Involvement.		
207	Bill Williams	Unstated	Unstated		21/03/2014	E
I just wanted you to know I fully and utterly support you in your plans for Stonehenge. It'll still be there so it doesn't matter what you do, I hope you don't bow down to a few hippies with nonsensical, romantic notions that really don't matter in the general scheme of things. Good luck with your project, I hope it goes through				Noted		
208	Tom Jones	Unstated	Unstated		25/03/2014	E
Hi, I am wishing to receive more information on the application to build on Salisbury Plain. many thanks T.Jones				Consultation material is posted to the gov.uk website: https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/salisbury-plain-training-area-master-plan-army-basing-programme A further round of consultation is due to commence in May 2014 to give residents, members of the community and stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the proposed final masterplan document.		
209	Sarah Rushton	Unstated	Unstated		25/03/2014	E
Dear MOD Please can you find an alternative area to build your new development? Thank you. Kind regards Sarah Rushton				Due to the nature of the units being sited on the Plain as a part of Army 2020 Reaction Force the Plain is the only place in the country which can accommodate the complex and demanding training exercises needed to maintain operational effectiveness.		
210	Rex Hanman & Sheila Pearson	Bulford Road Tidworth	Resident		27/03/2014	E
Dear Sir/Madam Having been residents of Bulford Road for 32 years, we have inevitably seen an increase in the traffic on what used to be a minor road. This was greatly exacerbated by the changing of the vehicle checkpoint but recently this seems to be becoming more of a problem. Traffic at times is now backed up the road in a solid queue and between the normal morning and evening "rush hour" times, it is becoming an increasingly lengthy procedure to infiltrate the traffic from our drive. With the expansion of building programmes and the expected increase in the local population, would it be possible to move the checkpoint to a different location? Access to the camp ought to be possible, without vehicles having to enter Tidworth ie somewhere along the A338 via one of the many existing tank tracks. I realise that in this day and age, traffic problems are a fact of life, but wonder if there is some way, in which in this instance, life could be made easier for both the army and the residents in Tidworth. Rex Hanman and Sheila Pearson				traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas could then be developed. Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the Special Landscape Area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Garrison will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall.		
211	Councillor Mark Connolly	Tidworth	Wiltshire Councillor for Tidworth Tidworth Deputy Mayor		28/03/2014	E
Paraphrased - Original Saved as Wiltshire Councillor Connolly Email Pleased that SFA are to be located where soldiers are based. With this in mind the majority of housing should be located in Larkhill/Bulford as they have good local services for troops and family. The impact upon the local highway network should not be underestimated No more than 200 SFA should be required for each of the areas of Tidworth and Perham Down. The totality of developments and purchases means that the work of the Tidworth Community Area Partnership over the last 20 years is being re-verse engineered at a time Tidworth was supposed to be being rebalanced through open market housing. Disappointed that the North West Quadrant, which had been identified in the Tidworth Community Area Plan as possible open market housing for the future, is to be used for c200 SFA. Only supports this use on the basis that the rest of Site T15, T16 and T19 are released for civilian/open market housing in the future Content with the small site at T12 to the South of the town to be used for SFA as it is effectively in-fill Disappointed that site PL2 (East boundary of the settlement) is not on the preferred list. Perham Down residents feel isolated with no facilities and few buses. The addition of a further 200 properties may assist with a new shop being provided and better links to Tidworth/Ludgershall One area of major concern is the lack of expansion opportunities for the Wellington Academy Hope the impact of the additional 360 SFA at T14 and T11 (the former Site 19 development) are also taken into account, even though they are not part of Army Basing. Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail				Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the Special Landscape Area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Garrison will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall. In total 300 SFA will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall. traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.		
212	Jill Martin	Unstated	Unstated		28/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
213	Mark Baker	Unstated	Larkhill Business Group		29/03/2014	E
214	Claire Ridge (Clerk)	Unstated	Rushall Parish Council		30/03/2014	E
215	Paul Timlett	Unstated	Unstated		31/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
 Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
 Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
216	Robin Priestley	40 Bowling Green Lane London EC1R 0NE	98 Degrees		31/03/2014	E
217	Gordon Cook	Bourne Court, Ragged Appleshaw, Andover SP11 9HX	Unstated		31/03/2014	E
218	Pewsey Community Area Partnership	Unstated	Pewsey Community Area Partnership		31/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 **PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES**

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
219	Kate Fielden	Unstated	Stonehenge Alliance		31/03/2014	E
220	Alistair Sommerlad	Unstated	Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site Partnership Panel		31/03/2014	E

Paraphrased - Original saved as Pewsey Community Area Partnership

On 17 th March 2014, PCAP held a meeting on Army Rebasing (also attended by Colonel Gosling) to provide information to Parish Councils, schools and others in the Pewsey Community Area on the Defence Infrastructure Organisation's (DIO) Masterplan which is the document currently in consultation. The meeting enabled examination of the potential impacts of the Masterplan by those directly and indirectly affected and consideration of the outward ripple effect from the corridor of development that will take place.

This document summarises the issues and ideas that were discussed which should feed into the consultation.

PCAP welcomes the potential opportunities that the Army Rebasing presents to the Pewsey Community Area, being an area adjacent to the major planned developments. However, there are some concerns, mainly in those areas where the impact is not clear or not yet understood. Further clarification, discussion and involvement on these topics would be very welcome so that the necessary plans can be put in place

Transport

A342 & A345 are the main links in the area and are very busy, with serious accidents a regular occurrence. Road surfaces are poor. There may need to be an increase in public transport if there are more people based in Upavon. Understanding the impact on public and private transport at this stage is difficult as the DIO has stated that work on this area has only just started. CATG (Community Area Transport Group) should raise the increase in population and potential demand in response to the current Wiltshire Council Public Transport consultation. Because work in this area is embryonic, DIO should continue close consultation with the Community Areas affected during their fact finding period.

Health

Parish Councils need to make sure the GP practices are thinking about the impact of these population increases.

Comments noted.

Paraphrased - Original saved as Stonehenge Alliance response

We consider any proposals for further development at Larkhill to be unwelcome, for the reasons we have given. We particularly object to any proposals for built development that would be visible by day or night from the WHS or interfere with solstitial alignments which may have had meaning for those who built Stonehenge (cf. Stonehenge WHS Management Plan Policy 3d). We therefore have strong objections to proposals for potential development located south or just north of the Packway, notably areas L.2, L13b, L15a, L15b and L18, i.e., all of the 'High Level Site Sift' areas set out under 'Consulting for a Master Plan: 4 Larkhill'. 'Mitigation' by tree planting in these areas would not suffice to overcome our objections.

Road transport

The Consultation documentation mentions the need for assessment of road junctions at Countess, Longbarrow Roundabout and Airman's Corner (now a roundabout also). All three of these junctions have undergone major changes in recent years, to the severe detriment of the World Heritage Site and its setting. Problems of traffic flow resulting from recent works at Longbarrow Roundabout and the closure of the A344, are giving rise to local pressure for dualling the A303. Further housing and activity at Larkhill could only exacerbate the situation for all concerned, with further implications for the well-being of the WHS.

Natural Environment

The use of water derived from the River Avon SAC catchment area and discharge of harmful waste or chemicals into (or ultimately into) this SAC are a particular concern for a water resource already known to be over abstracted. European protected sites and species cover considerable tracts and watercourses in the Larkhill area and are protected by law under the Habitats Directive. The impacts of development upon such sites and species ought not initially to be the subject of consultees' preferences, since there is a legal responsibility on behalf of HMG to protect them from any adverse impacts at all. Impacts of development on European designated sites and protected species are not to be measured by scales of magnitude of impact (e.g., IER Tables 6.1 and 6.2): since any unavoidable adverse effect, either individual or cumulative, is to be considered unacceptable in such cases. Thus the methodology outlined in the IER is invalid for compliance with the Habitats Directive.

Although it might be claimed by HMG that there is an overriding public interest in new development at Larkhill, it would at the same time appear to us perverse to suggest that this is the only location where development of the kind proposed could take place.

Furthermore, in view of the very high concentrations of internationally designated and protected sites in the vicinity, we urge HMG to reconsider its proposals for Army rebasing at Larkhill and to make a firm commitment to rehabilitate the WHS in the longer term, thereby helping to ensure that harm to the natural and historic environment of the area around Larkhill is avoided.

The areas north east of Stonehenge have not been selected for development of SFA. Therefore there will be no adverse impact on the view of the sunrise from the stone circle. See Masterplan for further details.

The sites south of the Packway have been omitted from the final masterplan. DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage.

To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.

traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.

Due to the nature of the units being sited on the Plain as a part of Army 2020 Reaction Force the Plain is the only place in the country which can accommodate the complex and demanding training exercises needed to maintain operational effectiveness.

The intention is for new homes to be located close to existing bases to minimise travel time for personnel. The key unit locations for incoming units as set out in the Regular Army Basing Plan are Perham Down, Larkhill, Bulford and Tidworth. Consequently the areas of search for potential housing sites have been centred around these 4 bases.

Wessex Water has confirmed that sufficient capacity is available within existing abstraction licences to serve the uplift in water supply demand for the proposed development at Larkhill (based on demand generated by 540 SFA). See the Outline Environmental Appraisal for further information.

As Chair of the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site (WHS) Partnership Panel, I am writing to comment on the MOD (DIO) Army re-basing project as part of the 2014 consultation on options set out in the Masterplan for the Salisbury Plain Area.

Although we understand the need for new construction and development to support the return of Armed Forces personnel from overseas, we must oppose any proposals which would threaten the designation of the area as a World Heritage Site. This designation is founded on characteristics known as the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Proposals in the Masterplan which include potential development within the WHS boundaries, and developments North of the boundary which would adversely affect the setting.

The proposal in 1986 by the United Kingdom Government to inscribe Stonehenge and its associated ancient monuments and landscape as a World Heritage Site was accepted by the United Nations UNESCO body because of the area's outstanding monuments and setting. This OUV, ratified by UNESCO in 2013, is based not on the monument of Stonehenge alone but on the unusual preservation of a wide range of neolithic and later monuments in a relatively undisturbed landscape setting. This landscape and the relationship of the monuments to it, is what gives the World heritage Site its unique value. It allows us and future generations to discover the history, life and beliefs of those who lived in Britain and Europe four thousand and more years ago.

The role of the Partnership Panel is to protect and promote the World Heritage Site. It is clear to us that construction within the WHS boundaries would pose a significant threat to the OUV of the site and therefore would put at risk its status as a World Heritage Site. Mooted options for housing south of the Packway in Larkhill fall clearly into that category. The World Heritage Site Partnership Panel would oppose these options being pursued. Such development may well lead to UNESCO publicly questioning the ongoing inscription of the Site on the World Heritage List. This would be a significant step to take and would have consequences beyond the immediate Stonehenge area, compromising other Wiltshire sites such as Avebury, and the UK Government's standing in UNESCO.

We are fully aware of the need to rehouse Armed Forces personnel and their families on return from Germany and do understand that the selection of appropriate sites for development is not an easy one. We look forward to welcoming these families to visit, enjoy and contribute to the World Heritage Site. It is most encouraging that your proposals promise that 'The strongest weight will be given to the World Heritage Site in discussions.' (Planning Context Report of Feb 14). Please do consider the Partnership Panel, which represents all the stakeholders, as a focal point with which you can expect constructive engagement and consultation as your plans mature.

No SFA development is planned within the World Heritage Site. DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage.

To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
221	M Alexander	Bulford	Unstated		31/03/2014	E P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
<p>I would like to register my objection for the use of site B23. This land is directly behind my home and I feel that the building of new homes on this land would have a huge effect on not only my own home but also that of my neighbours. At present we enjoy a morning view of the sun breaking through the trees in the morning as well as our children growing up being able to watch the wildlife contained within those trees. This was one of the main deciding factors in the purchase of our home. The building of houses on site B23 would not only take away one of the appeals of the homes on Newmans way, but also block natural light into our gardens. The other main issue is the loss of privacy for our gardens and bedrooms to the rear, Homes built on B23 would have a ground floor level with the bedrooms of Newmans way also a view down into the gardens. Again the fact that my property was not overlooked from the rear was a factor in the purchase. Although not of immediate concern, potential loss of resale value and appeal of the property spring to mind, should I wish to move on in the future. There appears to be no indication of access roads on the plans, so, is there the possibility of Newmans way becoming a through road? Surely site B7 or site B30 would be better suited as they have direct access to main roads already, also they do not encroach on existing properties. Site B19 is on camp, so would encourage the green travel aspect of your planing as distance to work would be just a walk. I think that building on B23 would result in a large increase in traffic through the village causing more congestion at the already busy cross roads, I see on my way to work in the mornings, a lot of people driving from one side of the road to the other at Larkhill, so have no reason to doubt that this would be the case in Bulford.</p>				<p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). Most of the new SFA in Bulford will be located close to Canadian Estate as it is preferential for new military families to be located in proximity to existing military and civilian families so as to foster integration. The detailed design of new SFA at planning application stage will be sensitive to the character of Bulford village. Particular attention will be given to minimising visual impact of new development from key vantage points. The strip of woodland serves as a good landscape buffer between the housing on Newmans Way and Swattons Close, and will be retained. New development will be served by an access off Bulford Road. An option to create an access from Double Hedges is also being explored. Further transport assessments will need to be undertaken at planning application stage to determine whether this would be a feasible proposal.</p>		
222	Selig Finklaire	Dairy Cottage, Kings Stables, Upper Woodfood, Salisbury SP4 6PA	Unstated		01/04/2014	P
<p>Transcribed - Original saved as Selig Finklaire Amesbury is already divided between the Town Centre and Solstice Park. Consideration needs to be given to further growth and where it should be. New and improved local services might then be planned including hospitals, and medical facilities, transport, retail outlets and enlarged parking areas. With many additional serving personnel and their families including those in single living accommodation, leisure facilities will be most important, both for them and for local residents.</p>				<p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p>		
223	Anon	Unstated	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - Original saved as Ex Army Teacher Do not want Larkhill and Durrington connected as one big village, losing their individual identity. Upgrading of bus services urgently required. Local dentists do not take NHS patients.</p>				<p>Land at area L15b has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill thus mitigating potential coalescence. Our latest calculations suggest that the incoming population will generate a demand for 1.64 dental practitioners to support that population. See Masterplan for further information.</p>		
224	Val Scrase Head of Children and Young People's Community Health Services (Wiltshire)	Great Western Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Wilton Health Centre, Wilton, Wiltshire SP2 OHT	Great Western Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust		03/04/2014	E
<p>I am responding on behalf of children and young people community health services following the consultation event that you held in Tidworth and requesting further information on what services would be required to support the project and how they would be delivered. We have estimated that, based on the numbers of families and children moving to the area and the national guidance around caseloads and prevalence of health needs within the his population, that we would require the following additions to our staffing and services: • Health Visiting – 2.5 wte additional HVs and support staff • School nursing – 2.5 wte school nurses and support staff • Speech and Language therapy – 2 wte therapists and support staff. • Child Health information team – to manage and monitor screening and immunisations – 2 wte staff. We would work closely with the army health services, GPs and educational establishments to try and deliver these services in health or education settings and as near home or bases as possible. Regards, Val.</p>				<p>Comments noted.</p>		
225	Natalie Travis (Turning Point)	Cheviot House, 67-73 Castle Street, Salisbury, SP1 3SP	Turning Point		02/04/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Natalie Travis I am writing as the Operations Manager of the Wiltshire Substance Misuse Service; we provide an integrated drug and alcohol service that serves the whole of Wiltshire and provides a range of interventions for all drug and alcohol users. This service is provided by Turning Point and began 1/4/13. There is growing concern from the service and it's commissioners (Wilts Council) about the impact that re-basing will have on the service. There has been no consultation with service who's design and staffing is based around current need and does not include the addition in the local community. Our experience tells us the drug and alcohol services invariably see high levels of problematic and dependent alcohol use, amongst army personnel and their families. We would appreciate being included in on-going consultation as this is of a direct impact on the service.</p>				<p>WYG (Consultants to DIO) responded directly to the consultee - text below: ----- Thank you for your response form on Army Basing, which I collected today from Salisbury Library. WYG are the consultants preparing the Masterplan for DIO and conducting the public consultation on their behalf. We have been in consultation with Wilts Council since last year on Army Basing involving the Planning Department, and through them the various specialist departments including health. There was a special consultation presentation meeting held at the Tidworth Garrison Theatre on 3rd March for medical, dental and health services, a copy of the presentation is attached. My apologies for not issuing an invitation to your organisation, invites were on the basis of information provided by Wilts Council. I will forward your response form to the WC Planning Department officer dealing with Army Basing and coordinating their response.</p>		
226	Anon	Unstated	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Military partner Location for exhibition is not good, being in a library. Need to put it in Tesco's foyer to get the most attention.</p>				<p>We are relying on advertising to inform public of the consultation. A 6 week period in Tesco foyer would be unacceptable to the retailer.</p>		
227	Mr and Mrs White	Durrington	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Mr and Mrs White We want to keep Larkhill/Durrington as separate villages.</p>				<p>Land at area L15b has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill thus mitigating potential coalescence.</p>		
228	Tony Cummins	Bulford	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Tony Cummins Site B23 - line of trees alongside old railway line fronting estate, would like assurances that tree belt will be retained if B23 used or part of B6 with same tree belt.</p>				<p>Preferred Site B23 has been included in the final Masterplan, however, the woodland along Newman's Way/Churchill Avenue/Swattons Close is to be retained.</p>		
229	Anon	Larkhill	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Unknown Amesbury Exhibit Major concerns regarding Countess Road roundabout. 500 extra homes in Larkhill will have huge impact on existing traffic issues around the area. Problems with rat runs off the A303.</p>				<p>traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.</p>		
230	Anon	Unstated	Unstated	Unstated	24/02/2014	C
<p>Transcribed - original saved as Unknown Durrington Exhibit Would like military housing to be together and not integrated into general community housing. Having other military families around is extremely important for support when spouse on deployment. Civilian families do not have the experience of this issue to be able to help.</p>				<p>Comment noted. This reflects the Army's preference. It is preferential for new military families to be located in proximity to existing military families so as to foster integration.</p>		
231	David Foggie	10 Old Castle Road, Salisbury SP1 3SF	Unstated	Unstated	02/04/2014	C

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
Transcribed - original saved as D Foggie				It is anticipated that training activity will return to levels prior to commencement of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This resulted in specific operational training requirements dissimilar to those previously carried out. With the return to training for 'contingency' (potential for as yet unseen operational deployment) the Reaction Force brigades will be required to train in their primary role.		
1. Keep a lower profile - e.g. Fewer artillery practices, and less military hardware in Wiltshire 2 and 3. It is relatively unspoilt, yet. It does NOT belong to the MOD 4. Future needs are supposedly LESS if we are to believe in reductions of personnel number. 5. They should not be on previously unbuild land. If they are, the presumption must be that MOD is acting as a state property developer, whilst remaining largely unaccountable to national (civil) and local government. 6. Who is to pay for such improved local services? Not ratepayers - non military - I hope 7. By being minimised				The agreed capacity limits for the training impact on SPTA are agreed via a unilateral undertaking between the Secretary of State for Defence, relevant Statutory Bodies and Local Authorities.		
I have lived 22 years at the above. I question why artillery/live firing still takes place in the 21st century, to the detriment of my environment. Are the MOD using the plain as a training area, or as a proving ground for the defence industries? Are we training foreign troops in exchange for payment? If we are training British troops, what, pray, are we training them in, and for?				The MOD is subject to the same planning conditions as any other developers and is in discussion with Wiltshire Council as the Planning Authority to agree appropriate financial contributions as other developers would. Wiltshire Council is discussing with Government Departments and local MPs, the source of capital funds to provide non-military infrastructure required to support the additional population that will result from Army Rebasing. Also the MOD makes a "contribution in lieu of council tax" which funds ongoing running costs of new facilities and services for accommodation that lies within the wire.		
232	Eddie Boyle	Unstated	Unstated		22/02/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as E Boyle				Development will occur on both greenfield and brownfield sites situated predominantly around the existing camps of Bulford, Larkhill and Ludgershall.		
I would ask that building on greenfield sites be restricted to a minimum						
233	Hugh D McKenzie	3 Oval View, Bulford Road, Tidworth, Wilts SP9 7SD	Unstated	Unstated	19/03/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as H McKenzie				Following further constraints analysis, no new SFA will be developed in Tidworth. The adjacent transit route, landscape character and proximity to the special landscape area together with the difficulty of providing a road access, severely constrains the cost effective delivery of land for SFA development. Instead, the 100 SFA to serve the Tidworth Barracks will be developed in Perham Down/Ludgershall.		
Using sites that are lying dormant at present, in and around Tidworth area. Tracked vehicles to use designated tank tracks on the plain and not use the Bulford Road as a means of access.						
234	K O'Connor	Manor Cottage, Lower Street, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP2 8EY	Unstated	Unstated	12/03/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as K O'Connor				Through discussions with Wiltshire Council, DIO gained a much better understanding of capacity of existing infrastructure. Baseline capacity and projected demand were assessed during the preparation of the final Masterplan. Upgrades to existing infrastructure and key items of new infrastructure required to support the incoming population will be considered in the Masterplan document. DIO will continue to work closely with Wiltshire Council during the planning application stage to plan for and provide the required additional infrastructure.		
1. To demonstrate how the surrounding area e.g. Salisbury and key amenities e.g. Salisbury Hospital, Wiltshire libraries etc. are expected to be impacted and how impacts can be positive thing as a result of detailed, intelligent planning. 6. I am aware of existing problems (concerns) that the Army does not sufficiently enable Army families/individuals to benefit from credit unions/good banking as opposed to loan sharks visiting army settlements. This is not a single issue for me but prompts question of whether the Army will invest time/some money in things other than bricks and mortar. 7. I am not keen on the complete/apparent absence in the "Turning vision into reality" section and "Masterplan" section of any commitment to high quality building design...perhaps even the goal of sometimes outstanding [merit]...the photograph(s) of housing suggests that yet more pastiche, cookie cutter, housing and housing estates will be built. 6/7. I would have welcomed a "what if" section. What if the Army no longer needed this accommodation in 2050...What are the real sustainable futures for these developments?				Further details on the delivery strategy and programme is included in the final Masterplan..		
235	M Kemp	Middlecroft Farm, Shrewton SP3 4LA	Unstated		05/03/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as M Kemp				traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.		
Dealing with the traffic on the A303 is paramount before any influx of people. Trying to run a business, having had the A344 closed, is becoming increasingly difficult. Daily deliveries of food stuffs for livestock are delays and weekly sales of livestock do not need to sit on the A303 for hours at a time. Night exercises should be kept to a minimum. Low flying frightens livestock and should be kept to a minimum.				It is anticipated that training activity will return to levels prior to commencement of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This resulted in specific operational training requirements dissimilar to those previously carried out. With the return to training for 'contingency' (potential for as yet unseen operational deployment) the Reaction Force brigades will be required to train in their primary role. The agreed capacity limits for the training impact on SPTA are agreed via a unilateral undertaking between the Secretary of State for Defence, relevant Statutory Bodies and Local Authorities.		
236	Lucy Mundy	18 Salisbury Road, Bulford SP4 9DG	Unstated		02/04/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as L Mundy				DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable.		
I have lived in Salisbury Plain all my life, originally Shrewton, now Bulford. The plans for the housing sites appear well thought out although the Larkhill site should be on land opposite Packway. English Heritage have already built what they like for Stonehenge. Its time they gave back to the locals who have put up with the mess they made. My only concerns are the roads, these are already suffering from Solstice Park through Bulford, Durrington, Larkhill and Shrewton due to the mess made of Stonehenge and A303. Further people result in more vehicles on roads, in particular the junctions in Bulford Village which serve Bulford, Tidworth etc.				However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage.		
I would also prefer to see more army vehicles using the many roads across the plain itself rather than village routes. I understand this may be impossible at times but it would help reduce traffic congestion and some roads were built specifically by the MOD for their vehicles - why not use them more. I feel the increase in army housing should be positive if infrastructure is also built according to increase in demand for sports facilities, schools and entertainment.				To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.		
The increase should look to improve the local area, not by just building houses but facilities which local non army people can benefit from too. Make the houses homes for families to settle and be able to join the community of Wiltshire.				traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.		
				New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
237	Mrs M Foggie	10 Old Castle Road, Salisbury SP1 3SF	Unstated		02/04/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as Mrs Foggie				Noted		
3. We live in the outskirts of Salisbury, when heavy guns are fired on the Plain our doors and windows rattle and the foundations shake. Heavy guns seem a waste of money and an unnecessary waste of environmental resources in this modern age. 5. The new plans are excessive, as the public have been given to understand that the Army is being shrunk. Given this premise, it can only be assumed that the MOD is starting a housing development; ostensibly for service personnel, but that the accommodation will be sold on, just as has happened in the past.						
238	Peter Casson-Crook	Turnmoyle House, Bulford Road, Tidworth, SP9 7SE	Unstated		02/04/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as P Casson-Crook				Noted		
Please see my email of 19 March 2014. This explains all. 1) Move VCP 2) No tracked vehicles in future along residential stretch of Bulford Road						
239	Anon	Unstated	Unstated		02/04/2014	C
Transcribed - original saved as Unknown Salisbury Library				New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
Adequate infrastructure needed to support the increase in population - Wiltshire 1) Roads - potholes 2) Hospitals - pressure 3) Schools 4) Police - to tackle social problems - drink problems, major problem in the army, navy airforce						
240	Gordon Alexander	57 St Leonards Close, Bulford SP4 9DS	Unstated		18/03/2014	C

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
	Transcribed - Original saved as G Alexander					
	A new community centre type building to accommodate various local groups such as St Johns Ambulance, 6th Wiltshire Boden Power Scout Group, Army Cadet Force, to be situated outside the wire to facilitate both military and civilian children, building would require some form of storage to hold various types of stores from tentage to cooking materials.			New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
241	K Garland	9 Milston View, Durrington	Unstated		02/04/2013	C
	Transcribed - Original saved as K Garland					
	Against 15b as this will merge both villages - should retain their unique qualities. A345 at this point already very busy due to housing estate Avon Fields. Library run by volunteers might need a fuller service, lack of appointments already at the doctors, dentists. Lack of social amenities!			New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
242	Sally Whistle	4 Strangeways, Larkhill	Unstated		31/03/2014	C
	Transcribed - Original saved as S Whistle					
	Local people seem not to want Bulford, Durrington and Larkhill to be joined up in one huge sprawl and I can sympathise with this. There is little point in choosing to live in a village if it then becomes a large amorphous mass of housing. As a military wife I would like to see the housing as close to the camp as possible because otherwise we become neither fish nor fowl - neither civilians able to live a village life, nor military families who have access to military families' provision of facilities. Even at the moment any sort of facilities for families is severely lacking. How about a cinema, swimming pool, a variety of shops? In addition, many families do not have a second car and if the houses are too far away from work either the family buy a second car or non military partner is left rather stranded since buses are so infrequent and expensive. More houses and more families would need more schools, creches, entertainment, sewerage, traffic calming, water supplies, recreation outdoors, clubs, doctors surgeries, dentist. In essence Larkhill would need a massive revamp to make it somewhere where military people could actually live rather than exist. I wouldn't like to see us tacked onto Durrington and expected to get on with it. I would like it to be military housing properly provided for.			Land at area L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill thus mitigating potential coalescence and enabling the settlements to retain their unique qualities. New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
243	Basil Davie	Hartland House, Kennel Row, Netheravon SP4 9RH	Unstated			C
	Transcribed - Original saved as Basil Davie					
	1) Encourage troops into community 2) Only as military training area 3) No 4) No 5) Please put consideration to where the families themselves want to be 6) Increase royal army medical corps. Facilities 7) By present residents offering help The services are our life blood, in this case the army. Some dreadful living quarters for other ranks were provided years ago. Let families be happy, give them the best. Their husband/wives put their lives at risk - when needed.			Statements/Comments Noted		
244	Mick Fellows	31 Philip Road, Durrington, SP4 8DX	Unstated			C
	Transcribed - Original saved as Basil Davie					
	1) I am ex military - 22 years, artillery, most at Larkhill 2) Site 15B should not be built on. This will cause unnecessary strain on Durrington. We want to remain Durrington and not be swallowed into Larkhill Garrison. 3) English Heritage do not want sites L12, L14A and L14B used because of interference with Stonehenge - Rubbish! You can't see Stonehenge from these sites. These sites are perfect for Larkhill - walking distance to work for the soldiers. 4) Larkhill Parkway will not cope with the influx of the increase in families. It would be good for a new school and shops (anything other than estate agents would be a benefit). Also a garage selling fuel would prevent an overload of traffic at Rangers Garage in Durrington 5) In summary: No building on L15B			Land at area L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill thus mitigating potential coalescence and enabling the settlements to retain their unique qualities. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales. New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.		
245	Peter & Janet Noal	88 Fargo Larkhill SP4 8LL	Unstated		28/03/2014	P
	L15b - Unsuitable as splits Larkhill & Durrington into areas, also roads are not built for peak flow traffic causing backlog and jams to Larkhill Camp. L17A - A good view for some but still road problems and what about shopping facilities, Tesco, Spar and other amenities? L2 - Land now could be used for housing if all infrastructure is in place. L13b - Could be used if selected screening from English Heritage is provided, electrical supply and sewage close by road crossing could be made safer. If new amenities are forthcoming. L18 - Good and safe site for officers site housing. But will still impact on road usage? <u>What do you think of the community engagement and the proposals made by MoD so far?</u> It would be great if we all sang from the same song sheet. Same date, time with plenty of notice. With most times and days or nights and further follow up reports as soon as can be done. <u>How can we best integrate Civilian and Military Community?</u> Try and talk as one. But not at the same time and in language we understand. <u>Any other comments</u> About time things are moving? I hope in the right direction?			Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. New social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new retail facilities will be provided in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Sites L2, L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).		
246	John Rodell	Unstated	Unstated		14/03/2014	E
	I fully support our Armed forces and look forward to welcoming them into the Salisbury Plain area. However I am concerned that obvious Brownfield sites within Larkhill to the South of the Packway appear not to have been considered for development on the assumption that English Heritage would not agree to sites either within the World Heritage area or within the view of Stonehenge. It is my understanding that this is not the case and these sites should have been considered and included in the Consultation/Masterplan. The natural and most logical place to develop Army Families housing is a close as possible to existing facilities such as shops and schooling to minimise on traffic increases by allowing people to walk or cycle to the facilities and work. The military community is valued by the local residents of both Larkhill and Durrington, I urge you to review the omission of the sites for development South of the Packway. John Rodell			DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.		
247	Rosemary Behan	Durrington	Resident		14/03/2014	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code			
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box			
						As a long time resident of Durrington and a retired Teacher of many Army pupils I would like to make a few observations following viewing plans for Larkhill expansion 1. Surprised that the chosen site for the majority of properties is a corner area L15B .This is opposite an area I thought that English Heritage would want cared for i.e Durrington Walls and Woodhenge (closely linked to Stonehenge) There is ongoing archeological investigations here 2. Site L15B is too near to A345 Netheravon Road already busier due to new Durrington estate .Being so close to Durrington it is too big a development . 3. By choosing L15B it is so far from the Primary School in Larkhill as to necessitate the movement of parents by car instead of the walks now undertaken . Local shops on The Packway are too far from families to be a community facility 4.Iam horrified that productive Farmland is to be considered to be estate L15B 5.The underused areas identified L15A ,L12,L17a would be more suitable .Close to facilities and away from the overcrowded village of Durrington . 6.Observation!!! I have no idea what the objectors mean by the comments in respect to interfering with Stonehenge (it was possible to have a brief far distant view from the X5 bus from opposite St Alban and St Barbara 's Church--- very fleeting !)			Land at area L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. New social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new retail facilities will be provided in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community.
248	K Garland	9 Milston View, Durrington				P			
						Against L15B - Will merge both villages. 1) A345 at either point already very busy due to housing estate Avon Fields. Q1) <u>What do you think of the community engagement and the proposals made by MoD so far?</u> Clear but not always concise	Land at area L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill thus mitigating potential coalescence and enabling the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Wiltshire Council is monitoring traffic levels where issues have been highlighted and this data will be used to help determine whether any mitigation measures are required.		
249	David and Samantha Wallis	11 Fargo Road				P			
						L15B - Too near civilian housing L17A - The best plot for building L2 - Will impact civilian access and road congestion L13B - Too near civilian housing and will impact access for residents and congestion on Packway L18 - Too near civilian housing ruin AONB Q1) <u>What do you think of the community engagement and the proposals made by MoD so far?</u> Poor and not well thought out or managed. poor communication to civilian residents Q2) <u>How can we best integrate Civilian and Military Community?</u> By respecting our wishes to live in the country side without constan building work incluing dust noise and pollution. not destroying our view. Q3) <u>Any other comments.</u> Have had had no compenstion from new substation work over 1 year of works, dust, noise and limited access? Stonehenge visitor , car park provision and road surface is dsigracefull.	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. New social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new retail facilities will be provided in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).		
250	Brian and Sandra Stanely	112 Fargo Road				P			
						L15B - Too near civilian housing L17A - Probablely a better site L2 - Road congestion L13B - Congestion on Pack Way L18 - N/A Q1) Poor communication Q2) More meetings between both parties Q3) We are a village lets treat matters that way	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. New social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new retail facilities will be provided in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).		
251	J Thompson	86 Forgord Larkhill				P			
						L15b, L17A, L2, L15B, L18 --> Road infrastructure and all sites Q1) The army need housing and they need to be in the possible place for them. so where will new schools be built to accomadate the new influx of chilrden? Q2) Is there a them and us. never noticed Q3) The road infrastructure needs to be sorted before any of the above sights are used. I believe there has been a misunderstanding. At 2 recent meeting I have called for the MoD, our MP's and Wiltshire Council to talk with the World Heritage Organisation to reconsider the Areas south of the Packway which are highlighted in black and crisscrossed on the attached map. Not in the field opposite Steel House .	DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales. Wiltshire Council have confirmed that local primary schools in Larkhill will be unable to sustain much development beyond 150 homes. If a large level of development were to be located at the settlement, a new two form entry school would be required. In addition to this capital requirement, some 1.8 hectares would be needed. An indicative location for the new school is identified in the Masterplan. traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment.		
252	L Ellis	7 Bluebell way, Durrington SP4 8FH				P			
						L15b - Against this site as there is no natural boundary between larkhill and durrington. Loss of green space for locals. Too close to new development just built L17A - Would prefer it not to be here for reasons above but as lost resort ok L2 - Ok L13B - Ok, nearer larkhill L18 - ok, as nearer larkhill and by other army houses Q1)Extra provisions will have to be put in place eg schools, doctors, shops etc. so the military families do not disadvantage civilian families. military school provide theses facilities - they should not take prioity in getting spaces. Q2) By keeping natural boundary between villages. Q3) Questions as to why houses can't be built near Woodhenge or Shrewton side of Larkhill. Why Durrington! What about Netheravon camp which could be re-opened?	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. No development is planned at Netheravon. No SFA development is planned at Upavon, although there will be some behind the wire development. The intention is for new homes to be located close to existing bases to minimise travel time for personnel. The key unit locations for incoming units as set out in the Regular Army Basing Plan are Perham Down, Larkhill, Bulford and Tidworth. Consequently the areas of search for potential housing sites have been centred around these 4 bases.		
253	Mr & Mrs Scott	42 Avondown road, Durrington				P			

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 **PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES**

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
254	Mrs S Potter	549 Netherayon Road				P
255	Trevor Line	11 Longfield close, Durrington				P
256	Ross Line	11 Longfield close, Durrington, SP4 8BZ				P
257	Maureen Hargrave	3 High street, Durrington Wilts				P
258	Chirs Hargrave	3 High Street, Durrington, Salisbury, Wilts, SP4 8AD				P
259	Di Symes	544 Neheravan road, Durrington				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
L15B - Against - Space needed between L'hill and d'ton - pollution, traffic, noise and air would be dreadful on A345 which is already a very busy road L17A Perfect - Next to camp - Close to facilities for families L2 - As above - good site L13B - As above - good site L18 - As above - good site Q1) L15B is hopeless, I think this area has been picked by MoD in Whitehall, with little thought to either Durrington residents or the army family's needs. The traffic on the Netheravon Road is so busy without adding a further 500 + cars, and I personally don't want to live on an army camp - which is what would happen. Q2) By giving us space - if we are on top of one another the community will struggle to integrate - Durrington residents will be hostile to such close building Q3) The roundabout to Hackthron Road is used as a wildlife corridor to Manor Park and the water meadows - deer, foxed, badgers all use it and this would be blocked. also nesting buzzards and bats would be disturbed.	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.					
260	R Whitehouse	6 Rowan Close, Durrington SP4 8DF				P
L15B - No, to close to Durrington so by losing its own village identity. L17A L2 L13B - Ok Close to Army Camp L18 Q1) L14A, L14B And L12 are by far the best option as they are by army camp and keeps Durrington's own identity	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.					
261	Liz Guy	25 Stonehenge Road				P
L15b - Strong Against, Furthest point from both L'hill and Durrington amenities eg - School, doctors, shops, which means more traffic as it is to for for mums and children to walk. Q1) I think they lack common sense and like many other large organisation they treat it as a game and are squandering taxpayers money Q3) Bureaucracy at its worse, we are bombarded by bits of paper to register our opinions then they experts came up with a totally different option going back to the start again.	Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.					
262	Julie Meikle	5 Rectealion Road, Durrington				P
L15B + L17A - these might seem the cheaper offer but having several areas nearer work would greatly lessen traffic and give a more community feel, not sling hundred of people together in the middle of no where. NO HERE 1) Everyone except the planner seem to be agreement that south of The Packway is a much better option for so many new homes, nearer camp. 2) Smaller groups of houses, spread between different builders would not impact on the environment so much 3) 14A - 14B	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.					
263	Gary Snelgrove	Dimgeg dell hackthron durrington				P
L15B - Against, too far from Larkhill camp, too close to A345 L17A - Against, too far from existing amenities ie Parking, shops, schools and medical facilities L2 - Against, Site of historical interest L13B - Against, as above L18 - Possible for offices quarters as close to existing offices Q1) L12 is the most sensible solution for the place of 540 new homes, as is would sit within easy reach of all facilities of larkhill camp Q3) Please Explain why L12, L14A and L14B have been omitted?	Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.					
264	Elizabeth Snelgrove	Dingley Dell, Hackthorne, Durrington, SP4 8as				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code	
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box	
L15B - Against. Too far from Larkhill Camp. Families will need to intergrate with existing families at Larkhill. L17A - Against - As above. L2 - Agains - Site of significant historical interest L13B - Against - As L15B L18 - For - This area would be suitable for officers quarters as it is close to existing officers quarters. Q1) I think MoD are looking fo an easy solution rather than what is for the servicemen and their families.				Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.			
265	C Sims	18 Willow Road, Durrington				P	
L15B - Its nether in Durrington nor Larkhill, out of step with the two villages. Q1)They should keep the development closer to the military areas Q2)Smaller developments				Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities.			
266	Tim O'hane	55, High Street, Durrington				P	
L15B - Unnecessary to take up a site in excess of the size needed. Takes families further away from places of work. L17A - If the Packway solution is rejected, this site affes the better location adjacent to the barracks L2 - A preferred site for the officer community L13B - A possible solution but limited space, high in infrastructure costs and the worst place build in sight of Stone Henge L18 - Sound - the optimum site for officer community Q1)The army has been very proactive with the local community. DIO have been reluctant to engage with the community Q2)Allow the military community to integrate gradually in schools and workplaces Q3)It would be useful to know the extent of the army plans within the wire to know where the access to the barracks will be.				Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.			
267	Philp Coyle	27 Downland Way Sp4 8BX				P	
L15B - Against - this area is a natural drainage site for the surrounding area's and any development on it will exacerabte any furture precipitation into Durrington VIA the 345 Q1)We have to accpet the army to this area and our community - it would be wrong not to. However, they would not want us inside the 'wire' in large numbers any more than we would not want them concentrated in large numbers i.e. Area L15B Q2)By building in thoses area's NOT preferred by the army for military accommodation and civilian housing.				Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities.			
268	Roy German	8 Westfield Close, Durrington SP4 8BY				P	
L15B - To far from main sphere of activities L17A - As above L2 - Ok, Housing already existing but still away from main wired area L18 - As L2 Q1) Proactive Q2) Good communications are essentail Q3) L12 is best and obvious site for housing close to wired area				Sites L2 , L12, L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).			
269	Mrs Paula Shea	1 Poores Road, Durrington, Salisbury				P	
L15B - Too close to village. Should be within close proximity to camp L17a - No Problem L2 - Have no objection L13b - Favourite L18 - No objection Q1) Community working hard to take on board feeings of locals. MoD as usual only interested in their immediate solutions Q2) We do quite well now by considering each other and working together.				Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).			
270	Councillor Wendy Parsons	5 Marina Crescent, Durrington				P	
L15B - Against: Durrington wants to keep its vilgge status, and not become a military base, there must be a green dividing line. L17A - For: Extension of present quarters - close enough for soliders and families to walk/cycle to work and faciliities L2 - Against: Site of first military airfield in the world should be preserved as historic with a museum built L13B - For: Soldiers and their families could walk/cycle to their work place/shop/medical facilities and schools L18 - For. Q1) These proposals have been rushed though by desk-bound people who have probably never visited any of the sites. They do not take into account the military families with young children who will be expected to walk long distances to school/shops etc 2) Larkhill and Durrington have a very good community partership but it seems most militarty families do not want to integrate unless they buy their own property within the village and start to see things from a civilian point of view 3) Where is the Unesco representative? Do they know what is going on in the area? Will there be a full archaeological survey done prior to building beginning?			Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). The works will be subject to planning approval before building commences. Any technical work such as Archaeological Assessments would be carried out at the planning application stage.				

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
271	Mrs M Wardell	674 Netheravon Road, Durrington				P P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
<p>L15B - No, we need to lessen the carbon footprint and there needs to be Green Belt between villages L17A - Maybe L2 - This is the oldest airfield and should not be built on L13B - This could be an ideal place for some accommodation L18 - This would be ideal for officer family accommodation</p> <p>Q1) I am worried that the powers that be are not listening to the community the ideal place for the houses is L14A, L14B and L12 Q2) Q3) I still think the place to build is L14B, L14A and L12. It would be better for the service families and the shops on the Packway</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The MOD is fully committed to minimising the impact of travel on the environment. The ABP presents an excellent opportunity to deliver an exemplar sustainable transport programme in Salisbury Plain. To this end, the MOD will prepare a Salisbury Plain Green Travel Plan, an area-wide framework of features and guidance which would apply to both existing and future service personnel working in the Salisbury Plain area. The Travel Plan will be formulated in consultation with all the necessary military and civilian stakeholders. Preparation of the Travel Plan will explore all options, considering areas in and around SPTA, including Andover and Warminster. By minimising the travel impact of development, the Travel Plan will help to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, improve local air quality, minimise health risks and reduce congestion. Encouraging personnel to carry out their everyday activities in a more sustainable manner can also contribute to improvements in the local environment.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
272	Mr R A Wardell	674 Netheravon Road, Durrington				P
<p>L15B - No L17A - Maybe L2 - Yes L13b - Yes L18 - Yes</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
273	Mrs D Douglas	14 Rigmount Durrington SP4 8AH				P
<p>L15B - Too far from main camp and facilities. Too close to already very busy A345. L17A, L2, L13B And L18 - A combination of all or some of these locations would be much more sensible in my view</p> <p>Q1) It is so good to see that the consultation process is being taken seriously and the attendance at the meetings is high indicating strong local interest and concerns. However, the general feeling appears to be that the MoD needs to really listen and take note of views expressed and consider the options very carefully to avoid future problems and difficulties in the area. Q2) By establishine good, strong communication links between all concerned parties and by keeping those channels open and active at all times to avoid misunderstandings and misinterpretations which will inevitably lead to problems</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
274	Lesley Hunt	37 Avondown Road, Durrington				P
<p>L15b - It is essential that Durrington keeps its village status and does not join up with Larkhill. Road will be to busy with cars being used for work L2 - This will be a good continuation of offices or SNCO's quarters L18 - This will be good continuation of offices quarters and SNCO quarters</p> <p>Q1) It would appear that the MoD has completely ignored any thoughts of the people of Durrington unless suitable for them. It has given no thought to the soldiers who prefer to be close to camp and their facilities Q2) People of Durrington appreciate that military personnel need to come to Larkhill but this will require additional facilities which will be impossible for Durrington to supply. Military families need to be near their camp. Q3) Please do not make decisions from paper. Come to Durrington - see the real issues and talk. Try a role reversal for military and civilian alike, SEE the REAL WORLD we live in.</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p> <p>New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.</p> <p>DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable.</p> <p>However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.</p>		
275	A.G.HUNT	37 Avondown Road, Durrington				P
<p>L15B - Durrington is a village and should remain a village. This site would put to much traffic on to the A345 and its to far from Larkhill for the army personnel L2 - A good area for some of the extra MQ'S needed L13B - A good site close to Larkhill main gate and The Packway shops</p> <p>Q3) The MoD, DOI and local MP's should find time and attend a meeting and listen to opinoins of the villagers on the proposals for the sitting of the extra MQ'S</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
276	Mrs C Coveney	89 Bulford Road, Durrington SP4, 8EX				P
<p>L15B - Against, as too far from existing army facilities L17A - No preference either way L2 - Against, again too far from army facilities L13B - Neither for or against L18 - For, already houses there.</p> <p>Q1) Everything seems to have been done at the last mintue Q2) I think the 2 communities get on well now, with space between the 2.</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
277	R Coveney	89 Bulford road, SP4 8EX				P
<p>L15B - Against - too many cars will be used to get to work. L17A - For - There one quartes there already</p> <p>Q1) Not enough notice Q2) I thought we were! Q3) It seems too rushed</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
278	Mrs H Haydn-Davies	29 High Street, Durrington				P
<p>L15b - Against; 1) Too far from camp/packway facilities/ETC; 2) Provides a green break between Durrington/Larkhill; 3) agricultural land under cultivation. L17A - As L15B L2 - Against - too near Durrington Walls and green space. L13B - Too near The Packway - houses should be minimum 100m from public roads L18 - for - provides extension to officers married quarters</p> <p>Q1) I think community engagement is good so far and that people feel the need to welcome the service families to our area however, ensure that the best possible sites are chosen. Q2) As far as i can see we have a well integrated civilian and military community and would wish it to coutinue Q3) Its really important to listen to C.O and what is best for his troops and their families in his area.</p>				<p>Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan.</p> <p>The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).</p>		
279	Anonymous				Undated	P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
Date: 19 May 2014 **PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES**

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>I have studied the information online concerning the above attended the hastily convened meeting at the village hall (Durrington) in December and would like to give my opinion/comments to those who are making the decisions concerning the above.</p> <p>1) It is important that no precise numbers are available from MoD regarding the life of the 4 units that Larkhill will be preparing. 2) Also, there are no numbers as to the single/family accommodation that is expected. 3) Redundancy Programme - Again no numbers. Question - As we are with withdrawing 4,000 military personnel from Germany and the fact that our troops are withdrawing from Afghanistan (2014) what exactly are these people are to do when they return to the UK? It has become apparent within the last year that the British Government has, at last, realised that the public does not want our troops embroiled in foreign conflicts none of which (Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan etc etc, African nations civil wars) has had a positive outcome. It was good to see that sense prevailed on the question of Syria. Question - Do we really need to retain such large number of troops doing nothing? (They are better employed seeing to our own country's needs i.e. flooding relief (only used when London was affected - forget about the rest of the country!)) Matters regarding the sites for housing in Larkhill Having studied the plans provided after meeting it is only common sense that the accommodation for both single/families should be as near as possible to the military area at Larkhill. It already provides school, medical facilities, shops, community accommodation etc, plus building facilities vacated by the unit moving out.</p> <p>The area of farming land between Durrington and Larkhill must be maintained at all costs otherwise this area will become yet another urban sprawl!</p> <p>These sites either side of The Packway would be ideal for development being of no agricultural or aesthetic quality. With careful planning and landscaping the area could be greatly improved and enhance. The military environment there about. Having visited Stonehenge very recently the view from that area (to waylay any misgivings that English Heritage might leave as to their objections).</p>
280	Peter Haydn-Davies	29 High Street, Durrington				P
						<p>L15b - This area should not be used: (a) Agricultural Land (b) Provides a 'green' break between Durrington/Larkhill (c) too-far from camp/Packway facilities/shops Etc L17A - See above A,B,C L2 - (B) Provides a 'green' break along The Packway L13b - Too near to The Packway, housing should be a minimum 100m from public road. L18 - FOR provides an extension to the already officers married quarters</p> <p>1) The community engagement and response so far has been very good. Local people both civilian and military have thought carefully, sensitively and meaningfully about the local impact and the well being of the families. 2) Coming to live in Larkhill. Since coming to Durrington, 2 years ago we have come to know many military and ex-military people. Join local activities where civilian and military families attend. Talk to people in neighbourhood. 3) These families are coming here, let's accommodate them in the best possible location where they have the best access to their work and the facilities already established at Larkhill i.e.: L4, L6, L5A, L14a, L14a, L16</p>
281	R.Fraser	1 Birchwood drive, Durrington, SP4 8ER				P
						<p>L15b - Against: Not close enough to Larkhill garrison, therefore there will be several hundred extra car journey's per day. Loss of separate identities of Larkhill and Durrington. L17A - For L2 - Maybe too far from garrison As L15b L13B - For L18 - As L2</p> <p>1) The MoD have not engaged with the community in a satisfactory way, with just a few days notice. the MoD has not thought through the proposals in a responsible way. 2) In the same way as we have up until now 3) No</p>
282	E Ruse	53 Willow Drive, Durrington				P
						<p>L15b - Against: to close to A945, accident waiting to happen, we want to keep Durrington and Larkhill separated L17a - would be more suitable 1) It's time the MOD listened to local public 2) 3) Larkhill garrison and Durrington should be kept separated</p>
283	Jacia Cooper	Delmont Mailna Crescent Durrington				P
						<p>L15B - Against, to near to Durrington open land should be kept. Dangerous road. L15A - More predictable</p> <p>Q1) The MOD Will have there own way and not listen to the local community Q2) Q3) Please keep Larkhill and Durrington separated</p>
284	Martyn Jones	6 Westfield Close, Durrington				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>L15B & L17A - Against, erodes the natural green belt/open space separation between Larkhill and Durrington. Will cause a large increase in traffic along The Packway from its junctions with the A345 several times a day with service personnel travelling to and from places of work and garrison based schools, medical centres and other facilities.</p> <p>L2 - Against, playing the English Heritage card, this development would be in sight of Woodhenge and Durrington Walls, probably discounted by them as it is not profit making like Stonehenge</p> <p>L13B - No objection as this development would compliment the local community and army preferred build areas of L12, L14A, L14B and L6</p> <p>L18 - No real objection. Again would be in sight of/close to Durrington Walls and Woodhenge but it makes sense to build officer accommodation here next to existing.</p> <p>1) I feel that the proposals made so far by the MOD/DIO have been the exact opposite of what the local communities, local businesses and even the army favoured, did they even look at our proposals? After reading their 82 page document it looks like its already done and dusted and they will build where they like.</p> <p>2) I believe that the military and local civilian communities are well integrated and have been since the garrison was built. We have seen from the recent meetings the military are always well represented and have the same ideas as the cities Durrington & Larkhill have always had a partnership.</p> <p>3) English Heritage have too much power over the local area, they have already caused daily misery to Shrewton, Larkhill, Durrington and Bulford without dictating where and how development can take place at Larkhill.</p>
285	Mr A Members	670 Netheravon Road, Durrington				P
						<p>15b - Least sensible option. Most families have 2 cars so carbon footprint up to 1080 cars vs 540 if sited close to camp and shops at L14/L12</p> <p>L17a - Slightly better as soldiers could access the camp but still a fair trek to shops, school, and facilities. cars will be used.</p> <p>L2 - Isn't this the site of the WWI horse hosp? might be ok to sensitivity build around it but better sites = L14/L12 + extend offices patch (L18?)</p> <p>L13B - Slightly Better option but better to challenge World Heritage's decision and build in L12/L14 area</p> <p>L18 - Assuming south of L2, defiantly extend officer patch and could cater for 540 with L17A</p> <p>1) coming from an army family and working for the MoD I am not surprised that DIO have adopted their usual 'head in the sand' stance. We must challenge the decision on L12/L14 as its the most sensible location - as backed by the army users of the site.</p> <p>2) We already have various links between the two communities but will need to ensure sufficient infrastructure and amenities exist to cater for all.</p> <p>3) I will be emailing my MP on this issue</p>
286	Olivia knight	4 Downland way, Durrington SP4 8BX				P
						<p>L15B - Against: Not close enough to camp to save carbon footprint. Will create more pressure on local roads at peak times because families will have to drive to schools and work instead of walk - closer to Durrington than Larkhill.</p> <p>L17A - For: Close to camp. Closer to shops and army medical services etc. (reduction in public transport has meant buses to schools etc not an option)</p> <p>L2 - Preferable to L15B but not ideal</p> <p>L13B - For: Again closer to military amenities, access to shops and schools for military families, reduction in car travel.</p> <p>L18 - For: To extend officers quarters - add to adjacent officers housing.</p> <p>L12/L14A/L4B - Ideal: Reasons for not being preferred sites are questionable</p> <p>1) Some of the factions involved in these decisions do not appear to be listening to the community (civilian or military) nor does it appear they want to listen.</p> <p>2) By ensuring close and easy access to their place of work, schools, services for the military, this reducing pressure on civilian infrastructure under pressure will inevitably cause resentment</p> <p>3) Are we guaranteed sufficient services (Doctors, schools, Play areas, safe road access) will be provided at the outset of project, not years down the line?</p> <p>Sites L12/L14A/L4B should be discussed & considered</p>
287	Bill Knight	4 Downland way, Durrington SP4 8BX				P
						<p>L15B - Not a practical site. Its recent years there's been a housing estate built on the land opposite so enough traffic coming onto A345 already.</p> <p>L17A - For: Better for the army people being nearer to amenities, schools, shops, in Larkhill. All centred in one place makes sense.</p> <p>L2 - Preferable to L15B but not ideal at least its away from Stonehenge and about where traffic/from site L15B would converge.</p> <p>L13B - YES: again because its closer to military amenities; reduction in traffic - shop keepers need the trade in Larkhill too.</p> <p>L18 - YES: good idea use there are already offices quarters below it.</p> <p>Q1) It seems some of the factions involved in these decisions are not getting together to discuss the problems (Civilian or Military) do not appear to want to listen more times should be allowed to address the issues</p> <p>Q2) By ensuring close and easy access to their place of work, schools, services etc. this would reduce pressure on civilian infrastructure. Already there is too much traffic on the Stonehenge roundabout as it is.</p> <p>3) There will certainly need to be services (doctors, schools etc) at the outset this could cause big problems .</p>
288	David Beanish	11 Heron Walk Durrington				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
L15B - This site is detached from Larkhill itself, the shops and other business, the road leading to the Packway will come more connected L17A - 2nd Preferred site to L.2 L2 - Best location as it is near the present facilities as Larkhill and near its Larkhill camp Q1) As all MoD personal are coming to work at Larkhill it seems that the best solution is to build near to Larkhill camp rather than close to Durrington Q2) To add to the existing Larkhill community rather than Durrington as it is already capacity in regard to extra housing. Q3) Why have MoD discounted previously advertised sites?						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.
289	R Attwood	760 Netheravon Road Durrington SP4 8AX				P
L15B - too close to Durrington & A345 L17A - Next to Larkhill camp and existing MQS. Maintains gap between Larkhill & Durrington. Easy access into camp L2 - Area of historic interest L13b - it seems okay but leave space opposite the church L18 - Historic interest Q1) Not sure what the community engagement is. the DIO seems to be going ahead with it own plans - ignoring the wishes of the majority of Durrington villagers Q2) We appreciate that the army personnel need homes but why integrate? We wish to keep our village as it is and not expand it into Larkhill Q3) What's wrong with the white area between L15B and L17A? Combined with L17A there is plenty of room for 540 Houses and still maintain a distance between Larkhill and Durrington						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre has also been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.
290	Mr Jan Belza	Avonvale Halkthorne Road, Durrington				P
L15B - Worst possible option. Closer to Durrington than Larkhill, greenfield site. Too far from camp for soldiers to walk to work. Will encourage car use so increasing congestion on the A345 Packway. Families too far from Larkhill amenities L17A - More acceptable if any entrance to the camp is made on it western boundary. Extends too far north. Would be better to use the southern half + L1 So linking to exiting quarters L2 - Not ideal but better for soldiers then L15B and L17A. I Wouldn't object. L13B - I am in favour of this site. It is shielded by tress on it's eastern boundary and is close to work and amenities. If it was intended south it would take the bulk of housing L18 - I am in favour of this site. It will be adjacent to exciting married quarters My preferred options - anywhere south of The Packway! Q1) I think our community reps are doing their best to make their voices heard, however DIO appear to be making decisions that no one else want. They need to be made to have the wishes of all other interested parties Q2) As an ex-military man, I already mix with many serving solders, generally soldiers with interest outside of the army will be looking to join clubs use civilian facilities etc, so a pamphlet detailing what is available with contact phones now, emails, delivered to quarters would help Q3) I am surprised DIO haven't looked at re-building some of the exiting areas. Some of the housing is ancient and could do with replacing. The worst 2 quarters I lived in during 22 years service are still being used at Larkhill.					Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre has also been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.	
291	Jemma Manders	670 Netheravon Road, Durrington				P
L15B - Against: More emissions from 500+ extract cars driving along A345 with residents getting to work in Larkhill every day L2, L13B, L17A & L18 - For: closer to work for army residents so can walk/cycle to work easily - no carbon emissions L12 would be a far better option for all. Q1) It was great to be consulted on positioning of the housing - however very disappointed that the current community and future army residents are in agreement of best positions but are being totally ignored Q2) The suggested hub in the Durrington library position and/or a hub in Amesbury could bring us all together for many different events. Q3) I have lived in Durrington for over 35 years - I fear future develop ment in the village will mean the death of all countryside green areas. I am very saddened by this.						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre has also been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.
292						P
L15B - This is too far from facilities in Larkhill would need to get into cars to go to work. L2 - This may well be good for extension to offices quarters 3) I feel there ought to be negotiations with World Heritage so that L12 could be used. It would not affect Stonehenge site at all.						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill which will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).
293	Mrs S Gamble	10 Windor Road Durrington				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>L15b - Far too near existing houses & too close to village of Durrington/ too far from facilities and would mean cars to be used for soldiers getting to work.</p> <p>L17A - The same reason as above</p> <p>L13B - Fine.</p> <p>Q1) They do not understand locals. It would be one big sprawl into Durrington who cannot cope. The facilities for troops and families are in Larkhill.</p> <p>Q2) By social events</p> <p>Q3) English Heritage don't care about the quality of life for the army or the villagers</p>
294	Eileen A Brownhill (MRS)	27 Pinckney way Durrington				P
						<p>Against</p> <p>L15B - Too far from facilities and services especially for mum and a small children, welfare of families</p> <p>L17A - Should be primary concern not ease of building. Would mean more parking issues</p> <p>L2 - Not acceptable when sites L14a, L14b and L12 also available. These sites would afford an opportunity</p> <p>L13B - To provide more much needed recreational facilities for children and young people from both</p> <p>L18 - Service and civilian communities</p> <p>Perfect sites are L14A, L14B and park of L12</p> <p>1) There has been little information other than general plan of where and when units will be moving. As usual there seems to be little recognition of local opinion by various agencies.</p> <p>2) There has been integration of civilian and services population for many years many services families settle in this area and contribute a great deal to local communities</p> <p>3) English Heritage appear to be the overall leaders in the process with no consideration being given to the welfare of the families coming into the area or indeed for those families (both service and civilian) who will be affected by the whole process</p>
295	Mr NH Brownhill	27 Pinckney's way Durrington				P
						<p>L15B & L17A - Distance for solders and families to travel to facilities and services especially pre school and junior school, occasioning use and card and parking problems. Too far from children to walk.</p> <p>L2, L13b & L18 - Barley accessible when L14A L14B and L12 are available. This would also be an opportunity to provide more recreational facilities for children.</p> <p>The perfect sites are L14a, L14B and Part of L12</p> <p>Q1) There has been little done other than the broad brush plan of with the units will remove and priltally where to there has been no face to face chance to put the locals opinion to the various agencies</p> <p>Q2) The communicates are already integrated with many present and past military and Amesbury as well as the remaining local parishes</p> <p>Q3) English Heritage seem to be leading the choice of sites with no consideration of the well being of the future families what are their reasons for discounted sites?</p>
296	Vivien Waterman	13 Ridemount Durrington				P
						<p>L15B - Greenfield site, too far from facilities e.g. shops, doctors and army welfare services. Adjoining busy main road.</p> <p>L17A - Again as above</p> <p>L2, L13b, L18 - Again as above.</p> <p>Q1)Community engagement very good, MoD proposals appear sensible. The omitted site are by far the best for development. Close to facilities and already partial developed in many cases. Improvement by removal of derelict buildings. Exception L19 an amenity in itself.</p> <p>Q2) The communities are already well integrated and provided we work together on these plans. I feel this will continue</p> <p>Q3) Concern for young families being isolated if living on proposed sites.</p>
297	A Lund	3 Willow Drive				P
						<p>L15b - Against too far too Larkhill amenities which lead to more traffic problems.</p> <p>L17a - Slightly better</p> <p>L2 - In favour. Should not be discounted because of English Heritage. There is already building south of the Packway</p> <p>L13b - As above.</p> <p>Q1) Proof of the pudding - Need to be convinced it is really on board. The reasoned objections to it's proposals. Omitted sites would tend to prove the opposite.</p> <p>Q2) You can't force integration. As far as I know the communities of Durrington and Larkhill are used to the military presence and welcome what ever contribution it makes</p>
298	L Hancock	3 Glebe Road, Durrington				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
Q1)Community engagement excellent: Prefer L12 - The most sensible site Not much as regards MoD proposals so far. They prefer the L15a. Site which will increase the traffic on the A345 considerably Q2) Provide enough services, facilities, doctor, school, to enable us all the line together as we have for many years! Q3) More pressure should be put on English Heritage. They have ruled matters regarding Stonehenge for far too many years now!						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre has also been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses. DIO fully acknowledge the local community's support for SFA to be delivered south of the Packway. In the absence of environmental and timescale constraints, the rationale for this option i.e. building close to existing amenities, would seem the most sustainable. However, after careful consideration, DIO have judged that proposals to develop SFA south of the Packway would pose a very high risk to the programme of delivery due to the World Heritage Site (WHS) designation. Proposals for development within the WHS would involve a number of statutory bodies who would need to be satisfied with the proposals prior to the submission of any applications, and with that, it is anticipated that significant delays may occur at planning application stage. To achieve successful delivery of the development, DIO have decided to develop SFA in an alternative site, north of the Packway, which is within a less environmentally sensitive location away from the WHS, where large-scale development may be more easily delivered within the available timescales.
299	C Lloyd	20 Marina Road				P
L15b - Spilling the landscape. Too close to 345. Soldiers will drive to camp that's 500+ cars on road as wives also have lives and work. L17a - no objection but then again people will be driving to work. Q1) The MoD have already decided and will do what they want regardless of what services families and the civilian community want. Q2) There is no issue, the civilians and military have a good relationship. We want better facilities, sewage, drainage. This is a flood risk area. Schools, Dr's and dentist. Q3) Most of the people living in Durrington are ex-service personnel, work for mod or serving personnel, listen to us. If you put on preferred site think of the carbon footprint of 500+ cars to camp. Some added comments on the L15b site, and in general for all of the sites. 1) I presume an archaeological dig and survey will be done on all sites 2) What happens if something is found? Think of the delays 3) Carbon footprint, soldiers will drive from L15b site increasing the numbers of cars using the A345 and the route to Larkhill camp, please remember wives have lives too and 2nd cars are common in this modern age too. 4) Can the local facilities cope with the increase in families i.e. GP's, dentists, schools 5) If this site goes ahead could the MOD help fund a local community centre on the site, perhaps some allotments 6) If L15b is used is there a guarantee that only 540 houses will be built as this is a large area with potential to build more 7) This is a flood area. What are the flood management plans for the local houses backing onto this field? The serving soldiers and their families have always worked well together, we are a community. Most of us, including me, have been part of both. I know what its like to be an army wife and the negativity that it brings. MOD listed to your serving soldiers and families, give them the homes that they and the local community can live with and do not				Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan thus leaving a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill. This will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. Of the preferred sites, site L17a is considered to be the most favourable site for a large number of SFA in Larkhill. The need for new social infrastructure (e.g. primary school), and land for new community/retail facilities will be assessed in conjunction with the development of substantial SFA at site L17a to create a sustainable community. Land north of the golf centre has also been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). New SFA will need to be supported by appropriate community infrastructure to enable it to become part of a balanced community. The potential provision of further school places, retailing, community facilities and public open space and will take account of the level of facilities currently available at each location. Opportunities to further military-civilian integration will be a key determining factor in the selection of final SFA sites. The emphasis is on building sustainable places and not just houses.		
300	Paul Lloyd	20 Marina Road				P
L15b - I objective to this as there is no guarantee you will stop at 540 houses. Too close to 345 where the infrastructure will not take 500+ cars L17a - Think of carbon footprint of 540 families driving to overpaid other work places. Q1) The MoD already have their plans in place, service families do not want this site, please listen to them - Unless the MOD are going find more DR'S, Dentist surgeries, improve or build new schools and community hubs for the area that's a lot of facilities to cater for the local community Q2) There is no issue with integration of both communities they were together and living together comfortably but the issue will be infrastructure failings from sewage to school etc. Q3) many families here in Durrington are ex-service men and women. We have good inter-relationships. Put the houses closer to camp, do not isolate your soldiers and families, we have lived in areas where the impact with civilians was negative, do not create a them and us						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill which will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014). traffic studies and assessments have been carried out as part of the overall plan to identify pinch points and areas of concern. Plans to mitigate problem areas can then be developed. Further details are set out in the outline transport assessment and Framework Travel Plan.
301	Mr Brain Doughas	14 Ridemount Durrington SP4 8AH				P
L15b - Too far from the garrison - would involve a lot more traffic on and around the A345. they army personnel need to be in the centre of Larkhill. Q1) It was a good to see so many people at the meeting on Thursday 27th feb. The general opinion of the meeting was that the MoD were not listening and the area for the building of the 540 houses should be on the land marked L14a, L14b and L12. This would allow easy access to the army bases for all military personnel.						Sites L14a, L14b, L12, L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).
302	Timothy Shea	60 Meads Road, Durrington SP4 8BG				P
L15b - Against L12 a better proposition L17a - No Comment L12 - Lots of space close to schools and The Packway, better for shopping etc.						Sites L2, L12 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).
303	Wendy Shea	60 Meads Road, Durrington SP4 8BG				P
L15b - Too close to Durrington - means two communities fuse into one. Right under helicopter flight path! L17a - Seems good place. We lived on Biddulph road, when foster walk built, it blended in well (just by L17A) L2 - Despite historic land (what isn't?) seems as good place as many L13b - No objection but unlikely as historic crash site of early flying Q1) Community is showing interest, concern and a lot of sense. MoD the usual slap happy "not on my tour of duty" attitude as they won't be around for the consequences Q2) As we have always done, share facilities but leave military to live together support each other and show them we do care and will help them. Q3) I feel as a local but member of Larkhill for 18 years, living separately is better for both communities						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L15b between Larkhill and Durrington has not been included in the final Masterplan. This will leave a strategic gap between the settlements of Durrington and Larkhill which will mitigate potential coalescence and enable the settlements to retain their unique qualities. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).
304	Marion Spencer	1 Westfield close, Durrington				P
L15b - Against - this site is not close to either Larkhill or Durrington. It is a lovely piece of countryside that denotes a boarder between Larkhill and Durrington. L17a - Closer to Larkhill but still isolated L2 - Ok L13b- More integrated to Larkhill close to shops/school etc L18 - Ok L15a and L15b Q1) I think it is all signed and sealed anyway and whatever we say everything is already decided and certain people will be making loads of money and to hell will the locals and military families! Q2) By investing in the infrastructure giving us a decent library (not relying on volunteers, shops, a good bus service (not closing bus station (bit late for that)) youth clubs with a half decent investment, sports centres not being threatened with closure ever year. Local pub in Durrington would be nice. The list is endless. Q3) Words fail me about how to describe how I feel about this stitch-up						Sites L2 , L15b, L13b and L18 have not been included in the final Masterplan. Land at site L17a has been included in the final Masterplan. The site selection process indicating the reasons for the inclusion and/or exclusion of specific sites can be found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final Planning Context Report (20 May 2014).
305	Mr M Ridley	5 Windsor Road, Durrington Wilts, Sp4 8Aa				P

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses

Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014

Date: 19 May 2014

PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
306	E Ridley	5 Windsor Road, Durrington Wilts, Sp4 8Aa				P
307	John Wigglesworth	1 Pickneys Way, Durrington, SP4 8BS				P
308	D P Collins	Bergresford Lodge, Hackthorn Road, Durrington				P
309	Rob Hocking	667 Netheravon Road Durrington				P
310	Mary Towle		Durrington Town Council		26-Mar-14	P
311	Mark Funnell	SouthWest Region Place Farm Tisbury	National Trust	Mark.funnell@nationaltrust.org.uk	31-Mar-14	E

Salisbury Plain Masterplan: Schedule of Consultation Responses
 Formal Public Consultation - 19 February to 1 April 2014
 Date: 19 May 2014 PART 2 - OTHER RESPONSES

Ref	Name	Address	Organisation	Email Address	Date received	Receipt Code
						P = Post E = Email C = Comments Box
						<p>Of particular concern is that the SFA currently proposed for Larkhill would represent 45% of the total requirement, despite the fact that Larkhill is acknowledged to be the "most constrained" of the settlements under consideration in terms of statutory designations.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that the capacity of local environments to accommodate new development and activity should be given considerable prominence throughout the decision-making process.</p> <p>Following a site selection exercise, the draft masterplan has identified three sites at Larkhill that are "preferred" by the MOD/DIO (i.e. those north of the Packway). Key issues for these sites include the impact on the World Heritage Site and its setting, and the implications for OUV; as well as the impacts on specific archaeological monuments and remains and their settings – including the sites of four Early Bronze Age monuments within site L15b, and the nearby Durrington Walls.</p> <p>A further issue would be the impact on landscape and visual amenities, including views north from the Packway, and views to the south-west when approaching the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>A particular concern is the area that is effectively one large field (L15a/L15b), where it is considered that any new development should be avoided.</p> <p>Three sites are identified as having "potential" for SFA housing (i.e. those south of the Packway). Due to anticipated detrimental impacts on Stonehenge, visual amenity, ecology and land management, it is considered that little or no development should take place south of the Packway.</p> <p>Any plans to enlarge the current Larkhill sewage facility are likely to have a very significant impact on the World Heritage Site. Alternative provision may therefore be required, whose impacts on the Site and its setting would also need to be determined.</p> <p>The Highways Agency has already raised concerns that a large amount of new housing at Larkhill is likely to lead to a "significant impact" on the A303 between the Countess and Longbarrow roundabouts. Any further development in the vicinity of the single carriageway stretch of the A303 should preferably contribute to a solution to this underperforming stretch of road.</p> <p>Whilst the rationale behind the army rebasing proposals is acknowledged, it is important that the capacity of local environments to accommodate additional development is given sufficient weight throughout the decision-making process. This includes giving appropriate consideration to the significance of the World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Serious concerns are raised that the "preferred" level of development envisaged for Larkhill.</p>
312	Katherine Burt	Blandford Forum Dorset	Environment Agency	Katherine.burt@environment-agency.gov.uk	03-Apr-14	E
						<p>Comments made on Draft Phase 3 Context Report, full copy in Appendix 22: Water supply and waste water disposal Flood risk / Surface water drainage Groundwater protection /contaminated land Pollution prevention River crossings/other proposals impacting on watercourses</p>
313	Phil McMahon	Inspector of Ancient Monuments English Heritage 29 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND	English Heritage	McMahon, Phil [Phil.McMahon@english-heritage.org.uk]	11-Mar-14	E & P
						<p>Refer to Appendix 22 for a full copy of the response from EH</p>
314	Alice Walker	Somerset, Avon & Wiltshire Team Natural England	Natural England	alice.walker@naturalengland.org.uk	14/03/2014	E & P
						<p>Refer to Appendix 22 for a full copy of the response from NE. Preferred Sites Training</p>
315	Caroline Power	Inspector of Historic Buildings & Area Blandford Forum Dorset	English Heritage	Caroline.Power@english-heritage.org.uk	24/03/2014	E
						<p>Refer to Appendix 22 for a full copy of the response from EH Planning Context Report Appendix 9 - preferred/potential sites Appendix 11 - Military base zoning plans</p>
316	Kevin Ladner	Economic Development & Planning County Hall	Wiltshire Council	Ladner, Kevin [Kevin.Ladner@wiltshire.gov.uk]	19/02/2014	E
						<p>Refer to Appendix 22 for a full copy of the response on the Phase 3 Planning Context Report, Outline Environmental Appraisal and Interim Environmental Report from Wilts Council, with their comments on :</p> <p>Wiltshire Council Comments - Introduction Strategic Comments Main Settlement comments - Commentary and opportunity for improvements; Constraints (Larkhill; Bulford; Tidworth & Ludgershall) General Comments</p> <p>Detailed Technical / Editorial Comments on the PCR Comments on the OEA</p>