

## APPENDIX 1:

### Initial summary of main issues raised through consultation on Wiltshire Local Plan Review

#### 1. Introduction

1.1 Consultation to inform the Wiltshire Local Plan closed on 9 March 2021. Overall, in excess of 3,500 representations from 2,682 people and organisations were submitted on the consultation documents. A breakdown of the number of representations is provided in this report below against each consultation document. This summary outlines an initial analysis of the main issues that have emerged from the following consultation documents:

- Emerging spatial strategy
- Empowering rural communities
- Addressing climate change and biodiversity net environmental gain
- Planning for the Principal Settlements (Chippenham, Salisbury and Trowbridge)
- Planning for the Market Towns (12 in total)

1.2 A tabular format is used for each document and the consultation documents can be viewed via this [link](#).

#### 2. Emerging Spatial Strategy (372 comments, 324 respondents)

2.1 The scale of housing was the dominant subject of comments. Most representations were from the 'general public and town or parish councils' and 'developers and agents'. This analysis therefore focuses on these sources as they tend to represent the extreme differences in views and breaks them down into the main areas commented on.

Amount of housing	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The environmental impacts of this number of new homes are too great (both for lower and higher estimates of housing need for the plan period 2016 to 2036).</li><li>• Infrastructure is insufficient to support it (both for lower and higher estimates of housing need).</li><li>• Should not exceed the standard method requirement (a higher number will result in difficulties sustaining a five-year supply).</li><li>• Job growth does not support a higher amount than the standard method calculation.</li><li>• The amount of housing is being justified to deliver development at Chippenham.</li><li>• Evidence underpinning housing numbers is out of date due to COVID and impact on economy (housing need is less than estimated).</li></ul>

Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A higher number than the standard method is supported; with many supporting the higher end of the range or above.</li> <li>• It should be higher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To boost supply over the assessed need of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (44,000)</li> <li>- By a longer plan period (see below)</li> <li>- To deliver more affordable homes</li> <li>- To reflect recent high levels of delivery (Housing Delivery Test)</li> <li>- To both respond to and support economic recovery</li> <li>- To marry up with the maximum forecasts of five or ten-year migration trends in housing market areas where they differ</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Climate change</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy does not do enough to address climate change.</li> <li>• It represents business as usual - greenfield and car based. There should be carbon accounting and measurable targets set by the plan.</li> <li>• Lack of employment allocation at Melksham would exacerbate out-commuting and increase carbon footprint.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy should focus growth on “sustainable settlements”, with general support for the main settlements.</li> <li>• Should extend “sustainable settlements” to include local service centres and large villages - both generally and certain settlements named e.g. those well related Swindon and Salisbury (see transport).</li> </ul>
<b>Transport</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main settlements are already congested, and additional growth cannot be supported.</li> <li>• Greater emphasis upon accessibility by active modes of travel and brownfield development.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A focus on sustainable settlements can reduce the need to travel and support more sustainable modes.</li> <li>• Settlements near Salisbury (Laverstock and Wilton) and Swindon (Purton and Cricklade) are well located to support more environmentally friendly transport links.</li> </ul>
<b>Distribution of growth</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much emphasis upon greenfield sites and brownfield sites should be prioritised.</li> <li>• The COVID-19 pandemic will change behaviour and release land for new homes (e.g. in town centres).</li> <li>• The decline of town centres should be reversed.</li> <li>• Trowbridge Town Council considers that growth at Trowbridge should be dispersed around the town (village locations and Green Belt review).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that inability to meet growth in Trowbridge Housing Market Area (HMA) will impact on locations in Melksham Community Areas in adjoining HMA.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is too great a focus on large sites at Chippenham, Trowbridge and (to a lesser degree) Melksham to be sure housing needs can be met in a timely way.</li> <li>(Consequently) higher scales of growth are necessary at other market towns.</li> <li>There is too much of a focus on main settlements when rural settlements can play a greater role than solely meeting local need.</li> <li>Opportunities to extend Swindon west have not been properly considered.</li> <li>There is too much emphasis upon brownfield land.</li> <li>Cotswold Business Park / Kemble Airfield promoted as new community for 2,000 homes (of which a significant part is in Cotswold District Council).</li> </ul>
<b>Economy</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth should provide more employment to balance jobs and homes and reduce commuting.</li> <li>Becoming carbon neutral and changing behaviour as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic will affect employment needs.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The economic evidence is out of date and needs to be revisited.</li> <li>Further evidence is needed on sectoral requirements.</li> <li>Junctions 16 and 17, M4 are promoted for strategic employment use.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan period</b>	
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The end date of the plan should be altered so that it plans at least 15 years ahead at the time of adoption (2038 to 2040).</li> <li>The plan baseline should be brought up to date so that it plans positively for the future (2020 or 2021).</li> </ul>
<b>Neighbourhood planning</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confusion about neighbourhood plan requirements for towns, and the relationship between the Local Plan and neighbourhood plans.</li> <li>Confusion regarding purpose of brownfield targets and how these relate to the overall requirement for main settlements.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy should not rely on a large proportion of the homes needed being brought forward by neighbourhood planning.</li> <li>The relationship between neighbourhood plans and the Local Plan needs to be clarified.</li> </ul>

### 3. Empowering Rural Communities (337 comments, 158 respondents)

- 3.1 Over half of the comments received were from the general public, with approximately 20% from landowners, developers or their agents and just under 20% from Parish and Town Councils. The main topic of interest was the proposed housing requirements for Local Service Centres and Large Villages. The summary of responses below has been arranged around the proposed changes to strategic planning policy for rural areas, as set out in the consultation document.

#### **Suggestion for 40% affordable housing on sites of 5 or more dwellings**

##### 40% Target:

- Many were supportive, with some asking that it be a minimum and others that it should be higher. A 50% target was suggested for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Some felt that it should be less than 40%; with one suggesting baseline target of 20%, with parish and town councils given scope to set higher targets in neighbourhood plans.
- Some highlighted national guidance that allows different targets to be set for different types/locations of sites.
- Others noted that the 40% target will need to be viability tested before it can be justified.
- Some expressed concerns that 'wherever possible' encouraged negotiation of lower provision, whereas others called for greater flexibility to reflect actual need at point in time.
- It was also suggested that a 40% target would compromise quality and mean greater proportion of larger homes for house builders to meet profit expectations.

##### The 5 dwelling threshold:

- Concerns that a 5 dwelling threshold would encourage developers to breakup larger sites.
- A 5 dwelling threshold is inconsistent with national policy and presupposes that applications for Designated Rural Status would be successful.
- A 5 dwelling threshold would impact on site viability in rural areas.
- Lower threshold of 2 dwellings was suggested in AONBs.
- Some support; thresholds higher than 5 (such as 10) would mean reduced affordable homes in rural area.

#### **Revised Core Policy 44 - community led housing in rural areas**

- General agreement and support for the proposed policy. However, concerns also raised.
- Some considered maximum homes on sites should remain as 10; others suggested 20 homes on some sites would be unviable - increase to a maximum of 30 dwellings, being no larger than 5% of the existing village size.
- Housing needs assessments to cover both affordable and market housing.
- 'Community support', 'genuine local need', 'community led' and 'affordable' should be clearly defined

- Inclusion of Community Led Homes (CLH) is supported; should reflect that can be provided by groups other than Community Land Trusts e.g. co-operatives
- 25% market homes cross-subsidy not justified.
- Concerns that allowing cross-subsidy of up to 50% market homes on CLH sites is too high, although some also felt that it should apply to all schemes.
- Self-build homes can't be retained as affordable in perpetuity.
- An additional exceptions policy is needed to support both affordable and market custom/self-build housing.
- Appropriate housing density should be one of the policy criteria.
- Provision should be made for down-sizing/retirement homes.
- Doesn't reflect proper use of brownfield sites.

**Restricting permitted development rights to prevent small homes in rural areas being increased in size or replaced by larger homes**

- Views were mixed. Whilst some were broadly supportive, many others were against.
- Wrong to restrict/withdraw permitted development rights. People extend to accommodate growing families due to restricted supply of larger houses and because moving is unaffordable.
- Would be justified if best way of maintaining good mix essential for vitality of village.
- 'Small' needs to be defined.
- Rural areas are already at disadvantage (poorer transport, more expensive internet, lower speeds, etc). Removing rights compared to those in urban areas is inequitable.
- Extending homes encourages redevelopment of buildings in need of repair. The proposed approach would prevent this.
- National policy encourages need for mix of housing to support local needs and the vitality of rural communities.
- Approach appears at odds with national planning policy, which is clear that policies should be positive and support sustainable development in rural areas.
- National guidance confirms permitted development rights should only be removed in exceptional circumstances. Government is clear that people should be able to alter and extend their own homes, which has led to a significant expansion of permitted development rights reflective of this presumption to support homeowners.
- There is no evidence to justify the approach proposed. Permitted development rights are enshrined in law and a compelling case is needed to withdraw them.
- Should only be applied to new and existing affordable homes regardless of size.
- Need for restrictions should be informed by housing needs assessments; and an understanding of number of households wishing to downsize and composition of the existing housing stock.

**Housing figures for Local Service Centres and Large Villages**

Method for calculating housing requirements:

- Figures do not seem to be based on clear evidence. Detailed methodology with stage-by-stage results should be published.
- Method should include factors such as:
  - safety and capacity of the highway network
  - access to public transport

- school capacity
- shop/ post office provision
- access to health services
- employment opportunities
- Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land
- availability of sites for development
- proximity to services and facilities in nearby settlements
- how development can contribute to vibrancy of village and support services and facilities

- Method should be simpler, based on percentage increase of the existing population.
- Overall housing requirements allocated to Large Villages and Local Service Centres for each of the HMAs is too high.
- Figure for some places is too high e.g. Shaw/Whitley and Atworth
- Growth should be directed to areas where it will serve to enhance the vitality of communities across the area to support both housing and economic growth.
- Methodology is prejudicial against smaller Large Villages (LVs), imposing disproportionate level of housing upon them – proposed housing requirements for many of the smallest Large Villages is greater proportionately than for some of the Local Service Centres.
- Commitments that match or exceed requirements imposes moratorium on further growth to 2036 at those settlements.

#### **Policy for housing delivery and settlement status**

- Local Plan should allocate sites at Local Service Centres and Large Villages and not wait for Neighbourhood Plans or until the site allocations plan is reviewed.
- Should be time limits for how long Neighbourhood Plans will be given to allocate housing sites to meet their requirements.
- High residual housing requirements leave villages wide open for speculative development.
- Housing requirements should be for designated neighbourhood areas rather than settlements.
- Position of settlements in hierarchy should be reviewed to consider changes since they were first identified.
- Winterslow, Redlynch and Morgan's Vale should be reclassified as Small Villages.
- Purton and Lyneham should be reclassified as Local Service Centres.
- Durrington's population is significantly higher than other Large Villages - should at least be a Local Service Centre. No justification for changing status of settlement from Market Town.
- Shaw and Whitley should not be treated as a single Large Village, housing requirement is disproportionate.

#### 4. Addressing climate change and biodiversity net gain (163 comments, 158 respondents)

4.1 Comments generally fell into two groups. The first, those with environmental interests including general public and some parish councils who felt the Plan should be more aspirational in terms of achieving net zero carbon. The second, the more cautious development industry who pushed back questioning cost of building to zero carbon standards and the need for justification. Little evidence was provided through comments to help develop policy themes explored through the consultation. A summary of comments against the five policy themes is set out below.

<b>Tackling flood risk and promoting sustainable water management</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Flood risk from all sources should be reduced through an evidence-led assessment process.</li><li>• Proposals for new development:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- must be safe from flood risk from all sources, including the cumulative effects of flood risk.</li><li>- should incorporate multifunctional Sustainable Drainage Systems (wherever practicable) alongside natural flood management measures and nature-based solutions.</li><li>- should include measures to significantly reduce water consumption (e.g. using a standard of 110ltr/day).</li></ul></li><li>• Policies must be set for protection of water resources (e.g. Source Protection Zones).</li></ul>
<b>Enhancing green/blue infrastructure and biodiversity</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposals for new development to be designed with sufficient, accessible and interconnected open spaces.</li><li>• Trees form an integral element of design of new developments.</li><li>• Strategy for protecting and enhancing green/blue infrastructure should be linked to expanding the network of active travel routes (wherever practicable).</li><li>• Proposals for new development should deliver biodiversity net-gains through comprehensive enhancement of existing habitats.</li></ul>
<b>Delivering sustainable design and construction methods in the built environment</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposals for new development should utilise design features - such as choice of fabric, plot orientation, appropriate massing/density and natural features - to adapt to and wherever practicable mitigate for the effects of climate change.</li><li>• All new residential and commercial developments should be built to zero carbon standards for energy efficiency.</li><li>• Some felt that proposals for delivering zero carbon standard developments can be achieved with limited or no impact on scheme viability; but developers questioned the ability to do so.</li></ul>
<b>Encouraging sustainable renewable energy generation and management</b>

- Proposals for new development should have the ability to link to the national grid with limited or no impact on scheme viability.
- Proposals for new development should reduce energy demand and consumption.
- Opportunities for small-scale and large-scale renewable energy schemes should be encouraged and where necessary planned for through allocations of land.
- Wiltshire Council should lead by example in the installation and delivery of renewable energy from all practicable sources.
- Council's 'policy' of not supporting large-scale wind energy schemes should be reversed.
- Greater capture of wind and solar energy should be planned for, subject to the satisfactory mitigation of environmental impacts.
- Greater encouragement and support for the installation of community renewable energy schemes.

#### **Promoting sustainable transport, active travel and improving air quality**

- Opportunities for incorporating new Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points and hydrogen fuel refilling facilities should be fully explored and adopted.
- Proposals for new development should be in accessible locations to maximise opportunities for active travel.
- Opportunities for sustainable public transport schemes should be incorporated into major development schemes to encourage modal shift.
- All new development proposals should be adaptable and provide storage areas for bicycles and clothes drying facilities.
- Changes to working arrangements due to the pandemic should be factored into the design of new residential and commercial buildings.

## **5. Principal Settlements: Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury**

- 5.1 In response to the proposals for the three Principal Settlements there were significant representations relating to 'strategic matters' (e.g. the proposed scale, distribution and location of growth, lack of infrastructure, track record of delivery failure on large greenfield allocations, particularly at Trowbridge) and 'site specific' matters (e.g. traffic/congestion, environmental impact, loss of open space, disregard for the character of nearby villages).

### **Planning for Chippenham (473 comments, 375 respondents)**

#### **Summary**

There were significant objections in response to the proposals, the scale of housing growth receiving the most comments, alongside objections to the preferred sites. Other specific issues raised by a significant number of respondents, include the need to prioritise brownfield over greenfield land, impacts on transport, landscape and biodiversity, and importance of green infrastructure and addressing climate change. Alternative greenfield sites were suggested including to the west of the A350 and an extension to Rawlings

Green allocation. Strategic employment allocations are promoted to the north and south of Junction 17, M4.

**Scale of Growth**

<p>General public and Town and Parish Councils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant objections to proposed level of growth - too high. Comments include how Chippenham is becoming too large and lacks infrastructure; housing numbers beyond Chippenham’s needs.</li> <li>• Lead to out-commuting, increasing traffic and effect environment (air and noise pollution.)</li> <li>• Impacts on greenspace and cycleways.</li> <li>• Requests to prioritise redevelopment of brownfield land, higher brownfield land figure, reuse vacant buildings in the town centre and other empty buildings for residential use.</li> <li>• Requests for housing to be distributed to other towns and villages.</li> <li>• Climate change and loss of greenfield land is a concern; retain for farms and food production.</li> <li>• HIF bid pre-determined scale of growth.</li> <li>• Not enough evidence for housing figure.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>Developer/agent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Chippenham as focus for growth.</li> <li>• Although questions about deliverability of high number of dwellings in plan period, as well as existing allocations.</li> <li>• Mixed support for brownfield target.</li> </ul>
------------------------	---

<p>Other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritisation of brownfield land supported but must be designed sensitively to historic environment.</li> <li>• No robust case for level of growth. Not deliverable.</li> <li>• Excessive loss of countryside and resultant impact; contradicts climate emergency declaration.</li> <li>• Brownfield target implies loss of substantial employment land/space, undermining jobs and homes balance - increasing out commuting (carbon use) and congestion.</li> <li>• Support homes as positive for economic future of town</li> </ul>
--------------	---

**Place shaping Priorities**

<p>General Public and Town and Parish Councils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impact of COVID-19 on the town centre and new uses for vacant buildings, including residential uses to strengthen centre; suggestion no need for new employment land.</li> <li>• Disagree that new road is required.</li> <li>• Should emphasise importance of River Avon, other green corridors and separation from surrounding villages (e.g. Tytherton Lucas, Stanley). Concerns about coalescence.</li> <li>• Priorities designed to support new sites, rather than lack of leisure and retail in Chippenham or adverse effects of development on Bremhill Parish.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect: Marden River similar to River Avon; North Rivers Cycle route as important corridor for walkers and cyclists. A road to the East of Chippenham will not ease congestion. Prefer the road to the south of Chippenham.</li> <li>• General support by Chippenham Town Council, as match Neighbourhood Plan Vision - minor amendments for priorities 1 (employment), 2 (town Centre) and 5 (Transport).</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers comments on the place shaping priorities generally relate to their use in justifying preferred sites.</li> <li>• Owners of Borough Parade and Emery Gate Shopping Centres seeking to change existing shops to residential.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities could reflect positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.</li> <li>• Sport England suggests the creation of a healthy, inclusive sustainable town can be achieved through use of their 'Active Design' guidance.</li> <li>• Priorities are business as usual references to sustainable development, air quality and congestion, town centre investment. Won't create homes or jobs for local people.</li> <li>• Priority 5 is disingenuous due to focus on traffic congestion, which facilitates homes to south of Chippenham.</li> <li>• National Trust objects to southward expansion of Chippenham due to impacts on wider landscape setting of Lacock village and its historic assets.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Sites</b>	
General public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant objections to preferred sites. Some support for other options instead, particularly west of A350.</li> <li>• Significant objection to Future Chippenham and HIF proposals - done deal without consultation.</li> <li>• Retain farms and use for local food production.</li> <li>• Petition from 65 Hardens Mead residents seeking some fields to be designated as local greenspace (Site 1, East Chippenham).</li> <li>• Much of Site 1 (East Chippenham) is in Bremhill Parish and not supported by Bremhill Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Town Council objects to preferred sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- severe adverse impact on town, unacceptable damage to local environment - destruction high-quality farmland and wildlife habitat in Avon and Marden Valley.</li> <li>- New road including 2 river crossings and railway bridge not required without excessive housing numbers.</li> <li>- Sustainability Appraisal site criteria is biased; site selection methodology used to dismiss other options, which would not require costly carbon intensive infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No brownfield or town centre sites included as options despite opportunity to improve town character and vibrancy.</li> <li>- Selected for commercial reasons (Wiltshire Council owned land), to coincide with road route and support business case for a new road.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers of land within preferred sites generally supportive; but raise objections on specific points, particularly place shaping priorities and concept plan layouts.</li> <li>• All developers seeking to maximise residential use on their land; less supportive of providing other uses e.g. employment, schools, renewable energy, greenspace.</li> <li>• More housing can be accommodated north of the North Rivers Cycle Route (New Leaze Farm); this has closer links with town centre than other parts of the site.</li> <li>• Promotion of some parts of sites as standalone developments.</li> <li>• Employment land locations would be better located nearer to A4 and/or A350; seeking advice from Local Enterprise Partnership.</li> <li>• Developers for other options consider their sites should be preferred as they do not involve major infrastructure and capable of early delivery - they challenge sustainability appraisal, site methodology including place shaping priorities.</li> <li>• Allocation of Langley Park as a brownfield site is promoted.</li> <li>• Promotion of additional land at existing Rawlings Green allocation to provide more housing and country park.</li> <li>• Promotion of extension to employment site south of M4 Junction 17 and new strategic allocation of land north M4 Junction 17 for employment.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater clarity needed on how impact on historic environment has informed spatial strategy and site selection considering legislation and national policy.</li> <li>• Some support that sites are the most appropriate.</li> <li>• Proposed economic development helps redress out-commuting and support town centre.</li> <li>• Lack of progress on Rawlings Green will impact on delivery of east Chippenham site. Alternative mix of sites based on lower quantum suggested that benefits from credible public transport.</li> <li>• Recommendation for the completion of hospital link road instead of the southern link road.</li> <li>• County farms should be used for local food.</li> <li>• Objections to all proposed sites. New economic evidence is needed to consider impact of COVID-19 and inform balance of jobs to homes - question need for employment land; retail and offices should be converted into homes.</li> <li>• Support for more homes north of cycle route due to accessibility to town centre and railway.</li> </ul>

<b>Concept Plans</b>	
General Public and Town and Parish Councils	<p>Detailed comments from Chippenham Town Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail of sites should be left to neighbourhood plan; albeit broad support for land uses.</li> <li>• Infrastructure, renewable energy, green buffer, local green spaces, walking and cycling routes, sustainable building construction and biodiversity net gain most important aspects.</li> <li>• Concerns about impact on villages.</li> <li>• Walking/cycling to link with existing network, urban area, town centre and transport modes.</li> <li>• More employment land to reduce car use.</li> <li>• More land for renewable energy.</li> <li>• Objects to built-up areas either side of cycle route, should be a green corridor as in emerging neighbourhood plan; housing to north contrary to Bremhill neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>• Uses for Hardens and New Lease Farms should be agricultural.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Agricultural Land Classification for East Chippenham - site includes soil graded as best and most versatile.</li> <li>• Sewage treatment works in south Chippenham option may need to be expanded, as such residential development would need to be at appropriate distance.</li> <li>• Significant infrastructure, such as bridges, will cross the floodplain and the main river - development of infrastructure must not increase flood risk, and be delivering flood risk betterment for community and new development.</li> <li>• Opportunity to provide a longer length of River Park through the town and beyond should be looked at, including options to replace radial gate, for benefit of biodiversity, amenity and flood risk.</li> <li>• Proposals should demonstrate how responded to the historic environment including historic and landscape setting of the town, as well as historic assets.</li> <li>• Wilts and Berks Canal Trust considers that provision of canal should be integrated into site proposals and construction secured as green and blue corridor with walking/cycling routes.</li> <li>• Location is sought for an indoor community tennis facility at town.</li> </ul>

### **Planning for Salisbury (357 comments, 289 respondents)**

#### **Summary**

Significant concerns were expressed by the local community about effects of additional growth, both upon infrastructure and the city's historic landscape setting; and particularly the preferred site North of Downton Road between the city and Britford. Impact on ecology of the East Harnham Meadows SSSI being a key concern as well as coalescence. Fewer

objections were expressed about the other two preferred sites, but concerns were raised about impact on historic environment. Considerable support was expressed for brownfield development first from the community with some wishing to see Churchfields brought forward for housing led development. Conversely, the development sector highlights that brownfield is uncertain and may not realise affordable housing that is needed. Alternative sites were promoted.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| General Public and City and Parish Councils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redevelopment of brownfield land should be prioritised, re-use vacant buildings in the centre and elsewhere for residential use; ahead of greenfield/reduce greenfield loss.</li> <li>• Objections mainly to consequences of growth i.e. lagging infrastructure delivery, impact on highways, air-quality, landscape and biodiversity.</li> <li>• More active travel modes needed.</li> <li>• Concerns about loss of greenfield land.</li> <li>• General support for redevelopment of Churchfields for residential rather than retain in employment use, due to concerns about traffic (congestion, air quality) as alternative to greenfield.</li> <li>• Improvement of amenities and facilities needed at Old Sarum.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Developer/agent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments that housing number for Salisbury should be higher, particularly given demand.</li> <li>• Brownfield development is uncertain and will not deliver.</li> <li>• Salisbury needs affordable housing, more easily realised through greenfield development.</li> </ul> |
|-----------------|--|

**Place-shaping Priorities**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| General public and City and Parish Councils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that priorities on landscape setting of city and separation with outlying villages (particularly Britford) not properly reflected in preferred sites selected.</li> <li>• Place shaping priority about Central Area Framework and visitor economy should be expanded to incorporate other sectors.</li> <li>• Priority for affordable housing should include explicit reference to key worker, young people and elderly.</li> <li>• Churchfields should be prioritised for redevelopment as Wiltshire Core Strategy to avoid HGVs through city cen</li> <li>• Support for redeveloping Churchfields and r</li> <li>• educing employment.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

**Preferred sites**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| General public and City and Parish Councils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant objections to preferred site North of Downton Road; concerns raised about coalescence of Salisbury with Britford, East Harnham Meadows SSSI, views to Cathedral, loss of landscape character and flooding.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salisbury City consider site should be country park, particularly if North of Downton Road is allocated.</li> <li>• Britford parish suggest alternative site option should be considered in combination with preferred site North of Downton Road.</li> <li>• Reduce quantum of development proposed on preferred site North of Downton Road.</li> <li>• Relatively few objections to preferred site South of Downton Road.</li> <li>• Quidhampton Parish Council objects to Quidhampton Quarry (although not preferred site) becoming housing allocation.</li> <li>• Concerns about preferred site North East of Old Sarum due to impacts on landscape and Monarch's Way long distance path, and lack of facilities and amenities at Old Sarum.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from developers and landowners of preferred sites; promoter of preferred site South of Downton Road seeking its expansion to include Britford Park and Ride.</li> <li>• Developer associated with alternative option South of Harnham promoting its allocation.</li> <li>• New sites submitted and promoted adjacent to Beehive Park and Ride (Old Sarum), and south-west of Salisbury, adjacent to existing allocation on Netherhampton Road.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection by Natural England to preferred site North of Downton Road adjacent to East Harnham Meadows SSSI, due to potential impacts from recreation and air quality on the grasslands.</li> <li>• Significant concerns by Highway's England about access to Quidhampton Quarry, albeit recognise it is not a preferred site.</li> <li>• Environment Agency raised concerns about preferred site at Old Sarum, which is adjacent to a Source Protection Zone (vulnerable to pollution).</li> <li>• Historic England raised concerns about: how development of preferred site at Old Sarum could be accommodated in sensitive and historic landscape setting; and for preferred sites at Downton Road, whether heritage and landscape constraints have been appropriately taken into consideration (Woodbury Scheduled Ancient Monument and heritage assets at Britford).</li> <li>• National Trust is concerned about further north-wards expansion of Salisbury that would have adverse impacts on landscape setting of Figsbury Ring (scheduled ancient monument).</li> </ul>
<b>Concept Plans</b>	
General public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant objections to Site 6, North of Downton Road (reasons see above).</li> <li>• Some support for custom and self-build housing.</li> </ul>

Developers and agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over inclusion of custom and self-build housing.</li> <li>• Developers of preferred sites at Old Sarum and North of Downton Road have presented different approaches.</li> </ul>
-----------------------	--

### Planning for Trowbridge (397 comments, 360 respondents)

<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>There was a significant level of objection to the scale of growth and preferred sites at Trowbridge. Traffic, specifically the volume and congestion that development would bring to that part of Trowbridge, Hilperton and Staverton receiving the most comments. Other specific issues raised, like Chippenham, include: the need to prioritise the redevelopment of brownfield sites first; the scale of growth (housing need), flood risk, infrastructure provision, biodiversity and landscape. Alternative sites were promoted through the consultation.</p>	
<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p>	
General Public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed opinion. However, more objections than support for proposed level of growth (reasons below).</li> <li>• Post COVID-19 and Brexit impacts not yet known.</li> <li>• Town needs regeneration and lacks adequate infrastructure.</li> <li>• Some requests for housing to be distributed to other towns and villages; including at Southwick and North Bradley or a new settlement created.</li> <li>• Scale of preferred sites inappropriate for Hilperton and Staverton – Hilperton is a Large Village, scale of growth contrary to Wiltshire Core Strategy.</li> <li>• Preferred sites would exacerbate commuting on congested roads and increase flood risk.</li> <li>• Allocated employment land should be considered for homes.</li> <li>• Growth should not be artificially inflated to justify a secondary school - rationale for secondary school is not explained.</li> <li>• Prioritise redevelopment of brownfield land, including vacant buildings in town centre, and set higher brownfield figure.</li> <li>• Objections due to climate change and loss of greenfield land.</li> <li>• Long-established, naturally integrated green spaces between settlements must be safeguarded against inappropriate development for mental and physical well-being.</li> <li>• Integrity and identity of Semington village must be maintained and protected from over-expansion of Trowbridge.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement with Trowbridge's Principal Settlement status as focus for growth and level of growth, some stated it wasn't high enough.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other comments impact of COVID-19 not yet known - advocates more decentralised strategy to meet growth with more development to market towns and rural areas.</li> <li>• Support for strategic site to be allocated that transcends into next plan period. Site large enough to promote self-containment</li> <li>• Suggestion that Trowbridge could do more if other settlements more constrained.</li> <li>• Growth distribution strategy too weighted towards large scale complex sites adjacent to principal settlements and less reliance should be placed upon volume home builders to deliver a small number of complicated strategic sites (for which there is poor delivery track record in Wiltshire).</li> <li>• Smaller sites, separate from the main allocation, will enable choice for developers and provision of self-build plots.</li> <li>• Brownfield target too high.</li> <li>• Economic evidence out of date; plan should enable more employment generating development.</li> <li>• Greenbelt review required at town.</li> <li>• New housing sites promoted: Green Belt sites; employment allocation at Ashton Park; additional land adjacent to preferred options.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic England consider greater clarity needed on how level of growth and proposals have considered and responded to historic environment (landscape setting and heritage assets).</li> <li>• Prioritisation of brownfield land, including underused heritage buildings, is supported but must be designed sensitively to historic environment.</li> <li>• Reappraise employment and economic growth and take realistic approach to housing numbers for a town which is swamped with commuters.</li> </ul>
<b>Place shaping Priorities</b>	
General Public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few comments from local councils, suggestion that vague and ineffective.</li> <li>• Some stated that the priorities are reasonable, but the strategy seems to bear little relationship to them.</li> <li>• Order of priorities should refocus on sustainability and climate change.</li> <li>• Impact of COVID-19 on town centre and new uses for vacant buildings (including residential uses), should be reflected.</li> <li>• Provision of services and amenities, such as health, play provision and the re-generation of the town centre should be prioritised.</li> <li>• Prioritise protecting village identities and importance of green infrastructure (including green belt and spaces), development should take place within town boundary not encroaching on villages.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities are nearly all focused on the town, not enough about the villages and important greenspace around them.</li> <li>• Staverton should be one of the villages identified. Addressing traffic impact around the town and surrounding area should be prioritised e.g. Staverton bridge and Hilperton village despite Elizabeth Way.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad support for priorities.</li> <li>• Right priorities but don't appear to have necessarily informed preferred strategy for town.</li> <li>• Wording in priority (v) (bat mitigation) should be reviewed to ensure it has a 'place-shaping' focus and not one that limits development sites.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic England suggests the priorities could reflect positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.</li> <li>• Sport England suggests the creation of a healthy, inclusive sustainable town can be achieved through use of their 'Active Design' guidance.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Sites</b>	
General Public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable objections to all preferred sites.</li> <li>• Location for growth inappropriate - it does not share a contiguous boundary with the town; and goes beyond recently adopted settlement boundary.</li> <li>• Specific concerns about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic generation and congestion in Trowbridge, Hilperton and Staverton, impact on road network including Staverton Bridge and walking and cycling;</li> <li>- exacerbation of flood risk;</li> <li>- lack of infrastructure, including health care and local services;</li> <li>- loss of farmland;</li> <li>- impact on biodiversity and landscape;</li> <li>- loss of market value of existing homes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be prioritised before greenfield - develop Bowyers site, East Wing, unused commercial land and premises etc</li> <li>• Capacity of preferred sites far exceeds any "local" needs.</li> <li>• Alternative sites/strategies suggested: Green Belt release (better locations to Trowbridge centre and station), dispersing growth to Southwick and North Bradley villages; adjacent to Green Lane Wood; Biss Farm employment allocation; either side A361 beyond rugby club; new settlement elsewhere (Hullavington, east of Devizes or west of Salisbury); locate neat new roads West Ashton, Melksham and Chippenham.</li> </ul>

Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from land promoters within preferred sites, with feedback on proposals and objections on specific points on concept plan layouts.</li> <li>• Close collaborative working will be needed between Council and developer to ensure no viability challenges are created through development assumptions and policy requirements.</li> <li>• Developer's concern about extent of open space on their part of the allocation, preferring to see more housing.</li> <li>• Promoter of North East Trowbridge preferred site considers that land at Paxcroft Farm could be provided as 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' to provide recreation facilities to avoid harm to bats.</li> <li>• Questions raised about: site selection methodology and how Green Belt land has been dismissed; what is meant by a self-contained sustainable community; relationship of Staverton Road Bridge improvements to the preferred sites.</li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England: Concerns raised, as preferred sites are in a medium risk area associated with important bat populations, ecological connectivity with the Kennet and Avon Canal important. Further assessment is needed and updating of Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy to consider functionality of landscape including Hilperton Gap.</li> <li>• Local Plan must also consider potential designation of Trowbridge Woods as a SSSI.</li> <li>• Concerns raised by Wessex Water about scale of development, which is significant and requires major investment in networks and treatment. Clear guidance needed as to timescales and phasing to ensure strategies and investment can be in place.</li> <li>• Historic England suggests that greater clarity needed on how landscape setting of town and historic environment has informed site selection in accordance with national policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Concept Plans</b>	
General Public and Town and Parish Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than providing comments about the concept plans, comments generally focused on in principle objections to the preferred sites being allocated (as set out above) - other comments relate to land being used for food production, open space for recreation.</li> <li>• Most disagree but conclude, if going to be built should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Examine potential for district heating systems. Otherwise use solar energy on homes. Mixed views on wind power.</li> <li>- Consider water source heat pumps utilising the canal as a heat source.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar panels on roofs of all new buildings/ retrofitted on old buildings where possible.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New construction must meet highest standards of energy efficiency</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions rationale for allocating green space on majority of site being promoted as part of preferred site, when series of smaller open spaces throughout the new allocation may be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Location of proposed uses are not agreed, and alternative plans are promoted.</li> <li>• Some support for masterplan and design code approach.</li> </ul>

## 6. Market Towns

- 6.1 Generally each local community was concerned about the scales of growth being proposed. Many wished to see brownfield development prioritised and as much as possible delivered so that it is the only form of development. Communities expressed how much they valued the character and setting to their settlements and saw greenfield development as likely to be harmful in those respects.
- 6.2 Developers on the other hand most often considered that scale of growth at Market Towns should be higher. Many supported this view on the basis that too many homes were being focussed at the Principal Settlements, contrasting the large urban extensions proposed there with the opportunities they said they could provide to deliver housing sooner and more easily.
- 6.3 There was more consensus around place shaping priorities. These seemed to be broadly in tune with the views of each community. However, there were additional suggestions, alongside questioning of how priorities could be achieved.
- 6.4 The pool of sites suggested at each Market Town attracted a good proportion of comments from both the local community and others. These included comments from statutory agencies, like Natural England and Sport England, to sites that affected their interests, for example because of potential impacts on nearby Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or for potentially impeding the use of playing fields.
- 6.5 Historic England advises that the form and character of a town, within its wider landscape and historic setting, and the availability of suitable sites should inform the proposed scale of growth. To this end, it is suggested that the Council prepares a Heritage Topic Paper for each settlement and ensures that Conservation Area appraisals and management plans are kept up to date.
- 6.6 The Environment Agency highlight that Amesbury, Salisbury, Warminster, Devizes are within the River Hampshire Avon catchment which is currently failing protected area and Water Framework Directive objectives because of elevated phosphorus.
- 6.7 A summary of the main issues raised for each Market Town is set out below in alphabetic order.

**Planning for Amesbury (18 comments, 18 respondents)**

**Respondent Type**

**Main Issues Raised**

Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils

**Scale of Growth**

- Town Council supports self-sufficient communities and balanced housing and employment growth. They are concerned the 350 additional homes suggested are top-down without adequate consideration of local factors.
- Town Council support separating Amesbury from Bulford and Durrington, but clarification is needed on each settlement's future housing requirement.

**Place Shaping Priorities**

- Sport England supports the priority to improve recreational facilities and sports pitches in Amesbury.
- Town Council agrees with all place shaping priorities but considers that self-sufficiency also requires enough infrastructure to balance development.

**Pool of Sites**

- MoD objects to Site 3 (south of Amesbury) due to the Aerodrome and Technical safeguarding zones associated with Boscombe Down. Natural England also highlights provisionally as Grade 3 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)
- Natural England objects to Site 2 (rear Countess services) – as it supports mixed area of both Deciduous Woodland and Lowland Fen registered as Priority Habitats.
- Wessex Water prefers Sites 1 (north of Amesbury, south A303) and 3 (south of Amesbury) as seeming the most appropriate for connections to water services. Site 2, adjacent to sewage treatment works with a risk of reduced amenity due to fly and odour issues.
- Town Council raises concerns for all three sites. Site 1 overlooks the A303; Site 2 is close to river and Site 3 is close to Boscombe Down. All three might result in adverse impacts on the World Heritage Site, and recreational pressures on the Salisbury Plain Special Protected Area (SPA). They suggest development of any sites would require contributes towards local infrastructure.
- Highways England notes two sites are next to the A303 and there could be noise and air quality issues, which will need to be mitigated alongside any other impacts on the integrity of the asset.

**Other**

- Town Council suggests effects of the pandemic, move towards a Net Zero economy and increased working from home will change

	<p>the needs of the population and shape requirements for Amesbury.</p>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of growth should be increased because Amesbury not only serves residents of the town but also neighbouring areas.</li> <li>• Residual housing requirement should be increased from 350 dwellings to a minimum of approximately 1,500 dwellings for the period 2018-2040.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New proposed site at South West Amesbury could potentially deliver or facilitate several of the priorities by the provision of new in infrastructure.</li> <li>• Site 3 is large enough to accommodate a mixed-use development that includes new land for employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New site proposed on land adjacent to High Post Business Park - 146.5 acres of land for employment use.</li> <li>• New site proposed on land west of A345 to the south of High Post (Fourmile Hill) - 355 acres of land for mixed use development.</li> <li>• New site proposed on land South West Amesbury as a development of approximately 1,200 new homes to include local village centre, community facilities, potential health hub, new primary school, green space and mobility hub.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views on the scale of growth were mixed. Some saw Army Re-basing already filling the towns 'quota' of additional homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place shaping priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities were generally acceptable.</li> <li>• Additional infrastructure was necessary to accompany any additional growth. Health services and education provision is particularly limited.</li> <li>• With few jobs there was little encouragement to live and work within the town.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The town needed to be served by more shops</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local councillor suggests Amesbury has seen significant growth and that scale of development proposed would further constrain</li> </ul>

	<p>already limited infrastructure. There are also limited brownfield sites.</p> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local councillor supports the priorities but suggests the integration of Boscombe Down and Amesbury should be included.</li> <li>• Priorities supporting future development of Porton Down and Boscombe Down should be included.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A local councillor advises that Site 1 floods, noise pollution would be problematic on Site 2 and Boscombe Down could have adverse impacts on Site 3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stagecoach support development on Land South West Amesbury, as it could underpin delivery of public transport infrastructure.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Planning for Bradford on Avon (674 comments, 667 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England advise that air quality impacts from growth should be assessed.</li> <li>• Town Council considers the scale of growth acceptable if it can be delivered on brownfield sites determined by neighbourhood planning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council suggests there should be more detailed reference to the need to address the climate emergency and biodiversity.</li> <li>• Town Council also considers there should be stronger recognition of heritage, landscape setting and infrastructure constraints affecting the town.</li> <li>• Town Council question's whether land should be provided for employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England objects to Site 3 (golf course) unless golf course is shown to be surplus and Natural England raise concerns about potential loss of green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Of three sites, Town Council suggested only a small part of Site 2 (land north of Holt Road) might have some potential for</li> </ul>

	<p>development. Any sites should be identified by neighbourhood planning.</p>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of growth should be higher as the town has a range of services and facilities and a pronounced need for affordable homes.</li> <li>• A supply relying on small windfall sites cannot respond flexibly to changes in demand and will not deliver affordable homes.</li> <li>• Town does not have a good supply of previously developed land and the role of a brownfield target is unclear.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed growth will not be enough to address the priority for affordable housing in the town</li> <li>• Employment and economy is stated as a priority but no provision suggested for additional land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites 2 (land north of Holt Road) and 3 (golf course) have been promoted for development confirming availability.</li> <li>• Site 1 (allotments) has not been formally promoted but it has been suggested that it can be developed in combination with site 2, with relocation of allotments to an area within site 2.</li> <li>• Alternatives or additions to the sites are promoted at the Football Ground, North of Poulton Lane, Land parcels off Bath Road, Leigh Road West and Trowbridge Road (to rear of Beehive). All except the football ground are Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a review of Green Belt boundaries and the neighbourhood plan should plan more positively to meet needs.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of growth too high and would exceed the capacity of local infrastructure. It would create unacceptable environmental harm, including to local air quality.</li> <li>• Small minority supported a higher scale pointing to a local need for affordable homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No proposals for additional employment land provision undermine a priority to support the economy.</li> <li>• Strong support for pedestrian/cycle bridge across the River Avon.</li> <li>• Town should have a by-pass.</li> <li>• Green space and biodiversity should have greater recognition.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant scale of objections to all three sites for a variety of reasons, particularly Site 3 (golf course). Sites 1 and 3 (allotments) are valued community spaces</li> <li>• Some indicated that site 2 would be preferred out of the three and a minority of others thought that the golf course would be preferable.</li> <li>• Sites were suggested adjacent to Beehive (Green Belt), the undergrounding of Station Car Park to free up land and land along Winsley Road (Green Belt).</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some suggested that homes could be provided by converting vacant retail.</li> <li>• Impact of COVID-19 and the future of the town centre were raised as concerns</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Planning for Calne</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council accepted suggested scale subject to concerns about employment and infrastructure being addressed. Employment land at Oxford Road and Spitfire Way should be safeguarded and employment provided as a priority.</li> <li>• Significant additional growth could potentially deliver an eastern bypass.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council listed key priorities as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protect and provide sites for employment - early provision;</li> <li>- Provision of open space and allotment land;</li> <li>- Provision of land suitable for cemetery space;</li> <li>- Improvements to existing and new pedestrian and cycle routes;</li> <li>- A Town Centre levy; and</li> <li>- Provision of Primary School places and NHS services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Calne Without Parish Council believes the priorities should be determined in the Neighbourhood Plan and include provision of infrastructure such as broadband in rural areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calne Without Parish Council consider it would be appropriate to examine the feasibility of developing sites that would bring together existing new development on the edge of town</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England raise concerns about the cumulative impacts that development of sites 2, 3 and 4 may have on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</li> <li>• Wessex Water state that sites to the west of Calne have more potential spare capacity, although significant development to the east could lead to significant capacity improvements</li> <li>• Historic England note that several proposed sites adjoin or affect the setting of designated heritage assets. Their significance needs to be determined and applied to inform site suitability</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calne is capable, and suitable for accommodating a higher level of growth to meet housing needs and to support economic growth.</li> <li>• Proposed level of growth should be higher to achieve transport solutions to alleviate air quality issues.</li> <li>• Calne is not significantly constrained in environmental terms.</li> <li>• Question whether brownfield sites are available for 60 dwellings and can be viably developed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting the range of housing needs, particularly for older people and affordable homes, should be recognised by a higher scale of growth.</li> <li>• It is stated in the settlement profile for Calne that significant additional growth could potentially deliver an eastern bypass - this should be included in the strategic priorities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement that this is the right pool of sites for the Council to be considering at this time; but Council need to demonstrate they have considered all reasonable alternatives.</li> <li>• Given past delivery rates of new homes on brownfield land it is highly unlikely that Calne's housing needs can be met in full using brownfield land.</li> <li>• Three new sites were put forward for consideration through the site selection process.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of infrastructure at Calne to cope with significantly higher growth.</li> <li>• Brownfield target should be much higher.</li> <li>• Any growth should lead to improvement in town centre services and amenities.</li> <li>• Significant number of comments supporting an eastern bypass between Sand Pit Rd and A4 at Quemerford.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities are supported but question how they will be achieved.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre regeneration urgently needed - town has a much larger population than the centre would suggest with a lack of shops, pubs and amenities.</li> <li>• GP, dental surgeries and more shops are needed.</li> <li>• Growth should seek transport solutions to alleviate town centre congestion and air quality concerns.</li> <li>• Local green spaces and biodiversity are highly valued by local people.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development should make full use of all available brownfield sites before encroaching onto greenfield sites.</li> <li>• Sites around Calne received various objections and support depending on where people live.</li> <li>• Sites should be chosen that have good access to the transport network and employment.</li> <li>• Sites to be developed should be decided through the neighbourhood plan process.</li> <li>• Site 4 is very large and if developed should provide for an eastern bypass linking Sand Pit Road/Oxford Road with the A4 at Quemerford.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire to develop links with Bath University, Swindon colleges and other centres of learning to create opportunities for new environmental and economic business to revitalise Calne</li> <li>• Important that any development is aesthetically pleasing, allowing residents to integrate into the community, adding value to the town</li> <li>• Sustainability needs to be given much greater importance in all respects - site location, method of building, house insulation, heating systems, cycle routes, access to public transport etc.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of growth should be constrained until Neighbourhood Plan has completed an assessment of town centre brownfield sites in the light of pandemic.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Corsham (40 comments, 40 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council considers levels of growth above those proposed would put undue pressure on local health services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the priorities with rewording suggested.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council support for sites 5 (The Circus), part of 3 (Land east of Lypiatt Road and west of B3353) and part of 4 (Land east of Leafield Trading Estate and west of Lypiatt Road).</li> <li>• They also outline opportunities to consider land excluded at Potely Rise and Copenacre.</li> <li>• Town Council object to further consideration of Sites 1 (Pickwick Paddock, Bath Road), 2 (Land South of Brook Drive), and 6 (Land to the North of 16 Bradford Road).</li> <li>• Natural England objects to Sites 5 (The Circus) and 6 (Land to the North of 16 Bradford Road) due to potential impacts on Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Box Mine Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Corsham Railway Cutting SSSI and Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> <li>• Potential for all sites to impact on Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC. Detailed consideration of this is required during further assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to protect the local mining industry.</li> <li>• Protection of the green buffer.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure improvements i.e. healthcare and roads.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for additional growth at Corsham.</li> <li>• Opportunity to increase requirements at Corsham to ensure housing needs are met across Chippenham Housing Market Area.</li> <li>• Brownfield target should be avoided or clearly evidenced.</li> <li>• Plan period should be extended and the housing requirement for Corsham increased to reflect this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development to south of Corsham would help avoid coalescence with villages to the west and should be a priority.</li> <li>• A priority should be the enhancement of existing public transport.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites should be included in the pool, including former RAF Rudloe Manor and other brownfield sites which fall outside of, but are well related to, main settlements.</li> <li>• General support provided for pool of sites as proposed.</li> <li>• All sites are actively promoted, except Site 5 (The Circus), which is not available for development at this time.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three sites excluded at stage two are promoted.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional growth should be as minimal as possible and is potentially too high as proposed.</li> <li>• Any additional homes should be on brownfield sites.</li> <li>• Need for clarity relating to the brownfield target, which is higher than the residual number of homes to plan for.</li> <li>• Transport infrastructure improvements and local facilities, such as schools and healthcare need to accompany new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities need updating to reflect impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on shopping habits. The need for the provision of a second supermarket is questioned.</li> <li>• Need for improved social infrastructure, particularly local health services.</li> <li>• Addressing climate change, particularly renewable energy opportunities, need to be incorporated.</li> <li>• Local transport infrastructure improvements, particularly sustainable transport modes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally, the further consideration of any greenfield sites is argued. Brownfield sites within the town should be considered.</li> <li>• All sites are subject to objections, most pointedly Sites 3 (Land east of Lypiatt Road and west of B3353) and 4 (Land east of Leafield Trading Estate and west of Lypiatt Road).</li> <li>• Some support for Sites 1 (Pickwick Paddock, Bath Road) and 6 (Land to the north of 16 Bradford Road).</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joined up approach needed with carbon reduction targets.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Devizes (118 comments, 111 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devizes Town Council and Neighbourhood Planning Group (NPG) state that it is not sustainable to plan for more housing than is needed for the local population. Level of growth proposed would decrease self-containment and increase traffic at peak times. More consideration to be given to type of housing needed to suit the population profile.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potterne Parish Council supports brownfield development close to the town centre to avoid further traffic congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devizes Town Council and NPG consider high priority should be given to the North Wessex Down Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). More recognition is needed of the landscape setting of the town.</li> <li>• More reference to proposed 'Devizes Gateway Rail Station'; more focus on homes to meet local needs; and more detail on design.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England do not support: Site 1 (land adjoining Lay Wood) due to impact on AONB and restriction on movement of species in Lay Wood from wider landscape to east; Site 2 (land at Coate Bridge) due to impact on AONB. They consider Site 3 (land east of Windsor Drive) would need careful consideration due to AONB setting and nearby allotments as green infrastructure asset.</li> <li>• Historic England seek clarification that proposals have considered and responded to the historic environment - town's history, character and landscape setting surrounding heritage assets.</li> <li>• Devizes Town Council and NPG favours smaller sites in line with the neighbourhood plan, and brownfield sites (Devizes Wharf Regeneration project, hospital site and land linked to Green Lane treatment centre).</li> <li>• Devizes Town Council and NPG object to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site 1 (Land adjoining Lay Wood) due to impact on AONB setting and distance from the town centre (more than 20 minutes walking distance).</li> <li>- Site 2 (Land at Coate Bridge) due to impact on rural setting.</li> <li>- Site 4 (Broadway Farm) due to distance from town centre.</li> <li>- Site 6 (Greencare Nursery) due to proximity to woods.</li> <li>- Site 7 (Caen Hill Farm and Garden Trading Estate) due to access and impact on landscape setting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Devizes Town Council and NPG suggest Sites 3 and 5 should be reduced and consider Site 8 suitable due to proximity to town centre.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the level of growth and calls for a higher housing requirement for Devizes.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites are difficult to deliver, a more balanced approach to housing delivery should be sought rather than brownfield first.</li> <li>• Further greenfield sites should be identified.</li> <li>• Brownfield target is based on historic windfall and there may not be enough deliverable sites.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is general support for the place making priorities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should not just focus on strategic and complex sites but identify moderate and small sized sites.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites have been promoted at: Wadworth Brewery site, Devizes School and two sites that will be surplus to NHS requirements - the old Devizes hospital site when the new Integrated Care Centre opens and Southgate House.</li> <li>• Some housing should be allowed on the Wiltshire Core Strategy Horton Road employment site allocation.</li> <li>• Sites 3 and 4 are being promoted together and can be combined with an adjoining site - land east of Windsor Drive.</li> <li>• Additional land is promoted: to increase Sites 5 and 8, and Site 2 with benefit of connection with the Canal; new land south of Marshall Road has been promoted; existing neighbourhood plan allocation at Hillworth Road is promoted together with an adjoining site.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some responses called for development to occur on brownfield sites only.</li> <li>• Scale of growth generally considered to be too high or 'about right'</li> <li>• Those of objecting to high level were concerned about traffic and air quality issues; lack infrastructure including GP surgeries, dentists, roads and schools; loss of agricultural land; impact on wildlife; and landscape impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for place shaping priorities.</li> <li>• Further emphasis could be added on protection of natural environment, biodiversity and greater access to green spaces in the town.</li> <li>• Development should not exacerbate traffic problems in town</li> <li>• Consider access to potential Lydeaway train station.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure for new housing</li> <li>• Heritage value of town should be emphasised.</li> <li>• Greater recognition of Devizes Wharf regeneration, vitality of the town centre and good design.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many object to the Site 6 (Greenacres Nursery) due to existing use by community as greenspace as well as its importance for biodiversity, including bats.</li> <li>• Site 6 incorrectly classified as brownfield land.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to all other Sites, particularly Site 2 (land at Coate Bridge) and Site 5 (land off the A342 and Sleight Road).</li> <li>• Underused retail and commercial units should be redeveloped for housing.</li> <li>• Empty properties should be tackled.</li> <li>• Windsor Drive is an effective outer boundary to the town.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB consider growth to be okay, and support brownfield target due to landscape constraints at town.</li> <li>• Trust for Devizes consider growth to be about right but raise concerns about growth elsewhere and need to maintain housing land supply to avoid impact on Devizes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust for Devizes consider: higher recognition of AONB and setting of the town is needed; vitality and viability of the town centre must be considered, particularly following COVID; the renewal of Devizes Wharf and restoration of Assize Court are crucial for the town.</li> <li>• The Devizes Assize Courts Trust call for specific heritage related place shaping priority to recognise heritage value in town as well as referencing the aims of the Devizes Wharf project and role that Assize Court play in that.</li> <li>• North Wessex Down AONB comment little weight has been given to the setting of the AONB.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Wessex Down AONB don't support Sites 1, 2 and 3 due to impact on landscape setting.</li> <li>• Canal and River Trust consider Sites 1 and 2 should contribute to enhancements to the canal towpath.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Malmesbury (61 comments, 61 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Council (on behalf of the Joint Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (JNPWG)) consider the suggested scale of growth to be unsustainable because of the pressures on local infrastructure that would result; and there is no local need for more homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Council (JNPWG) support recognition and support for the special irreplaceable characteristics of the town,</li> </ul>

	<p>including landscape, heritage and ecology. Priorities should extend to climate change and encompass a town centre strategy</p> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Council (JNPWG) identify constraints and object to all the pool of sites. Additional greenfield sites are not needed and should not therefore be considered.</li> <li>• Natural England raise concerns about the impacts that development of Sites 4 and 5 to west of town may have on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</li> <li>• Sport England object to the potential loss of the cricket club in Site 1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council (JPNWG) consider there should not be a target for housing on brownfield land. Opportunities are limited and it would lead to the loss of other uses important to the town to residential redevelopment.</li> <li>• Town Council (JPNWG) identify a range of other issues (such as traffic, education and sport and leisure that are referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan)</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed level of planned growth is too low.</li> <li>• The town is a sustainable location for further growth to meet needs for affordable homes and help support local economic growth</li> <li>• There is insufficient justification for curtailing continued growth below past rates</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A priority to meet the housing range needs, particularly affordable homes, should be recognised by a higher scale of growth</li> <li>• Economic growth prospects should be matched by allocating land for business development</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites 1, 4 and 5 were supported by developers, landowners or their agents.</li> <li>• Five other parcels of land were suggested as fresh opportunities or land that should not have been rejected</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed level of planned growth is too high. The character and attractiveness of the settlement will be harmed, including access to limited and diminishing green space</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is insufficient infrastructure to support further significant development.</li> <li>• Levels of growth should respect proposals in the neighbourhood plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be greater recognition of the distinctiveness of the town, preserving its historic character and setting.</li> <li>• The town centre has an important role and character that should be protected and supported.</li> <li>• There should be a greater reference to meeting the needs of the young</li> <li>• Priorities should recognise needs for local sports and leisure provision</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope for development shown by a pool of sites does not correspond to the scale of growth proposed.</li> <li>• The only sites that should be developed are those in the neighbourhood plan or brownfield sites</li> <li>• Site 1 had the most objections largely because of its size, the threat to the cricket club and the impact development would have on the town's surroundings</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a greater emphasis upon tackling climate change.</li> <li>• The character of the town was already under threat from development that would harm it.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Malmesbury River Valleys Trust highlights the role of site 1 in mitigating flood risks and as a site of biodiversity value.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Marlborough (52 comments, 48 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preshute Parish Council voiced objection to levels of housing and employment land that had not directly been tested, believing it unsustainable. Justification base on need for affordable housing is not fully evidenced.</li> <li>• Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (MANPSG) and Marlborough Town Council called for more detailed assessment of capacity for brownfield land to provide new homes.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MANPSG and Marlborough Town Council generally support for priorities but wished to see the findings of their work on these to be given consideration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England is concerned by Site 1's proximity to River Kennet SSSI and does not support Site 2 due to proximity of priority habitat. They raise the importance Savernake Forest SSSI and disused railway tunnel for species (bats).</li> <li>• The Environment Agency comments that the effect of climate change on the fluvial flood levels from the river may affect lower areas on Site 1; and as Site 2 lies almost entirely within Source a Protection Zone for Marlborough public water supply borehole it is not taken forward.</li> <li>• Sport England raised concern over Site 3 due to its proximity to playing fields, outlining no land should be developed on or impacting sports facilities.</li> <li>• Preshute Parish Council raised concerns about landscape character and impact on the AONB.</li> <li>• The MANPG and Marlborough Town Council referred to site selection work they undertook to allocate sites within their neighbourhood plan and highlighted that some sites appearing in the Site Selection Report had been identified as unviable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MANPSG and Marlborough Town Council outlined concerns regarding the impact of growth on education capacity, highway network and traffic congestion.</li> <li>• The MANPSG and Marlborough Town Council outlined a need to provide sports and leisure facilities.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of growth was broadly supported noting the need to provide more affordable homes.</li> <li>• The Council should undertake a more detailed assessment of capacity for brownfield land to provide new homes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad agreement that affordable housing needs are met as part of a mixed and balanced community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The withdrawal of Preshute from the Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan means some sites cannot be considered by the that Plan that may be preferable. This should not influence the Local Plan Review.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites 3 and 4 can deliver a healthcare facility and primary school land.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were concerns about the scale of growth being justified by a need of affordable housing that is not fully evidenced.</li> <li>• There was concern that additional housing was not being matched by equivalent new employment.</li> <li>• Growth should not put undue pressure on local infrastructure. In particular there were concerns about the effects of traffic, including HGVs and concerns about air quality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many were concerned about protecting the towns assets and character, in particular landscape value and biodiversity of natural space.</li> <li>• The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic need consideration in relation to changing travel patterns and need for employment land.</li> <li>• Town centre should be enhanced.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be genuinely affordable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were contrasting views on the role of the Neighbourhood Plan. One view was that neighbourhood planning should allocate sites for development. A different view was that the Local Plan should lead the planning process.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB support the need for new development but advise this should be prioritised on brownfield land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB broadly support the place shaping priorities, offering refinements.</li> <li>• Higher priority should be given to environmental considerations and net zero by 2030.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Wessex Downs AONB did not support the pool of potential development sites due to landscape sensitivities and ecological habitats. Consideration should be given to dark skies.</li> </ul>

**Planning for Melksham (102 comments, 95 respondents)**

**Respondent Type**

**Main Issues Raised**

Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils

**Scale of Growth**

- Joint response of Melksham Without Parish Council (MWPC), Melksham Town Council (MTC) and Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (MNPSG) - consider there has been a disproportionate uplift to Chippenham HMA and thus Melksham specifically.
- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG wish to see additional employment land allocated at Melksham
- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG strongly supportive of development of brownfield land being prioritised
- Wessex Water consider development proposed at Melksham is significant and appraisal will be required to consider solutions and how best to direct investment for growth.

**Place Shaping Priorities**

- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG generally supportive of priorities but suggest some amendments.
- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG - Melksham and Bowerhill have reached a point where much of its existing market town infrastructure is at or over capacity. Growth must be linked to delivery of infrastructure (schools, healthcare and community facilities) and investment in the town centre.
- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG supportive of A350 bypass but consider larger scale planned growth should be delivered with and not before its delivery.

**Pool of Sites**

- MWPC/MTC/MNPSG consider that Sites 1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17 are most suitable for development and suggest an alternative site (Cooper Tires brownfield site) is also suitable.
- Historic England note several sites adjoin or affect the setting of designated heritage assets. Their significance needs to be determined and applied to inform site suitability.
- Semington Parish Council is seeking a 500m no development zone to the north of the Kennet and Avon canal if Sites 5, 6 or 7 are allocated for development.
- Sport England is concerned that Site 1 would prevent Melksham football and rugby club from expanding its facilities and that careful masterplanning will be required

**Other**

- Canal & River Trust request early engagement if bypass route to cross River Avon
- Environment Agency highlight need for detailed flood risk assessment for the Melksham link project that will connect with

	<p>the River Avon; and potential for integrated approach to navigation and flood risk.</p>
<p>Developer/agent</p>	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most consider level of growth is appropriate, but some think it is too low.</li> <li>• Town is a sustainable location for further growth to meet needs for affordable homes and support local economic growth</li> <li>• Seek review of decision not to allocate employment land at Melksham.</li> <li>• General support for brownfield site development but this should not impact on the overall phasing and delivery of other sites that will be required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the priorities.</li> <li>• Support the proposed A350 bypass as it is needed as a strategic corridor.</li> <li>• Education, health care and transport improvements are rightly key infrastructure priorities that need to be addressed by new developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the pool of sites proposed.</li> <li>• Acknowledgment that several large sites may be needed to meet housing requirement.</li> <li>• Three new sites were promoted for development (land at Verbena Court/Eastern Way, land north and west of Manor Farm and land between Eastern Way and Site 1).</li> </ul>
<p>General Public</p>	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed level of growth is far too high for a town the size of Melksham.</li> <li>• Melksham should retain its rural market town feel.</li> <li>• There should be a more equal distribution of new housing to other settlements in the HMA.</li> <li>• Brownfield target is not ambitious enough.</li> <li>• This high level of growth will add to coalescence with the villages of Bowerhill and Berryfield.</li> <li>• There is insufficient infrastructure to support further significant development, especially schools, GP surgeries and dentists.</li> <li>• Significant growth should not come forward before a bypass is in place as it will only add to A350 traffic congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the priorities.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural environment along the River Avon corridor should be protected.</li> <li>• New development must support regeneration of the town centre.</li> <li>• Widespread support for Wilts &amp; Berks Canal restoration.</li> <li>• Kennet and Avon Canal must retain its rural character.</li> <li>• The town needs more GP and dental surgeries and a new secondary school.</li> <li>• There is generally a mixed response to the need for an A350 bypass - some believe it is urgently needed, some believe it is not a priority.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a policy of developing brownfield sites first and a higher brownfield target.</li> <li>• The only sites that should be developed are brownfield sites and those allocated through the neighbourhood plan process.</li> <li>• A priority should be the redevelopment of the Cooper Tires site which could aid town centre regeneration.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a greater emphasis on tackling climate change and enhancing biodiversity.</li> <li>• An eastern bypass will have significant landscape and biodiversity impacts.</li> <li>• Infrastructure, especially schools, transport and healthcare must come first before any new housing.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stagecoach consider that Melksham has potential to support growth on a strategic scale and they see scope to develop the level of public transport provision substantially</li> <li>• National Trust is concerned that development to the north and east of Melksham will add to rat-running issues through Lacock.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong support for the safeguarding of route for the canal and restoration by Wilts and Berks Canal Trust.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Royal Wotton Bassett (59 comments, 57 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<b>Scale of Growth</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council is only supportive of the proposed level of growth if it can be assured that the infrastructure improvements to support it can be delivered.</li> <li>• Wessex Water state that significant improvements are likely to be required to support this scale of growth.</li> <li>• Highways England notes a potentially significant level of development and obstacles to overcome if growth is to be successfully delivered (traffic at Junction 16 and within the town), further information is sought on mitigation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Council would like to see four additional priorities to reflect those that have emerged from public consultation on the neighbourhood plan review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England is concerned that Site 7 contains Wootton Bassett Mud Springs SSSI designated for its fluvial geomorphology.</li> <li>• Sport England is concerned that development at Sites 1 and 3 (north of town) could impede the use of adjacent playing fields</li> <li>• Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council do not support: Sites 1 and 2 (north of town), 4 (land at Whitehill Lane) ,7 (south of town) and 8 (land at Woodshaw), but in principle would support Sites 3 (land at Maple Drive), 5 and 6 (south of the town).</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Town Council do not support the brownfield target, as it is not in accordance with national policy, which requires neighbourhood areas to be given a 'housing requirement' figure. Also, target is based on historic windfall delivery and may not be possible to allocate sufficient sites.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of growth was generally supported, but it was suggested that higher scales could help meet needs for infrastructure (e.g. health and education). Growth scales reflected the town's relationship with Swindon.</li> <li>• The Neighbourhood Plan could be a platform to bring forward small scale brownfield land to complement Local Plan allocations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally considered to be the right priorities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites 1, 3,4,5,6,7 and 8 have all been promoted, Site 2 was not.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable whether brownfield sites are actually available and can be viably developed.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth should be lower and the need for additional employment land was questioned</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities 1 (protecting the distinct character and identity of the town, recognising its proximity to Swindon), 9 (conserving and enhancing environmental assets around Royal Wootton Bassett) and 10 (maintaining the town's elevated historical setting and central conservation area) are considered the most important.</li> <li>• There needs to be a bypass to deal with the town's traffic problems.</li> <li>• Investment in school and GP provision is needed</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites to the west of the town should be avoided to preserve the historic character of the town. Concerns raised about harm to landscape in relation to the Royal Wootton Bassett escarpment and Dauntsy Vale.</li> <li>• Significant objections to Site 4 (land at Whitehill Lane). These included references to flooding, traffic problems and loss of biodiversity.</li> <li>• Sites 5,6,7 and 8 should be avoided as they are on the floodplain.</li> <li>• Site 8 could cause coalescence with Swindon.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stagecoach consider quantum for the Swindon housing market area is suppressed, and as such fails to recognise role that Royal Wootton Bassett can play to meet the five delivery principles set out in the Emerging Spatial Strategy document. Higher growth can help support public transport infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wilts and Berk Canal Trust supports the safeguarding of a route and restoration of the canal as a priority.</li> </ul>

**Planning for Tidworth and Ludgershall (14 comments, 14 respondents)**

<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
------------------------	---------------------------

<p>Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils</p>	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Tidworth and Ludgershall Town Councils agree with the scale of growth, but do not support higher levels of housing.</li> <li>• They also support prioritisation of delivering employment at Castledown Business Park ahead of allocating additional employment land; and support limited retail and leisure uses on the site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Councils provide general support for priorities and some rewording.</li> <li>• Ludgershall Town Council propose the incorporation of priority to address climate change, through 'greener' housing.</li> <li>• Environment Agency asks that the need to avoid impacts on River Avon SAC from new development are incorporated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Town Councils provide support for Sites 1 (Land East of Crawlboys Road), 4 (Land at Empress Way), 5 (south-west Ludgershall), 6 (Land North of Wellington Academy) and 7 (Land North of A3026).</li> <li>• Tidworth Town Council is concerned over sites around Tidworth.</li> <li>• Ludgershall Town Council believe Sites are good representation of land availability.</li> <li>• Wessex Water outline water supply requirements as a key consideration for this area, as it is subject to three separate undertakers.</li> <li>• Natural England outline landscape concerns relating to Sites 1 (Land East of Crawlboys Road), 4 (Land at Empress Way) and 5 (south-west Ludgershall).</li> <li>• Objections relating to the potential scale of residential development at Site 4 (Land at Empress Way).</li> <li>• Sport England raised concerns relating to Sites 5 (south-west Ludgershall) and 6 (Land North of Wellington Academy), which are adjacent to playing fields.</li> </ul>
<p>Developer/agent</p>	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of growth proposed is not justified and should take account of the extent of the functional relationship with Andover.</li> <li>• Increasing housing development will support the delivery of Castledown Business Park. The delivery of which should be prioritised ahead of making additional allocations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting 'local needs' does not reflect the area's strategic role.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities iv and vi require the delivery of Site 4 (Land at Empress Way).</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites 5 (south-west Ludgershall), 6 (Land North of Wellington Academy), 7 (Land North of A3026), 8 (Land West of Pennings Road), 9 (North-west Tidworth), 10 (Land South of Bulford Road) and 11 (Land South of The Mall) are unavailable at this time.</li> <li>• Site 4 (Land at Empress Way) is actively promoted.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed scale of growth is supported.</li> <li>• Additional employment could help overcome Ludgershall's dormitory role.</li> <li>• Castledown Business Park should be able to meet short term employment needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the priorities as written.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some support for the proposed pool of sites.</li> <li>• Concern that the continuation of Empress Way linking to the A342 to the east would be needed ahead of additional housing development at Site 4 (Land at Empress Way)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport improvements are required to address local transport issues, including road, cycle and pedestrian improvements.</li> <li>• Timing of delivery of a road linking Empress Way to the east of Ludgershall is a key concern.</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current or a lower quantum of housing development is accepted.</li> <li>• A joint neighbourhood plan could be the appropriate vehicle for delivering brownfield sites and affordable housing.</li> <li>• Prioritisation of the delivery of Castledown Business Park ahead of additional employment allocations.</li> <li>• Support for start-ups/small businesses at Castledown Business Park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the continuation of Empress Way, increased recreation and leisure facilities for younger people and housing to meet locally identified needs.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was strong support for Sites 5 (south-west Ludgershall) and 7 (Land North of A3026).</li> <li>• Salisbury Reds object to the further consideration of Sites 1 (Land East of Crawlboys Road), 2 (Land North of A342), 3 (Land North-East of A342) and 6 (Land North of Wellington Academy) due to distance from the existing bus network.</li> <li>• Public and private rights of way, which cross the railway line will require detailed consideration during further assessments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road improvements are required to address local transport issues, including road, cycle and pedestrian improvements.</li> <li>• Timing of delivery of a road linking Empress Way to the east of Ludgershall is a key concern.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Planning for Warminster (25 comments, 24 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapmanslade Parish Council support the identification of opportunities for housing on brownfield sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapmanslade Parish Council outline a need to emphasise active travel.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England indicate that landscape and biodiversity are a concern for Site 9 (Land at New Farm).</li> <li>• Environmental Agency states that pollution prevention in relation to River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is a concern for Site 9 (Land at New Farm).</li> <li>• Environment Agency states risk of contamination of Warminster Malting Public Water Supply boreholes for Sites 5 (Land at Church Street), 6 (Land Adjacent 89 Bath Road), 7 (44 and 48 Bath Road) and 8 (Land at Brick Hill) and also, that sites are within areas where water resources and pollution prevention are a key consideration.</li> <li>• Highways England outline that due to proximity to A36, noise and air quality issues are concerns for Sites 4 (Warminster Common) and 8 (Land at Brick Hill).</li> <li>• Historic England have heritage concerns relating to Site 2 (East Warminster/East of the Dene).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England objects to Sites 1 (North Warminster/Elm Hill) and 2 (East Warminster/East of the Dene) due to loss of playing fields.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks identified related to a reliance on the delivery of the West Warminster Urban Extension - small/medium sites needed to diversify supply.</li> <li>• Interim Sustainability Appraisal suggests that there is capacity for additional/higher levels of growth.</li> <li>• Reliance on housing delivery through neighbourhood plans should be avoided.</li> <li>• Asks for detailed consideration of cross boundary housing needs and suggests unmet housing needs from Mendip District should be provided for.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A priority is needed to encourage the delivery of green space alongside new homes.</li> <li>• Support for incorporation of a priority for the use of sustainable materials and construction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to maximise development at the West Warminster Urban Extension should be taken.</li> <li>• Opportunity on land excluded north of Grovelands Way, which is subject to planning permission for specialist housing for older people.</li> <li>• Sites 2 (East Warminster/East of the Dene), 5 (Land at Church Street), 8 (Land at Brick Hill) and 9 (Land at New Farm) have been actively promoted. Site 3 (Land adjacent to Fanshaw Way) is also being promoted, but as part of a larger site area.</li> <li>• Site 1 (North Warminster/Elm Hill) is not currently available for development.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed scale of growth is accepted and should not increase.</li> <li>• Growth should be directed towards brownfield sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities should support redevelopment in the town centre.</li> <li>• Priorities should include: need for GP surgery expansion; tree planting on new developments; flood risk; and the need to protect green space.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redevelopment of brownfield sites should be prioritised ahead of allocating additional greenfield land.</li> <li>• Objections raised to the further consideration of Sites 1 (North Warminster/Elm Hill), 5 (Land at Church Street) and 9 (Land at New Farm).</li> <li>• Support for further consideration of Sites 4 (Warminster Common) and 8 (Land at Brick Hill).</li> </ul>
Others	<p><b>Scale of Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development in addition to that committed should be directed towards brownfield land/vacant land and buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities should support redevelopment in the town centre and other mixed-use development that could address the town's dormitory role.</li> <li>• Pedestrian, cycle and bus access should be a priority for all new developments to increase access between the town centre and edge of town developments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Woodland Trust outline that Site 8 (Land at Brick Hill) is near Norridge Wood Ancient Woodland, which should be considered during further assessment.</li> <li>• Allocation of additional greenfield sites should be avoided. Brownfield sites or the increase in allocation at the West Warminster Urban Extension should be prioritised.</li> </ul>

<b>Planning for Westbury (39 comments, 33 respondents)</b>	
<b>Respondent Type</b>	<b>Main Issues Raised</b>
Prescribed bodies including Town and Parish Councils	<p><b>Scale of growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council considers that for the scale of growth to be sustainable, the following need to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A350 congestion and air quality management</li> <li>- Sustainable transport and linkages</li> <li>- Town centre recovery and regeneration</li> <li>- Affordable housing delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some support for less housing balanced with employment growth.</li> </ul> <p><b>Place Shaping Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council supports emphasis on infrastructure delivery, sustainable transport links and provision of open space.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council highlights need for bypass, railway crossing from Mane Way/ Oldfield Road and better pedestrian links.</li> <li>• Town Council generally supports protection of employment areas, particularly at West Wiltshire Trading Estate but considers that former Westbury Ironworks due to its location by the station could have a more flexible approach to allow for greater diversity of uses and higher density to support economy of town.</li> <li>• Town Council highlights need to protect heritage assets and landscape setting of town and improve range of facilities and services.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of Sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council (with AECOM) identified those sites from the pool of sites they consider potentially suitable to progress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Potentially Suitable:</i> Sites 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12</li> <li>- <i>Not supported:</i> Sites 3, 5, 6</li> <li>- <i>Not assessed:</i> Sites 1 and 2 (outside of Westbury Neighbourhood Plan boundary), and Site 11.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Town Council (with AECOM) considered that SHELAA sites 229, 3679 should be considered, and not excluded at stage 2.</li> <li>• Natural England objects to Site 6 because of unacceptable landscape impact.</li> <li>• Sport England objects to Site 11 (Land at Redland Lane) unless playing fields are replaced or surplus to requirements.</li> <li>• LaFarge Cement Works is identified as potential brownfield site, instead of greenfield.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town Council supports brownfield target based upon previous years development; sees neighbourhood plan playing key role in delivery.</li> <li>• Town Council identify range of infrastructure alongside those identified in the consultation document.</li> <li>• Chapmanslade Parish Council highlight the impact of growth (past and present) on surrounding parishes, e.g. A3098 and Chapmanslade.</li> <li>• Westbury Leigh Primary School opposes more development to east of town, which has resulted in declining numbers for primary schools on the west.</li> <li>• Regeneration of town centre supported as priority, including improving air quality, range of shops and more housing.</li> <li>• Need for further employment questioned given existing areas and land.</li> </ul>
Developer/agent	<p><b>Scale of growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support higher level of growth at Westbury that could include additional housing required if plan period is extended.</li> <li>• Westbury is least constrained settlement in housing market area.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some question how the precise figure of 1,820 homes was derived (down from TR-B growth option figure of 2,920).</li> </ul> <p><b>Place shaping priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority 4 needs to be addressed with a transport strategy, outlining delivery, sustainable travel and identify site-specific measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further site assessment should consider the more detailed site assessments undertaken on behalf of the Town Council for the neighbourhood plan and, also include more recent confirmation of site availability.</li> <li>• Sites 1,2,3,7 and 10 are being promoted.</li> <li>• Calls for five sites that have been rejected should be re-instated.</li> <li>• New sites were promoted: southwest of Petticoat Lane, Dilton Marsh; at the former Westbury Cement Works; and Titford Farm, Westbury.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose bypass because of little evidence of need. Other strategies to reduce congestion and air quality may be more appropriate e.g., enhanced rail services.</li> <li>• Unconvinced of scale of education requirements in the town - Council's evidence shows a likely 17% drop in the proportion of under 14s by 2036.</li> <li>• Support for a more flexible approach to the future of the Hawke Ridge Employment Allocation if evidence shows little prospect of delivery.</li> </ul>
General Public	<p><b>Scale of growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of growth is too high, without commensurate level of infrastructure investment (e.g. schools, GPs/ dentists and transport, including a bypass)</li> </ul> <p><b>Place shaping priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority 4 is most important - the A350 is a major problem.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pool of sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 6 had most objections. There were also objections to Site 7 because of landscape and biodiversity concerns, and Site 11 as an existing playing field.</li> <li>• Site 10 had most support because of its proximity to existing housing/ employment developments, good transport links and opportunity to realise bridge over railway.</li> <li>• Other sites received a mixed response, or some objections (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9).</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Most prevalent concern expressed is need for A350 bypass to combat traffic congestion, poor air quality and road safety.</li><li>• Support for other transport improvements at Oldfield Road, a bridge over the railway off Mane Way and a shuttle bus between the railway station and town centre.</li><li>• Improve town centre - challenges include traffic problems, range of shops and pedestrian safety.</li><li>• Support for higher brownfield target and less, if any, further greenfield development</li><li>• Support for better housing design, lower density, more open space, carbon neutrality and adequate parking provision</li><li>• No demand for further employment provision, with Hawke Ridge remaining unbuilt and proposed housing near railway station likely to benefit commuters</li></ul>
--	---