

MALMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA BOARD MEETING – 7 SEPTEMBER 2011

Initial feedback on comments received through the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation relating to the Malmesbury Community Area.

The consultation on the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document closed on the 8th August 2011. Officers are currently analysing the responses to the consultation. A full report of the responses and actions arising from those responses will be available once a full analysis has been made of all responses. The outcomes from this will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy for Wiltshire. The table below provides an early indication of some of the key responses and issues identified to date. **Please note the consultation responses are still being assessed and this provides only an indication of comments to date.**

General theme	Summary of consultation responses processed to date
Settlement hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology for identifying the Market Towns takes into account the facilities in the settlement but fails to consider its size or geographical constraints. Malmesbury is smaller than other towns and placing it in this category raises an expectation of significant growth. Malmesbury seems to have a disproportionate amount of development compared to other market towns. • The boundary of the town of Malmesbury should be clearly defined. • There is a lack of guidance for development outside of the town of Malmesbury.
Transport and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new housing development should be phased to ensure that existing infrastructure is upgraded and new infrastructure is delivered early. • Will the proposed new homes be delivered alongside new schools; improved bus services; road improvement schemes; a train station; improvements to the local hospital and health care facilities? • The existing primary school in the town is practically at capacity. Any new housing development will exacerbate this issue. • More clarity should be presented in the plan to explain how traffic and congestion issues will be addressed. Terms such as “traffic demand management” do not provide the detail required to judge effectiveness. • Development should fully fund the necessary infrastructure. Wiltshire is a desirable place to live due to its historic built environment and landscape. Part of the Community Infrastructure Levy should be allocated to looking after these characteristics. • Expansion on the outskirts of the town has put pressure on education provision and other infrastructure without commensurate benefit to local retailers and recreation providers because people commute out of the town.
Employment provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the diversification of the employment base. • There should be more clarity on the amount of employment land that should be identified in the town. • The level of employment growth proposed is not in line with the level of housing proposed.

<p>Housing numbers and housing development proposals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general terms, the comments received suggest that Malmesbury faces a significant challenge in terms of the level of proposed new housing. • The level of new housing proposed for Malmesbury is too high and infrastructure provision is not fully addressed. It has been asked why the overall housing figure for Wiltshire has reduced (44,000 to 37,000 dwellings) and yet the figure for Malmesbury town has increased (730 to 760 dwellings) and the figure for the community area has increased (1100 to 1200 dwellings)? At the exhibition this increase in the housing target was not supported and not considered to be adequately justified. • Malmesbury Town Council state that the housing requirement for Malmesbury is flawed. There is no relationship between the number of extra homes proposed (32.4%) and the projected population growth in the community area (12.9%). The town primary schools are at capacity and it is not sustainable to make village schools viable by sending pupils from the town to them. As there are no plans to deliver essential infrastructure in line with core policy 2 there should be no additional housing delivered in the town during the plan period. • The process of forecasting the need for new housing on the basis of population is flawed. • There are a number of empty homes on the Filands estate. Why is nothing seemingly being done to balance the need for new homes with a clear process of addressing the number of empty homes within the town? • In accordance with PPS3, more should be done to re-use brownfield land before greenfield sites are identified and released for new development. • The proposed new development quanta must be phased in order to address existing infrastructure concerns, for example, schools provision. • A clear assessment of affordable housing need within the town should be provided. In addition, consideration should be given to what constitutes 'affordable' housing – experience suggests that the term is generally used to describe cheap and badly designed properties. • The mistakes of the past should not be allowed in the future. The existing development at Filands is considered to be poorly designed and laid out. • If necessary further housing development should be of high quality design. • It was suggested that housing development should be phased over three time periods rather than the proposed two (2006-2016 and 2016-2026).
<p>Town centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of retail provision, including convenience retail, on the high street. There is a lack of competition amongst convenience retail providers. • There is a lack of free parking in the town centre.