

## Southern Area Committee

5<sup>th</sup> August, 2004

Author : John Meeker  
Principal Planning Officer  
(01722) 4343396  
jmeeker@salisbury.gov.uk

# REPORT

Planning & Econ Dev. Portfolio Holder - Cllr. J Noeken

---

### DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND AT DUCK LANE, LAVERSTOCK

#### 1. Purpose of the Report

Policy H2G of the Adopted Local Plan (June 2003) allocates land for residential development at Duck Lane in Laverstock. This site was allocated to meet the district's overall housing requirement for the period up until 2011. The Local Plan indicates that in order to guide and control development of the site, a development brief will be prepared.

Following a lengthy preparation process which involved a working group from the Parish Council, a draft development brief was released for consultation on the 8<sup>th</sup> of April for a period of 6 weeks ending on the 20<sup>th</sup> May.

This report now considers the issues raised in the consultation period and highlights changes to the development brief where it is appropriate and reasonable to do so. Subject to members acceptance that all the raised issues have been satisfactorily addressed and that the changes made are appropriate, the report concludes by seeking a recommendation from this Committee to the Cabinet that the revised brief be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance which will be used to assess planning applications relating to the site.

#### 2. Background to Development Brief Exercise

Policy H2G of the adopted Local Plan allocates land at Duck Lane for residential development. Members will recall that this site was recommended by the Local Plan Inspector in his 2001 report and was the subject of much local objection. In response to local concerns a number of key issues were reexamined with regard to the site, including two separate studies on highway matters, which all concluded that there were no sound reasons to reject the allocation. On this basis the allocation was confirmed when the plan was adopted in June 2003.

It is a requirement of Policy H2G that a development brief be prepared for the site. The purpose of a Development Brief is to provide a broad framework for the development of a site in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan and to take into account more detailed local conditions. In short, the development brief is a bridge between the Local Plan policy and future Planning Applications.

A key part of the development brief preparation process is that appropriate public consultation is undertaken to inform those with interests and gain views which can be taken into account in shaping the final brief. The ultimate goal is to identify a development solution which optimises the benefits of the development and minimises any negative impacts.

When the Development Brief proposals have been subjected to consultation, and the views from that consultation exercise have been assimilated back into the brief (where it is reasonable and appropriate to

do so) it is expected that the document is adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). SPG, whilst having no statutory status in its own right, represents a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Work on the Duck Lane Development Brief began in October 2003 with a series of meetings between agents for the developer and officers. At the same time, a small Parish Council working group was formed to ensure that there was local input into the content of the brief. By March 2004, following a number of meetings with the developers, the Parish Council working group and other key individuals, draft proposals were ready for release for public consultation. In order to ensure that the proposals were exposed to as much public scrutiny as possible, officers and the developers agent prepared a range of publicity materials which included the delivery of leaflets to around 500 local households, and ran two public exhibition days at the St Andrews Hall in Laverstock. In all around 250 people attended the exhibitions which enabled them to see and question the proposals.

### **3. Results of the Public Consultation Exercise.**

A formal period of public consultation was undertaken in respect of the draft Development Brief between 8<sup>th</sup> April and 20<sup>th</sup> May 2004. As summarised above, every effort was made to ensure that local people were informed of this opportunity. Furthermore, some 40 other consultee organisations (including English Nature, the Environment Agency, Wilts & Dorset Bus Co, etc) were sent a copy of the brief to ensure that operational issues were taken account of.

At the close of the consultation period, 68 responses had been received. Of the responses received 4 were in support of the proposals, 12 were in objection, however the remaining majority raised points which either required clarification or contributed to making improvements to the brief. Officers have welcomed the inputs of all respondents to this exercise which has improved the quality of the brief in a number of areas.

A full summary of all the issues raised by respondents is set out in the table at Appendix I of this report. Minor changes to the brief are set out in the appendix and have been incorporated into the version which is now presented to members.

The following sections now go on to examine key subject areas which warrant more careful consideration.

#### **a) Highways and Access**

The major concern which has permeated all discussions related to this site right back to the time when the site was originally put forward was that the local road network was unable to cope with any new housing development. Members will be aware that the Council commissioned two separate studies to examine highway issues related to the site. Both studies concluded that there was no basis to reject the allocation of the site on highway grounds. However, the second study, undertaken by the respected transport consultancy Mott Macdonald, made a number of recommendations which were designed to mitigate against some localised problems which could be overcome. The draft development brief incorporated the recommendations of the Mott Macdonald study.

The development brief consultation exercise has resulted in a large number of responses in relation to this matter. Those responses that reject the development on the grounds of inadequate highways cannot be addressed in any further manner, however a number of responses identified issues and locations which officers have undertaken to investigate further with Highway engineers. These issues are considered in the following subsections below.

i) Loss of parking space for residents at the ends of Hill Road and Boundary Road

The existing turning heads at the ends of Hill Road and Boundary Road serve to provide for additional parking for residents. It is fair to observe that some properties have more than the average number of cars. In opening up the roads to the new development some of this parking amenity will be lost, however in the early plans that have been prepared by the developer, additional space has been set aside within the boundary of the new development to accommodate lost provision.

**Action** - To ensure this commitment is maintained the an additional bullet point is added into para 4.44 as follows

- The loss of some limited parking amenity at the ends of Hill Road and Boundary Road will be accommodated in a parking area in a proximal location within the new development area.

ii) More extensive use of anti skid surfacing at key locations on the approaches to the development site

The Mott Macdonald report suggested that the steeper gradients at the junctions of Down View Road / Duck Lane, St Andrews/Park Road and Park Road/Duck Lane would benefit from the laying down of high resistance surfacing to improve braking and address concerns about the dangers imposed in bad weather conditions. The brief excluded the mention of St Andrews/Hill Road.

**Action** - Accordingly, it is proposed that the reference to St Andrews/Hill Road is added into the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point related to para 4.44 of the brief. No other locations have been identified or suggested for this treatment.

iii) The corner of The Avenue and Duck Lane.

A number of respondents commented upon the blind corner of Duck Lane and The Avenue as being a hazard to road users. However one response highlighted the fact that improvements to this corner would increase risks as speeds were likely to increase as a result of any changes. This latter view is shared by highway engineers who consider that the blind corner acts as a form of traffic calming by encouraging drivers to slow on the approaches. Additional concerns were raised that cars approaching The Avenue from Duck Lane were often in the middle of the road as a result of car parking on Duck Lane. The formation of the footpath and formalisation of the car parking will mean that the road will be clearer in this location meaning that drivers will be able to use more of the carriageway than is currently the case, in turn reducing the identified problem.

No action proposed

iv) The Junction of Park Road and Duck Lane

Concerns were raised that visibility in emerging from Park Road onto Duck Lane is poor and that this needs to be addressed. A smaller number of responses raised concerns along the same lines in respect of Down View Road's Junction with Duck Lane. In response to these comments, the footpath works on Duck Lane will improve the visibility at both these junctions, and when combined with the introduction of a pinch point between the two junctions, highway engineers have concluded that the reduced speeds and improved visibility will overcome these concerns.

No action proposed

v) Road/Cycle safety and traffic noise.

A number of concerns were raised about increase traffic resulting in road safety issues on the existing estate roads for cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Pedestrian safety concerns appear to be unwarranted given that there are adequate pavements and footpath links, although clearly the formation of a footpath on Duck Lane will address the inadequacy of provision in this location. In terms of motorists and cyclists, there is already a 30mph speed limit extending throughout Laverstock as a whole; however in looking further at this issue the establishment of a 20mph zone was identified as an opportunity to address such concerns, including expressed concerns about increased traffic noise.

By means of explanation, a 20mph zone is normally based around residential areas where there is no through route which needs to be accommodated – in essence the roads serve the housing and no other purpose. For such an area to be designated as such, the road network should include formal and informal road features which contribute to low speeds. In examining both Down View Road and Hill/Park Road, highway engineers concluded that little, if any, work would be required to enable this designation to be introduced given the corners junction layouts and informal parking arrangements that exist. The District Council will pursue the designation of the estate roads in which feed onto Duck Lane as a 20mph zone with the County Council to coincide with the demands arising from the new development.

**Action** – new bullet point in section 4.44

- The District Council and the developer will work with the County Highways department to seek the designation of the new estate and existing adjacent estate roads as a 20mph zone which will include additional signing and speed reduction measures where they are considered appropriate.

vi) Parking on estate roads, in particular on the bend adjacent to the Village Hall on Park Road

On a general level, highway engineers have concluded that the majority of the tight bend in Park Road adjacent to the Village Hall was identified by residents as often being restricted by parked cars. On occasions this inhibited bus access to the estate. Prior to the publication of the draft brief a written note from the developers agent, requested by local Councillors, confirmed that dropped kerbs in key locations would be offered to residents to remove on street parking. This provision is in line with the recommendations of the Mott MacDonald study.

**Action** - Amendment of bullet point 3 in para 4.44 to read as follows

- Drop kerbs to be provided at the junctions of Down View Road and Park Road with Duck Lane. The Developer and the District Council will examine the need to provide additional drop kerbs along Park Road and the provision of a contribution towards this requirement will be set out as part of a s106 agreement.

vii) The Avenue and its Junction with Church Road

One respondent highlighted the dangers of crossing the wide entrance to The Avenue when walking up Riverside Road and suggested that a refuge in the middle of the junction would improve pedestrian safety as well as contributing to reductions in speed. The point made is accepted, however officers and highway engineers would point out that this apparent deficiency is an existing problem unrelated to the housing development and accordingly it would be unreasonable for the developer to contribute directly to this measure. Furthermore, the Mott

MacDonald study examined this junction and made no suggestions concerning possible improvements.

No action proposed.

viii) Footpath and cycle links to the city centre.

A large number of respondents raised issues concerning the foot and cycle links from Laverstock into Salisbury. Particular concern was expressed in relation to the lack of footway past Godolphin School on Laverstock Road which represents the most direct route into the city. Given that the allocation was argued by the developer to be well related to Salisbury, it is not unreasonable for the Council to negotiate contributions towards enhancing these linkages and the Joint Transportation Team have been drawing up an appropriate schedule of costs to which the developer will be required to contribute towards. In order to clarify this matter in the brief it is suggested changes are made as follows

**Action** – That point I in para 6.2 is amended to read as follows

- I. The provision of off site highway works as described in section 4 and contributions towards other measures which will encourage non-car based trips into Salisbury, including foot and cycle link improvements towards the city centre via Riverside Road and the Milford Hill area.

ix) Road access to the new development via Down View Road car park

A small number of respondents considered the development would be better served by an access through the car park on Down View Road. However, at least two residents pointed out that this land was set aside for car parking for occupants of adjacent flats and houses and that introducing a road would reduce the already stretched capacity. As highlighted above, highway engineers have identified on a number of occasions that the access via Hill Road and Boundary Road is adequate for this development proposal

No action proposed.

x) Prioritising the Duck Lane works at an early stage in the development process

A number of respondents have indicated that there will be a need to put the Duck Lane footpath in place at an early stage to address the pedestrian safety issues that have been identified. This suggestion seems a reasonable one to make and accordingly negotiations will be aimed at securing the works prior to the occupation of the first dwelling on the site.

**Action** – amendment of the first bullet point in para 4.44 to read as follows

- A footpath on the eastern side of Duck Lane between Down View Road and The Avenue which will be put in place prior to the occupation of the first dwelling on the development site.

xi) Alternative options for residents parking on Duck Lane

Residents of 15-37 on the eastern side of Duck Lane submitted a joint response related to parking provision for their properties. The new footpath on Duck Lane will formalise their existing parking arrangements which currently consist of an unmade area adjacent to the highway. The works will not alter the number of parking spaces available to residents in this location. The residents response proposes that the developer facilitates their desire to have off street parking on the frontage to their properties. This solution would involve the excavation of the raised bank

and the establishment of retaining walls on individual properties. Here the developer would need to accommodate dropped kerbs for each of the 12 properties whilst residents would each (or collectively if agreement could be reached) bear the cost of excavation and building work required to provide required hardstanding.

In examining this alternative to the status quo (i.e. that they retain parking in formalised on street parking bays provided as part of the footpath works) following comments can be made.

- a) County Highways have identified concerns that they would not wish to see 12 new separate private driveways feeding onto Duck Lane. This view is based on the fact that this would decrease road safety with cars emerging onto the road, particularly where reversing manoeuvres into the main carriageway would occur. Related to this there was concern that such manoeuvring might require additional road width which is not available (this matter was to be confirmed).
- b) From a planning perspective, there is concern that works to excavate the substantial bank in this location would be of detriment to the character of Duck Lane in this location. Clearly this matter would need to be considered by members in a planning application.
- c) The most significant point of note is the likely cost of excavation and retaining walls which would be required. To accommodate one car, excavation of 3-4 metres of the 6-8 foot bank would be required and there would certainly then need to be foot access to the actual dwellings.

In terms of recommending a solution with regard to these recommendations, officers would suggest that this matter is not essential to be decided upon for inclusion in the development brief and instead should be a matter for negotiation at the time of a planning application. There is clearly a need for affected residents to consider their approach to this matter give the cost implications. Ultimately a coherent view will need to be established amongst the residents of the properties concerned as a scenario of driveways being blocked by on street parking bays is likely to undermine the efforts made to improve their parking.

No action proposed at this stage.

## **b) Education Provision**

Increased demand for education places resulting from the new development was identified by local people as another crucial issue when the site was allocated in the Local Plan. When published for consultation, the draft brief included paragraphs which set out that the developer was committed to making contributions towards improving local education facilities and increasing the capacity to meet the new demands.

However, in terms of ensuring that the new primary education provision was put in place before new demands for school places arose, the brief was open in that it admitted that a timetable to ensure this would happen had yet to be agreed. In the period since the publication of the brief, officers have brought together the developers, the School and Diocese of Salisbury (who oversee St Andrew's Primary School) to seek some form of agreement about the costs involved, but more importantly the timetable required to ensure that the works are completed. The ultimate aim of the discussions was to ensure that new demands, predicted to arise from the completion of the first houses in Summer 2005, could be accommodated in the completed new school facilities at St Andrew's School.

The initial meeting suggested that a lead in time of a year would be needed to secure planning consent and undertake the required works at St Andrews to be ready for September 2005, although clearly this timetable is reliant to a degree on the developer making the appropriate financial contribution. Another factor is related to the works proposed being granted planning permission and initial meetings with

Development Control officers on this matter are programmed for August. In order to assure members about the planned timetable, a letter will be submitted to the Committee, probably as late correspondence, setting out how the works will be timed. Clearly, the main focus is to ensure that the works are completed on time, but alongside this account needs to be taken of the possible disruption to the operation of the school and its teaching during the construction works.

With regard to secondary education, the LEA and Diocese have agreed that a financial contribution will be adequate to provide for new demands amongst this age group and this will be negotiated in the normal fashion as part of the s106 legal agreement.

In light of the reassurances about the works to St Andrews Primary School from the Diocese of Salisbury, who will ultimately be responsible for this matter, it is proposed that the brief is amended as follows.

**Action** – Amendment of para 4.53 as follows

4.53 The principal education matter to be addressed by the development is the provision of new classroom space and extensions to the core facilities at St Andrews Primary School by September 2005. Discussions with the Diocese of Salisbury in July 2004 have confirmed that the completion of the works can be achieved by that date. However, this commitment is subject to two principal factors which are outside of its control, namely the granting of planning consent for the school improvements, and the receipt of developer contributions required to undertake the works. In response to these factors, the District Council is committed to expediting the determination of any planning application for the school works (in line with normal procedures) and the developer will be required to make a commuted payment immediately following the granting of planning consent.

#### **c) Contributions to Community Facilities**

One area that was omitted from the original brief was any requirement for contributions to local community infrastructure. During the public exhibitions, the Village Hall Committee approached officers to identify that there were long held plans to extend the village hall which would approve its amenity. Clearly this extension of the hall's facilities represents a response to increased demands for the use of the facility which will grow further in light of additional population growth in this part of the village. Accordingly, in line with policy R4 of the adopted Local Plan it is considered appropriate that the developer should contribute a sum which will be made available to cover the extension costs involved. This sum will be agreed as part of the s106 legal agreement which is required to be entered into by the developer.

**Action** - a new paragraph 4.54 has been included to read

##### **Community Facilities**

4.54 It is accepted that the new development will contribute to new demands on existing community facilities. During the consultation exercise it was identified that there is scope to extend Laverstock Village Hall and that consideration had been given to increasing its capacity. In light of the new demands likely to be forthcoming from an increased population in the locality it is considered appropriate, in line with Policy R4 of the adopted Local Plan, that the developer makes a commuted payment (as part of the s106 legal agreement) to cover identified costs involved in extending the Village Hall.

#### **d) Affordable Housing**

The District Council has highlighted the need for affordable housing on a district wide basis in light of increasing evidence of the inability of local people to afford their own home. With regard to this development site, the Parish Council and local people, with the exception of one individual, have

supported the proposals to include at least 25% affordable housing, although a good proportion of the responses felt that 25% was not enough. In light of the current situation, the District Council shares this view and the brief has therefore been adjusted to indicate that a proportion of not less than 33% affordable housing is provided on the site. In reality this should provide for 40 affordable homes which will be split between rented and homes for purchase under a shared ownership scheme.

Members and local people may question why this proportion has not been set higher. In response to this one must bear in mind that any development site can only yield so much planning gain for the community. The District Council commissioned some research work to examine the viability of a number of development schemes in the district which concluded that, on this particular site, the 33% level could be readily provided without any public subsidy. This conclusion takes into account other requirements which the development is expected to provide for including improved education facilities, open space, road and footpath improvements as well as contributions to the village hall and open space maintenance costs.

However, at the time of writing this report, it remains that the developer is unwilling to provide any more than 30% and members are advised that discussions are ongoing to resolve this point prior to its presentation to Cabinet. Officers would recommend that members should approve their brief in relation to this matter subject to the action set out below being fully accepted by the time it is presented to Cabinet. Should agreement not be reached on the wording set out below, this issue will be brought back to the next meeting of the Southern Area Committee.

**Action** - General Principle 3 (page 9) and para 4.51 of the original brief will be amended to read

GP3 - provide a range of house types and sizes including a proportion of not less than 33% affordable housing.

4.51 Policy H2G of the adopted Local Plan requires that at least 25% of the housing provided should be affordable housing. In line with the District Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on affordable housing, which is underpinned by a Housing Needs Survey and local Council waiting list figures, it is appropriate that not less than 33% of the total number of units provided on the site should be affordable housing. This housing will be made available in the first instance to those in identified need in Laverstock, however, properties may also be used to address significant need known to exist in Salisbury. The precise type, tenure and location will be negotiated with the District Council as part of a s106 legal agreement at the time of a planning application.

## **e) Public Open Space**

The draft proposals set out 3 options for the positioning of a children's play area within the development scheme set out on page 23 of the original brief. The majority of respondents who commented on this matter felt that the central location, adjacent to an existing area of open space off Down View Road, was most appropriate in that this allowed surrounding houses to overlook the play area and that this would help to foster community cohesion between new and existing residents. The Parish Council's response supports this view and accordingly this option has been selected for the play area.

The need for recreation facilities for older children adjacent to the development was also identified by a number of respondents. The general consensus was that equipment, perhaps in the form of kick walls or skateboard ramps, should be provided on the existing recreation area to the south of the site. This view is supported by the Parish Council. In order to address this requirement it is proposed that the Youth/Adult R2 contributions which will be required from the developer should be spent on these facilities in this location.

With regard to the landscape amenity area on the northern boundary of the site, respondents supported the incorporation of this feature, subject to the planting scheme being appropriate to screen the



development. The Parish Council maintains that the formalised footpath across the site should closely follow the line of development to ensure personal safety issues are addressed.

An overarching issue affecting all three of the public open space components associated with this development is the maintenance and upkeep. Outside of Salisbury City it is a normal expectation for Parish Councils to take on responsibility for maintenance of Public Open Spaces and any play equipment/sportswalls, etc. This remains the preferred option to give consistency across the district, however, in its representation, the Parish Council indicated that the District Council's Parks Service would be better equipped to take on this responsibility which would also extend to the Parish Councils own existing recreation ground to the south of the site. On the basis that the Council's Parks service maintains land within the existing housing estate for the benefit of council house tenants, and that its base of operations is relatively nearby, the Council's Parks manager has indicated that there is an economic case for this delegation of the maintenance responsibilities. However, in taking on this responsibility there are a number of points to note.

- a) That in taking on maintenance responsibilities for Laverstock Parish Council's existing recreation ground, the Parks Service will, following consultation, specify the nature, layout and standards of equipment placed on this ground and arrange installation. Furthermore, in taking on this responsibility, the Parish Council will be required to ensure that an appropriate sum is set aside for the long term maintenance of the site by the District Council.
- b) That the Parks Service will work with the developer to equip the on site play area (adj. Down View Road) and be provided with an appropriate commuted payment to cover its maintenance in the long term.
- c) That the Parks Service will work with the developer to ensure that the layout of the northern landscape amenity area is manageable and safe. Furthermore, an appropriate maintenance sum to cover the long term upkeep of this area will also be required from the developer.

The transfer of land to District Council, and the securing of appropriate commuted sums for maintenance, will be agreed as part of a section 106 legal agreement which will be required to accompany the planning application.

**Action** - the following changes are proposed to the draft brief.

Combine para's 4.48 and 4.49, include new para 4.49 and amendment to para 4.50 as follows

- 4.48 In light of consultation, it is proposed that a children's play area be located on land adjacent to an existing open space off Down View Road which will ensure that the facility benefits from passive surveillance by nearby properties. The new children's play area should consist of a minimum of the following
- A suitable safety surface which conforms to current BSI safety standards
  - Secure fencing with self closing access to prevent animals gaining access
  - A range of play activities from toddler provision right through to facilities for children of 12 years of age, subject to specific circumstances of the locality and any other considerations
- 4.49 As set out in para 4.46, the developer will be required to make a commuted payment towards youth and adult recreation provision. In light of consultation it has been identified that there is a need to provide youth recreation facilities, which could be accommodated on the existing recreation area to the south of the site. It is proposed that part of the commuted sum be used to equip this area.

- 4.50 It is a requirement that appropriate maintenance measures are put in place to ensure that the open spaces within the development (including the northern landscape amenity area) are kept safe and in good condition. In light of the fact that the District Council maintains existing spaces within the estate adjacent to the site, the Parks service have confirmed that they would take on maintenance responsibility for the open spaces within the site should the Parish Council not accept this role. This arrangement will be subject to the receipt of an appropriate maintenance payment from the developer (as part of the s106 legal agreement) which will be calculated in line with the Council's current formula.

#### 4. Next Steps

Subject to the agreement of the changes set out in this report and the attached table at Appendix I, members are asked to recommend that the brief is formally adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the Cabinet at its September meeting. Subject to this agreement by the Cabinet it is likely that a planning application will then be submitted for the development of the site.

#### 5. Recommendation

**That Members accept the proposed changes as set out in this report and in the revised Development Brief attached to the report and recommend to the Cabinet that the Brief be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.**

---

#### Background Papers:

Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003)

Land off Duck Lane Laverstock (Consultation Draft) April 2004

Both available at [www.salisbury.gov.uk/planning](http://www.salisbury.gov.uk/planning) via the Forward Planning web page.

#### Implications:

- **Financial:** Section 3a (xi) – Residents Parking on Duck Lane - Members should be aware that a number of properties on Duck Lane are Council owned and thus there may be implications for the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme
- **Legal:** As set out in the report
- **Human Rights:** Article 6 (the right to a fair hearing) may apply. The consultation process contributes to compliance with this.
- **Personnel:** None at this stage
- **Community Safety:** None at this stage
- **Council's Core Values:** Excellent service, thriving economy, fairness & equality, open council & willing partner, communicating with the public, supporting the disadvantaged, protecting the environment.
- **Ward(s) Affected:** Laverstock & Ford

## APPENDIX I - Duck Lane Development Brief : Summary of consultation issues raised, responses and proposed actions

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
PC	Laverstock PC	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provision of education facilities at St Andrews School</li> <li>b) Location of the Play area in line with option 3 as set out in the brief and installation of equipment for older children on the existing play area</li> <li>c) Incorporation of lost parking at Boundary Road/Hill Road into the new development</li> <li>d) Provision of footpath along Duck Lane and support for residents idea to provide off street parking in front gardens</li> <li>e) Use of anti skid surfacing at key points on the approaches to the new development</li> <li>f) Provision of foot and cycle links around the site and contributions to improvements to links into Salisbury</li> <li>g) Contributions towards better facilities at the Village Hall</li> <li>h) Action to be taken to reduce rainwater run off down existing estate roads and reuse of this water where possible.</li> <li>i) Off site improvements to junctions (Park Road/Duck Lane, Avenue/Church Road</li> <li>j) Provision of more than 25% affordable housing with priority to those with Laverstock links</li> <li>k) Responsibility for maintenance of Public Open Spaces to be passed to SDC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Education matters are set out in section 3b) of the attached report</li> <li>b) Public Open Space matters are set out in section 3e) of the attached report</li> <li>c) Provision will be made for lost parking space as part of the development scheme.</li> <li>d) Highway issues are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>e) Highway issues are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>f) All the links identified in discussions have been incorporated into the brief. Substantial developer contributions will be focused towards improving links to the city</li> <li>g) Contributions to Community Facilities are set out in section 3c) of the attached report</li> <li>h) Sustainable drainage systems will be included to address surface water run off at source. Any improvements to the current situation will be accommodated where works are required to be undertaken as a direct result of the development.</li> <li>i) Highway issues are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>j) Affordable Housing issues are addressed in section 3d) of the attached report</li> <li>k) Public Open Space matters are set out in section 3e) of the attached report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – addition of point in para 4.14 which will ensure that any lost parking as a result of the new access via Hill Road and Boundary Road are replaced.</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6</li> </ul>
67	Salisbury Community Cars	Neutral	Establish a car club to improve sustainability of transport.	This will clearly depend upon the willingness of residents to participate	<b>No action</b> , but <i>Support should be encouraged for this type of initiative</i>
66	Mr W Smith	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Corners of The Avenue / Duck Lane, and Park Road / Duck Lane need improvements</li> <li>b) Contributions towards improvements to the Village Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>b) Contributions to the Village Hall are set out in section 3c) of the attached report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b></li> </ul>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
65	Unnamed	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concern about any loss of parking at Duck Lane. Is there the ability to accommodate parking to the rear of properties on Duck Lane</li> <li>b) Concern about surface run off on Down View road. Must ensure that the development does not exacerbate this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The improvements will provide for at least as many dedicated spaces as exist already</li> <li>b) The development will incorporate sustainable drainage systems which will address surface water at source.</li> </ul>	<b>No action</b>
64	Unnamed	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Support for the general layout and character of the scheme, use of anti skid surfacing in key locations, the treatment of the site's northern boundary, school contribution (improvements must be timed to meet new demands), affordable housing</li> <li>b) Need to ensure that the northern amenity area is appropriately managed with funds for the PC to be made available</li> <li>c) Concern about any loss of parking at Duck Lane. Is there the ability to accommodate parking to the rear of properties on Duck Lane</li> <li>d) Must ensure that there is adequate parking provision in the new development</li> <li>e) Concern about surface run off on Down View road. Must ensure that the development does not exacerbate this</li> <li>f) Concern that the development will further reduce local water pressure</li> <li>g) Site should include green landscaping</li> <li>h) Needs reassurance that during the construction phase, measures are put in place to minimise disturbance and nuisance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The support of the respondent is noted in these matters</li> <li>b) The developer is required to provide a sum which will cover the maintenance costs in perpetuity</li> <li>c) The improvements will provide for at least as many dedicated spaces as exist already</li> <li>d) On site parking will provide for garaged and other off street parking with more capacity for visitors. Further details will be set out at the planning application stage to allow people to be satisfied that adequate is made.</li> <li>e) The development will incorporate sustainable drainage systems which will address surface water at source.</li> <li>f) Changes to para 3.22, as proposed by Wessex Water will ensure that a commitment to maintain water pressure in the wider area can be enforced.</li> <li>g) The landscaping plan in the brief shows that the scheme will incorporate open spaces with trees in addition to boundary treatments and the landscaped amenity space to the north of the site</li> <li>h) It is accepted that there may be disturbance from the construction phase and measures will be put in place to address this as set out in para 6.3 of the brief</li> </ul>	<b>No action</b>
63	B Kerwood (CPRE)	Support	Support for affordable housing requirements, encouragement of walking/cycling, overall design, transition of layout to the rural edge, s106 elements (incl. school), access strategy, sustainability measures, landscaping,	The support of the respondent is noted	<b>No action</b>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
62	P Roquette (S Wilts LA21)	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) concern about cycle/walking links from site into city</li> <li>b) parking on the site should not dominate the streets</li> <li>c) tighten emphasis on eco-standards of buildings</li> <li>d) locate play area in position C</li> <li>e) equip existing play area for youth uses</li> <li>f) separate footpath link to Duck Lane via from existing recreation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Developer is required to make s106 contributions to improve foot/cycle links</li> <li>b) this is already addressed in para's 4.12 and 4.43 of the brief</li> <li>c) the Council is promoting sustainable building and a change would bring these proposals in line with other large sites</li> <li>d) Open space is considered in section 3e) of the attached report</li> <li>e) Youth/Adult R2 contributions will allow Parish Council to equip existing play area</li> <li>f) Linkages to the existing play area will be retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – wording of para 4.28 should be adjusted to require all homes to be at least 'Good' BREEAM Ecohome standard and a proportion at 'Very Good' standard</li> </ul>
61	J Walker (COGS)	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) concern about safe cycle links from site to schools and city</li> <li>b) Cycle signposting and bike parking would encourage use</li> <li>c) 20mph HomeZone to improve cycle safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) developer is required to make s106 contributions to improve foot/cycle links</li> <li>b) s106 contributions referred to in a) could be used for these purposes</li> <li>c) There is agreement with the developer that the whole estate will be a 20mph zone and this could be extended to the existing estate in light of road safety concerns raised in the consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6</li> </ul>
60	J & R Newman	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Brief does not show how it will limit the need to travel by car</li> <li>b) Problems for foot/cycle access to city past Godolphin School</li> <li>c) Concern that improvement to The Avenue will increase speeds</li> <li>d) Separate play areas – childrens play area central.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As many linkages from the site for foot and cycle use have been included as well a requirements for bus stop enhancements. Bus and cycle route information will be provided to new occupants. Planners and developers cannot ultimately control car use but can put in place measures to improve convenience of alternative modes.</li> <li>b) Substantial developer contributions will be focused towards improving links to the city</li> <li>c) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>d) Open space is considered in section 3e) of the attached report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6</li> </ul>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
59	H Thomas (Gov't Office for the South West)	Neutral	Raises a number of technical issues which will improve the reading and understanding of the brief	Some matters raised are considered to be inconsequential and have not raised any concerns from any other quarter. The matters raised are noted and accepted changes are set out in the adjacent box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – change to para 1.2 “...will be a material consideration <del>which the council will take into account</del> when determining a planning application....”</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – Para 3.16 – Off site highways are shown on page 21, not page 15</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – Para 4.14 - References to documents referred to will be made clearer</li> </ul>
58	M Wilmott	Neutral	Notes the omission of Piggy Lane (between Milford Mill Road and Southampton Road) from map on page 6. Main comment relates to the need for improvements to cycle and walking links to the city	Substantial developer contributions will be focused towards improving links to the city	➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6
57	H Cave Penney (WCC Archaeology)	Neutral	Notes potential for archaeological finds on the site and requests that an archaeological evaluation is undertaken prior to the determination of a planning application in line with provisions in PPG16	The potential for archaeological finds is noted and survey/evaluation work will be coordinated with WCC Archaeologists	➤ <b>Action</b> – amendment of para 3.17 to reflect the requirements of the County Council's Archaeology Service
56	G Thorncroft	Neutral	a) Highway concerns related to Park Road and corner of Duck Lane/The Avenue. b) Contribution requirements for Village Hall	a) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report b) Contributions to the Village Hall are set out in section 3c) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
55	M Cox (Wessex Water)	Neutral	Makes a number of suggested wording changes which will improve the understanding of requirements of the developer	The technical input of the water company and statutory sewage provider are welcomed to improve the content of the brief	➤ <b>Action</b> – make various amendments to para 3.22 as set out in the representation
54	R Ballard	Neutral	Makes a range of positive suggestions for local highway improvements at key points around the site	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
53	Highways Agency	Neutral	No comments		
52	J Bunting	Neutral	Concern about parking at the top of Hill Road.	Provision will be made for lost parking space as part of the development scheme.	➤ <b>Action</b> – addition of point in para 4.14 which will ensure that any lost parking as a result of the new access via Hill Road and Boundary Road are replaced.

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
51	J Hillyard	Neutral (?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concern over noise and disturbance from increased traffic</li> <li>b) Suggests access via car park on Down View Road</li> <li>c) Loss of parking / turning space at end of Hill Road and Boundary Road</li> <li>d) Seeks reassurance about loss of privacy</li> <li>e) More extensive use of anti skid surfacing on steeper sections of Hill Road and adjacent Village Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>b) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>c) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>d) Landscape plan shows planting adjacent to existing properties. Details need to be examined at the time of Planning Application.</li> <li>e) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – addition of point in para 4.14 which will ensure that any lost parking as a result of the new access via Hill Road and Boundary Road are replaced.</li> </ul>
50	P Tilley (WCC Highways)	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Masterplan does not adequately indicate that Boundary Road should be an alternative main link into the site</li> <li>b) Emergency Access links to serve clusters of 50+ houses may be required</li> <li>c) Support for contributions to local public transport and cycle/foot links</li> <li>d) Concern that there is no addressing of issues raised at end of para 3.16 – off site cycle/foot links to the city</li> <li>e) Emphasises the need to carefully design edge of pavement housing within the scheme to avoid car/pedestrian conflict.</li> <li>f) Support for traffic calming, surfacing and pedestrian access improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The annotation of Boundary Road as a secondary access recognises that the majority of new houses will use the Hill Road access. Boundary Road will still exist and be designed as a main access.</li> <li>b) If the ultimate design of the development precipitates the need for additional emergency only access it will be for the developer to agree a suitable solution.</li> <li>c) &amp; f) Support is noted for contributions to off site improvements and on site measures</li> <li>d) Substantial developer contributions will be focused towards improving links to the city. The exact improvements will be set out by the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team</li> <li>e) County Highways will be a consultee on any future planning application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – adjust masterplan annotation of Boundary Road to ensure its joint main access status is clearly set out</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6</li> </ul>
49	G Milne Wilts Fire Brigade	Neutral	<p>Recommends the installation of domestic sprinklers to new units to improve domestic safety</p>	<p>The recommendation is highly valuable and has been passed to the developer. However, it is not the role of a development brief to set out the specification of new homes.</p>	<p><b>No Action</b> <i>although the recommendation has been highlighted to the developer for inclusion at the planning application stage</i></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
48	G A Hall	Object	a) No conclusive answer about the number of houses on the site from discussions b) Disturbance to existing residents c) Lack of adequate on site parking d) Unclear about the ability of the developer to address all local infrastructure needs	a) The site is allocated to provide 'about' 120 houses – a usual margin of 10% is allowed for b) It is accepted that there may be disturbance from the construction phase and measures will be put in place to address this as set out in para 6.3 of the brief. Beyond this, the consideration of turning the whole estate to a 20mph zone has the potential to minimise the expressed concerns about increases in traffic c) On site parking will provide for garaged and other off street parking with capacity for visitors. Detailed plans at the planning application stage will enable local people to satisfy themselves that adequate provision is being made. d) The developer is required to make provision or contributions towards additional needs generated by the development. Affordable housing, school improvements, highway works, village hall extensions, improved bus stop and equipped open space provision are the main requirements and other matters will be considered where they are reasonable and relevant to the development	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
47	Mr & Mrs Carlisle	Neutral	Brief has largely reassured respondents. Particular support for landscaping elements and would encourage early planting of screening elements to advance the benefit they will bring in preserving privacy	There is no reason why peripheral planting cannot be undertaken at an early stage in the development	➤ <b>Action</b> – That para 4.36 of the brief is supplemented with a commitment to undertake boundary planting, particularly to the north and west of the site, at the earliest opportunity
46	Mr & Mrs Marriner	Neutral	Improvement/extensions to the Village Hall should be funded by the developer as it should act as the focus for social activity for new residents	Contributions to the Village Hall are set out in section 3c) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
45	Mrs R Ford	Object	Concern about the disturbance which will be caused to elderly residents, but more particularly the difficulties/problems likely to occur at the construction phase.	It is accepted that there may be disturbance from the construction phase and measures will be put in place to address this as set out in para 6.3 of the brief.	<b>No action</b> – <i>disturbance at construction phase is already addressed in brief</i>



Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
44	J (?) Barker	Object	a) Concerns over construction phase impacts b) Will the Duck Lane footpath improvements be prioritised as an early requirement ?	a) It is accepted that there may be disturbance from the construction phase and measures will be put in place to address this as set out in para 6.3 of the brief. b) The footpath works will be required to be put in place prior to new traffic arising from the development – this is likely in late summer 2005	➤ <b>Action</b> – That para 4.44 be amended to establish that the Duck Lane footpath (and associated measures) are in place prior to the occupation of dwellings on the site.
43	JK Gross	Neutral	Emphasises the need to provide for affordable housing on the site and that 25% is not enough - at least 50% should be encouraged. Suggests that first time buyers should be the focus.	Affordable Housing matters are examined in section 3d) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
42	Mr & Mrs Cooper	Neutral	a) Encourages the provision of road safety features (signage, speedbumps, etc) b) Considers that play area should be in a central position c) Would wish to see the development being well landscaped including trees. d) Concerned about the Boundary Road access being suitable	a) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report b) Public Open Space matters are examined in section 3e) of the attached report c) The landscaping plan on page 18 of the brief shows that the scheme will incorporate open spaces with trees in addition to boundary treatments and the landscaped amenity space to the north of the site d) The site is required to have two main access points and Hill Road and Boundary Road were identified by highway engineers as being acceptable for the purpose. In reality the development layout will mean that Hill Road is likely to be the main access with Boundary road likely to serve a smaller proportion of the eventual number of houses.	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
41	T Brightman (Envirmt Agency)	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) minor wording changes reflecting current definitions and requirements</li> <li>b) promotion of water conservation measures in new properties</li> <li>c) Recommends that BREEAM EcoHome standards be increased to Very Good – or at least a proportion of Very Good units</li> <li>d) Sets out an expectation for an Environmental Management Plan to assess and guide construction processes. Suggests signing up to Considerate Construction scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The changes are accepted and set out as actions in the adjacent box</li> <li>b) Section 4.28 of the brief addresses water conservation measures. Any subsequent planning application will be expected to demonstrate measure which will reduce water wastage.</li> <li>e) the Council is promoting sustainable building and a change would bring these proposals in line with other large sites</li> <li>f) Given the concerns expressed in other representations there is no reason why these requirements should impose an unnecessary burden on the developer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – Para 3.20 – change “... sites location <del>within a Ground Water Catchment Area</del> on a Major aquifer and adjacent to a Groundwater Source Protection Zone, the Environment Agency’s...”</li> <li>General Principle 12 (Page 10) – change to “Provide any necessary on and off site infrastructure including the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems”</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> - wording of para 4.28 should be adjusted to require all homes to be at least ‘Good’ BREEAM Ecohome standard and a proportion at ‘Very Good’ standard</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – amendment of section 6.3 to require that a Environmental Management Plan is required and that the developer signs up to the Considerate Constructors scheme</li> </ul>
40	R Jugg	Neutral (?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concerns about School improvements</li> <li>b) Lack of consultation about highway works</li> <li>c) Exacerbation of Surface water drainage problems</li> <li>d) Visibilty at Duck Lane at Park Road/Down View Road junctions, and corner at The Avenue/Duck Lane</li> <li>e) Measures to limit nuisance during construction phase</li> <li>f) Location of bus shelter at Duck Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Matters related to St Andrews school are set out in section 3b) of the attached report.</li> <li>b) The development brief was designed to encourage responses from local people on the highway works at Duck Lane.</li> <li>c) The development will incorporate sustainable drainage systems which will address surface water at source.</li> <li>d) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>e) It is accepted that there may be disturbance from the construction phase and measures will be put in place to address this as set out in para 6.3 of the brief.</li> <li>f) The re-siting of the bus shelter will be a matter for the planning application which will be subject to its own public consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b></li> </ul>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
39	A Lockyer	Object	Raises concerns about access to the site via existing estate roads including concerns about construction traffic	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report and construction phase issues are already set out in para 6.3 of the brief	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
38	Name withheld	Object	a) Concerns that affordable housing will attract social problems b) Concerns about exacerbation of existing drainage problems affecting Riverside Road c) Suggests traffic calming at Duck Lane to slow traffic	a) There is no evidence to suggest that affordable housing on the site will lead to social problems. The need for affordable housing is critical in Salisbury and sites like this one have an important role to play b) Studies of this issue at earlier stages found no link to drainage from the estate, Sustainable Drainage Systems will be used to deal with drainage from the site at source c) A pinch point is already proposed between the junctions of Park Road and Down View Road on Duck Lane.	<b>No Action</b>
37	R Clark	Neutral (?)	Raises concerns about the use of The Avenue to access the site	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
36	D Brick	Neutral	Raises concerns that the measures included to discourage car use/ encourage cycling and walking are unlikely to have much effect, particularly in light of poor quality of links to London Rd, Southampton Rd and the City	The developer is required to provide substantial contributions towards improving cycle/foot links to the city. Ultimately however, planners and developers cannot control car use but can put in place measures to improve convenience of alternative modes	➤ <b>Action</b> – clearer s106 requirement for non-car links to the city in section 6
35	A Bruton	Neutral	a) Concern about exacerbation of surface water drainage problems b) Not aware that there is a footpath adjacent to the Down View Road residents car park c) Concern that residents car park at Down View Road will see further use by unauthorised persons	a) Sustainable Drainage Systems will be used to deal with drainage at source on the new development. Existing problem requires attention by statutory provider b) Parish Council have confirmed that there is a right of way established in this location c) Unauthorised parking is unacceptable and residents are encouraged to monitor parking patterns and inform local Councillor if their facility is being abused.	<b>No Action</b>
34	S Adams	Neutral	Concerns about traffic volume on Park Road and requests the provision of driveways or pull ins	The section of Park Road that links Duck Lane to Hill Road has been identified in para 4.44 of the brief as an area for action. In key locations there is an offer to provide dropped kerbs to allow residents to form driveways to their properties	<b>No Action</b>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
33	S Thomas	Object	Raises objection to the development on the grounds of impact on the wildlife at Burroughs Hill and adjacent Downs	This issue was addressed during an earlier stage of the site's examination. Consultees including English Nature and WCC Ecologists raised no objections about impacts on local wildlife.	<b>No Action</b>
31	M Travers	Neutral	Concerns about traffic volume on Park Road and requests the provision of driveways or pull ins	The section of Park Road that links Duck Lane to Hill Road has been identified in para 4.44 of the brief as an area for action. In key locations there is an offer to provide dropped kerbs to allow residents to form driveways to their properties	<b>No Action</b>
30	Mrs Naish	Object	The pinch point proposed for Duck Lane is supported in that it provides a footpath, however it will leave 7, Duck Lane without any parking	This is a clear problem which the developer has recognised and the off site highway improvements have been amended to provide spaces for this property	➤ <b>Action</b> – The off site highway improvements shown on page 21 have been amended to include parking space for residents
29	Mrs Prichard	Object	Raises concerns about the suitability of the access to the site using Duck Lane and the connecting estate roads	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
28	D Patterson	Neutral	Raises concerns about the suitability of the access to the site using the estate roads and cites the difficulties faced by buses caused by on street parking and bad weather conditions.	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
27	J O'Brien	Support	Is concerned that the minimum 25% affordable housing will be exactly that and feels that a proportion of upto 50% would be more appropriate	Affordable Housing matters are examined in section 3d) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
32 & 16-26	J Gidley (2) Mr/Mrs Kirkham Unnamed J Theaker Unnamed Mr/Mrs Snook S Steggles (?) G Blake Mr/Mrs O Connell S Stainer S Hastings (Residents of 15-37 Duck Lane)	Neutral	Mrs Gidley submits 2 representations. The first asks whether the footpath to the rear of Duck Lane properties could become a road to enable parking at the rear of these properties, in turn freeing up space on Duck Lane itself. The second response, which is common with the other respondents seeks the incorporation of individual parking spaces for residents into the front gardens of 15-37 Duck Lane.	Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
15	A Paines	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Seeks assurances about the boundary treatment which will be adjacent to her property</li> <li>b) Expresses concerns that highway remain inadequate to serve the development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Examination of the Landscaping plan on page 18 of the brief should reassure the respondent that planting will be provided to screen the development. The details of the type and nature of the planting will be a matter for residents to examine when the planning application is submitted.</li> <li>b) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> </ul>	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
14	I Osmond	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Generally welcomes the layout which incorporates passive surveillance of play areas and footpaths.</li> <li>b) Suggests Play Area should be in a central location not in SW Corner</li> <li>c) Concern about the form and layout of the landscape amenity area</li> <li>d) Courtyards and shared surfaces need to be well organised to ensure parking patterns are clearly controlled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Support is noted</li> <li>b) Open Space issues are addressed in section 3e) of the attached report</li> <li>c) A full landscaping plan will be prepared for this area and consulted upon with the Parish Council, SDC Parks Service, Wildlife, Community Safety and other appropriate organisations as part of the planning application process</li> <li>d) This will need to be demonstrated as part of the planning application process</li> </ul>	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
13	M Kightley	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Considers that an access via the Car Park at Down View Road would better serve the development</li> <li>b) Parking at Hill Road/ Park Road will be a constant problem for drivers, particularly bus services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Residents of the flats at Down View Road have expressed concerns about use of their car park for an access, particularly as Highway Engineers have already found the road system to be acceptable via Hill Road</li> <li>b) The section of Park Road that links Duck Lane to Hill Road has been identified in para 4.44 of the brief as an area for action. In key locations there is an offer to provide dropped kerbs to allow residents to form driveways to their properties</li> </ul>	<b>No Action</b>
12	Mr/Mrs Hayward	Support	No detailed points raised	The support is noted	<b>No Action</b>
11	S Stainer	Neutral (?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Still has concerns about the highways issues, particularly junctions of St Andrews Road/Park Road, Duck Lane/The Avenue.,</li> <li>b) Would like more detail about Duck Lane improvements and suggests early implementation of the measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>b) More detailed proposals for the Duck Lane improvements are being discussed with officers and can be viewed on request. The footpath works will be required to be put in place prior to new traffic arising from the development likely in late summer 2005</li> </ul>	➤ <b>Action</b> – That para 4.44 be amended to establish that the Duck Lane footpath (and associated measures) are in place prior to the occupation of dwellings on the site.

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
10	D Furnell	Neutral	Makes a statement of fact the the Down View Road car park is for the benefit of residents of the 24 flats and 4 houses adjacent	The proposals do not include any means of access through the car park if this is the concern of residents.	<b>No Action</b>
9	Mr & Mrs Issacs	Neutral	Enquires what form the boundary treatment will take adjacent to Down View Road	In relation to the property concerned there will be mixed shrub planting used to soften fencing. Details of the type and nature of the planting/fencing will be a matter for residents to examine when a planning application is submitted	<b>No Action</b>
8	M Owen	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Objects to Boundary Road being used as a main access. Considers it was designed as a cul de sac and would therefore be appropriate only as a gated emergency access</li> <li>b) Further improvements are needed to the Duck Lane proposals, particularly the corner with The Avenue. The works also need to be put in place as soon as possible.</li> <li>c) The Play Area should be placed in the southwest corner of the site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The site is required to have two main access points and both Hill Road and Boundary Road have been confirmed as being acceptable for the purpose. Hill Road is likely to be the main access as a result of the layout; however Boundary Road will need to be retained as an open access.</li> <li>b) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> <li>c) Open Space issues are addressed in section 3e) of the attached report</li> </ul>	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>
7	T Owen	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Objects to Boundary Road being used as a main access. Considers it was designed as a cul de sac and would therefore be appropriate only as an emergency access</li> <li>b) Further improvements are needed to the Duck Lane proposals, particularly the corner with The Avenue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The site is required to have two main access points and both Hill Road and Boundary Road have been confirmed as being acceptable for the purpose. Hill Road is likely to be the main access as a result of the layout; however Boundary Road will need to be retained as an open access.</li> <li>b) Highways matters are examined in section 3a) of the attached report</li> </ul>	➤ <b>Actions set out in Report</b>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
6	Mr & Mrs Scott	Neutral (?)	a) Concerned that Boundary Road should not be used as a main access. Considers it was designed as a cul de sac and poses road safety issues. b) That loss of car parking at the end of boundary road has not been adequately considered. c) Parking on Duck Lane is not adequate	a) The site is required to have two main access points and both Hill Road and Boundary Road have been confirmed as being acceptable for the purpose. Hill Road is likely to be the main access as a result of the layout; however Boundary Road will need to be retained as an open access. To address road safety a 20mph zone is being considered for the whole estate b) Provision will be made for lost parking space as part of the development scheme. c) At least as much parking as currently exists will be provided for at Duck Lane. It is not reasonable for the developer to have to contribute to more parking provision	➤ <b>Action</b> – addition of point in para 4.44 which will ensure that any lost parking as a result of the new access via Hill Road and Boundary Road are replaced.
5	J Steggles	Neutral	Seeks reassurance that the ability for her to undertake works to provide foot access to her property (as planned) will not be compromised by the works in Duck Lane	The respondent's ability to undertake the works should not be compromised by the Duck Lane improvements and she is encouraged to liaise with the developer to coordinate works if this is possible.	<b>No Action</b>
4	J Newman	Neutral	Sets out personal housing difficulties and expresses support for 25% affordable housing on the site.	Affordable Housing issues are set out in section 3d) of the attached report	➤ <b>Action set out in report</b>
3	R Thomas	Neutral (?)	Concerned that Hill Road appears to be the only access to the site	Hill Road and Boundary Road will both be access points for the development with Down View Road providing an alternative to Hill Road outside of the site.	<b>No Action</b>
2	S Newman	Support	General expression of support for the scheme which is considered to be a good for the village	Support of the respondent is noted	<b>No Action</b>
1	E Champion	Neutral	Asks whether properties will be available to existing poorly housed tenants and whether there will be a play area on site	A proportion of properties on the site will be for rent and the respondent is encouraged to speak to the Council's Housing department regarding transfer to a more appropriate property. A play area will be provided on site. More details of this are set out in section 3e) of the attached report	<b>No Action</b>