

## Emerging Strategies Consultation Responses Summary Table

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		Broadband		We would like to see a policy to guarantee free basic broadband for those living in social housing to help ensure that those who are already at most risk of remaining in poverty do not get further left behind.
Cotswold Canals Trust	Local organisation		Canal		Cotswold Canal restoration through Stroud has been successful and has promoted economic growth. Local authorities should safeguard the route and adopt supportive policies. Cotswold Canal will in future reconnect with Wilts and Berks Canal.
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Canal		<p>Requests assessment of canal route before any development of route to ensure there is 'no unacceptable risk to ecology, flood risk, water resource and water quality'</p> <p>We request that this goes further to recognise, and safeguard against, potential impacts from canal restoration and ensure that any land safeguarded for its restoration includes land for necessary associated development needed to mitigate for its impacts. This might include: space for storage reservoirs to be filled when water supply is more plentiful for use during dry spells; 'polishing' reed-beds, or other mitigation features that might be required to ensure water quality impacts are addressed so that they do not affect existing watercourses or other habitats dependant on an adequate supply of clean water.</p>
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		Canal		Regarding the Wilts and Berks canal and the North Wilts canal, significant parts have been built over. For example, Fleming Way in the town centre has been built over the canal route. In addition, the petrol station at the bottom of Kingshill and Greenbridge retail park sit over the route. There are other obstacles too numerous to mention. The costs would be prohibitive to reinstate the canal through the town.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Inland Waterways Association	National organisation		Canal		Supports option 2, option 1 would be acceptable, objects to option 3
Wilts & Berks Canal Trust, Swindon Branch	Local organisation		Canal		<p>The canal trust has made completion of the link between Swindon and Royal Wootton Bassett a priority for the short term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- canal restoration wouldn't have achieved the success it has without protection policies</li> <li>- but the application of protection policies has been mixed due to pressure from developers and insufficiency of lines drawn on map in policy. - The corridor width needed for construction in new urban development is usually between 22 and 34m, some of which is usually new green space. A corridor of 30m width would accommodate almost all lengths of canal in Swindon and provide a 3m towpath/cycleway as well as a wildlife reserve on the offside.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst retaining the long-term objective of connecting Kingshill to Mouldon Hill and Cricklade, the trust is examining the partial solution of reverting to an earlier scheme by restoring the line as close to Wharf Green as possible with a small turning basin near that end. A spur yet to be confirmed would then lead to the railway crossing and the rest of the town centre route north. The indicative route to be shown on the plan may need to be described as under review pending identification of any proposed changes.</p> <p>Restoring canal through town centre is a long term aim but is an essential phase of a long-term project to recreate the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal and other waterways forming the southern canals network; a project with a history of over 30 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wish to supply a new route map for inclusion in policies map</li> <li>- request policy seeking developers' contributions e.g DMP32 of the VoWH plan</li> </ul> <p>Wiltshire Council has agreed to transfer the part of the</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>canal route within its ownership to the Canal Partnership</p> <p>1997 the Scott Wilson Feasibility Study of the whole canal estimated a visitor spend of £20m pa, 290 jobs created, a 19% premium on waterside housing prices and community benefits in line with those referred to above. A 2003 prefeasibility study for the canal in central Swindon carried out for the New Swindon Company estimated it would generate £9m per year in visitor income and create 166 jobs and various other benefits</p> <p>95% of canal users use the canal towpath</p>
1 x respondent	resident		Canal		Should not follow same tunnel as road under the m4
4 x respondents	resident		Canal - option 1		Support
62 x respondents + Cotswold Canal Partnership Stroud District Council (Canals Manager) Hall and Woodhouse	resident, community organisation, business		Canal - option 2		<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30m width would allow provision for cycle pathways, with benefits including health and wellbeing, reduction in air pollution and congestion</li> <li>- opens up potential for canalside facilities</li> <li>- gives more certainty to delivery</li> </ul>
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Canal - option 2		Support option 2 with 30m corridor for canal

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Canal - option 2		Support, but should not apply for town centre
85 x respondents + Cotswold Canal Partnership Stroud District Council (Canals Manager) Hall and Woodhouse	resident, community organisation, business		Canal - option 3		<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- swindon TC is centre of the wilts and berks canal and restoration of the centre required to deliver southern canals network</li> <li>- removing town centre protection will remove the prospects of restoration and linking with other routes</li> <li>- SBC is a partner in the Wiltshire, Swindon and Oxfordshire Canal partnership whose aim is to restore the Wilts and Berks canal.</li> <li>- There is widespread public support of restoration</li> <li>- heritage value of canal</li> <li>- 2005 report by Arup stated canal is deliverable</li> <li>- restoration can deliver benefits e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- town centre regeneration and economic growth.</li> <li>- tourism</li> <li>- community benefits</li> <li>- Health and wellbeing benefits</li> <li>- leisure benefits</li> <li>- Nature benefits</li> <li>- flood alleviation</li> <li>- enhanced pedestrian and cycle route</li> <li>- reduced reliance on cars</li> </ul> </li> <li>- examples elsewhere where canals are successful e.g. Birmingham, Reading, Banbury, or areas where canals have been redelivered successfully e.g. stroud.</li> <li>- canal restoration successful in Wichelstowe - should extend into centre</li> <li>- The canal trust is reviewing the options of a preferred route and is developing an updated scheme</li> <li>- before the town centre protection is removed a cost benefit analysis should be carried out</li> </ul>
4 x respondent	resident		Carbon offset		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- local plan should include minimum tree or meadow planting requirement and effective management regimes</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Civic Voice	Local organisation		Central Area		- wish to see CAAP policy which identifies Milton Road Baths and The Mechanics' Institution as within railway village conservation area
4 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		DE2 should be reinstated - no references to statutory targets for reductions in CO2 emissions
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		- suggests specifying that all new residential development must incorporate solar panels with minimum output of kw hours. Should also be required to incorporate battery storage from solar panels. - roof alignments of all new residential properties should ensure that main sloping roof should have one of its two faces aligned with +/- 45 degrees south.
Client Earth	National organisation		Climate change		- a local carbon reduction target should be set and proposed policies' consistency with that target should be identified and performance against that target should be monitored - the SA should compare the impact of different options on emissions
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group)	Local councillors		Climate change		- SBC should set a zero-emissions by 2030 target with carbon budgets and clear, evidence led, enabling policies within the local plan to meet them; - Together with these comments we are attaching the Climate Change policies in the draft Local Plan prepared by Merton Council. We commend them to Swindon Borough Council as a model of what a responsible and forward-looking local authority should be able to achieve. Other examples are cited including - nothing should be planned that isn't fit to take its place in a net-zero emissions future - a new target for renewable energy generation should be set - the development of new buildings either residential or commercial should be zero carbon - there should be policy about improving the energy efficiency of existing dwellings

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
CPRE	National organisation		Climate change		There should be emphasis on grey water recycling and surface water catchment within Design Guides and these requirements laid out in any Master Plan landscaping document. There should also be reference to ground and air pump energy systems being required for smaller developments and even small blocks of 3 or 4 houses grouped together.
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		Climate change		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- comments tracked on the plan</li> <li>- adopt 2025 zero carbon target rather than 2030</li> <li>- set up a local citizen's assembly</li> <li>- start a local education programme to tell the truth to your residents</li> <li>- DE2 should be enhanced not dropped as residential buildings account for around 14% of UK emissions</li> </ul>
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		Climate change		Very little mention of any 'green ethos' and how this will be encouraged, especially with climate change now top of the world agenda?
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		Climate change		We would like to see many more specific and robust actions to achieve net zero emissions in all aspects of the Local Plan. In particular, all new commercial buildings and new-build housing should be designed to be carbon-neutral, including provision of the infrastructure for the widespread installation of solar panels
Swindon Climate Action Network	Local organisation		Climate change		<p>One of the most important aspects is energy is 'fabric first' efficient design, including airtightness, insulation, solar orientation, heat recovery ventilation (MVHR) and waste water heat recovery for showers.</p> <p>We would recommend including as much as possible of Chapter 13 of the Bristol local plan review draft</p>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		Climate change		Aim should be to reduce transport emissions, not merely to reduce their growth

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		Climate change		Detailed amendments to climate change topic paper proposed (consult original version) - suggestions for additional DAQs Objection to the dismissal of district heating
The Eco Committee of Ridgeway Sixth Form	Local organisation		Climate change		All policies should align with the objective of achieving net zero emissions. Carbon reduction targets are one way in which this can be achieved. States that there is a need for actions, not just aims.
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		Climate change		Council should stipulate that housing is build to 19% more efficient than building regulations.
1 x respondent	resident		Climate change		New developments should be designed to latest standard of energy efficiency.
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		Insufficient targets in local plan to address climate change - should include quantifiable, measurable targets, including on: - reforestation - car-pooling - electric car charge points - low carbon public transport - incentives to businesses and households to reduce emissions - supporting green energy projects - ensuring time-expired vehicles are replaced with low carbon alternatives - all approved planning applications should be carbon neutral
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		Contents of Local Plan supported - but should address climate change/environmental emergency
1 x respondent	resident		Climate change		Policies should require solar panels on all new buildings
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		Sustainable development principle should be strengthened in view of climate emergency Solar panels should be required on all suitable new builds Should not rely on passive solar benefits All new buildings should be zero carbon
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		Supports comments of extinction rebellion

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		Zero carbon homes should be encouraged
2 x respondents	resident		Climate Change		<p>Draft local Plan review is significantly weaker on climate change than current Local Plan 2026</p> <p>Removal of DE2 - Local Plan review should strengthen this policy/retain a policy relating to sustainable construction</p> <p>Failure to embed low carbon/climate change measures into policies for new communities/strategic allocations</p> <p>Draft local plan and climate change topic paper do not address legislative requirements for climate change, with ref to section 19 and of planning compulsory purchase act, para 149 nppf and climate change act amended 2019.</p> <p>Local target for carbon emissions reduction should be incorporated as core policy objective, and policy monitored annually</p> <p>Lack of a proactive approach to climate change</p> <p>Consider 'guidance and practice elsewhere' to inform climate change policy, as per specialist housing topic paper</p> <p>Ref to RTPi report 'planning for smart energy future' for policy guidance Fails to respond to NPPF para 35 re reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, resilience and low carbon energy</p>
4 x respondent	resident		Climate Change		<p>All housing should be required to be built to 'fabric first' principles including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maximising air-tightness</li> <li>- using high insulation</li> <li>- optimising solar gain</li> <li>- using thermal mass of building fabric to retain heat or cold</li> <li>- no gas boilers</li> </ul> <p>BREEAM 'excellent' standards or equivalent should be carried forwards</p> <p>higher density housing and commercial development should be encouraged</p> <p>refs to improving existing buildings has been dropped - local plan needs to strengthen measures to reduce energy</p>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>needs of the existing housing stock Should encourage use of low carbon, local and responsibly sourced materials</p>
4 x respondents	resident		Climate Change		<p>Local plan should set zero-emissions target by 2030 and evidence based policies within the local plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- should include steps to educate and change behaviour</li> <li>- should set policies that create clean economy</li> <li>- should set policies that reduce our negative impacts on the environment</li> <li>- should set policies for healthy and active communities</li> </ul> <p>Anything that does not contribute to these above goals should be refused</p> <p>Should set out carbon budgets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2030</p> <p>Reference in current local plan to "a local low carbon electricity target of 200MWe by 2020" has been deleted and not replaced - new target should be set</p> <p>Onus should be on developers to demonstrate why they can't meet emission reduction standards - increased cost/lower profitability not valid reason</p> <p>Ref to relevant legislation/legal duties e.g climate change act 2008, NPPF, EIA regulations, and 33A of PCPA</p> <p>Provisions of policies which have a positive impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing biodiversity and reducing environmental harm need to be incorporated into other policies.</p> <p>Refs to energy hierarchy have been dropped</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
4 x respondents	resident		Climate Change		Supports comments of extinction rebellion
1 x respondent	resident		Climate change topic paper		Suggests changes to climate change topic paper
The Ramblers	National organisation		CM2 removal		- policy CM2 should be reinstated
2 x respondents	resident		Coalescence		Identities and boundaries of villages and hamlets should be respected/strengthened
1 x respondent	resident		Coalescence		Non-coalescence areas should be strengthened
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Developer	Impact Planning Services	DM heritage	S0457 and S0461	National policy provides detailed guidance on the approach to be taken in determining application which affect the historic environment. Any duplication of this guidance should be avoided unless considering the impact or enhancement on a specific asset. In this context we would support the review of all Conservation Area appraisals and guidance documents, to provide up to date consideration of the relevant characteristics. The Conservation Area was designated in May 1973. The Appraisal and Management Plan may be accorded some limited weight, however it is acknowledged that they are particularly aged having been readopted in 2006 and is now some 13 years old.
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM1 Place Making Principles	Land north of A420 (NEV)	The proposed policy wording doesn't support this context specific approach advocated by the NPPF. Furthermore, a more general observation is the use of "must", which in effect removes any opportunity for an iterative design process to be achieved that is appropriate to the intrinsic characteristics of a scheme. Again, the NPPF uses "should", which allows for due consideration of an effective alternative.
1 x respondent	resident		DM1 Place Making Principles		Part a add reference to cyclists Part 3 - add bullet stating that tall buildings should be allocated a similar amount of adjacent public open space/public realm per dwelling as the average - fair access to open space for all

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		DM1 Place Making Principles		Should include ref to the protection and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity - plan should make it clear to developers that they must provide evidence on this basis
1 x respondent	resident		DM1 Place Making Principles		Should mention energy generation as well as energy efficiency
4 x respondent	resident		DM1 Place Making Principles		Ref to energy efficiency too narrow and no ref to energy hierarchy
CPRE	National organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		Should say <b>seek</b> rather than <b>take</b> opportunities for sustainable design. Include water conservation and use in the wording
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM1 Place Making Principles		To include a new design policy requiring emphasis on pedestrian movement and walkable connectivity through new developments whilst simultaneously proposing a 40mph 7m wide Southern Connector Road through what is termed a village appears to be conflicting and fragmented policy making. Whilst the intention is good, the practicality of delivery of both the design policy and the SCR proposals appear to be in conflict.
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		At para a introduce a presumption against any development which encourages car use, including permitting 'drive through' restaurants, cafes and fast food outlets. Promote cycling and cycle infrastructure (as well as prioritising pedestrians) as part of placemaking for health and environmental reasons. - supported but should be expanded to cover a 'building fabric first' approach to encourage ultra-efficient buildings which also have renewable generation on site to cover all energy needs. At para e add 'and to enhance biodiversity'
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM1 Place Making Principles		Support, the approach to new development is positive. There is a lack of examples of what the requirements mean. What does 'passive surveillance' and 'active frontages' mean?
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		DM1 f) very loose policy giving little to conservation and enhancement of the AONB. Development should be

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					responsive to the context of the natural, built and historic environment
Salisbury and Wilton Swift Group/North Wiltshire Swift Group	Local Organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		Suggested amendment - "design should integrate biodiversity enhancements for species which inhabit the built environment. Examples of mitigation by design include integral swift bricks, house martin cups, hedgehog highways and bat boxes etc. Such inclusions are demonstrated to improve the wellbeing of residents as well as meeting the biodiversity net gain criteria."
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		Cycling provision can have a highly significant, beneficial impact on place making. Towns and cities which prioritise cycling (by investing significant resources in cycling infrastructure and soft measures to encourage cycling) can reap significant benefits for congestion, pollution, air quality, personal health, community feeling and the local economy. - a. Add "prioritise cycling", for health, environmental and public realm reasons. Throughout the Local Plan, any reference to prioritising cycling should mean that the needs of people on bikes are given more weight than the needs of people in vehicles: design decisions should be taken in favour of cycling.
The Ramblers	National organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		Support emphasis on walker friendly environments
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM1 Place Making Principles		Strongly support the sustainability aspirations across these principles but suggest adding to the end of para e. "as part of a strategic approach to green infrastructure"
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		DM1 Place Making Principles		- Wroughton parish would actively discourage the build of generic and bland housing models built and sold at the edge of town suburbs across the UK. - each dwelling should have one street tree planted between the curtilage of the dwelling house and the road - To provide combined utility services to any new development using the minimum NJUG requirements to contain all utility apparatus

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
CPRE	National organisation		DM1 ro DM4		New design policy/a new design guide should be informed by para 102 d) and e) of the NPPF to reflect changes in lifestyles over the plan period
Gladman	Land promoter		DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	Draft policies DM1, DM2, DM3 and DM4 set a range of design principles for development proposals to follow. Consideration should be given to further condensing the number of policies that are proposed here, which are in some instances repetitive. This is particularly the case for Policy DM3, which relates to large scale developments which will also be the subject of criteria contained within specific allocations policies (such as SA1, SA2 and SA3
CJV Properties Ltd	Landowner	Impact	DM10 Land Uses Within Centres	s0101	Support policy, which reflects the radically changing economic environment affecting town centres across the UK
McDonalds Restaurants	Developer	Planware LTD	DM11 Hot Food Takeaways, Drinking Establishments, Betting Offices and Payday Loan Shops		there is no sound justification for the policy. Point 2, which imposes a blanket ban on restaurants that include an element of A5 use "within 400-metres walking distance of an existing or proposed primary or secondary school entrance." Point 2 is unsound it should be deleted from the plan.
CJV Properties Ltd	Landowner	Impact	DM12 Supporting the Night Time Economy	s0101	Oppose policy, This policy is too restrictive and therefore there is a need to widen the application of this policy so that it can apply to a wider area of the town centre
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM12 Supporting the Night Time Economy		Policy should refer to night bus services
Theatres Trust	National organisation		DM12 Supporting the Night Time Economy		Support
Gladman	Land promoter		DM13 Residential Standards	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	It is important that any such policy approach is fully justified in relation to need and clearly taken into account through evidence of whole plan viability.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM13 Residential Standards	Land north of A420 (NEV)	in order to adopt the optional technical standard of the NDSS, the LPA should have a rigorous assessment outlining the need, viability and consider the timing of such proposals. the requirement for all dwellings to be built to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards at this stage is not sufficiently justified, effective or consistent with national policy and so should be deleted as a requirement. HHT object to the application of stringent requirements associated with the design and layout of apartments as prescribed at point 2, which should be supplemented by additional wording to ensure the policy is effective and justified: "...taking account of viability and/or wider planning considerations and site-specific considerations".
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM13 Residential Standards	North Star	Flexibility required. in dense urban developments other single aspect units are acceptable as a matter of principle. 8 units - Alternative ways to provide this is to make naturally lit, wider corridors, potentially with seating areas, and for there to be concierges in reception. In dense urban developments outside the town centre, such as North Star, there should be flexibility to provide 5 sq m balconies plus play space, public realm and incidental private open space on roofs, podiums etc.
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	DM13 Residential Standards	Pry Farm	do not support the inclusion of policies which restate national standards
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	DM13 Residential Standards	S0032	A more flexible approach is required. It would be reasonable to state that "1. All residential development including extensions must meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. 2. Apartments must also, where possible

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM13 Residential Standards	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	<p>No evidence to demonstrate the 'need' for the use of the NDSS in Swindon or whether there is a particular problem with the size of new residential properties coming forward, including new builds, conversions or changes of use that is causing 'harm'.</p> <p>Implementing the NDSS will impact on viability owing to the relationships between unit size, build costs cost per square metre and selling costs per square metre.</p> <p>Increased cost to consumer reducing choice at the entry level of the market and will impact on affordability. Larger homes will impact on density and reduce the assumed number of dwellings on sites - impact on delivery of infrastructure; S.106 and CIL contributions and housing.</p> <p>Should the Council pursue this policy it's introduction should be phased in over the plan period to allow the implications of the policy to be factored into those land deals still to be secured.</p>
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	DM13 Residential Standards		<p>Objection (policy is unjustified): at present the draft policy is unjustified and contrary to NPPG0020 (Reference ID: 56-020-20150327) which requires evidence of need, viability and timing to adopt the nationally described space standards.</p>
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	DM13 Residential Standards		<p>No justification is provided for policy</p>
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM13 Residential Standards		<p>Support</p>
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM13 Residential Standards		<p>- nationally described space standard has potential to delay delivery of NEV. They support the HBF view that if the NDSS is adopted then transitional policy arrangements need to be put in place.</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM13 Residential Standards		To para 2a add: Include natural ventilation or mechanical or other heat recovery and ventilation systems aligned to efforts to reduce emissions of residential developments At para 2c include requirement for drying rooms or shared spaces for line drying of clothes to reduce emissions from tumble driers.
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM13 Residential Standards		No need for NDSS demonstrated. No evidence homes that don't meet NDSS are not selling or purchasers are dissatisfied. - requiring NDSS could undermine delivery of starter homes for first time buyers - NDSS reduces density and increases land take, - may have adverse affect on affordability for first time buyers and therefore delivery rates - if NDSS introduced there should be transitional arrangements as land deals underpinning strategic allocations didn't factor in NDSS
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM13 Residential Standards		Should not to be included in Development Plan just because a Council considers them to be desirable It will also be necessary for the LPA to demonstrate that the cost burden associated with this has been tested as part of the whole plan viability assessment. Concern over delivery of entry level housing
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM13 Residential Standards		no justification for Policy DM 13 and relates to a table which is likely to be out of date during the plan period.
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM13 Residential Standards		objection to the proposed introduction of space standards. The Council should take account of the impact of potentially larger dwellings on land supply and consider impacts on the affordability of new homes coming onto the market. With regards to paragraph 2 of this draft policy, Persimmon Homes raises concern about introducing such an inflexible policy for the design of apartments. If the Council does intend to introduce the nationally described space standard, it should set out a reasonable transitional period following adoption to enable developers to factor the cost of space standards into future land acquisitions.



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					The policy should also be subject to viability assessment in line with national planning guidance.
Retirement Housing Consortium	Developers	The Planning Bureau Ltd	DM13 Residential Standards		Part 2 of the policy does precisely the opposite in adding additional requirements that go beyond the technical standards that can be applied in prescribing that (a) single aspect units "must only be east, west or south facing" (b) must include additional mitigating measures (c) avoid long internal corridors with no natural light (d) "ensure each core serves no more than 8 units per floor"; (e ) have access to specified levels of open space and specific widths to balconies. Part2 of Policy DM13 should be deleted as it is (a) not justified or effective (b) runs contrary to national policy and guidance (c) has not been viability tested.
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM13 Residential Standards		Blanket National Described Space Standards - undermine viability of development schemes and result in fewer affordable homes. - many households may not desire or require housing that meets these standards - higher rental and heating costs. - to implement across all residential development - must demonstrate that it is being done to address a clearly evidenced need
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		DM13 Residential Standards		Support
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM13 Residential Standards		Policy should refer to requirement for bicycle parking
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	DM13 Residential Standards		Inflexible - does not allow site specific constraints to be taken into account - recommended alteration: - 1. all residential development including extensions should, where possible, meet the Nationally Described

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
					Space Standards' - 2. Apartments must also, where possible....
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM14 Mix and Density		Oppose market led approach to mix, say this will just lead to most profitable being built
Gladman	Land promoter		DM14 Mix and Density	Land at Shrivenham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	Broadly supportive.
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM14 Mix and Density	Land north of A420 (NEV)	HHT support the Council's approach to adopt a market-led approach to housing mix
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	DM14 Mix and Density	S0032	Support
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM14 Mix and Density	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Pegasus draw attention to the need to set space standards in accordance with paragraph 123 of the NPPF (2019) however it may transpire that an inflexible approach to minimum gross densities may not provide the variety of typologies required to meet the housing needs of different groups for the plan period. In some instances it may be necessary to consider a lower density and the policy should provide flexibility for such matters to be considered on a case by case basis.
On behalf of	Land owner	Impact Planning Services	DM14 Mix and Density	S0454	It is important that any attempt to establish a housing mix requirement (such as that proposed in Policy DM 14) should include provision for lower density high value housing. This form of development would have to be at a significantly lower density than the minimum densities currently set out within Policy DM 14

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
On behalf of	Land Owner	Impact Planning Services	DM14 Mix and Density	S0455	The Borough needs to encourage the provision of higher value (non-estate) lower density homes in the Borough – particularly adjacent those towns and villages with an attractive setting. This meets the requirement in the NPPF paragraph 61, which states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. In accordance with the social objective for sustainable development set out in paragraph 8 of the NPPF, the needs of the present and future generations for homes is required to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. It is important that small to medium sites are brought forward to meet current local demand and that emerging policy identifies the need to meet this requirement.
1 x respondent	resident		DM14 Mix and Density		There needs to be an assessment into the needs for different dwellings types/sizes, which should be referred to.
1 x respondent	resident		DM14 Mix and Density		Part 1 - does not support - this paragraph should be replaced - cannot give the responsibility of mix and density of housing to be decided on developers calculations, based on profit
1 x respondent	resident		DM14 Mix and Density		Does not support market led approach to housing mix - suggests there will be overprovision of 4-5 bed dwellings
Capital Land	Land promoter	Ridge	DM14 Mix and Density		- policy shouldn't set minimum densities
CPRE	National organisation		DM14 Mix and Density		- policy should be widened to include designs for other groups who may need a variety of dwelling sizes but don't fall under 'specialist housing'. - object to a market led approach to policy - say minimum densities should be accompanied by a new approach to landscape and street design
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM14 Mix and Density		Agree with HBF comments, concern about impact of density policy on viability

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM14 Mix and Density		We support the ability for the housing mix to be developer lead for this ensures diversity of housing mix across jurisdictions better able to respond to market led housing demand in the area.
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM14 Mix and Density		Haydon Wick is urban so we expect a high density of new homes. High density housing will be perfect for walking and cycling as the residents are concentrated together but design and layout will need to be carefully controlled.
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM14 Mix and Density		Support - setting minimum densities across the area not in accordance with NPPF, may be necessary on case by case basis to consider where a lower density may be more appropriate.
Keith Hillyard	Land owner	Gary Llewellyn	DM14 Mix and Density		Object. Needs policy reference to housing for families (3+ bedrooms), housing for executives (5+ bedrooms), housing for students and housing for self/custom builders. Suggested wording: 1. The unit type and size mix of market housing will be determined by developers in response to market demand, subject to compliance with Policy DM13 (on national space standards), to meet the needs of all sectors in the local community, including those with specialist requirements. All major development (of 10 or more units) comprising dwellings (with the exception of specialist housing developments) should provide some variety of dwelling sizes, to facilitate choice in the marketplace to create a mixed community 2. The unit size mix of social or affordable rented housing should be determined in consultation with the Borough Council's Housing Department and be based on the most up to date evidence of need. 3. The unit size mix of self-build/custom housing will have regard to the Borough Council's self build and custom housebuilding register (as required by the 2015 Act, as amended) and demonstrate a personal connection with the chosen location.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>4. The provision of housing through conversion, intensification, extension and replacement must have regard to the impact, both individually and collectively, on the surrounding area and its sensitivity to change.</p> <p>5. The minimum gross residential densities using local character and a transect-based approach are set out in the table below. Maximum densities are not defined and appropriate densities should be determined based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. accessibility to services and facilities on foot and by cycle, and access to the quality and quantity of public transport provision;</li> <li>b. ability to achieve applicable car and cycle residential parking standards;</li> <li>c. maximum densities consistent with achieving high quality design; and</li> <li>d. privacy, security and sunlight/daylight penetration.</li> </ul>
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM14 Mix and Density		Support
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM14 Mix and Density		Policy DM 14 Mix and Density – whilst it is noted that the policy states that ‘...the unit size mix of market housing will be determined by developers in response to market demand’, the policy then goes on to contradict that statement by setting minimum densities

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Messrs Slattery, Gallagher and Hall	Land owners	Gary Llewellyn	DM14 Mix and Density		<p>Object. Needs policy reference to housing for families (3+ bedrooms), housing for executives (5+ bedrooms), housing for students and housing for self/custom builders.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The unit type and size mix of market housing will be determined by developers in response to market demand, subject to compliance with Policy DM13 (on national space standards), to meet the needs of all sectors in the local community, including those with specialist requirements. All major development (of 10 or more units) comprising dwellings (with the exception of specialist housing developments) should provide some variety of dwelling sizes, to facilitate choice in the marketplace to create a mixed community</li> <li>2. The unit size mix of social or affordable rented housing should be determined in consultation with the Borough Council's Housing Department and be based on the most up to date evidence of need.</li> <li>3. The unit size mix of self-build/custom housing will have regard to the Borough Council's self-build and custom housebuilding register (as required by the 2015 Act, as amended) and demonstrate a personal connection with the chosen location.</li> <li>4. The provision of housing through conversion, intensification, extension and replacement must have regard to the impact, both individually and collectively, on the surrounding area and its sensitivity to change.</li> <li>5. The minimum gross residential densities using local character and a transect-based approach are set out in the table below. Maximum densities are not defined and appropriate densities should be determined based on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. accessibility to services and facilities on foot and by cycle, and access to the quality and quantity of public transport provision;</li> <li>b. ability to achieve applicable car and cycle residential parking standards;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>c. maximum densities consistent with achieving high quality design; and</p> <p>d. privacy, security and sunlight/daylight penetration.</p>
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM14 Mix and Density		<p>Wording of part 2 - requires pre-application discussions - considered not acceptable.</p> <p>Should set a policy to deliver a sufficient mix of all house types, tenures and restrictions to meet specific needs, referencing most up to date evidence, and allow developers to demonstrate how proposals will meet needs in accordance with evidence.</p>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM14 Mix and Density		<p>Para 3.a. should refer to access by bicycle</p>
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM14 Mix and Density		<p>The Local Plan should encourage specialised housing for adults with learning disabilities, the elderly and teenagers leaving care</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	DM14 Mix and Density		Support flexible approach to housing mix Support flexible approach to site density part 3b - needs to be flexible enough to allow development to come forward with reduced parking provision, where it is sustainably located and appropriate - suggests removal or rewording
Gladman	Land promoter		DM15 Affordable Housing	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	The evidence underpinning this requirement will need to be kept up-to-date as the plan making process progresses and the viability of delivering this level of affordable housing tested alongside all other policy requirements associated with the emerging plan. The ability of the final housing allocations within the plan to support the Council in meeting the affordable housing needs of the area will also be a key consideration as plan making progresses.
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM15 Affordable Housing	North Star	It is considered that Part 1 of this policy should acknowledge that lower amounts of affordable housing may be acceptable where they can be supported by a viability assessment. This is normal practice.
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	DM15 Affordable Housing	S0032	notes that no viability evidence has been produced in support of this consultation
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM15 Affordable Housing	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Evidence underpinning the DM15 may not reflect the most up to date affordable housing need across the Borough.
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM15 Affordable Housing	S0429	An additional criterion should be added to allow for viability assessments to be submitted and agreed with the LPA to deliver lower levels of affordable housing, where this has been proven necessary
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	DM15 Affordable Housing	S0457	Further diversification of the housing market in Swindon is required. While the needs of new entrants to the housing market and those who cannot afford market, housing is covered to a degree in the Affordable Housing policy (DM 15), there is no recognition of the need for Higher Value housing, as explained above. The socio-economic balance is uneven at least as evidenced by the physical type of stock of housing accommodation shows and the Plan



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					should introduce policies such as the need for low density high value homes as a means of helping broaden the social mix within communities in Swindon.
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	DM15 Affordable Housing	S0462, and S0461	The requirement to provide 30% affordable housing on sites of 10 dwellings or more or over 0.5ha through Emerging Policy DM15 is supported. This policy should however, reflect the definition of affordable dwellings within the NPPF Annex 2: Glossary. This includes starter homes and discounted market sales housing to meet a range of needs across the district and affordable routes to home ownership.
1 x respondent	resident		DM15 Affordable Housing		Questions how to prevent applications coming in just below threshold
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM15 Affordable Housing		Suggest affordable housing percentage should be higher in locations where there is lots of employment and lower elsewhere
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	DM15 Affordable Housing		Lack of evidence of impact of affordable housing requirement for C2 self-contained, needs to be considered in whole plan viability exercise
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM15 Affordable Housing		Need to update evidence on affordable housing. New policy needs to be viability tested Support lower affordable housing requirement in Swindon town centre
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM15 Affordable Housing		Policy DM15 Affordable Housing – concerned that neither the policy nor its supporting text mentions the issue of viability, particularly where sites are required to provide significant infrastructure
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM15 Affordable Housing		- lower threshold of 5 or fewer dwellings in AONB should be written into the policy

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM15 Affordable Housing		Objects to the policy as currently worded as it not justified or consistent with national policy. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that planning policies should expect "at least" 10% of homes to be available for affordable home ownership as part of the overall affordable housing contribution. The policy as currently worded seeks to place a cap the tenure mix on all developments of 10 homes or more. This is presumably not the intention of this policy as paragraph 2 states that affordable housing mix and tenure should reflect current need as advised by the Council's housing officer. If retained as currently proposed, all elements of this policy should be subject to a viability assessment of the Plan.
RentPlus UK Ltd	National organisation	Tetlow King	DM15 Affordable Housing		Support policy - Development Control Guidance Note needs to be updated to reflect new evidence and new NPPF 2019 - errors in para 3.49 of supporting text
Retirement Housing Consortium	Developers	The Planning Bureau Ltd	DM15 Affordable Housing		The Policy should not be pursued any further until such a time that its impact on viability, and particularly that of specialised housing for older people has been properly assessed. for this reason alone, policy DM15 must be found unsound as it is not in compliance with paragraph 35 of the NPPF in so far as it not justified nor consistent with national policy and guidance. Additionally, its extension to forms of Extra Care accommodation should also be removed
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM15 Affordable Housing		Part 3 of policy DM15 - should be reworded to align with NPPF para 64 - at least 10% homes on site should be available as affordable ownership (as part of overall affordable housing contribution of site). - part 4 of policy - recent appeal decisions - not appropriate for the Council to seek affordable housing contributions from C2 extra care. lack of evidence to support at present
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	DM15 Affordable Housing		- does not support affordable housing targets to self contained units within C2 - no evidence/viability assessment provided to justify . NPPF para 64 re

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					exemptions where proposed specialist accommodation. - older persons housing vary significantly in terms of standard models of development of sale
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM15 Affordable Housing		Seek affordable housing based on future need (31%) and ideally set a target closer to 40%
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM16 Housing for Older People	North Star	the requirement for 50 % units to be designed to Reg M4 (3) may be unduly onerous depending on the age of the residents and level of care. There are many forms of housing for older people and where it for the more able with less warden control, there should be less onerous restrictions. The policy should be amended accordingly.
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	DM16 Housing for Older People	S0455	Additional draft policy wording supplied. Whilst the introduction of the new Policy DM 16 is welcomed, it cannot be taken forward in its current form. It is important to recognise that there is a range of accommodation necessary to meet the housing needs of older people. For example, a condition such as: 'On the site hereby approved, other than the manager's or warden's accommodation, all other dwellings shall be occupied only by; - Persons over 55 years of age - Persons living as part of a single household with such a person or persons; or - Persons who were living as part of a single household with such a person or persons but who have since died Reason: The units of the residential accommodation have been designed for occupation by persons who satisfy the above criteria and are unsuitable for family housing',
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	DM16 Housing for Older People	S0455	Allocation of sites is also required. A second new policy is proposed which can be adapted to each particular site. Draft wording supplied/
1 x respondent	resident		DM16 Housing for Older People		Apartments not supported - isolate people with limited mobility
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact	DM16 Housing for Older People	s0456	Support but not in present form - policy should identify sites, particularly for 'country club'

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
					style housing with s106 age restriction, proposed policy wording suggested
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	DM16 Housing for Older People		Supported but should identify specific sites
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM16 Housing for Older People		it is especially important that any new housing for older people is built to zero carbon standards as it reduces fuel poverty and the costs of living and ensures healthy temperatures can be maintained.
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM16 Housing for Older People		There is a lot of elderly residents in the parish which means they need accommodation suited for them. Disabled residents may need bungalows as climbing stairs is tricky. Bungalows are also wheelchair friendly.
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM16 Housing for Older People		Policy needs to be justified by Swindon-specific evidence to meet requirements of PPG, generalised evidence of an ageing population is insufficient - policy needs to be viability tested

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Messrs Slattery, Gallagher and Hall	Land owners	Gary Llewellyn	DM16 Housing for Older People		<p>Object: policy needs to reflect the definition of older people in the Revised NPPF which acknowledges that this can include those who are very “active” to those who are “frail”. This means that accessibility to what the Topic Paper sees as essential services (i.e. public transport, retail, medical, leisure, social) will vary depending on the personal health and capabilities of the older person so that some will walk or cycle to them and some will need help by using a mobility scooter or wheelchair. Suggest policy wording:</p> <p>1. In order to meet the needs of an ageing population, defined as those being 55 years of age and above, the Council encourages the provision of a range of specialist housing types (including extra personal care, retirement living apartments and mainstream housing such as bungalows and sheltered housing) that should be well integrated into the local community.</p> <p>2. Proposals will be permitted where they:</p> <p>a. are accessible to local facilities and services by a range of transport options including the existing and proposed walking, cycling and public transport networks; and b. can demonstrate that they have been designed to meet the specific needs of occupants with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· individual dwellings with inbuilt flexibility (in accordance with the optional Building Regulations M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and adaptable dwellings) in order to enable easy adaptation to meet changing needs over time; and</li> <li>· at least 50% of dwellings suitable for occupation by wheelchair users, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users (in accordance with the optional Building Regulations M4(3) Category 3: Wheelchair user dwellings); and</li> <li>· all communal spaces and facilities (both internal and external) provided as fully mobile and wheelchair accessible;</li> <li>· where appropriate, provision is made for the convenient and secure storage of mobility scooters (including charging</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>points) and wheelchairs; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· suitable measures to create a safe and secure environment”.</li> </ul>
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM16 Housing for Older People		<p>Objects to the requirement for all new housing to be delivered in accordance with the optional Building Regulations M4(2) Standard as this policy is not justified in the Specialist Housing Topic Paper. This is considered to be excessive and not consistent with national planning policy as the NPPF prescribes that the need for additional optional standards must be clearly evidenced. The proposal to increase the percentage of new housing which must meet the M4(3) standard is also not justified. Persimmon Homes does not object to the threshold for meeting this policy being reduced from 50 to 25 dwellings as the identification of a 50 dwelling threshold appeared in any case to arbitrary. The application of the existing 2% policy requirement to a reduced 25 dwelling threshold would ensure that all residential developments of 25 dwellings or greater should include dwelling(s) designed</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					for wheelchair users. If retained, all elements of this policy should be subject to a viability assessment of the Plan in line with national planning guidance.
Retirement Housing Consortium	Developers	The Planning Bureau Ltd	DM16 Housing for Older People		Part 1 of the Policy be amended as follows: In order to meet the needs of an ageing population the Council encourages the provision of a range of specialist housing types, including extra care and , retirement housing <del>apartments and mainstream housing such as bungalows and sheltered housing</del> . That Part 2 (B), bullet points 1 to 3 be deleted as they are not justified or effective (b) run contrary to national policy and guidance (c) have not been viability tested.
Retirement Housing Consortium	Developers	The Planning Bureau Ltd	DM16 Housing for Older People		Policies need to facilitate the delivery of specialist housing for older people and not hinder it. Lack of viability assessment
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM16 Housing for Older People		Support, provided granny annexes don't become separate dwellings, suggest insert promoting executive homes to ensure money stays in Swindon
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM16 Housing for Older People		Concerns re: affordable for C2 reiterated
Swindon Area Committee of WALC	Local organisation		DM16 Housing for Older People		Support, but highlight need to ensure that there is a robust defence against applications that seek subsequently to turn granny annexes into separate dwellings
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM16 Housing for Older People		- para 2.a. should refer to access by bicycle, many older people cycle

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Swindon Equality Action Group	Local organisation		DM16 Housing for Older People		- there should be one policy DM16 that covers accessible and adaptable dwellings i.e. merge DM16 and DM17
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	DM16 Housing for Older People		- could identify allocations for such accommodation at each settlement (inc Blunsdon)
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM17 Accessible Housing	Land north of A420 (NEV)	Objects to Policy DM17 a) and b) as drafted. A requirement to provide all new housing in accordance with optional Building Regulations M4(2): Cat 2 Accessible and Adaptable dwellings is considerably onerous and is not supported by any technical evidence that suggests it responds to an identified need and does not affect the overall viability of schemes. The implications of which in relation to plot size, parking requirements and overall scheme density are significant, and would severely compromise not only the viability of the site but also the ability for development to deliver in line with approved outline parameters. Policy DM17(b) requiring proposals for 25 dwellings and above to accommodate wheelchair users is not effective, nor justified, because of the precise nature of the requirement (10%). As the supporting text makes clear the needs of wheelchair users and matching supply to occupants is inherently complex. The appropriateness of a given level of housing on a particular site will reflect a variety of circumstances including the accessibility of the site as a whole but also potential alternative provision for particular needs including the elderly or mobility impaired. There is a better construction using the thresholds articulated in the current policy which requires all developments to demonstrate how they have taken into account the needs of all groups, including wheelchair users, and which recognises that the need for and scale of provision for wheelchair users will vary. As such suggest Policy DM17 is amended to read: "Development proposals for 50 dwellings or more should demonstrate how the proposals take account of the needs of those with impaired mobility including through the range and choice of housing



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>available. The Council will seek, where appropriate, to negotiate up to 2% of the dwellings to be suitable for those with impaired mobility including provision of homes in accordance with M4(2) Category 2 (Accessible and Adaptable dwellings), having regard to development specific context and scheme viability”.</p>
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM17 Accessible Housing	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	<p>It is clear that should the need in Swindon for accessible housing be as great as the emerging policy requires that a greater percentage of accessible housing would have been achieved in the past two years through the development management process, both through appeal decisions and those applications negotiated by the local planning authority. This might be a result of the Council’s limited evidence on the existing need for M4(2) and M4(3) standards and therefore the emerging policy is not in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, as set above. Moreover, any requirement for higher optional standards, especially for M4(3) should be thoroughly viability tested, such requirements can only be set for those dwellings over which the Council has housing nomination rights as set out in the NPPG</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		DM17 Accessible Housing		<p>part a - recommends changing to all dwellings, rather than 10 or more</p> <p>part b - recommends maximum number viable</p> <p>part 2 - recommended alteration ; "where through lifts are to be provided, these should be located in circulation space i.e. hallway/landing with the safety off the user and fellow dwelling occupants in mind."</p> <p>part 4 - recommended alteration: "the council will support the provision of proposals for housing designed to meet the needs of other groups of disabled people where providers can show their design meets the requirements of the specific group."</p>
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	DM17 Accessible Housing		<p>Objection (policy is unjustified): at present the draft policy is unjustified and contrary to NPPG009. There is no clear evidence of need or viability as the NPPG requires. Whilst the 2017 SHMA (para. 5.88) recommends that all new housing should meet Category 2 standards it is caveated: "the evidence supports the need for all dwellings to meet Category 2 requirements, providing that this does not compromise viability." (emphasis added). At present there is no viability evidence.</p>
Hills	Land promoter	Pro-vision	DM17 Accessible Housing		<p>Our understanding of how this draft policy would operate is that, with the policy in place, SBC would not impose a condition requiring compliance with optional requirement M4(2) for any scheme of less than 10 dwellings. In Hill's view the threshold should be 25 dwellings having regard to the viability of residential development in the Borough. The proportion of Accessible and adaptable dwellings to be provided on larger developments (+25 units) should be evidence based, having regard to the viability of provision. The "Specialist Housing Topic Paper" (July 2019) acknowledges that "the effects on viability will need to be tested for all these options". Until that viability testing has been completed the draft policy cannot be "justified".</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM17 Accessible Housing		Policy needs to be justified by Swindon-specific evidence to meet requirements of PPG, generalised evidence of an ageing population is insufficient Policy needs to be viability tested Bullet point 3 should be deleted as is an additional requirement beyond the national technical standards
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM17 Accessible Housing		Does not provide sufficient evidence to show that this increase is necessary and justified. Furthermore, it has not been shown that this has been tested as part of a whole plan viability assessment.
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM17 Accessible Housing		supported - however should consider site constraints/other benefits of proposals. Needs to show robust evidence/viability testing
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM17 Accessible Housing		Accessible developments should include provision for storing disability adapted cycles.
Swindon Equality Action Group	Local organisation		DM17 Accessible Housing		There should be one policy DM16 that covers accessible and adaptable dwellings i.e. merge DM16 and DM17 - para 1.b. should set the threshold at 20 dwellings - seek additional text on wheelchair housing, people who use a wheelchair inside their homes. It generally needs to be on one level and, in addition to easy access, it has above average space standards in order to allow full wheelchair manoeuvre throughout. All wheelchair units should be accessible by lift where the dwelling entrance is not at ground level. These units should be evenly distributed throughout the development and should cater for a varying number of occupants. It is also important to note that in all new developments, dwellings should be visitable.
1 x respondent	resident		DM18 Annex Accommodation		-Suggest change of language from 'granny annex' to 'annex accommodation'
CPRE	National organisation		DM19 Agricultural Workers' Dwellings		- Instead of having a. and c. as separate requirements there should be one requirement for functional and financial evidence to demonstrate the present and

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					projected need. A Business Plan. Instead of having a. and c. as separate requirements there should be one requirement for functional and financial evidence to demonstrate the present and projected need. A Business Plan.
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM19 Agricultural Workers' Dwellings		- This policy should explicitly allow for very low impact/self-sufficient developments and dwellings for people who live off the land or gain the majority of their income from working within the land area, be it in agriculture or not.
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	DM1-DM4	Pry Farm	do not support detailed and prescriptive design policies. The thrust of these policies is already set out in national planning guidance and the application of local vernacular in design is set out in the Swindon Residential Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Guidance) and it is not necessary for it to be set out again in the Local Plan, The sub-provisions of the DM policies are highly subjective rather than providing measurable guidance as to the design outputs required.
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		Should include ref to the protection and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity - plan should make it clear to developers that they must provide evidence on this basis
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		support, although fails to require a standard for energy and water efficiency
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		Should prevent standard volume housebuilder layouts/design
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		building layouts should maximise solar gain in winter and minimise in summer - south orientated roofs - provision for battery storage
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		consider design for energy efficiency

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- plan should reference energy efficiency of buildings.</li> <li>- e.g. triple glazing, insulation, heat pumps, solar panels, optimal orientation of buildings, use of renewables, space for recycling and growing food, waste water and water capture</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		<p>concern that there is no account for energy efficiency in the design of buildings, or consideration of water reduction in line with NPPF para 150</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- suggests that development must justify the energy used to complete them</li> <li>- suggests applicants should carry out an energy assessment, and identify a cost/contributions to organisations for carbon offset/local greening projects</li> <li>- policies should require rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		DM2 Design of Buildings		<p>policies should ensure new housing developments are water and energy efficient e.g. grey water recycling systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- omission of such measures not in line with declared climate emergency</li> </ul>
CPRE	National organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		Policy should identify energy conservation and generation targets
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		Add: incorporate safe and dry bike parking wherever possible. support biodiversity through planting requirements.
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM2 Design of Buildings		<p>The question of high quality, well-functioning, visually attractive architecture is surely very subjective; what looks attractive to one, may not be so to another; are there any themes they would like to see i.e. Cotswold stone in 'x' % of housing/new developments? There is no reference of any 'green' themes; are they going to insist on a green build approach?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no examples provided of what durable materials means</li> <li>- The plan states that building should be 'appropriate scale to other buildings in their vicinity in terms of height and mass' this, on face value, contrasts with the plan to</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>'minimise the amount of land used for development?'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An appropriate relationship with neighbouring buildings'; does this mean they need to all look the same?</li> <li>- no reference to health, wellbeing or accessibility which are referred to in NPPF</li> <li>- To make a town attractive /memorable do you not need some diverse and exciting developments. Pushing the boundaries of design and build? Do they want Swindon to aspire to anywhere, or to promote a green /environmental stance?</li> </ul>
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM2 Design of Buildings		whilst the principle of the policy is worthy, it uses subjective measures to establish what is acceptable
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		Para e. Including storage / parking for cycles, as per adopted parking standards.
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		<p>propose stronger energy efficiency standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New build residential development shall achieve reductions in CO2 emissions of 19% below the Target Emission Rate of the 2013 Edition of the 2010 Building Regulations.</li> <li>- All new non-residential buildings shall achieve the BREEAM "Excellent" rating.</li> <li>- All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how internal overheating will be avoided by the use of passive cooling and ventilation.</li> <li>- New residential developments will be monitored by random post-construction testing to ensure that measured energy consumption is in line with modelled performance.</li> <li>- All new developments (including single buildings) shall source a minimum of 25% of their total energy requirement from generation on site.</li> </ul>
Theatres Trust	National organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		Support the policy, in particular agent of change principle

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM2 Design of Buildings		There should be a requirement for the use of sustainable materials given the carbon intensive nature of new development and scale of development planned. For example South Somerset's Local Plan which says that the procurement of locally grown timber to the UK Woodland Assurance Standard should be supported.
Gladman	Land promoter		DM20 Housing on Retail Parks	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	As currently drafted, the policy provides very little guidance as to the appropriateness of redevelopment proposals of this nature. The Council should consider a criteria based policy approach that allows the positive consideration of such proposals, but ensures that they are tested in the context of wider sustainability criteria such as access to education facilities and employment, design requirements and measures to ensure that such proposals do not lead to isolated enclaves of residential development coming forward which could promote unsustainable patterns of travel
1 x respondent	resident		DM20 Housing on Retail Parks		Concentration of leisure uses not supported outside the centres. However, there is a need for local youth facilities. - suggests policy linked to DM31
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM20 Housing on Retail Parks		Support change
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		DM21 Gypsy and traveller		concern about vandalism and ASB at Chiseldon Firs - suggest gypsy and traveller site at Honda
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land promoter		DM22 Transport and Development	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	Broadly supportive of the proposal to consolidate policies TR1 and TR2 into the single new policy DM22

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM22 Transport and Development	Land north of A420 (NEV)	Considers that clarification is required to point 7, in relation to electric vehicle charging points, which the policy refers to accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards, reference should also be made to national guidance and policy and the inclusion of other low-emission vehicles.
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM22 Transport and Development	S0429	Should be amended so that it reflects the tests in NPPF paragraph 109 where development should not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or lead to a situation where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Similarly, when considering mitigation (criterion 6) the same threshold should be applied and not one that requires nil detriment
1 x respondent	resident		DM22 Transport and Development		provision for ev charging should involve making it possible to adapt, rather than automatically providing a charging point
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact	DM22 Transport and Development	s0456	Support emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	DM22 Transport and Development		Objection (policy conflicts with NPPF): criteria 6 sets out that 'any' adverse impacts should be mitigated arising from construction and operational stages. However, the NPPF109 test is whether impacts would be 'severe'. The policy should be amended.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM22 Transport and Development		This transport assessments should be a policy requirement, not guidance - concern transport assessments don't adequately assess cumulative impacts
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	DM22 Transport and Development		Object: policy uses subjective measures to establish what is required
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		DM22 Transport and Development		suggest adding following text to policy: "Due consideration should be given during the planning process where development is proposed in small villages or hamlets that have no facilities, limited public transport or where it would be unsafe to access facilities in nearby settlements by



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					walking or cycling by reason of having to use rural unlit roads with no footways.”
members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a target for transitioning transport emissions to zero by 2030 should be included in the plan</li> <li>- a sustainable transport hierarchy should be included in the plan: avoiding the need to travel, supporting safe separate walking and cycling provision, using public transport and improving public transport provision, better integrating private transport with the train and long distance bus networks, supporting zero emissions private transport</li> <li>- SBC should invest significant resources in cycling infrastructure and soft measures to encourage cycling and adopt design management policies which give the needs of people on cycles higher priority than people in vehicles.</li> <li>- investment in the provision of quality public transport should be a principle of the plan, as in Greater Manchester Spatial Framework draft</li> <li>- references to an express bus network should be reinstated</li> <li>- Local Plan should stipulate a minimum of 30% EVCP</li> <li>- a schedule requiring the provision of car club spaces should be set out in the plan</li> </ul>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		generally very good. What this means is that new development should make it easy to walk and cycle and more difficult to drive and park - this should be stated in the local plan as often cycle provision goes 'around the houses' is indirect and stops at dangerous junctions, J16 of M4 being an example.
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		DM22 Transport and Development		minimum 6.5m carriageway widths needed for buses, also provide a list of things that need to be in the bus stop (consult response)
Highways England	Statutory consultee		DM22 Transport and Development		policy currently exceeds the requirement in NPPF para 109 and Circular 02/2013 paragraphs 9 and 10. Should be re-worded to accord with para 109

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- policy should be clear about what is required and should make clear whether it is AC Level 1 (a slow or trickle plug connected to a standard outlet) or AC Level 2 (delivering more power to charge the vehicle faster in only a few hours) EVCP or other alternatives.</li> <li>- need for viability evidence</li> <li>- need confirmation of engagement with the main energy suppliers to determine network capacity to accommodate any adverse impacts if all or a proportion of dwellings have EVCPs.</li> </ul>
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support, but policy should reference safeguarding canal route</li> </ul>
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy should also state that development should not be of detriment to the character of the local landscape in particular rural areas where new roads and associate infrastructure can suburbanise a locality altering the intrinsic character of the local and wider landscape.</li> </ul>
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strengthen to provide a strategic approach to providing utility and leisure cycleways with coherence with wider networks (existing and planned) established at an early stage of outline permission.</li> </ul>
Swindon Area Committee of WALC	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Borough should consider how EVCPs can be provided on existing residential streets</li> </ul>
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage car-pooling at the take-up of public transport.</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local plan should adopt Quality Standards for Cycling: we suggest the London Cycling Design Standards.</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should explain what good access by bicycle means</li> </ul>
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 20mph speed limits should be used for all residential roads in new developments</li> <li>- policy should reference need for electric charging points to be easily accessible in new developments</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
The Ramblers	National organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		Welcome the importance attached to the need to encourage walking, and to protect public rights of way
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM22 Transport and Development		Strongly support the addition of paragraph 8. [note TDM requested the deletion of this policy as unclear and potentially addressed through DM3]
Gladman	Land promoter		DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	It is noted that this refers to development proposals outside of Swindon Borough. Care must be taken to ensure that such a policy meets the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF and evidence provided to explain how this matter has been addressed through the Duty to Cooperate
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development	Land north of A420 (NEV)	HHT object to this policy as currently drafted and consider the following amendment should be made to criterion (a) to ensure that obligations placed on developers are commensurate with the development proposed. a) "meet the appropriate proportionate cost of new infrastructure made necessary by the development (including cumulatively with other development);"
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Should be reviewed in the light of changes to the CIL Regulations which occurred on 1st September 2019 which now allow for the pooling of S.106 contributions without restriction and also allows for S.106 contributions and CIL contributions to be pooled to assist in delivering the same piece of infrastructure. It is also considered that the policy should acknowledge that contributions should only be sought where obligations would be fairly and reasonably related to the development in accordance with CIL Regulations
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		concern about infrastructure to address cumulative impact of smaller developments is not being provided through s106 or CIL

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		needs to be supported by adequate viability evidence
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		Support, emphasise the importance of infrastructure not being delayed
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		Add 'to include fibre cable' after 'utilities'
Warneford School Board of Governors	Local organisation	Gary Llewellyn	DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		Support but suggests policy wording amendments "All development, including development adjacent to but outside of the Swindon Borough boundary, shall make provision to: a. meet the cost of new, altered and expanded infrastructure made necessary by the development (including cumulatively with other development);
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM23 Infrastructure Requirements Resulting from Development		recommend that the policy explicitly references both grey and green infrastructure
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure	Land north of A420 (NEV)	HHT wish to make the Council aware following the introduction of The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2018, the responsibility for ensuring adequate potable water rests with the statutory undertaker and not with the developer, as such this policy should be amended to refer to waste water and sewerage infrastructure only.
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure	Land north of A420 (NEV)	HHT consider that point (d) that all developments must secure measurable net gains for biodiversity is unnecessary as it duplicates the policy requirement set out at point (a) which also requires provision of net gain for biodiversity
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and	North Star	Where statutory providers have not acted reasonably in this regard, developers should not be required to fund

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
			Sewerage Infrastructure		studies or infrastructure or for their developments to be held back. Such comment should be added to this policy
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	The NPPG7 requires the local authority to justify why the optional higher standard should be introduced into planning policy in Swindon. As the Council has not yet published an updated Water Cycle Study to support the emerging Local Plan. Review there is no evidence to support the introduction of the proposed optional requirement. The most recent Swindon Water Cycle Study (2014) concluded that demand management measures would enable sufficient water supplies for proposed population growth in the Borough up to 2026.
1 x respondent	resident		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		suggests reference to working with water companies to use biogas to reduce reliance on traditional gas
1 x respondent	resident		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		support recognition of water stress in Swindon
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		support

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		<p>the contents of points 1 and 3 seem very similar. We recommend that these are amalgamated into one point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support use of the usage target in the water company's business plan, which is a positive step and acknowledges the water stress situation in and around the Swindon area</li> <li>- It should be made clear within policy DM 24 that developers will need to assess the impact of any proposed development on the environment to ensure there are no detrimental impacts, such as by the addition of ' , and/or determine the extent of ecological impact' at the end of paragraph 1.</li> <li>- In the supporting text of DM24, we request that you state that non main waste water may require a permit from the Environment Agency and this should be considered at the same time as submitting planning applications.</li> <li>- recommend including a blue infrastructure policy or including wording in this policy to ensure that increased foul sewerage and demands on water supply do not result in the deterioration of water quality or ecosystems (please contact us for further guidance if this is the case).</li> <li>- suggest a new water cycle study is needed. In terms of the list of sewage treatment works and their future capacity we require evidence that you have corresponded with the water company as they have updated their business plans up to 2025 and see if any infrastructure improvements would be required and these are scheduled to happen in time with the proposed development.</li> </ul>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support building regs requirement as a minimum, but should encourage developers to go further</li> <li>- Include references to promote use of sustainable drainage solutions, including use of planting to reduce and slow run off, green roofs and walls, water cleaning through natural staged filtration and other eco-design techniques. Install grey and black water systems in residential and commercial properties to reduce water stress.</li> </ul> <p>Include requirements to consider these options and only</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					exclude them after life cycle based assessments have shown them not to be preferable from an environmental perspective.
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		- Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows. Is this a contradiction of the text that says Development will not be permitted unless such capacity is in place before the development is occupied?- does this mean that this will not be permitted before the development begins? Does Barnfield Treatment Works have sufficient capacity to cope with future demand?
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		- a water cycle study should be prepared to justify policy
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		optional standard must first be tested and justified. Criteria 1, 3 and 4 should be deleted. Criterion 2 should be relocated to Policy DM34.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		support policy
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		septic tanks only suitable in very rural locations. Policy should require developments to demonstrate appropriate arrangements for foul water disposal
Swindon Area Committee of WALC	Local organisation		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		Septic tanks are unacceptable in areas other than very rural locations. The policies should require all applications to demonstrate that their arrangements for foul water disposal are appropriate to the location, including taking account of development areas allowed by other policies in the plan

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		- We urge that immediate steps be taken to alert and engage with the public in developing policies to ameliorate the situation, including seriously promoting water-saving in businesses and households, building on experiences from other areas or countries facing water shortages.
Thames Water	infrastructure provider	Savills	DM24 Water Supply and Wastewater and Sewerage Infrastructure		- generally support the policy but the New Local Plan should also include a specific policy on the key issue of the provision of water and sewerage/wastewater infrastructure to service development. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods. Text of a new proposed working for Policy DM24 is supplied in Thames Water's consultation response - The Environment Agency has designated Thames Water as a seriously water stressed region, Thames Water support the mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day as set out in the NPPG (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 56-015-20150327) and consider that this should be included in a policy in the new Local Plan.
1 x respondent	resident		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		community approach to renewable energy supported
1 x respondent	resident		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		plan should name sites feasible for wind turbines - add paragraph which refers to map appendix of feasible locations
1 x respondent	resident		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		policy is not strong enough
2 x respondents	resident		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		Could be strengthened by Merton-style policy requiring renewable energy generation as part of development
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		Policy should include EVCP



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- define what low carbon means</li> <li>- support para 3</li> <li>- Plan also needs to refer to battery and other storage technologies and opportunities. For example ensuring all residential developments have SMART EV VTG charging points. Vehicle to Grid (VTG) is an established 2-way charging technology using the batteries in EV's (ownership is rising quickly) which can play a key role in future energy stabilisation and emissions reduction through dynamic demand management.</li> <li>- On district heating deletions: generally this seem sensible, however district heating schemes should not be excluded where there is a significant heat source that can be matched with a significant heat demand, e.g. incinerator with swimming pools and high density housing and commercial use.</li> <li>- if local communities are to identify renewable energy locations they need technical support from the council</li> </ul>
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		The identification of suitable locations for wind turbines would be locally led through neighbourhood planning. Would these include local public consultations to ensure Nimby doesn't influence decisions.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		support policy
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM25 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy		Labour believes there should be a clear aim within this Local Plan to make Swindon a carbon neutral town by 2030
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM26 ICT and Telecommunications		want upgrade to broadband in Blunsdon
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM26 ICT and Telecommunications		This section should include a statement supporting the development of SMART towns and places, that enable the swifter roll out of low carbon technologies, for example SMART electricity and transport networks locally.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM26 ICT and Telecommunications		support policy

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Swindon Area Committee of WALC	Local organisation		DM26 ICT and Telecommunications		high speed broadband should be available to all rural areas of the Borough
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM26 ICT and Telecommunications		installations should not obstruct walking or cycling routes
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	DM27 Community Facilities		supported but should allocate land for such facilities
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM27 Community Facilities		The local plan should support the retrofitting or new build of all feasible community facilities towards a zero carbon target as examples of what can be achieved. Improvements to these buildings provide significant opportunities for community groups to educate and encourage people in the Borough to move to a zero carbon lifestyle, an essential part of enabling the borough to become zero carbon and to adapt to the effects of the climate heating by 2030.
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	DM27 Community Facilities		supported - more specific allocations for community facilities should be made where there are identified needs
Theatres Trust	National organisation		DM27 Community Facilities		We support this policy, but suggest a refinement of part 2 whereby the policy requirement also seeks marketing evidence to include a rental or sale price appropriate to the existing use and condition of the building.
Theatres Trust	National organisation		DM27 Community Facilities		support - suggest part 2 also requires marketing evidence to include a rental or sale price appropriate to the existing use/condition of building

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Warneford School Board of Governors	Local organisation	Gary Llewellyn	DM27 Community Facilities		Support but suggests policy wording amendments Proposals for new or extended or expanded existing community facilities will be supported where: a. the site is located within or adjacent to an existing settlement; b. the site is accessible to all members of the community and by a range of transport modes, including walking and cycling; and c. the site, if possible and practicable, is co-located with, or will support co-location with, other community uses.
Swindon Area Committee of WALC	Local organisation		DM28 and DM31		policies need to state that proposals must comply with the following criteria: local accountability; economic sustainability; robust in the long term
1 x respondent	resident		DM28 Green Infrastructure		- suggests stronger protection of GI, and monitoring of GI - suggests stronger ref to local/incidental/amenity green space e.g front and rear gardens due to loss of these spaces. Environmental and social benefits of these spaces. - suggests encouragement of local engagement for re-greening projects
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM28 Green Infrastructure		support, there should be a requirement for meadow planting as carbon sequestration
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM28 Green Infrastructure		'watercourses' should be added to the end of the second paragraph after 'woodlands'
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM28 Green Infrastructure		support but express concern about the potential for new planting damages existing adjacent properties. Suggest provision should be made for regular inspections. State that parish councils shouldn't be obligated to take on maintenance responsibilities

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM28 Green Infrastructure		<p>para 6 adopt the wording of DM31 at 5 from 'In the event', with suitable substitution of GI for POS where appropriate. Remove the reference to Community Interest Companies. The Asset Lock on CIC assets precludes their eventual transfer to a Local Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does this cover the issue of fencing off specific parcels within an area of open land dedicated as green infrastructure in order to support horsiculture or other income-generating activity that can contribute to its longer term sustainability? Would this be allowable?</li> <li>- Two different trigger points/timings should be explicit in any S106 agreement – the timing of the provision of the facility and the trigger point for the handover to the eventual responsible body. The policy should recognise this. Also, the policy should state that where a parish council or charitable body has accepted future ownership, they should be formally consulted over the design of the facility. Does the requirement for a contribution towards 5 years maintenance only if land passes to a PC make it less attractive to a developer?</li> </ul>
Thames Water	infrastructure provider	Savills	DM28 Green Infrastructure		<p>support but in order for the public sewers and water supply network to operate satisfactorily, trees, and shrubs should not be planted over the route of the sewers or water pipes.</p>
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM28 Green Infrastructure		<p>strongly support policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- suggest clarifying para 4 by insertion of the words 'from the first stages of development design'</li> <li>- suggest a policy that requires a specific level of tree planting</li> </ul> <p>- we may wish to promote Building with Nature - for ancient and veteran trees RPAs need to be larger than BS 5837: 2012</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM29 Great Western Community Forest		a date should be set for reaching 30% tree and woodland cover
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM29 Great Western Community Forest		support but express concern about planting obscuring views, say parish councils must be consulted about planting plans
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM29 Great Western Community Forest		a) end of sentence should include the words; where appropriate. Creating woodland could be detrimental to the natural and scenic beauty of AONB
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		DM29 Great Western Community Forest		We would like to see a number of very specific goals taken by the Borough Council to 1) accelerate meeting the 30% target [for forest cover], 2) involve the community and especially young people in the planting of trees throughout the Borough, 3) establish bee-friendly corridors across the Borough, 4) dramatically reduce the use of weed-killers by the Borough Council.
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM29 Great Western Community Forest		strongly support policy

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM3 Design in Larger Developments	Land north of A420 (NEV)	<p>objection – A development threshold of 20 units is not of sufficient scale to provide a range of housing nor indeed a mix of uses to support a new community. To require a masterplan and detailed codes as a minimum to support this scale of development is considered onerous and not effective. The scale of development proposed in the draft policy, applications are likely to come forward as a single reserved matters submission through which the design can be considered as a whole, avoiding the need for overarching design co-ordination. A more common application of such a policy that requires a greater degree of design analysis is to complement strategic scale sites of some 500 + dwellings and the policy should be amended to reflect this more appropriate scale of a new neighbourhood and ensure onerous requirements are not placed on applications for a non-strategic development. Furthermore, clarity needs to be provided with regards to its interaction with the same requirement for an overarching masterplan and detailed design codes for ‘new communities’ (SA Policies) to make clear that this policy requirement would have been met if already done as part of the strategic site process. This is particularly important for reserved matters submissions which come forward as part of the delivery of a strategic scale site for which there is a specific policy. In addition, Consider that that the stipulation for the submission of an overarching masterplan and detailed design codes as minimum and presented as the single design mechanism is inflexible and therefore not effective, for the reasons already set out at paragraph 2.5-2.8 that also apply to the proposed application of this policy. The requirement to ensure that there are no gaps/ ransom strips between areas of development is a land assembly issue and may not be effectively controlled nor prescribed through policy. The NPPF is silent on the issue of land assembly and ransoms with regard to the development management process.</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM3 Design in Larger Developments	North Star	. Design is a reserved matter and the issues that are considered important can be covered via parameter plans and a Development Specification document at outline stage. Therefore, when referring to Design Codes, it should be acknowledged that other forms of documents can cover off these matters too.
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM3 Design in Larger Developments	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Threshold should be raised to a strategic level; for example 500 plus dwellings
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM3 Design in Larger Developments	S0429	threshold should be revised to 250
1 x respondent	resident		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		add bullet stating development should be resilient for the future, taking into account future temperature rise
1 x respondent	resident		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		should include ref to the protection and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity - plan should make it clear to developers that they must provide evidence on this basis
1 x respondent	resident		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		support, although fails to require a standard for energy and water efficiency
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	DM3 Design in Larger Developments		policy over-prescriptive, design codes for later phases can't be prepared at the outset, requirements to ensure a coordinated and comprehensive development of the wider development area cannot be provided by any individual applicant
CPRE	National organisation		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		The current Swindon Residential Design Guide SPD does not seem to have been either explicit enough or strong enough to achieve high quality attractive settlement patterns. The lay-out and landscaping of larger developments must contain estate roads which allow local buses as well as emergency vehicles to access them, be less disjointed in their building runs, allow for more POS and less "gardens" (usually put down to slabs) street

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					design which allows space for trees and most importantly harmonise the rafts of housing types into visually positive groups which have some meaning. It should be forcefully requiring much increased cycle parking, bus shelters and water storage within the development area
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	DM3 Design in Larger Developments		<p>It would be helpful for policy DM3 to confirm that design codes and design reviews would be required at reserved matters stage in the case of outline applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On points of detail, criterion 2b requiring no gaps or ransom strips between developments and adjacent areas is not really a planning matter to be subjected to the planning balance but rather a matter for landowner discussions,</li> <li>- in criterion 2d there is no need to state specific street lengths as each proposal should be judged on its merits and connections to ensure connectivity. To limit streets to 100m long creates building blocks which could be too short to create a street frontage and artificially constrains schemes which might be capable of enabling residents to reach destinations regardless of street lengths.</li> </ul>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		add: Ensure zero carbon and/or minimal environmental impact developments
Hills	Land promoter	Pro-vision	DM3 Design in Larger Developments		Achieving a high standard of design is supported. Policy should not be extended to relate to ransom strips. Planning policies should be concerned about the use of land, not the ownership of land. Would be impossible to operate effectively – not sound.
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM3 Design in Larger Developments		this policy is considered to be overly prescriptive, particularly the requirement for detailed design codes for phases, which appear to be required at the outset. The policy is also setting requirements (ensure a coordinated and comprehensive development of the wider



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					development area, which cannot be provided by any individual applicant
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		- No landscaping included or integration of open space. There is an emphasis on health and well-being and access to the countryside (25year environment plan). This needs to be integrated into the policies.
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM3 Design in Larger Developments		objection is made to the requirements stipulated in paragraph 2 of this draft policy, which are overly prescriptive – for example, the policy puts forward a maximum ‘block length’ which appears arbitrary and unsubstantiated as no justification is provided in the documents published with this consultation. Second part of the policy is not ‘sound’ as with respect to paragraph 35 of the NPPF these requirements are not justified or consistent with national policy. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF (2019) states that “Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements”. From the documents presented in this consultation it is not clear whether these draft policies have been subject to a process of sustainability appraisal and the consideration of reasonable alternatives. This process should have informed the drafting of these policies. As such, it will be necessary to undertake a sustainability appraisal and subsequently consult on this.
Salisbury and Wilton Swift Group/North Wiltshire Swift Group	Local Organisation		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		Suggested amendment - "design should integrate biodiversity enhancements for species which inhabit the built environment. Examples of mitigation by design include integral swift bricks, house martin cups, hedgehog highways and bat boxes etc. Such inclusions are demonstrated to improve the wellbeing of residents as well as meeting the biodiversity net gain criteria."
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM3 Design in Larger Developments		para d. The permeable street pattern should prioritise movement by pedestrians and cyclists.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		DM30 Protecting Open Space		supports protection of open space
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM30 Protecting Open Space		The parish asks that sites such as Moulden Hill, Seven Fields and Cliffords Meadow are mentioned.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM30 Protecting Open Space		- support
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM30 Protecting Open Space		recommends the deletion of point 'e' within this proposed policy as it has the potential to undermine the thrust of the policy with reference to re-providing equivalent 'size'. It is agreed that there may be potential to improve the quality of an open space offering in the redevelopment of the site.
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM30 Protecting Open Space		- para d) must be based on projected population growth over the plan period, not current populations - Suggest use of Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard
Gladman	Land promoter		DM31 Open Space in New Development	Land at Shrivenham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	Any such requirements should be fully justified and take into account the qualitative and quantitative needs of the area in which development is being proposed
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	DM31 Open Space in New Development	North Star	In dense urban developments outside the town centre, such as North Star, there should also be flexibility in application. There are many examples of highly successful developments across the UK where standards are applied flexibly. The policy should be amended accordingly.
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM31 Open Space in New Development	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Clarification over open space requirements at Appendix 1 of the Development Management Policies consultation document are welcomed
1 x respondent	resident		DM31 Open Space in New Development		point 4 (and appendix 1 and para 3.8.13) - No reason is given for not applying the Fields in Trust standard. Either the Fields in Trust standard should be applied or reasons giving for not doing so. Citing historic precedent for a lower

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					standard that is admitted to have not achieved its aims is inadequate.
1 x respondent	resident		DM31 Open Space in New Development		questions whether general recreation includes indoor facilities - wording needs to be clearer to avoid conflict with DM20
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM31 Open Space in New Development		there needs to be policy control on management companies including how much they charge and delegate to residents
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	DM31 Open Space in New Development		policy uses space standards that are not supported by Sport England, should instead refer to latest Playing Pitch Strategy
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM31 Open Space in New Development		concern about allotment specification. Thames Water quote a few years ago was £1,000 to add a water trough on the south edge of Goodearl. Further, the Council has also suffered vandalism and / or absentmindedness resulting in taps being left turned on overnight. The costs of adding utilities to a remote site like Tadpole Field may well make it prohibitively expensive and could lead to a severe disparity in rents.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM31 Open Space in New Development		- support
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	DM31 Open Space in New Development		It is noted that the policy refers to space standards that are not supported by Sport England, particularly for outdoor sports provision. Policy should instead refer to the latest version of the Playing Pitch Strategy.
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM31 Open Space in New Development		recommends that the LPA consider increasing the 'access standard' for play areas as part of the assessment of reasonable alternatives for this policy. It is considered that adding flexibility to this policy would help to improve the offering of equipped play in new developments. This would not reduce the quantity of play space but would allow for more creative opportunities for designing play into new developments and has the potential to increase the quality

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					of offer on major new sites through comprehensive masterplanning. The walking guidelines currently set out in this policy are inconsistent with the national 'Fields in Trust' recommended benchmark guidelines for formal open space. The Local Plan review offers an opportunity to review this policy.
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM31 Open Space in New Development		Two different trigger points/timings should be explicit in any S106 agreement – the timing of the provision of the facility and the trigger point for the handover to the eventual responsible body. The policy should recognise this. Also, the policy should state that where a parish council or charitable body has accepted future ownership, they should be formally consulted over the design of the facility. Does the requirement for a contribution towards 5 years maintenance only if land passes to a PC make it less attractive to a developer?
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		DM31 Open Space in New Development		concern management companies are not effective. Request that policy seeks sufficient commuted sum to cover future maintenance
4 x respondents	resident		DM32 Biodiversity		net gain supported - development should be restricted that harms areas of higher biodiversity and conservation value
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	DM32 Biodiversity		Objection (unjustified): criteria 4 sets out that "All developments must secure measurable net gains for biodiversity" however in many cases it is not possible to achieve such gains on-site so the Council would need to establish a scheme which enables developers to pay into a fund for off-site biodiversity measures in order to achieve net gain. Without such a scheme Policy DM 32 will be ineffective and could constrain delivery of new homes.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		DM32 Biodiversity		support net biodiversity gain
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM32 Biodiversity		<p>suggest wording changes to accord with NPPF para 170: "All development shall minimise its impact upon and must secure measurable net gains for biodiversity, including protecting, restoring and establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- watercourses should be explicitly referenced within the table within Policy DM32, for example by in the 'Other sites' section of the table at the end of DM32 on page 50</li> <li>- the policy or supporting text should discuss enhancing and restoring watercourses (for example de-culverting) in accordance with section 8.3 of your SFRA May 2019</li> <li>- policy supporting text should be personalised to Swindon to portray special and important biodiversity within Borough e.g. Coate Water SSSI, the network of rivers, the historic canal, the chalk grasslands and ancient woodlands to the south of the Borough and the Thames corridor to the north</li> </ul>
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	DM32 Biodiversity		<p>Significant clarification is required for the calculation of biodiversity and how appropriate gains should be measured and the method to be used. As currently worded, this is vague. The use of the word secure implies that the biodiversity will be checked by follow up study. This is a very complex part of environmental policy and is unlikely to be enforceable. It would hypothetically be better worded as "provision should be made for". There is need to ensure that ecological studies are proportionate to the scale of the proposed development site. Criterion 2 should contain the wording to the effect of 'where necessary'</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					otherwise it is implied that every site must be checked for everything
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM32 Biodiversity		Support policy
Salisbury and Wilton Swift Group/North Wiltshire Swift Group	Local Organisation		DM32 Biodiversity		<p>support - however suggest more detail provided in an SPD to enable effective implementation e.g. similar to Exeter's resi design guide biodiversity section. Provides a number of extracts that could be considered.</p> <p>- suggests specific wording included regarding biodiversity enhancements - e.g. recommended specific wording on the provision of swift bricks - suggests provision of 2 to 4 swift bricks on a medium to large house, from 4 to 10 on a small block of flats, and 10 to 20 on a large site like a school, hospital or warehouse, or a major apartment development.</p>
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM32 Biodiversity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- strongly support policy requiring measurable net gains for biodiversity</li> <li>- it should be pointed out that the data sources listed under 'irreplaceable habitats or ecological sources' are not exhaustive. DEFRA mapping only covers ancient woodlands of more than 2ha in area. Reference should be made to the <a href="https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/">https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/</a> but this is non-exhaustive</li> <li>- protection of irreplaceable habitats should be made explicit at para 3 by insertion of 'irreplaceable habitat should not be lost except in wholly exceptional circumstances'</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Gladman	Land promoter		DM33 Landscape	Land at Shrevenham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	As currently drafted, it is not considered to be fully compliant with the provisions of the NPPF. In particular, criterion 1a refers to the protection of the intrinsic character, diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape within Swindon Borough. Whilst it is important for development proposals to respond to their landscape setting, it could appear to the reader that this policy is attempting to define all landscapes as 'valued'. The policy should be redrafted to reflect Paragraph 170 of the NPPF by setting out the need for development proposals to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Any provisions to 'protect and enhance' should only relate to valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan), as such clear justification should be provided within the Plan's evidence in relation to this to ensure that any such approach is consistent with national policy.
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	DM33 Landscape		Objection (conflict with NPPF): part 1 of the policy prevents any development which could harm or impact on the landscape, contrary to the more flexible and proportionate approach taken in the NPPF. NPPF170a concerns protecting and enhancing valued landscapes commensurate with their statutory or development plan status. NPPF171-172 refers to designated landscapes and those landscapes requiring the highest levels of protection (National Parks, the Broads & AONBs). Needs to be amended to ensure consistency with the NPPF. Some level of landscape impact will be inevitable in order to accommodate future growth in Swindon considered against the value of the landscape in question; the need for new homes, jobs or other uses; and the nature of specific development proposals – this will all form part of the planning balance.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Highworth TC	Parish Council		DM33 Landscape		Support policy as it references need to protect hilltop setting of Highworth
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM33 Landscape		support
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM33 Landscape		- 3) should include a line which addresses the need to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB.
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM33 Landscape		Persimmon Homes recommends the deletion of the additional paragraph 3 inserted into this policy as it duplicates guidance set out in the NPPF with respect to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
Salisbury and Wilton Swift Group/North Wiltshire Swift Group	Local Organisation		DM33 Landscape		Suggested amendment - Para 2b - developers must provide an ecological appraisal with their application. If accepted by the LA, the actions within the ecological appraisal should be conditioned. In order to fulfil the condition, evidence should be supplied of actual compliance.
1 x respondent	resident		DM34 Flood Risk		Current practice for gullies not capable of effectively draining flows from extreme events into underground drainage. Suggests that where gullies and piped water drainage systems used, developments must be required to incorporate alternative systems to manage extreme rainfall events. - drainage system must ensure that flows from site will be able to get into underground storage in extreme events - will require use of surface based conveyance - -policy should be amended to promote use of surface based drainage and to ensure that where underground drainage is provided, provision is made to manage exceedance flow
1 x respondent	resident		DM34 Flood Risk		- should list development that can take place in countryside



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM34 Flood Risk		<p>It is not clear why in points 2 and 3 'new development' is referenced instead of 'all development'. We advise that the word 'new' is omitted from points 2, 3 and 4 as illustrated below. In addition, we advise that the phrase 'which should assess the risk from all sources of flooding' is inserted between 'assessment' and 'and' in point 1. Adding the phrase 'in line with guidance within the SFRA' to the end of point 3 would help to ensure that developers refer to your evidence base when assessing flood risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- you should include the phrase 'sequential approach' within DM34, such as in point 1: '...the sequential and exception tests (and where appropriate the sequential approach) will be applied in the consideration of planning applications'.</li> <li>- suggested additional bullet points:  <i>All 'More Vulnerable' and 'Highly Vulnerable' development located in areas at risk of fluvial, surface water and groundwater flooding should set finished floor levels 300mm above the known or modelled 1 in 100 annual probability (1% AEP) flood level including an allowance for climate change. (SFRA Policy Recommendation 4)</i>  <i>Flood Zone 3b should be safeguarded from any development. Redevelopment in Flood Zone 3b shall not increase the vulnerability classification of the site and must result in a net reduction in flood risk. (Sections 8.6.1 and 8.6.2 of your draft SFRA)</i>  <i>- the following should be added to supporting text:  'An assessment of climate change should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance within the Swindon Borough Council SFRA'.</i></li> </ul>
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM34 Flood Risk		concern about what happens to water off site and who takes responsibility for managing watercourses
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM34 Flood Risk		support, suggest canal important to mitigating NEV flood risk

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM34 Flood Risk		All applications must include reference to the definitive Environment Agency surface as well as fluvial water flood map. We would prefer more specific mention of the need to counter the risk of surface water flooding, not just fluvial flooding. Our experience is that applicants simply quote the relevant flood zone or blame the condition of other landowners ditches, clearance of which may simply exacerbate the problem downstream
Thames Water	infrastructure provider	Savills	DM34 Flood Risk		Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included to support Policy DM34: "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM34 Flood Risk		Strongly support policy for naturalised SUDs on new development. Suggest this should also apply where possible on retrofit schemes
1 x respondent	resident		DM35 - Pollution		Should embed measures to discourage vehicles not complying with emissions standards
1 x respondent	resident		DM35 Pollution		-include vibration - 8b - enhancements to walking routes should be listed as reduction measure - provision of bus stops not listed as reduction measure - limits on emission standards for gas-filled boilers not considered
1 x respondent	resident		DM35 Pollution		-point 5 - comments that requiring an air quality for major development proposals only if they 'would impact upon areas identified at [sic] being at risk of non-compliance' - whether a development would have such impact would not be known unless such an assessment were done. The proposed policy also has the effect of permitting major developments that would have unacceptable impact on air quality within their own area. (Whilst paragraph 6 of this policy might mitigate against that, such impact would not be known without mandatory assessment )Recommends

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					air quality assessment should be required for all major developments.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM35 Pollution		policy should address water pollution from runoff where there is no mains sewage disposal
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		DM35 Pollution		suggest following change to wording: Water Quality "4. Development shall not harm, including through the mobilisation of contaminants already in the ground, <i>and where possible achieve improvements in</i> , surface or ground water quality."
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM35 Pollution		no mention of air pollution caused by parents idling cars outside schools. No mention of the school streets initiative.
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM35 Pollution		support
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		DM35 Pollution		Should include reference to AONB in particular the protection of dark skies, a special quality of the NWD AONB.
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM35 Pollution		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- prefer more prescriptive draft London Plan policy</li> <li>- giving priority to the needs of cyclists is a way to reduce air pollution</li> <li>- paragraph 1 should say 'no harm to human health' rather than unacceptable harm</li> <li>- paragraph 6 should avoid harm rather than only unacceptable levels, the scientific evidence is constantly growing and we should use the most up to date standards</li> <li>- paragraph 7 deleted 'where this is possible'</li> <li>- paragraph 8 should say 'the following measures will be sought', but generally this is strongly supported</li> </ul>
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM35 Pollution		the current wording in the Air Quality policy is not adequate in ensuring new developments do not deteriorate the air quality in Air Quality Management Areas and areas at risk of exceeding air pollution limits. We believe the policy should be definitive in stating that new developments should be making a positive contribution to air quality in

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					areas that are exceeding or at risk of exceeding the recommended levels for air pollution. New green infrastructure should also be encouraged in areas at risk of exceeding recommended air pollution levels.
Woodland Trust	National organisation		DM35 Pollution		welcome the intent at para 8a but recommend change of wording from 'landscape buffers' to 'green infrastructure buffers', - also strongly support promotion of street trees as air quality mitigation
Firecracker Development Ltd	Developer	DPDS	DM36 Development in the Countryside	Land adjacent to Honeyfield Alpacas	FDL would urge Swindon Borough Council (SBC) to revisit Draft Policy DM36 (Development in the Countryside) and introduce an element of flexibility which, in accordance with the NPPF, would allow for small-scale housing sites to be swiftly delivered in rural yet sustainable locations where there is a local need. It should be noted that there are examples of other local planning authorities (LPAs) having successfully implemented such policies, including Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (Policy SS6 (New Housing in the Countryside) of their Local Plan 2011 to 2029).
Gladman	Land promoter		DM36 Development in the Countryside	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	It is vital that the local plan provides a suite of suitably flexible policies that are able to positively respond to changing circumstances over the plan period. This includes the need to positively consider proposals for housing development in sustainable locations to meet needs that are not otherwise being met in the manner required by national policy. The use of settlement limits to arbitrarily restrict suitable development from coming forward on the edge of settlements would not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework. Gladman would be opposed to the definition of the settlement edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the District's housing needs, in accordance with the 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development'. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM36 Development in the Countryside	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	An additional criterion is suggested for this policy that would allow sites adjacent to villages or rural settlements to come forward for residential development should monitoring of the plan evidence that the adopted spatial strategy is not delivering housing supply as anticipated. This would ensure flexibility in the plan period and allow the Borough to respond to changing circumstances, in accordance with the NPPF, should, for whatever reason, allocated sites fail to deliver.
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	DM36 Development in the Countryside	S0429	should include a contingency policy to allow housing development adjacent to built up areas of appropriate settlements to come forward, on land that would otherwise be in conflict with Policy DM36 as currently drafted.
On behalf of	Developer	DPDS	DM36 Development in the Countryside	S0432	Need introduce an element of flexibility which, in accordance with NPPF, would allow for small-scale housing sites to be swiftly delivered in rural yet sustainable locations where there is a local need. It should be noted that there are examples of other local planning authorities (LPAs) having successfully implemented such policies, including Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (policy SS6 (New Housing in the Countryside) In their Local Plan 2011 to 2029).
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact	DM36 Development in the Countryside	s0456	- policy too restrictive, should allow in-fill housing
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		DM36 Development in the Countryside		The wording at proposed subsection (a) is not supported. NPPF para 79 is essentially a restrictive policy and it is not necessary for Policy DM36 to attempt to reinterpret it in a way which could be seen as making the policy more

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					supportive of new housing in the countryside than national policy allows.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM36 Development in the Countryside		support the policy that will support family continuations in rural areas where house prices are high
Mr Hillyard	Land owner	Gary Llewellyn	DM36 Development in the Countryside		<p>Suggests policy wording changes:            "In the open countryside, outside of the built-up area of settlements, only the following types of development will be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. new dwellings that accord with national policy on isolated new dwellings in the countryside, provided that, in the case of the re-use of a redundant or disused building, the building is worthy of retention, structurally sound, capable of conversion without substantial reconstruction and retains as much of the original character as practically possible;</li> <li>b. dwellings that are rural exception sites or entry level exception sites that meet the requirements of national policy and are adjacent to the built-up area of an existing settlement;</li> <li>c. agricultural workers' dwellings in accordance with Policy DM19; and</li> <li>d. low carbon and renewable energy development in accordance with Policy DM25;</li> <li>e. the diversification of a viable farm holding subject to use being made of its own resources and products;</li> <li>f. the development, on sites adjacent to the built-up area of an existing settlement, of community facilities in accordance with Policy DM27;</li> <li>g. rural tourism and leisure facilities which respect the character of the countryside, including small-scale visitor accommodation and attractions;</li> <li>h. the creation of small-scale rural offices or the expansion of other existing rural-based businesses through conversion of existing buildings or erection of new buildings;</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					i. at the Science Museum, Wroughton, expansion of museum related activities and associated enabling development providing the benefits of the development are delivered sustainably and do not conflict with other policies of the Local Plan".
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM36 Development in the Countryside		support but want greater clarity of what small scale is in paragraph h. also state that renewable energy shouldn't be permitted near to conservation areas or the AONB unless a significant benefit to the local community can be demonstrated
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM36 Development in the Countryside		support, particularly part b

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM4 Inclusive Design	Land north of A420 (NEV)	not necessary to present as a policy in its own right, as consideration of inclusive design is dealt with and interpreted through a design and access statement and implemented through building regulations, as part of the national accessibility standards included within the Part M4 Building Regulations. As drafted, the policy does not offer enough clarity for developers to ensure a development proposal meets the requirements of this policy. Part 1(a) of Policy DM4 reads: "achieve high standards of inclusive design". Part 1 (b) reads "fully accessible to everyone", however it is not clear from this how a development proposal would meet such requirements as there is no further detail given regarding what constitutes high standards of inclusiveness. Therefore, considers that Policy DM4 is not effective as currently drafted and if it is to be retained, clarity should be provided to support its application.
1 x respondent	resident		DM4 Inclusive Design		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support principle of policy</li> <li>- a - add "in order to facilitate full participation of all"</li> <li>- b - independent here is implied to mean without assistance. Recommended wording: "are highly accessible to all and can be entered, exited, used and navigated quickly and easily by all without avoidable imposition of risk, limitation, hindrance or delay."</li> <li>- c - considers use of word 'special' as patronising. Recommended wording: "avoid creation of disabling barriers of any kind, and in particular do not require some users to follow separate routes or create no-go areas which are inaccessible. If making changes to existing buildings and infrastructure, disabling barriers should be removed."</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		DM4 Inclusive Design		fails to provide a standard for energy and water efficiency
1 x respondent	resident		DM4 Inclusive Design		- Questions need for separate policy on this



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
CPRE	National organisation		DM4 Inclusive Design		this shouldn't be a standalone policy, could it not be cross referenced in Policy DM14
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM4 Inclusive Design		support. Paras b and c can be merged as they say the same thing. - All they need to add into be is 'regardless of ability' / 'are fully accessible (entered, navigated, used and exited) to everyone, regardless of their ability/capability - lack of specific examples of how accessibility goal will be achieved e.g. no steps, wider doors, zigzag paths for slopes
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM4 Inclusive Design		Support policy
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM4 Inclusive Design		para 1.c. This requirement should include (barriers for) those who use disability adapted bikes.
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		DM5 Core Employment Sites		We support strengthening policy to increase quality of employment.
Gladman	Land promoter		DM5, DM6, DM7 and DM8	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	The policies of the local plan should match the economic strategy for the area and include policies that encourage the local and inward investment that is required to meet anticipated needs over the plan period. Furthermore, it is vital that local policies are responsive to changing circumstances and that they are suitably flexible to ensure that sufficient land of the right type is made available and that the planning system does not act as an impediment to sustainable growth
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	DM6 Employment Land	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	A 2-year marketing period is excessive and might not reflect the dynamics of the market and consequently would result in parcels of undeveloped land that could otherwise contribute to meeting an unmet need for development in the area. period of marketing of one year is suggested
CPRE	National organisation		DM6 Employment Land		The new requirement for market evidence being extended is welcome, but this should be <b>included</b> in the written policy.
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM6 Employment Land		Resisting change of use is supported, but surely if the Borough receives an offer that benefits the town and a building has been for sale for say 18months, would the

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					Borough not consider this subject to a case by case review decision, rather than a blanket referral to policy?
Liddington PC	Parish Council		DM6 Employment Land		support policy
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	DM6 Employment Land		objects to the policy as currently worded as it is not positively prepared with respect to paragraph 35 of the NPPF. In a local context where there is a surplus of available land for employment (particularly with the news of the closure of the Honda plant) and a lack of deliverable land for housing, the wording of this policy proposing to place further deterrents to restrict the change of use from employment potentially to residential is not sound. The proposal to extend the requirement to market an existing employment site from a minimum of 6 months to a minimum of 2 years is not justified. It is also unclear how an applicant would provide evidence to support the other stipulations of this proposed policy.
South West Housing Association Planning Consortium	Developers	Tetlow-King	DM6 Employment Land		support principle. - however part c is imprecise and open to interpretation. Residential and employment can be compatible. Use of word 'attractiveness' too subjective
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		DM6 Employment Land		support allocating small and large sites - strategic employment sites should be prioritised for the renewable energy and advanced technology sectors - existing employment land should be protected
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM7 Office Development	Land north of A420 (NEV)	Supports the articulation of the hierarchy that supports a town centre (including and New Eastern Village District Centre and Wichelstowe employment land) first approach for office development that exceeds 1,000 sqm hierarchy.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		DM7 Office Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The promotion of smaller office sites within the town centre and a focus on larger developments at other areas already being developed i.e. Wichelstowe is good</li> <li>- Regarding office development the approach seems somewhat confused. The Borough is maintaining their approach of moving away from national policy in not having a 'town centre first' criteria. However, they acknowledge the lack of high-quality office accommodation in the town centre for offices below 1,000m2. Surely the Borough should be promoting a 'town centre first' approach in view of the above acknowledgement, whilst consideration to office space at other 'employment land' sites (Wichelstowe)?</li> <li>- do the bus companies support this accessibility requirement?</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM7 Office Development		para c there needs to be a specification of what good standard of access by bicycle means
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		DM8 Retail and Leisure on Employment Land		The local plan should include a presumption against drive through establishments as they encourage engine idling (which is illegal according to Road Traffic Act 2004), increase emissions and negatively impact on health of drivers and other local residents.
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	DM9 Centres and Main Town Centre Uses (Excluding Offices)	Land north of A420 (NEV)	Supports the focus for main town centre uses towards the New Eastern Village District Centre and agree with the classification of New Eastern Village District Centre as a 'District and Primary Rural Centre'.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		DM9 Centres and Main Town Centre Uses (Excluding Offices)		request designation of a Blunsdon local centre if options to expand Blunsdon are taken forward
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		DM9 Centres and Main Town Centre Uses (Excluding Offices)		para b. There needs to be a specification of what good standard of access by bicycle means

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Gladman	Land promoter		DM9, DM10, DM11 and DM12	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	welcomes the inclusion of policies in local plans that recognise and support the role of a range of defined centres across the hierarchy of settlements within local planning authority areas
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Boyer	duty to cooperate	s0486	no reference to HMA or opportunity to provide comments on the abandonment of a JSF, this means no opportunity to consider sustainable sites in the former North Wilts District
1 x respondent	resident		Duty to cooperate		comments on the density of Swindon in comparison to surrounding villages in Wilts. Questions whether need for Swindon can be met in Wilts
1 x respondent	resident		Duty to cooperate		suggests joint working with Wiltshire to locate development in villages within commuting distance of Swindon e.g. Broad Hinton, Winterbourne Bassett and Avebury
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Duty to cooperate		parts of Wilts within Swindon HMA could meet housing needs for Swindon Borough - suggests joint approach - standard methodology does not prevent joint framework - evidence to support accommodation of housing growth to the west of Swindon (e.g. SW regional plan evidence) westward expansion should be looked at in conjunction with Wilts Council - site promotion - Purton
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		Economy		As per the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership Energy Strategy Dec 2018, Swindon should seek to attract green industry and investment, e.g. building on the hydrogen hub and local expertise. This should be stated as a preference for economic development.
On behalf of	Land owner	Savills	Employment land	Spittleborough Farm	it is imperative that the LP Review allows for a flexible approach towards the provision of new employment land.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Employment land Requirement		<p>Closing of Honda site means Swindon needs new employment sites to meet demand of employers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no guarantee whether the Honda site will come available and when its owners will release it to create jobs. As such Swindon BC should not assume it is available or indeed developable within the new Local Plan period.</li> <li>- does not take into account modern business demands, consider plan will harm Swindon's position as a major employment location.</li> <li>- evidence from commercial property developers/agents suggests demand for research and development hubs, science parks, logistic sheds, offices close to M4 - considers plan fails to deliver market requirements.</li> </ul>
Wasdell Properties Ltd	Developer	Turley	Employment land Requirement		<p>underestimates the need to allocate additional industrial land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not address needs for different categories of B classes</li> <li>- lack of current industrial space to meet industrial land requirements, no evidence of the 77.48ha committed employment development</li> <li>- uncertainty of delivery of certain sites e.g wichelstowe, gateway north, blunsdon sites</li> <li>- does not consider specific requirements of specialist sectors (i.e. pharmaceutical) for large premises</li> <li>- evidence based on a decline in certain sectors (e.g pharmaceutical) - does not agree with this assumption</li> </ul>
Primegate Properties	Land Promoter	Origin 3	Employment Options	Hook south	<p>Whilst Option E1 looks to reuse the Honda site for employment purposes, the concern is that the site is not in the right location and is not accessible enough to the strategic road network to be attractive to growing businesses. It is our contention that Option E3 represents the best option to support the economic growth of Swindon. Under Option E3 and the delivery of our clients' site, a range of inward investment opportunities can be secured into the Borough.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	Councillor		Employment Options		- Favour option 3 allowing both small and large employment options
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Employment Options		- question deliverability and viability of employment land allocation at bottom of Blunsdon hill/north blunsdon. No evidence that highways agency have been consulted on new a419 junction/interchange to enable access. Evidence to suggest Highways agency will not support new a419 junction close to cold harbour junction. estimated cost of new junction over £30,000,000 in this location. Therefore consider site is undeliverable and unviable - landscape impact and impact on Blunsdon castle scheduled monument - consider Blunsdon hill as one of best visual approaches to Swindon and should remain undeveloped and protected.
Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce	Local organisation		employment sites		- criticise lack of large employment sites, say these might need to be outside of the Borough
1 x respondent	resident		Employment Option E1		support
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E1		support the option as there is sufficient land identified to meet needs for employment floorspace, particularly as the Honda site has potential to accommodate additional employment
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E1		support
Liddington PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E1		Support this option, should be sufficient to meet needs
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Employment Option E1		- it would be most inappropriate to seek to constrain evolution of economic sectors - consolidation has many merits as existing employment areas in the main benefit from credible public transport options - Council should be open to considering other sustainably-located alternatives, that are well-related to existing and potential public transport routes, and could also reduce the

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					need to travel from existing, committed and future allocated development.
W O Clarke Trust	Landowner	Strutt and Parker	Employment Option E1		- does not support - may harm economic growth and discourage investment - increased costs of redeveloping brownfield
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E1		supported
Wasdell Properties Ltd	Developer	Turley	Employment Option E1		- does not support - sufficient land has not been identified to meet need for employment floorspace - ambiguity surrounding Honda site
1 x respondent	resident		Employment Option E2		support
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E2		no objection to this policy option in principle although it is not considered necessary give that sufficient land has already been identified
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Employment Option E2		suggest small sites along sustainable transport corridors
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Employment Option E2		We think that this approach is likely to inappropriately and unnecessarily constrain future economic development.
Wasdell Properties Ltd	Developer	Turley	Employment Option E2		-F383does not support - will not meet the need of certain employment uses/businesses
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E3	s0030	suggest education, science and technology park (as per Cheltenham). A Tertiary Education/university campus and combined technology or engineering facility that would supersede New College and Swindon College - but oppose on conservation and landscape grounds

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Employment Option E3	S0073, S0076	support Option 3 –needs varying locations and size and type of sites being allocated and providing certainty to the employment land market for the plan period. Hannick support the consideration of the 2.789ha site S0073 'Land north of the A420' as an employment site option as listed in Figure 10 as well as site S0076 Land at the Marsh, Wanborough which was not considered as suitable for development in the SHELAA 2019. These sites are considered in greater detail below. The SA fails to consider alternative site options for employment use that were not considered to be deliverable by the SHELAA, despite the fact that sites have been submitted to the SHELAA which are situated in close proximity to existing allocations and/or planning applications currently under consideration by the authority which could provide further capacity at broad locations already allocated for employment purposes. It is requested that the local authority reconsider alternative employment sites options submitted to the SHELAA and available in the plan period in order to ensure a more rigorous assessment of Options for potential employment land allocations in the emerging Local Plan Review.
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E3		opposed, unnecessary as sufficient land is identified
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E3		support
Cllr Stan Pajak	Local councillors		Employment Option E3		supports option
Liddington PC	Parish Council		Employment Option E3		oppose this option which is contrary to the protection of greenfield land. Should only be considered if other options fail to deliver.
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Employment Option E3		support - will allow inward investment and existing local businesses to grow
W O Clarke Trust	Landowner	Strutt and Parker	Employment Option E3		support - allocating new land supports inward investment - would meet qualitative demand



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Wasdell Properties Ltd	Developer	Turley	Empoyment Option E3		support - subject to strategic site being located within borough - would meet qualitative demand - should be viewed as minimum level of provision - all sustainable sites for industrial/employment development should be allocated
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		Heritage asset		- Don't wish to see the old barns at Taw Hill be converted. Could they be listed?
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		Heritage transport		-The Swindon and Cricklade railway site and its proposed route into Moulden Hill should be safeguarded. it is understood that the Borough is being slow to extend the lease of the track bed which is an obstacle to attracting funding. A 99 or 999 year lease would be a great help.
Wrag Barn Golf Club	Landowner	Plan-A Planning	Highworth sites		- support growth at Highworth to support vitality of town - development focussed at north of Highworth may undermine vitality and viability of towns high street
1 x respondent	resident		Historic environment policy		- support shortening policy En10, but it should retain reference to local - non registered heritage assets such as Lwn Park and GWR park. Similarly for Buildings of significant local interest. NPPF unpecific.
1 x respondent	resident		Historic environment policy		nppf para 16 f should be quoted in full - local policy objectives should be provided for key sites that need protecting/bringing back into use in a way that preserves historic facades
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		Historic environment policy		Labour believes it's crucial a policy is included within the Local Plan that protects local heritage buildings/assets from being partly or fully demolished. Furthermore, we need to build on the success of the Heritage Action Zone bid and the improvements made to the Carriage Works, by using the Local Plan to encourage the redevelopment of the Mechanics Institute and restoring the Milton Road Baths.
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Historic environment policy		- desire to see policy EN10 retained and enhanced
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		HMOs		- concern about absence of policy on HMOs and the impact of concentrations of HMOs in some central areas

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					on character of area, street scene, amenity of neighbouring residents
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		Honda		suggest use of the Honda site for housing
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Honda		long culverted section of Kingsdown Brook under site. Redevelopment should seek to re-open watercourse. Building on top of, or within 8m would require EA consent - which may be withheld
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		Honda		It is to be hoped that the Honda site will be maintained as an employment site and not changed to housing
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		Honda		Promote Honda site as Industrial/Science Park. Emphasise housing is cheaper than Oxford etc
Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce	Local organisation		Honda		Honda site should remain exclusively available for employment purposes and protected by planning policy in the new Local Plan.
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Housing options	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Our client supports Option H2 - Graduated Dispersal as a spatial strategy as it seeks to allocate housing at the largest villages and at some or all of the other villages in the Borough. Such a strategy would result in the dispersal of 1,817 dwellings across the villages of the Borough. However, we also recognise the merit of making provision for a small number of larger site allocations to enable a more robust housing land supply and help build in some contingency. Separate representations have been submitted by David Lock Associates on behalf of Hannick Homes, Hallam Land Management and Taylor Wimpey, which advocates additional housing at the New Eastern Villages. Turning to the other spatial strategy options; Option H1 is considered to be a repeat of the Council's previous spatial strategy of allocating large greenfield sites, therefore it would not expand the range and choice of sites in accordance with national planning policy guidance. The approach is not considered to be sustainable as it would result in the coalescence of Swindon and Broad Blunsdon and the delivery of 1,500 homes from SHLAA sites S0050, S0429 and S0048 is uncertain. Option H3 proposes to focus development at

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>Broad Blunsdon, however this would again be a spatial strategy that focused the majority of new development in the Borough on green field development at one particular location and concern is expressed that this would not deliver housing at the rates required over the plan period owing to the lack of choice of sites provided to the housing market. Our clients support Option 2 however it is suggested that the Council consider distributing some of the proposed Highworth capacity to 'other villages' across Options 2, 3 and 4 given the lack of deliverable and developable sites evidenced at Highworth by the SHELAA. Our client's sites at Chiseldon and Wanborough are both deliverable and can be allocated to meet any increased housing requirements in these locations.</p>
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	Housing Option H3	S0460	<p>disagree with the SA's conclusions regarding Option 3 (Broad Blunsdon focus). Broad Blunsdon – taken as a parish area - is being considered in isolation and its treatment is contrary to the approach taken in the adopted development plan. In planning and sustainability terms Broad Blunsdon's proximity to Swindon is of critical importance. Broad Blunsdon's proximity to Swindon is clearly why the Council have allocated strategic growth to this location as part of the adopted development plan (Kingsdown allocation, Policy NC5). Furthermore, considerable investment is to take place in this area in public transport, new bridge across the A419 (which has secured £6.5M of HIF funding) and new community facilities (including local centre and 2 form entry primary school). It is already a sustainable location for development, with further sustainability benefits once Kingsdown is implemented. Pursuing this Option 3 will therefore enable the Council to direct development close to Swindon, reinforcing the strategy in the adopted</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					development plan. To suggest that directing development away from Swindon under Option H2 Graduated Dispersal is more sustainable
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Housing Options	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	Whilst the proposal to consider a wider distribution of housing is supported, this approach would only pertain to the delivery of 1,000 'residual' dwellings. However, for housing needs to be effectively met within the Plan-period, there is a need to consider further spatial options to test how thousands of additional dwellings could be realistically delivered. This is recommended in order to reduce the heavy reliance on high rates of completions being achieved at the New Communities, by 2036. This testing is also recommended to account for the fact that (as noted) the level of housing need could markedly increase beyond that currently identified.
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	Housing Options	Pry Farm	Do not support any of the four identified options as currently drafted. M&MSL believe that a full, comparative study of ALL development strategy options in the Swindon Housing Market Area should have been carried out so that the most sustainable strategy can be identified. This should also have been carried out with a view to a longer timescale being planned for to, say, 2050 and include all suitable land within the administrative area of Wiltshire as well as Swindon Borough. M&MSL believe that on the basis of historic evidence this would lead to a clear choice to deliver a sustainable (joint) strategy for both authorities

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Primegate Properties	Land Promoter	Origin 3	Housing numbers	Hook south	Council should consider including a larger buffer in their overall housing requirement. A larger buffer would be more in keeping with paragraph 50 of the NPPF and support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, rather than just building a small amount of "flex" into the numbers
Gladman	Land promoter		Housing Numbers	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	The inclusion of a meaningful contingency is common practice in plan making and would greatly assist in supporting the demonstration of the plan's soundness at examination. Gladman would also highlight the findings in the Inspector's report into the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy, published in June 2016. In that Report, at paragraph 71, the Inspector finds that to ensure the plan is positively prepared in line with the NPPF, the 10% reserve for housing sites should be increased to 20%
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Housing numbers	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	Should incorporate additional flexibility to respond effectively to a level of housing need, which is significantly greater than that identified. Reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- unpredictability inherent in the standard method and (by extension) the uncertainty regarding the level of housing need that may ultimately be established. In this respect.</li> <li>- do not endorse all aspects of ORS' methodology and consider that this results in too modest an uplift over the minimum LHN figure being concluded - underestimate levels of future employment growth (and therefore the extent of in-migration) within the Swindon HMA.</li> <li>- there is a case for further affordability and market signals uplifts<sup>6</sup>. These are justified to account for issues including the suppression of household formation and overcrowding concerns, which have accumulated within this HMA, and which contribute to detrimental socio-economic outcomes. In addition, it is also the case that the level of housing need identified in the consultation document (at paragraphs 4.2 to 4.8), falls well below the Objectively Assessed Need ('OAN') (1,450 dpa) established in the</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>'Swindon and Wiltshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment Report 2017' ('SHMA'). The conclusions of the SHMA in relation to OAN, as well as affordable housing need and related issues such as overcrowding, cannot simply be disregarded. Indeed, to treat the findings of the SHMA as 'redundant', is to propose an approach that is inconsistent with the PPG. In addition, it is noted (at paragraph 4.6 of the consultation report) that the Council proposes to identify land for 5 percent more housing than the minimum LHN figure, bringing the effective annual requirement to 1,090 dwellings. However, this figure does not appear to account for the quantum of need (1,080 dpa) identified in the Housing Needs Assessment 2019, as a 5 percent uplift over that figure would equate to 1,134 dpa. The potential of existing strategic allocations to deliver effectively is open to question. Likewise, the Council will be aware that the Housing Delivery Test could result in a 20 percent buffer being applied for the purposes of assessing the ongoing five year supply position.</p>
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Housing numbers	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	<p>Recent experience suggests that thousands of the 17,740 dwellings "already planned for" may fail to come forward as expected or within the Plan-period to 2036. The residual requirement is therefore likely to be significantly greater than anticipated and will not be sufficiently accounted for by the 5 percent uplift envisaged at paragraph 4.6 of the consultation document. There are specific reasons to doubt the viability of the strategic allocations in the current Local Plan. There are then credible reasons to doubt the potential of the existing strategic allocations to deliver effectively, prior to 2036. This is not necessarily to suggest that the New Communities should be deallocated. Indeed, these allocations could ultimately facilitate delivery in the long-term, including after the plan-period. However, this will require underling infrastructure cost issues to be overcome and, at present, there is little evidence to</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>suggest a solution has been secured. In view of the above, the assertion (made at paragraph 4.10 of the consultation document) that "...homes have been planned to meet close to 90% of anticipated housing needs to 2036", is not regarded as a justified and satisfactory basis for progressing the Local Plan Review. It is recommended that a critical review be undertaken to evaluate the New Communities' potential to meet housing needs effectively. This should be directed at establishing a more objective basis for understanding what quantum of development has a realistic prospect of being achieved during the Plan-period, and what quantum of development will need to be met elsewhere and through a different approach.</p>
Hills	Land promoter	Pro-vision	Housing numbers	S0020	<p>Hills believe that in the interests of promoting a more sustainable pattern of growth, consideration should be given to planning to provide additional housing growth at Swindon in order to reduce net commuting. With a 5% buffer the housing requirement should be 1134 dpa (without any further increase for commuting). Past delivery rates on small sites does not comprise compelling evidence and therefore windfall allowance should be discounted,</p>
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	Housing numbers	S0032	<p>the revised figure of 21,600 over the plan period is an underestimate of the appropriate level of housing required to be planned for across the authority -no evidence that forecast of additional jobs over the plan period should be viewed as anything other than a minimum likely level of job growth associated with their published growth strategies - It is not considered that the potential impacts of the closure of the Honda plant should be considered in isolation - overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population - Insufficient consideration is given to the extent to which the concluded scale of housing need will address affordability issues</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					the Council should factor in a 20% buffer, rather than the 5% buffer the Council have currently accounted for. The current buffer is insufficient to meet the residual requirement and to reinstate a five year housing land supply.
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Emery Planning	Housing Numbers	S0036	Our view at this stage is that allocating approximately 1,000 homes through this plan will not assist in meeting the 5 year supply or provide flexibility over the plan period. We consider that the windfall allowance of 855 should be planned for through allocations and that windfall sites would provide an element of flexibility over and above allocations to meet the 19,650 dwellings. Our view is that the plan should plan for at least 1,910 dwellings. There should also be a non-implementation allowance of 10% applied to the current supply and planned for through allocations.
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Housing Numbers	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	Paragraph 4.6 of the consultation document states a need to identify sites for only 19,650 dwellings, this provides less than 1% contingency on the required total of 19,440 dwellings and is considered insufficient as it may result in housing need not being met across the plan period for the Borough. It is considered that as a minimum and to accord with paragraph 11a) and to ensure that both housing and economic needs are met, and in accordance with the findings of Inspectors elsewhere that the Local Plan Review should plan for at least 5% above the identified housing need. This would require that a sufficient supply to provide for 20,412 homes was identified.



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
One Swindon Ltd	Land promoter	Turley	Housing Numbers	S0097	<p>the revised figure of 21,600 over the plan period is an underestimate of the appropriate level of housing required to be planned for across the authority -no evidence that forecast of additional jobs over the plan period should be viewed as anything other than a minimum likely level of job growth associated with their published growth strategies - It is not considered that the potential impacts of the closure of the Honda plant should be considered in isolation - overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population - Insufficient consideration is given to the extent to which the concluded scale of housing need will address affordability issues</p> <p>the Council should factor in a 20% buffer, rather than the 5% buffer the Council have currently accounted for. The current buffer is insufficient to meet the residual requirement and to reinstate a five year housing land supply.</p>
Kingsdown Nurseries	Owner	Turley	Housing Numbers	s0380	<p>the revised figure of 21,600 over the plan period is an underestimate of the appropriate level of housing required to be planned for across the authority -no evidence that forecast of additional jobs over the plan period should be viewed as anything other than a minimum likely level of job growth associated with their published growth strategies - It is not considered that the potential impacts of the closure of the Honda plant should be considered in isolation - overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population - Insufficient consideration is given to the extent to which the concluded scale of housing need will address affordability issues</p> <p>the Council should factor in a 20% buffer, rather than the 5% buffer the Council have currently accounted for. The current buffer is insufficient to meet the residual requirement and to reinstate a five year housing land supply.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	Housing Numbers	S0429	As a minimum, in accordance with the findings of Inspectors elsewhere, it is considered that to accord with paragraph 11a, and to ensure that housing and economic needs are met, the Local Plan Review should plan for at least 5% above the identified housing need. This would require that a sufficient supply to provide for 20,412 homes was identified
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Housing numbers	S0454	- plan shouldn't write off historic under-delivery - there is a need to do a forecast of completions in accordance with NPPF para 67
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Housing Numbers	S0455	The scale of past shortfall is significant and it should not be merely "written off" in the preparation of the new Plan. This "historic" unmet need must be taken into account in the new calculation of housing need. There is a strong case to raise the housing requirement to a more realistic level, taking into account recent, but long standing under delivery and the need to address wider economic and transportation issues. Inevitably however, this throws into sharp focus, the need for co-operation with neighbouring authorities.
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	housing numbers	S0458	The scale of past shortfall is significant and it should not be merely "written off" in the preparation of the new Plan. This "historic" unmet need must be taken into account in the new calculation of housing need. There is a strong case to raise the housing requirement to a more realistic level, taking into account recent, but long standing under delivery and the need to address wider economic and transportation issues. Inevitably however, this throws into sharp focus, the need for co-operation with neighbouring authorities.
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	housing numbers	S0462, S0457 and S0461	The scale of (past) shortfall is significant and it should not be merely "written off" in the preparation of the new Plan. This "historic" unmet need must be taken into account in the new calculation of housing need. There is a strong case to raise the housing requirement to a more realistic level, taking into account recent, but long standing under

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					delivery and the need to address wider economic and transportation issues. Inevitably however, this throws into sharp focus, the need for co-operation with neighbouring authorities.
Fairhurst UK Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	housing numbers	S0463 and S0467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- plan shouldn't write off historic under-delivery</li> <li>- there is a need to do a forecast of completions in accordance with NPPF para 67</li> </ul>
Ellipsis Farms Limited	Owner	Strutt & Parker	Housing numbers	S0477	The current standard method underestimates the level of housing need in the Borough and, as a result, the Council may not be adopting a positive and aspirational approach to undertaking the Local Plan Review. Reference to potential change in governments methodology, published SHMA figures and potential unmet needs of Wiltshire.
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Boyer	housing numbers	s0486	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5% uplift should be applied to the 1080 figure set out in the ORS report leading to a requirement of 1134dpa</li> <li>- overestimate of delivery at existing strategic allocations</li> </ul>
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Boyer	housing numbers	s0486	- site promotion, new site, Prior's Hill, Wroughton argue it wouldn't lead to coalescence and wouldn't be major development in AONB
Ainscough Strategic Land	Land promoter		housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- local housing need assessment (LHNA) is an underestimate because of underestimate of level of jobs growth in comparatively out of date FEMA and ELR and because of SWLEP evidence of strength of the local economy, Local Industrial Strategy and investment by the LEP</li> <li>- LHNA overestimates future economically active population because it fails to take adequate account of ageing population</li> <li>- LHNA should be more transparent in its method</li> <li>- insufficient consideration has been given to whether housing number will deliver affordable housing need in full</li> <li>- a 10% non-implementation rate should be applied to existing housing commitments, they shouldn't be counted in full</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					- delivery expectations on allocated sites are unrealistic, they should be reduced. if they are, projected completions reduce by 2,250
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact	housing numbers		plan shouldn't write off historic under-delivery - there is a need to do a forecast of completions in accordance with NPPF para 67
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	housing numbers		should be higher than LHN as affordability ratio has worsened in current local plan period - overestimation of housing delivery at New Eastern Villages, allocated housing figure for Great Stall West was 900 too high
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	housing numbers		- repeats criticisms from Turley's other reps: - underestimates employment growth - too pessimistic about impact of Honda closure - The LHNA has potentially overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population and the resultant underestimation of the additional working age residents needed to support future job growth. - plan should factor in 20% 5yhrs buffer - overestimate delivery at strategic sites
Cooper Estates Strategic Land Ltd	Land promoter	Terence Orourke	housing numbers		Proposed approach isn't positive strategy in line with government's strategy. Should plan for more than minimum LHN - should also plan for a higher number as affordability ratio may worsen in March next year and to take account of potential for LHN method change to lead to higher housing requirement

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Crest Nicholson	Developer	Savills	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- uplift should be to the ORS number and a 20% uplift is needed to boost supply of housing</li> <li>- The Swindon and Wiltshire 2018 Local Economic Assessment (SWLEA) shows that Swindon is underperforming in the delivery of development</li> <li>- should consider affordability both in Swindon and in Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire.</li> </ul>
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		housing numbers		- proposed requirement maintains status quo rather than boosting supply. A 20% contingency above minimum requirements should be allocated
Liddington PC	Parish Council		Housing numbers		- loss of Honda means housing numbers should be reconsidered to stop Swindon becoming a dormitory town rather than a town of destination
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	Housing numbers		<p>it is considered that there are circumstances for the uncapped LHN figure of 1,040 per year to be increased towards current annual housing requirement figure of 1,467 per year. This would also help to address the shortfall against the development plan requirement which stood at 1,742 when figures were last updated in April 2017. Given Swindon's economic status it is considered that the upper end of the forecast should be used, and the housing requirement adjusted upward, accordingly. We do not consider that all of these (strategic) allocations can be relied upon for the following reasons:</p> <p>a. NEV and South Marston (8,446 dwellings). This allocation for 8,000 dwellings has only one planning permission (for 370 dwellings) and whilst applications for a further 6,430 dwellings are before the Council, the allocated figure was based on an incorrect quantum of housing from the Great Stall West site due to an overestimation of the site area. Therefore 900 dwellings will not be delivered from this part of the site.</p> <p>b. In addition, it is considered that the delivery of nearly 7,000 dwellings (on the basis of the planning applications being approved) will take most of the period to 2036 and this will reduce the appetite for further applications to come</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					forward in this location. Therefore, we believe that further capacity for at least another 1,000 dwellings will need to be found
Tim & Matthew Painter and Dacroy Ltd		Turley	Housing Numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- repeats criticisms from Turley's other reps:</li> <li>- underestimates employment growth</li> <li>- too pessimistic about impact of Honda closure</li> <li>- The LHNA has potentially overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population and the resultant underestimation of the additional working age residents needed to support future job growth.</li> <li>- plan should factor in 20% 5yhrs buffer</li> <li>- overestimate delivery at strategic sites</li> <li>- insufficient consideration of whether the scale of housing need will address affordability issues</li> </ul>
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		Housing numbers		- concern about volumes of traffic using Swindon Rd, Marlborough Rd, Devizes Rd and Wharf Rd and negative affect on the life quality of residents living on these routes
1 x respondent	resident		housing numbers		- Local plan housing target should take into account Honda closure, and the need for sites should therefore be reviewed
1 x respondent	resident		housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- questions housing target of 1000 homes</li> <li>- will result in loss of countryside</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		housing numbers		- questions housing target due to closing of Honda - will reduce demand. Other developments in pipeline/with permission will adequately address needs

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		housing numbers		Questions need for the level of residential proposed given Honda closure and existing development at Tadpole, Badbury, NEV etc
1 x respondent	resident		housing numbers		suggests reduction considering climate change and water stress in the area
2 x respondents	resident		housing numbers		does not support methodology for calculating need. It is under wider scrutiny
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		housing numbers		<p>question section 4.6 1090 a year housing allocation - over 20 years this amounts to 21,800 dwellings, rather than 19,650 new homes as proposed in section 4.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Swindon has been selling consistently between 1,143 and 1,740 dwellings a year since 1980s - therefore do not support decreasing the number of dwellings so substantially</li> <li>- in 4.9 question where the 17,740 dwellings that are already counted are located, in particularly the 2177 within the Swindon urban area. Suggest this figure is incorrect as on unviable brownfield sites that will not be built out. evidence of this is that many of the sites listed have been undeveloped for many years. contaminated, or the cost of demolition or restoration makes these sites unviable.</li> <li>- section 4.9 - there are less than 317 dwellings left to build in Wroughton as at least 2 of the sites are nearing end of their build. figure of 979 dwellings shown as non-strategic greenfield expansion are over inflated</li> <li>- 570 dwellings allocated to south marston have been included within the 7876 dwellings at NEV</li> <li>- question where all of the 17,740 dwellings which are still to be built from the existing LP are located - believe there is an under allocation by approx 6780 to 7400 dwellings</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- repeats criticisms from Turley's other reps:</li> <li>- underestimates employment growth</li> <li>- too pessimistic about impact of Honda closure</li> <li>- The LHNA has potentially overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population and the resultant underestimation of the additional working age residents needed to support future job growth.</li> <li>- plan should factor in 20% 5yhls buffer</li> <li>- overestimate delivery at strategic sites</li> <li>- insufficient consideration of whether the scale of housing need will address affordability issues</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider residual requirement is too low.</li> <li>- failure to examine performance of current strategic allocations and review the likelihood of delivery of these sites to 2036</li> </ul>
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wishes to see housing trajectory for a more informed approach to housing requirement</li> <li>- addition of 250 homes across all spatial options - not clear on why/how this was reached</li> <li>- addition of 250 homes across all spatial options - underestimation of housing need</li> <li>- plan should factor in 20% 5yhls buffer</li> </ul>
W O Clarke Trust	Landowner	Strutt and Parker	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>standard method underestimates level of housing need</li> <li>- may need to accommodate unmet housing need from Wilts</li> </ul>
Wroughton Investments Ltd	Land Promoter	Turley	housing numbers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- repeats criticisms from Turley's other reps:</li> <li>- underestimates employment growth</li> <li>- too pessimistic about impact of Honda closure</li> <li>- The LHNA has potentially overestimated the job growth supported by an ageing population and the resultant underestimation of the additional working age residents needed to support future job growth.</li> <li>- plan should factor in 20% 5yhls buffer</li> <li>- overestimate delivery at strategic sites</li> <li>- insufficient consideration of whether the scale of housing need will address affordability issues</li> </ul>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Ainscough Strategic Land	Land promoter		Housing Option H1	s0048	support option to plan for long-term growth, - site promotion, could provide a new A419 junction
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H1	s032/379 s0048	- would undermine ability to demonstrate 5yhls - development near Lower Blunsdon CA would harm its rural setting - air quality impact - new separate A419 junction needed - oppose s0048 on conservation and landscape grounds
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H1	s379/32	consider it an attractive, logical approach to ensuring sustainable housing delivery can continue - but existing serious pressure on parts of the local highways network, which are aware also impinge on the national Strategic Road Network, given that the Turnpike and adjoining Coldharbour junctions suffer from demand that exceeds peak capacity. Until there is much more clarity regarding the practicality and funding of interventions to address this issue (including the potential to achieve mode shift taking advantage of a step change in public transport quality and availability), whether from development or otherwise, we recognise it would be inappropriate to rely on any further strategic development in the area. - support the evaluation of this as a longer-term rather than immediate option - Consolidating development here could credibly further boost demand for local service and justify higher bus frequencies, boosting further the relevance and attractiveness of the service against personal car use. We are of the strong view that it ought to be possible to extend the service at relatively limited cost in additional resources, subject to careful master planning to optimise the final bus routing. Existing No.9 service could be extended further north - should improve pedestrian and cycle links to Broad Blunsdon using the existing overbridge - either the Copse park and ride should be brought back

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					into service or a new park and ride site created, with option H1 it would be possible for this to be served by 4 buses per hour
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H1		<p>object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposed sites to the north and east of Blunsdon will impact on the setting of the village, the Conservation Area, hotel complex and fort.</li> <li>- current local plan has failed in its reliance on large strategic sites, impacting on 5YHLS.</li> <li>- small to medium sites will provide quick build out rates</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H1		<p>strategic scale sites provide opportunity for more comprehensive infrastructure improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- However slow to deliver required housing numbers</li> </ul>
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H1		would exacerbate traffic conditions on the local road network
Crest Nicholson	Developer	Savills	Housing Option H1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- there is a significant disconnect between option 1 of the SA and Option H1 in the Emerging Strategies report (ESR). The ESR refers to the potential to combine strategic expansion with additional housing at higher tier settlements, the SA report doesn't and that leads to H1 being scored more poorly</li> <li>- provides a list of benefits of Option H1 compared to other options, in particular it means development at edge</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					of most sustainable settlement, and ability for an immediate phase of development
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose the sites as they are distant from existing bus service, concern housing is so distant from Swindon town centre that it would be satellite housing fro Oxford</li> <li>- capacity issues at A419 Cold Harbour junction</li> </ul>
Highways England	Statutory consultee		Housing Option H1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further development at Blunsdon is likely to result in an adverse impact at the A419 Blunsdon junction. Blunsdon junction currently operates under constraint at peak times, resulting in mainline queuing. Queueing on the mainline is considered to be a severe safety risk.</li> <li>- Highways England would take the view that any development adding trips to an off-slip, which then results in mainline queuing, extends a mainline queue, and/or increases the frequency at which a mainline queue occurs, will have a severe safety impact on the SRN.</li> </ul>
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Housing Option H1		oppose, concern about traffic impact through Blunsdon and Highworth towards Faringdon

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Messrs Francis	Landowner	Ridge	Housing Option H1		<p>Option H1 is the most sustainable location for future growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capable of providing relief to the congested Coldharbour junction through the provision of a new junction on the A419 to the north capable of serving development east and west of the A419.</li> <li>- provides a future longer-term growth location for Swindon to build on.</li> </ul> <p>An allocation of the site at Appendix 1 in this Plan for early release will enable the pump-priming of the necessary infrastructure. However, Option 3 is also deliverable for around 1,000 dwellings, though for the reasons set out below, it is not assessed accurately in the LPR Emerging Strategies and its evidence base. there are inconsistencies in the plan and its evidence base with regard to this land. The SHELAA identifies two sites east of the A419 (S0404 &amp; S0048) which are combined to comprise s0048 in the LPR Emerging Strategies. The SHELAA incorrectly identifies the site area as 140.6 hectares with a capacity of 4,2980 dwellings rather than the 58.7 ha area and around 1,000 dwellings being promoted. The SHELAA also describes the site as being in the flood plain of the River Ray which it isn't. The remainder of the description relates primarily to land west of the A419 (S0030 and S0379/0032). Figure 3 in the LPR Emerging Strategies therefore significantly overestimates the area and development potential of site s0048 with a consequential lower scoring on the residential and employment site appraisals in the Interim SA report. Such inaccuracies in the evidence base are likely to result in unnecessary adverse comments during this consultation for Option H3 and an unsound plan if not corrected. site s0048 is capable of delivering around 1,000 dwellings on approximately 58 ha whether as part of Option 1 or Option 3</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		Housing Option H1		If either of these options is adopted, developer contributions should be obtained to help provide cycle links to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The large employment concentrations at South Marston and Honda, possibly along Kingsdown Lane;</li> <li>• Swindon Town Centre (to where there is currently no continuous, legible route);</li> <li>• Highworth</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H1		- not large enough to be viewed as strategic
W O Clarke Trust	Landowner	Strutt and Parker	Housing Option H1		- support - could address housing shortfall should there be any deliverability issues from the allocations being taken forward - larger sites can deliver specialist housing
Woodland Trust	National organisation		Housing Option H1		object to option, will affect ancient woodland at Upper Widhill Copse. Large scale development in proximity would negatively affect healthy functioning of this irreplaceable habitat by recreational pressure, noise and pollution disturbance
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H1		- in principle objection to housing at Wroughton as part of this option
Firecracker Development Ltd	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H2	Land adjacent to Honeyfield Alpacas	FDL consider Option 2 to also align most with their aspirations, allowing for dispersed smaller housing allocations across a number of villages in the Borough such as Wanborough
On behalf of	Land Owner	DPDS	Housing Option H2	s0017	It should be highlighted that there is a significant benefit in allocating a number of smaller or non-strategic sites, as these tend to deliver more quickly than strategic sites which can have complex ownership patterns and substantial technical constraints. It is these smaller sites, therefore, which truly contribute to the housing land supply of the Borough and address the shortfall from the previous plan period.
Kingsdown Nurseries	Land Owner	Turley	Housing Option H2	s0380	Option H2 since this represents the most sustainable option according to the Interim Sustainability Appraisal and

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					would help to ensure the viability and vitality of these settlements.
Bower Mapson	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H2	S0432	Broadly support option H2 – Graduated Dispersal as the preferred route for the local plan due to the option being able to deliver the largest amount of dwellings with the greatest number of sustainable locations
Backhouse Housing	Developer	Panning sphere	Housing Option H2	s0484	SME - quick delivery, supported by Housing White Paper. Promtion of site for consideration.
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H2		preferred option
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H2		support H2 - given size of town and status in settlement hierarchy, considers Highworth should be accommodating more housing than proposed. Help to sustain shops and services - ageing population in Highworth. New housing should be attractive to young people and families to create cohesive community
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H2		support
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H2		- in principle objection to housing at Wroughton as part of this option
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H2		faster delivery of housing. But less scope for delivering infrastructure improvements therefore less sustainable than H1
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H2		disagree with conclusion that option H2 most sustainable option based on SA - SA does not include detailed consideration of local housing needs or enhancing vitality of rural communities. Considers this is necessary to justify development at unsustainable locations, as SA concludes in appraisal of 'other village sites' that they score poorly in relation to access to services. Not clear how this represents sustainable option based on supporting docs. - housing at these locations would be more suitable as rural exception sites
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H2		- Agree that Highworth and Wroughton should be allowed to grow but that sites within the urban area of Swindon

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
					town itself should also be included as part of this particular growth option.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H2		- support option - allows steady flow of smaller developments - best for maintaining 5yhls
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	Housing Option H2		support this option to address immediate housing needs
CPRE	National organisation		Housing Option H2		- support as the most pragmatic approach
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H2		- support, but development should be focussed on sustainable transport corridors 400m either side of a road where 4 buses per hour (each way) or within 500m of a train station
Highworth Homes Ltd	Developer	Gary Llewellyn	Housing Option H2		supports Option H2: Graduated Dispersal and development at South Marston
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Housing Option H2		- generally support as best option to retain control over numbers. However Highworth water and sewerage infrastructure is at capacity and can't support further development
Home Builders Federation	National organisation		Housing Option H2		support. provides the greatest variety of housing development sites, addresses concerns about market capacity and deliverability
Keith Hillyard	Land owner	Gary Llewellyn	Housing Option H2		Supports option H2: Graduated dispersal - with reference to Upper Inglesham
Liddington PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H2		oppose option. Imprecisely worded option. Building at the edge of existing villages and communities is not a good policy
On behalf of	Land owner	Gary Llewellyn	Housing Option H2		supports Option H2: Graduated Dispersal and development at South Marston
Prospect Hospice	Co Land owner	Projec-Technique	Housing Option H2		support

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H2		villages like Wanborough are entirely car dependent - but further development on a limited scale is likely to be quite insufficient to positively alter the availability of local services, which today are exceptionally limited - development at scattered small villages is inherently unsustainable - Highworth is more remote from Swindon than the other options available North of Swindon and at Wroughton, which fundamentally undermines its ability to offer options that minimise the need to travel the settlement does not justify a strategic focus for development
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		Housing Option H2		dispersed option would make it more difficult to plan cycling links, increasing vehicle use
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	Housing Option H2		support this option and allocation of small/medium sites in urban area to address immediate housing needs
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H2		-not strategy in itself - partial solution that may address short term supply issue
Warneford School Board of Governors	Local organisation	Gary Llewellyn	Housing Option H2		Support for Option H2 (graduated dispersal) with reference to supporting Highworth
Wrag Barn Golf Club	Landowner	Plan-A Planning	Housing Option H2		-support
Wroughton Investments Ltd	Land Promoter	Turley	Housing Option H2		- support this option and allocation of small/medium sites in urban area to address immediate housing needs
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H2		- support
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H3	s0048	oppose the sites as they are distant from existing bus service, concern housing is so distant from Swindon town centre that it would be satellite housing from Oxford - capacity issues at A419 Cold Harbour junction
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	Housing Option H3	S0429	considered to provide the most sustainable option. Option 1 would provide for 1,800+ homes, options 2 and 4 for 1,000 homes and option 3 for 1,100 homes. Therefore, the only current option which provides for a sufficient number of homes is option 1. If any other option is to be pursued, it will be necessary to review the distribution accordingly to provide a sufficient supply.



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	Housing Option H3	S0460	In considering Option 3 there is of course a distinction to be drawn: development need not necessarily be focussed to Broad Blunsdon village but can be focused on the parts of the parish area closest to Swindon, such as along Turnpike Road – i.e. SHELAA site 0460 – complementing strategic growth, public transport and infrastructure investment already planned for this location. This reinforces the spatial strategy in the adopted SBLP whereby development is to be concentrated at Swindon.
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	Housing Option H3	S0460	We understand the issues raised with respect to the capacity of the Cold Harbour junction, however it is important to note that the Council and Highways England need to model, test and identify a mitigation package for this junction anyway since this is critical to delivery of the Kingsdown scheme and implementation of the adopted development plan. Once a package of mitigation is agreed this should clearly be factored in to a revised SA of options. Planned closure of Honda in 2021 should also be included in this modelling since it could have considerable impacts on the highway network, particularly traffic on the A419.
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H3		- Blunsdon is already taking considerable development - further development will change the character of the area. - therefore less sustainable than Option H1
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H3		would exacerbate traffic conditions on the local road network
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H3		oppose - landscape harm and harm to conservation assets - lack of core services to support quantum of growth - poor bus service - high level of existing development planned
Highways England	Statutory consultee		Housing Option H3		-Further development at Blunsdon is likely to result in an adverse impact at the A419 Blunsdon junction. Blunsdon junction currently operates under constraint at peak times, resulting in mainline queuing. Queueing on the mainline is

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>considered to be a severe safety risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highways England would take the view that any development adding trips to an off-slip, which then results in mainline queuing, extends a mainline queue, and/or increases the frequency at which a mainline queue occurs, will have a severe safety impact on the SRN.</li> </ul>
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Housing Option H3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose, concern about traffic impact through Blunsdon and Highworth towards Faringdon</li> </ul>
Messrs Slattery, Gallagher and Hall	Land owners	Gary Llewellyn	Housing Option H3		Supports option H3: Blunsdon Focus
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H3		<p>this could be considered as a variant of option H2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this option poses the greatest challenges for transport in general, and sustainable modes in particular</li> <li>- easier to integrate options west of A419 into the wider public transport network than those to its east, at present no credible bus service and virtually all journeys are car borne</li> <li>- any bus service that has to cross the Cold Harbour junction is likely to be subject to significant peak time delay. May be an option to extend Go South Coast's No.12 to terminate in Blunsdon Village.</li> <li>- Blunsdon doesn't have critical mass to support a regular service until Kingsdown and its spine road and bridge are delivered at which point a frequent bus service would be possible but won't have secondary school access</li> <li>- sees further growth at Blunsdon as a reserve or long term option, there may be potential to improve convenience retail in the village,</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		Housing Option H3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If either of these options is adopted, developer contributions should be obtained to help provide cycle links to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The large employment concentrations at South Marston and Honda, possibly along Kingsdown Lane;</li> <li>• Swindon Town Centre (to where there is currently no</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					continuous, legible route); • Highworth
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H3		can only address short term supply issue. Only suitable for small scale, non-strategic development - infrastructure, topographical and landscape constraints
Woodland Trust	National organisation		Housing Option H3		-object to option, will affect ancient woodland at Upper Widhill Copse. Large scale development in proximity would negatively affect healthy functioning of this irreplaceable habitat by recreational pressure, noise and pollution disturbance
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Housing Option H3		- question viability and delivery of land at the bottom of Blunsdon hill/north blunsdon. Can see no evidence that Highways Agency have been consulted on new A419 junction/interchange to enable access. Suggest that Highways agency will not support a new A419 junction so close to Cold harbour. Various quantity surveyors specialising in costing such junctions / interchanges have quoted that the cost of a new A419 junction in this location would be over £30,000,000. As such much of north Blunsdon is undeliverable, and unviable. Add to this the cost of pumping foul sewer uphill back to Barn Field Road Water Treatment works. - landscape impact and ipact on Blunsdon castle scheduled monument - consider blunsdon hill as one of best visual approaches to Swindon and should remain undeveloped and protected.
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		Housing Option H4		developer contributions should be obtained to help provide cycle links across the M4 and onwards to Swindon town centre, to south east and south west Swindon, and via Wichelstowe (see our comments on draft Development Management Policy SA1) to NCN route 45 and Royal Wotton Bassett

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
CPRE	National organisation		Housing Option H4	s0071/s0072	- concern about effect on traffic light controlled systems over the M4 bridge. If these sites were to be heavily public transport promoted, and car penalised, perhaps the effect could be mitigated. Not otherwise.
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		- will exacerbate traffic problems/bottlenecking at Croft Road and to J15 - infrastructure capacity concerns - e.g. doctors surgery - Wroughton is becoming town, without infrastructure to support it
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		not supported - sites conflict with policy objectives. - development should support independence and distinctiveness of rural settlements.
1 x respondent	Councillor		Housing Option H4		does not support, as puts all required housing in Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		preferred option - significant development planned north of m4 - allocating sites in Wroughton would help alleviate pressure on road system north of m4. - Wroughton sustainable location with potential for growth. - Offers more choice for residents
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		Not supported - Already 300+ dwellings in pipeline - additional housing will impact the character of the village - traffic congestion concerns, in particular impact upon Swindon Road and croft road. Resultant pollution - concentration of sites on eastern boundary - pedestrian access into village across main road will be difficult - loss of countryside surrounding village - local services at capacity e.g bmi hospital staff overspill parking into church car park - impact upon the character of the village - 'unfair proportion' of housing potentially allocated to Wroughton - Not in accordance with Wroughton Neighbourhood Plan.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		<p>Sites with permission should be built out before new land allocated . E.g top of Brimble hill, data centre site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns</li> <li>- Highway/traffic concerns - new development should require road improvements e.g Bramble Hill.</li> <li>- Weight restrictions on commercial vehicles should be applied - inappropriate use of Brinkley hill by HGVs</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Housing Option H4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- need for housing recognised, particularly for affordable</li> <li>- However, permissioned development in Wroughton totals 317. Additional 919 (if all sites to be progressed) would impact character of Wroughton into an overflow of Swindon.</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery, schools</li> <li>- Capacity on Swindon road - existing heavy traffic will be exacerbated</li> <li>- H2 graduated dispersal preferred</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Housing option H4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- H4 considered least favourable - will be in addition to houses already permissioned. If all Wroughton sites progressed will result in disproportionate increase in number of homes in village. Infrastructure cannot accommodate this level of growth e.g. doctors surgery, schools. No reference in plan to improving this infrastructure</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H4		<p>Wroughton is already taking considerable development - further development will change the character of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- therefore less sustainable than Option H1</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Housing Option H4		<p>quantum of housing proposed (all sites) plus land with existing permission would increase number of homes in Wroughton by quarter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this option would require significant infrastructure investment e.g doctors surgery, schools, recreation facilities</li> <li>- Highways/traffic concerns on Swindon Road, which will be exacerbated once Wichelstowe is complete.</li> </ul> <p>Wichelstowe southern relief road should be reconsidered.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H4		This is our preferred option. The focus of Swindon's growth for the next plan period should be to the south of the M4 in order to help spread traffic loads more evenly across the Borough and to alleviate pressure on vulnerable points in the local road network in particular Coldharbour junction, the White Hart roundabout/A420, Commonhead and the A419 travelling south towards junction 15 of the M4.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H4		- second preference option - good prospect of maintaining 5yhl's
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		Housing Option H4		concern about traffic impact on Chiseldon
Cllr Stan Pajak	Local councillors		Housing Option H4		opposes option
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H4		- second preference option as in general terms they consider services could be extended
Highways England	Statutory consultee		Housing Option H4		Further development at Wroughton is likely to result in an impact at M5 J15 and/or M4 J16. Both junctions have recently been improved/have a planned improvement to safely accommodate existing strategic site allocations. However, it is not clear whether further improvement would be required, over and above that currently planned and delivered, in order to safely accommodate new development in the Local Plan review
Oxfordshire County Council	local authority		Housing Option H4		preferred option as least likely to have an impact on Oxfordshire
Prospect Hospice	Co - Land owner	Projec-Technique	Housing Option H4		support

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Housing Option H4		<p>Wroughton is where the opportunities for sustainable growth on a strategic scale seem clearest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The settlement is already quite sustainable, with the availability of a range of local shops and services and the secondary school, as well as modest local employment opportunities. It is important to reflect that major employment is available within immediate reach by walking, cycling or public transport at Pipers Way.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, while it is true that congestion seriously affects Devizes Road, Pipers Way and other links to the north, generation of peak single-occupancy car movements would credibly be significantly less compared with almost all other options. This ought to weigh substantially in favour of this option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We are continuing to evaluate the longer-term business case to improve the service frequency on 49 to every half-hour, something that this Option could well help to catalyse.</li> <li>- credible option for 500 homes plus supporting services</li> <li>- no.9 service is current 20m frequency, could be increased as Wichelstowe is built out</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Housing Option H4		sustainable for small scale non strategic development, but does not contain infrastructure to support more than modest growth
Thames Water	Landowner	Savills	Housing Option H4		support

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Emery Planning	Housing Options	S0036	If Option H1 is taken forward, sufficient small and medium sized sites should also need to be identified through the Local Plan to provide flexibility. The allocation of our client's site through Option H1 would ensure flexibility in the housing delivery approach by providing a small site capable of delivering in years 1-5 of the plan period. The allocation of this site would also assist in delivering Option 2, which would identify housing sites dispersed across rural settlements and villages. This small-scale site represents a logical development site which could deliver in the first five years of the Plan, which is identified by the SLPES as the best performing development option. It should be noted that this site could assist in alleviating issues at this junction through potential highway improvements at Cold Harbour junction and solutions to reduce traffic conflict on the junction. In the event that Option 3 is progressed, our client's site would represent a logical allocation in the area surrounding Broad Blunsdon. Option 4 would focus on the expansion of Wroughton, with the majority of development located in this area. However, this does not prevent allocations being identified elsewhere, and it is considered that small-scale sites should also be identified in a dispersed pattern in order to promote sustainable development throughout the borough as a whole. Our client's site is considered to be an ideal small allocation site which would assist in delivering this option.
On behalf of	Land owner	Impact Planning Services	Housing Options	S0454	Broad Spatial Options are not wide enough as they have been heavily influenced by the options in the Sustainability Appraisal. Further diversification of the housing market in Swindon is required. The Borough needs to encourage the provision of higher value (non-estate) lower density homes in the Borough – particularly adjacent those towns and villages with an attractive setting.



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	Councillor		Housing options		Suggests combination of all the areas mentioned in H1, H2 and H3 would give desired land in a fair and practical policy
Cllr Stan Pajak	Local councillors		Housing options		suggests a combination of all the areas mentioned H1, H2 and H3 would give the desired land in a fair and practical policy
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Housing Options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- do not support any of the housing distribution options</li> <li>- no evidence of viability exercise on proposed sites, particularly in urban area</li> <li>- point out planning inspectors letter to West of England combined authority, particularly where politicians had influenced the proposed development within the WECA plan/had not studied all site options or had adequate reasoning as to why they had been discounted. suggest similar occurrence in Swindon. Point out little land allocated in Wanborough where cabinet member for planning is ward member.</li> <li>- question why some sites have been rejected that scored well in shela, whilst some sites have been allocated that appear unviable</li> <li>- suggest amount of rural greenfield land that will need to come forward to deliver the right number of dwellings needs to increase substantially. With electrification of the railway line, speeding up the journey time to London Paddington and Swindon's economic success, there should be more employment and residential land allocated</li> </ul>
Taylor Wimpey	Developer	DPDS	Housing Options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support any options</li> <li>- full study of all development strategy options in the HMA should have been carried out with longer timescale to 2050</li> <li>- smaller strategic sites can be delivered in short term</li> <li>- 'fragmented approach' - difficult to deliver new strategic employment sites</li> </ul>
White Horse Federation	Landowner	DPDS	Housing options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-preferred options are H2 and H4</li> <li>- smaller sites will contribute to HLS/can be delivered in the short term</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		housing options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- dispersal of development in rural areas is not supported by evidence base which identifies local needs and opportunities - does not demonstrate economic, social and environmental benefits to justify this approach.</li> <li>- does not accord with national planning policy on rural housing</li> </ul>
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Housing Supply	S0078, S0079, S0073, S0076	The emerging Local Plan Review provides the opportunity for the Borough to allocate sites to meet their housing needs in full, with capacity from any further consented small or large windfall sites providing contingency over the plan period. This approach would help to restore a five-year housing land supply with certainty for the Borough as smaller deliverable sites are allocated and delivered contributing to land supply in years 3, 4 and 5 of the plan. Therefore, Pegasus submit that the residual quantum of housing be allocated in the emerging plan is 1,817 homes (20,412 – 17,740 – 855) compared to the 1,055 dwellings in the consultation document
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	Housing Supply	S0429	Windfall development typically arises from the delivery of small sites across all settlements. If a strategy of rural dispersal is pursued, it is likely that the level of windfall delivery will reduce in favour of larger allocations at individual settlements. Therefore, depending upon the strategy (and the robustness of the calculations), the identified windfall allowance is likely to provide a maximum. On this basis, and allowing for a sufficient contingency of 5%, there remains a requirement to identify sufficient sites to provide for 1,817 homes (=20,412-17,740-855), as compared to the 1,055 homes (=19,650-17,740-855) which would arise from the 1% contingency identified in the Local Plan Review.
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	Housing Supply	S0460	Deliverable and developable sites are urgently needed to help bolster the Council's 5-year land supply, including land at Turnpike Road (SHELAA ref. 0460).
1 x respondent	resident		Inclusive Design Topic Paper		- suggests number of changes to inclusive design topic paper

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Inclusive Design Topic Paper		- suggests number of changes to inclusive design topic paper
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	infrastructure	Pry Farm	disappointed that key elements of infrastructure are not positively planned for in the Development Management policies
1 x respondent	resident		Infrastructure		- Before any new development is progressed: - infrastructure should be improved e.g. GP provision (waiting times in Swindon are worst in the country), better education provision, road and public transport improvements, town centre investment
NHS Swindon CCG	infrastructure provider		infrastructure		- note housing growth will create increased demand for primary care services
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	Joint working		Whilst a single plan for Swindon including its hinterland within Wiltshire would have been desirable, a Joint Spatial Planning Framework would have provided at least a mechanism for joint working. It is already evident from the statement above, a joint Statement of Common Ground is likely to lead to a much less rigorous examination of the issues and joint working. M&MSL remain of the view that a Joint Strategy for meeting housing needs in Swindon is still desirable.
The Ramblers	National organisation		LA1 Kimmerfields	LA2	- support new pedestrian crossing of railway
1 x respondent	resident		LA1 Kimmerfields		- improved north-south pedestrian permeability is mentioned in LA4 and a pedestrian and bicycle link from Wellington Street to Fleming Way in LA1. As the most direct route from the railway station to the cultural quarter would be via Kimmerfields, suggests requirement for those routes to form a legible route from the railway station to the cultural quarter
1 x respondent	resident		LA1 Kimmerfields		- suggests reference to protecting the canal route (as the route of the western flyer)
Civic Voice	Local organisation		LA1 Kimmerfields		design should prioritise considerations of height in context and the shadow cast by the midday sun

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		LA1 Kimmerfields		add and other green elements to encourage biodiversity - Car parking provision should be reduced and a requirement for safe, dry, cycle parking in the developments introduced.
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		LA1 Kimmerfields		No developments should impede the later provision of high quality cycling links (eg to connect ends of Flyer routes), engineered to London Cycling Design Standards. - para a. The link should segregate vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. - para e. Such connections should be usable by people on bikes. - para k. Cycle parking should be provided, as per Swindon's parking standards
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		LA1 Kimmerfields		- support, would like to see if local plan can be used to incentivise a larger independent retail and food sector
Seven Capital	Developer	Carney Sweeney	LA2 North star		As a result of its location and the character of the site and development, it is considered that the new accommodation would be most appropriate for those without families. Therefore whilst family accommodation would be proposed as part of a varied mix, it is not considered to be the main form of accommodation. Criterion g of the proposed new policy should therefore be amended accordingly.
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		LA2 North star		- para a The Master Plan should show proposed cycle links. - para b. Any bridge (or underpass) provided should be designed for use by cyclists. - The development should also improve the existing Western Flyer link and its connection to Swindon town centre via Sheppard Street.
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		LA2 North star		- support North Star development based on its current outline planning permission
Civic Voice	Local organisation		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	- want to see rebuilding of the station at an appropriate scale, including removal of Signal Point
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	Sites close to Swindon Railway station - A few of these sites lie close to secondary aquifers and have industrial

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					pasts which could have an adverse impact on groundwater quality.
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	It is essential that any redevelopment of the station incorporates extensive cycling links and safe/dry cycle parking - see the precedents in the NL's and Denmark, e.g. Rotterdam train station redevelopment with ~5k cycle parking spaces etc (see <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zWESiQImOC0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zWESiQImOC0</a> ). This encourages and makes it easy for people to cycle to the station. This also reflects the fact that the new green industrial revolution is starting to happen and - in the spirit of Brunel - it provides a focus on Swindon being a leading town/city in the country for this. Everything about this building should set the town apart - green procurement and materials etc
Oxfordshire County Council	local authority		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	support, want discussions to ensure that opportunities in this area and rail use are maximised
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- para c. This link should be designed for use by cyclists as well.</li> <li>- the redevelopment should also enable east / west journeys by bicycle as suggested by the Town Centre Movement Strategy. It should maximise all opportunities for journeys by bike to and from the station. Consideration should be given to providing continuous cycle routes from Bristol Street to County Road. the Town Centre network of cycle provision should be reviewed to maximise the number of high quality routes to and from the station.</li> <li>- para f. more cycle parking should also be provided</li> </ul>
The Ramblers	National organisation		LA3 Swindon Railway Station	LA3	support new pedestrian crossing of railway

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		LA3 Swindon Railway Station		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- comment regarding para 2.1.3 of the draft DM policies (Swindon's parkway station character, and intensifying the use of land around the station and delivering an upgraded station).</li> <li>- Supports policy ambitions, but comments that Swindon station acts as a parkway stations as it has no local stations for commuting into the town centre (like reading, oxford, bristol etc). Poorly served by buses also, particularly in the evenings. Question whether without local stations expanding station will be sufficient to encourage shift from car to train.</li> <li>- No parking at station reserved for rail users, any replacement car parking should be reserved for rail users as per Oxford parkway and bristol parkway</li> </ul>
Civic Voice	Local organisation		LA4 Cultural Quarter	LA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- suggest theatre and business conference centre rather than theatre and museum. The closure of Morrisons gives an opportunity to re-think this area which is a ready-made, attractive area for café life</li> <li>- suggest Morrisons should be designated as a site for a university</li> <li>- suggest re-location of the courts</li> <li>- suggest either a modern art gallery be built on Wyvern Car Park or museum and art gallery be re-located to the Carriageworks</li> </ul>
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		LA4 Cultural Quarter	LA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The concept of this area as a true cultural quarter is highly aspirational. The Policy should recognise that Old Town has a distinctive character and a thriving day and night presence that should be nurtured.</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		LA4 Cultural Quarter	LA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Cultural Quarter should be linked to the wider cycle network, allowing easy journeys to and from it on high quality provision.</li> </ul>
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		LA4 Cultural Quarter	LA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support, would like to see if local plan can be used to incentivise a larger independent retail and food sector</li> </ul>
Theatres Trust	National organisation		LA4 Cultural Quarter	LA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Trust supports the redevelopment of the Wyvern Theatre and urges the Council to engage with the Theatres Trust at an early stage as a statutory consultee.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		LA4 Cultural Quarter		improved north-south pedestrian permeability is mentioned in LA4 and a pedestrian and bicycle link from Wellington Street to Fleming Way in LA1. As the most direct route from the railway station to the cultural quarter would be via Kimmerfields, suggests requirement for those routes to form a legible route from the railway station to the cultural quarter
Theatres Trust	National organisation		LA4 Cultural Quarter		- support redevelopment of Wyvern in principle - recommend early engagement with Trust
Liddington PC	Parish Council		LA5 Hospital Expansion Land	LA5	- Support policy
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		LA6 The Old Town Hall and Corn Exchange	LA6	- must be excellent bike parking facilities
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		LA6 The Old Town Hall and Corn Exchange	LA6	- cycle parking should be provided
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		LA6 The Old Town Hall and Corn Exchange	LA6	- support
Liddington PC	Parish Council		LA7 Setting Protection of Coate Water	LA7	- Support policy
The Ramblers	National organisation		LA7 Setting Protection of Coate Water	LA7	- support protection of Coate Water setting
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	LA7 Setting Protection of Coate Water	S0455	Policy not sound as not based on up to date evidence. Landscape Study of Coate Water Country Park Setting supplied. Also comments on ecology, access and floodrisk
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Meeting Housing Needs at Royal Wootton Bassett	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	Whilst acknowledging that RWB falls within Wiltshire's administrative boundary, it is important to recognise that this settlement is the largest and most sustainable settlement within the cross-boundary HMA, other than the Swindon Urban Area. It should therefore play an enhanced role in meeting development needs. Specifically: frequent bus service and provision of park and ride on site;

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					comprehensive existing services; lack of physical constraints;
1 x respondent	resident		Natural environment		- more needs to be done to restore habitats and create new ones - should discourage paving over of front gardens - should adopt different maintenance approaches to grass cutting to create habitats
2 x respondents	resident		Neighbourhood Planning		- removal of Policy LN1 - neighbourhood planning should be supported - loss of opportunity to encourage climate change resilience/renewable energy at local level
1 x respondent	resident		New site		- new site suggestion - Badbury - suggest allocation in combination with Berricot Lane
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	New site		- north of railway - site promotion - potential for build to rent
Thames Water	Landowner	Savills	New site		- North of Wroughton (former Wroughton Sewage Treatment works site) - site promotion
Wrag Barn Golf Club	Landowner	Plan-A Planning	new site		- promotion of new site - Shrivenham road - closely located to schools and high street - could meet need for sites in the short term
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	Non coalescence areas (SA policies)		- overly restrictive in terms of types of development allowed in these areas - fewer exceptions than national green belt policies
1 x respondent	resident		Omission site	S0253	- does not support removal of this site
1 x respondent	resident		Omission site	S0290	- should be allocated for specialist housing for disabled
1 x respondent	resident		Omission site	S0276	-should be removed - only support development on the green area if Liden centre also redeveloped
Bower Mapson	Developer	DPDS	omission site	s0016	site promotion (land at Nightingale Lane, South Marston)
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	omission site	s0027, s0028	- site promotion of omission site, New Road, Chiseldon
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		omission site	s0033	- not very site option has been discounted



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Swindon Gospel Trust	Landowner	Turley	Omission site	S0033	- site promotion
Wroughton Investments Ltd	Land Promoter	Turley	Omission site	S0245	- site promotion - disagree with removal of site. Site can come forward independently of the surrounding council owned land - garden centre land not in Council ownership
Thames Water	Landowner	Savills	Omission site	S0309	- site promotion - rejected in Shelaa due to site not being actively promoted - confirm that it is available for development
Tim & Matthew Painter and Dacroy Ltd		Turley	Omission site	S0375	- site promotion - should be considered as extension to the Kingsdown development that can come forward separately
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		omission site	s0377	- extreme prominence on the north-facing ridge slope, the site could not lie within convenient walk of any conceivable public transport service, and this, aggravated by steep gradients and extended journey distances, also militates strongly against other sustainable modes being attractive or relevant.
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning	omission site	s0456	site promotion (land at Stanton Waters Farm, Hannington)
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		omission site	s0477	- distant from existing or potential bus services
Civic Voice	Local organisation		omission site		- request a re-plan and re-masterplan of the Tented Market site, including changes to Farnsby St.
Civic Voice	Local organisation		omission site		- request that Granville St. Car Park should be re-included as a site for mid-rise apartments
Civic Voice	Local organisation		omission site		- request that Bristol St Car Park be developed for housing with a bridge over the railway to STEAM
Public Power Solutions	infrastructure provider		omission site		- request that Waterside Park is designated as a "Energy Innovation Zone" (reasons explained in email) to support planning applications and climate change response

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Omission sites		<p>site promotion of following omission sites, consider they are suitable for residential and associated uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upper burytown farm, blunsdon</li> <li>- land between A49 and the marsh, Wanborough</li> <li>- land off shrivenham road, Highworth</li> <li>- land at haydon meadow, haydon wick</li> <li>- inlands farm wanborough</li> </ul>
Lower Burytown Farms Ltd	Owner	Fowler Architecture and Planning Ltd	Omission Site	Manor Farm Hannington	object to the site not being proposed as an allocation
	Owner		Omission Site	S0452	The above plot was added to the Shelaa list last year and it's been a bit of a shock to find out under the Local Plan 2026 review that our Shelaa listing SO452 isn't being taken forward. Which given that a development of 45 houses/flats etc that has the same heritage setting, narrow road and ecological constraints as ourselves has actually been granted planning permission and has been started less than 500 yards away is extremely frustrating and frankly hypocritical.
1 x respondent	resident		Open space		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- town centre and Eastcott wards - insufficient public open space compared to local plan standards</li> <li>- further development in the town centre should be restricted for this reason</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Open Space/public realm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- open space should be closer located to smaller dwellings that would likely have smaller garden space</li> </ul>
Civic Voice	Local organisation		other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- request to work with the Council and have a designated officer appointed</li> <li>- request production of maps. Argue that Rodbourne and Gorse Hill should be identified as part of New Swindon town centre.</li> </ul>
National Grid	infrastructure provider	Wood	other		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- request to be added to consultation database</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		other		<p>- We are concerned about 'orphan' dwellings/buildings ie those that are close to, or in, strategic development areas or housing policy areas that have not yet been developed We believe that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These should not be treated as being in open countryside, and issues of access, rights of way, foul drainage etc need to reflect their location and future surroundings</li> <li>• Where roadside footways would, in the long run, be desirable because of the wider strategic plans, plans should reflect that need by either safeguarding land or creating new footway.</li> </ul> <p>Either: Such a clause could be inserted in the new communities policies, in place of 'development in the open countryside' which seems a somewhat inappropriate description of open space land within a strategic development area. OR The policies dealing with development in the open countryside and conversions of farm buildings etc should all state that where neighbouring housing allocations are planned under one of the Local Plan policies, the above bullet points should apply</p>
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		other		<p>We would like to be sure that the Borough Council has a policy to prevent investment of any financial assets, including pensions, in companies which extract fossil fuels, whether investing directly or through a fund (e.g.: pension fund.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We would like to see policies to actively encourage voluntary sector initiatives to reduce consumption, such as tool libraries, repair cafes, community car ownership schemes, etc.</li> <li>- We would like to see policies which incentivise businesses and households to reduce food loss and waste, by encouraging initiatives such as Olio the food sharing app, community fridges, etc.</li> <li>- We would like to see deliberate planning to mitigate and provide relief for all Swindon residents in the event of such</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					disasters [natural disasters], for example in the construction of porous pavements, air-conditioned public spaces, building construction requirements such as roofs painted white, etc.
1 x respondent	resident		Park and ride		-object to further park and rides - existing vacant park and rides should be reused in advance of any new ones
1 x respondent	resident		Phasing		Plan should ensure infrastructure is provided before construction of dwellings
1 x respondent	resident		Phasing		Plan should ensure infrastructure is provided before construction of dwellings
1 x respondent	resident		Phasing		There should be financial incentives to ensure progress in accordance with build schedule agreed at consent
On behalf of	Land owner	Impact Planning Services	Plan period	S0454	Plan period should be extended to at least 2041 and probably 2051 to ensure 15 years to run at adoption
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Plan period	S0455	It is recommended that an extended period of forecasted housing growth be undertaken to at least 2041 and preferably 2051, also as a consequence of the essential need to examine and then planned resolution of the fundamental infrastructure constraints which face the Borough, in the forms of Junctions 15 and 16 of the M4 Motorway, the inadequacies of the A420 / A34 / M40 strategic route connecting Swindon with the central south midlands and Oxford-to-Cambridge Corridor, potential direct rail connection with Oxford together with the M4 corridor implications of the expansion of Heathrow Airport.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Plan period	S0458	It is recommended that an extended period of forecasted housing growth be undertaken to at least 2041 and preferably 2051, also as a consequence of the essential need to examine and then planned resolution of the fundamental infrastructure constraints which face the Borough, in the forms of Junctions 15 and 16 of the M4 Motorway, the inadequacies of the A420 / A34 / M40 strategic route connecting Swindon with the central south midlands and Oxford-to-Cambridge Corridor, potential direct rail connection with Oxford together with the M4 corridor implications of the expansion of Heathrow Airport.
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Plan period	S0462, S0457 and S0461	- plan period should be extended to at least 2041 and probably 2051 to ensure 15 years to run at adoption
Fairhurst UK Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Plan period	S0463 and S0467	It is recommended that an extended period of forecasted housing growth be undertaken to at least 2041 and preferably 2051, also as a consequence of the essential need to examine and then planned resolution of the fundamental infrastructure constraints which face the Borough, in the forms of Junctions 15 and 16 of the M4 Motorway, the inadequacies of the A420 / A34 / M40 strategic route connecting Swindon with the central south midlands and Oxford-to-Cambridge Corridor, potential direct rail connection with Oxford together with the M4 corridor implications of the expansion of Heathrow Airport.
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning	plan period	s0456	- plan period should be extended to at least 2041 and probably 2051 to ensure 15 years to run at adoption
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	Plan Period		Time horizon should be to 2050
Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce	Local organisation		Plan period		- seeks a long term strategic plan to 2050 - failure to review whether the strategic allocations will deliver housing at all

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury not a sustainable location - no facilities or bus route</li> <li>- Roads are narrow - increased development would be dangerous to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders on roads</li> <li>- development would greatly increase the size of Badbury</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury not a sustainable location - no facilities i.e post box</li> <li>- Roads are overused and narrow</li> <li>- development should be restricted to infill to maintain linear settlement pattern</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury not a sustainable location, no facilities or services inc public transport</li> <li>- Narrow roads</li> <li>- no footpaths, cycleways and poor street lighting</li> <li>- used as a rat run for J15</li> <li>- reliance on car usage</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- infrastructure at capacity e.g sewers, broadband, refuse collections, drainage, poor electricity supply</li> <li>- increased traffic - congestion and danger to pedestrians</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury is not a sustainable location. No facilities, services or public transport</li> <li>- narrow, dangerous road. No footpaths or cycleways</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing rat running in village would be exacerbated by new development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury is not sustainable - no facilities, services and public transport</li> <li>- new residents would mean increase in cars, increased traffic and road hazards.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury is not sustainable - no facilities, services and public transport</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury is not sustainable - no facilities, services and public transport</li> <li>- Journeys rely on the car - roads are not suitable for cycling</li> <li>- Road running through badbury is narrow, no pavements</li> <li>- Used as a rat-run, will be exacerbated by development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Badbury is not sustainable - no facilities, services or public transport.</li> <li>- nearest facilities in Chiseldon - development would require travel by car to access facilities</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-reference to para 172 of NPPF - 'great weight' to conserving AONBs</li> <li>- Conservation Area appraisal refers to tightness of settlement boundary - therefore not appropriate to extend settlement boundary</li> <li>- infrastructure will need assessing and potentially upgrading i.e sewers at capacity, impact on Broadband</li> <li>- single car width roads throughout village. development could exacerbate rat-running to/from J15</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury not a sustainable location, no facilities services</li> <li>- Nearest facilities in Chiseldon - car journey required. Traffic and environmental impacts of car usage</li> <li>- no footpaths, cycleways and poor street lighting. Lanes in hamlet not suitable for pedestrians</li> <li>- Used as rat run for J15</li> <li>- dangerous roads</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Area is rat run for J15</li> <li>- dangerous roads</li> <li>- no footpaths, cycleways and poor street lighting</li> <li>- Badbury is not a sustainable location. No facilities - nearest facilities in chiseldon and Wroughton</li> <li>- reliance on car usage</li> <li>- nothing to occupy children in village - further development could cause increase in vandalism and anti-social behaviour</li> <li>- proximity to M4 - noise and pollution impacts on future</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity has suffered since nearby badbury park built. Further development would cause decline in wildlife and biodiversity</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Badbury		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Badbury is not a sustainable location. No facilities, services or public transport</li> <li>- Large sites have recently been approved in Wanborough, Chiseldon and Liddington, and at Badbury park - these should satisfy housing needs</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Bishopstone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bishopstone does not need new development, or shop/playground that may come with development. Pub, village hall, school are enough for 'thriving community'</li> <li>- Residents within village drive to school, so would likely drive to shop if provided by new development - increase in cars.</li> <li>- development will change character of village, will affect its 'quaintness'</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Bishopstone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small scale new housing supported, however large 10+ developments on single site will impact upon the character of the village.</li> <li>- Limited facilities in Bishopstone - no shop, school at capacity</li> <li>- Pressure on utilities i.e. broadband</li> <li>- impact upon AONB</li> <li>- impact upon Conservation Area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Bishopstone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- comments on sustainability of Bishopstone in general - accessed via country lanes and has limited facilities. Not suitable for further development other than small infill sites</li> </ul>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Bishopstone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- proposed sites disproportionate to the size of village - impact on character</li> <li>- traffic concerns - narrow roads cannot accommodate additional traffic</li> <li>- infrastructure capacity concerns - e.g. sewage facilities</li> <li>- impact on the Conservation area</li> <li>- no public transport</li> <li>- widespread public opposition</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Bishopstone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objects to development in Bishopstone</li> <li>- impact upon the character of the village</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Castle Eaton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited facilities that can be accessed without a car. Nearest doctors in Fairford.</li> <li>- no public transport - narrow access roads to village unsuitable for buses.</li> <li>- Community hall events at capacity</li> <li>- Lack of interest from buyers in Castle Eaton - properties difficult to sell. New development may struggle.</li> <li>- New development will impact the strong community spirit</li> <li>- People will move away from village if there is new development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wanborough		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NEV allocation should satisfy housing need in this area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wanborough		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NEV allocation should satisfy housing need in this area</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Wanborough		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development at NEV will provide facilities not available in Wanborough</li> <li>- development will put pressure on existing facilities e.g school, doctors</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in principle objection to housing at Wroughton</li> <li>- insufficient capacity of existing infrastructure e.g doctors surgery, Great Western Hospital</li> <li>- impact on landscape surrounding village and rural feel</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Wichelstowe allocation and permitted Wroughton sites should satisfy housing need in this area
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Insufficient infrastructure to cope with development proposed across Wroughton e.g. doctors surgery
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Wichelstowe allocation not near completion - there have been issues surrounding the construction on the surrounding areas
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- large number of dwellings already permissioned over and above that allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>- No Infrastructure provided through previous permissions</li> <li>- In combination with Wichelstowe will impact character of Wroughton, high density housing not suitable.</li> <li>- If all sites proposed are taken forward, would greatly increase size of Wroughton, and cause coalescence with Swindon. Affecting identity of village.</li> <li>- Traffic impacts</li> <li>- Insufficient capacity of existing infrastructure e.g. doctors surgery</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In principle objection to development at Wroughton</li> <li>- Already 400+ dwellings approved in recent years. Unsustainable population growth for the village</li> <li>- facilities and infrastructure at capacity e.g. doctors surgery, pharmacy, schools</li> <li>- highways/traffic concerns - Wroughton is main through route into Swindon for surrounding villages. New development will exacerbate congestion</li> <li>- If all four sites taken forward - additional 919 houses and large, unsustainable population growth to village</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In principle objection to development at Wroughton</li> <li>- quantum is over that allocated in Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>- concerns about capacity of facilities/services/infrastructure e.g. doctors surgery, road infrastructure, traffic</li> <li>- Wichelstowe has caused pressure on facilities/services</li> <li>- loss of village feel</li> <li>- Wichelstowe and neighbourhood plan allocations mean Wroughton has had its share of development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In principle objection to development at Wroughton</li> <li>- development should maintain a non coalescence zone to the north of Wroughton, between Wroughton and Swindon.</li> <li>- Wroughton has recently permissioned over 300 dwellings</li> <li>- Infrastructure/facilities capacity concern. E.g. doctors surgery struggling to meet demand</li> <li>- In conflict with Wroughton Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>- transport assessments need to be undertaken regarding flow of traffic through the village</li> <li>- emerging strategies do not reference the maintenance of village character</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns regarding capacity of road infrastructure at Wroughton to accommodate proposed growth. Roads narrow at certain points with no capacity to widen</li> <li>- Wroughton is through route for villages around into Swindon. Further development will exacerbate existing congestion.</li> <li>- Concerns employment is not being delivered alongside residential sites - will become dormitory town</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In principle objection to development at Wroughton</li> <li>- would upset balance of village and result in younger population leaving the village</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-In principle objection to development at Wroughton</li> <li>- Impact upon infrastructure, e.g. doctors surgery at capacity, long waiting times. Great Western Hospital long waiting times for appointment</li> <li>- Will no longer be considered a village, as will be similar in</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					size to Highworth if development proposed comes forward. - Wichelstowe allocation should be built out before sites considered at Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Concerns about scale of development proposed if all sites taken forward, in combination with existing sites with permission - Infrastructure cannot accommodate level of development proposed - concerns Wroughton will become part of Swindon 'urban sprawl' - Will impact upon the rural character of Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-In principle objection to development at Wroughton - Object to loss of greenfields - important for wildlife and carbon absorption
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Further development not needed in Wroughton given development in Wichelstowe and Berkeley Farm - Infrastructure capacity - i.e Ridgeway school oversubscribed, cannot cope with additional population
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- pressure on existing infrastructure e.g. drains/sewers, schools, health services - no local jobs for new residents - encouraging commuting by car for employment
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- in principle objection to development at Wroughton - Village not suitable for proposed level of development - becoming a town rather than a village
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-in principle objection to development at Wroughton - Wichelstowe allocation should be built out before Wroughton considered. - Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery, roads, schools
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-In principle objection to development at Wroughton - Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery/health clinic waiting times, schools at capacity

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-In principle objection to development at Wroughton. - If all sites in consultation taken forward will result in 40% increase in the number of homes in the village.
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- in principle objection to development in Wroughton - contrary to Neighbourhood Plan - Loss of greenfield land and green spaces
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery. Health care provision should be extended to cater for village demands before any new development - Highways concerns - Wroughton is through route into Swindon. Insufficient capacity for current traffic and further development. Highways improvements required. Recommended solutions: - Allowing Mill lane to remain open to through traffic - allowing 24/7 access to all traffic via redpost drive - constructing footpath and cycle path from Wroughton to redpost drive via wharf road
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- In principle objection to development in Wroughton - Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery waiting times. No surgery in Wichelstowe has exacerbated this issue.
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-Infrastructure capacity concerns - insufficient amenities, facilities and roads - Number of sites with existing permission e.g. Artis Farm, Hills site etc. - cumulative impact on the sustainability of the village - development of north of Wroughton - negative impacts upon the landscape and community
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- further development not needed in Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Infrastructure capacity concerns, particularly health care services. Long waiting times for appointments at doctors surgery and Great Western Hospital - Requests information regarding what plans would be put

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					in place for the provision of healthcare services to accommodate new development
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns (e.g doctors surgery, schools)</li> <li>- Highway/traffic concerns - particularly Swindon Road, heavy traffic at peak times</li> <li>- Wichelstowe allocation should be completed before allocating sites in Wroughton</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wichelstowe allocation should be completed before sites allocated in Wroughton, including highways works to ease traffic on Mill Lane/Wharf Road.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wichelstowe allocation should be completed before sites allocated in Wroughton</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns - e.g roads, doctors surgery, schools cannot accommodate additional development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of greenfield land</li> <li>- loss of wildlife corridors</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns (e.g. doctors surgery, schools) to accommodate level of development proposed</li> <li>- conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g roads, doctors surgery, Ridgeway School</li> <li>- Suggests bypass/relief road to east of Wroughton</li> <li>- Until there are infrastructure improvements, there should not be further development in Wroughton</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development supported, providing infrastructure/facilities are improved to accommodate. E.g improvements to Swindon road. Should be included as part of any plans for development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wichelstowe allocation should be completed before allocating sites in Wroughton</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- does not support - infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. schools, doctors surgery and hospital (long waiting times)
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. doctors surgery long waiting times, schools at capacity. - Wichelstowe allocation and existing permissions in Wroughton should meet housing need for area
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		-infrastructure capacity concerns - e.g. doctors surgery - long waiting times - needs to be improved to accommodate additional development
1 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- insufficient infrastructure capacity - e.g. long waiting times at doctors surgery, school capacity
2 x respondent	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- pressure on existing infrastructure e.g doctors surgery
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Wichelstowe allocation should be completed before sites allocated in Wroughton. - pressure on existing infrastructure
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. - Swindon Road capacity - traffic bottleneck issues will be worsened by development - Doctors surgery - long waiting times for appointment. Increase in village population unsustainable - lack of safe cycle routes and limited bus service in the village - new residents will use their cars - Ridgeway school at capacity and requires refurbishment - large number of homes with permission yet to be built out in area

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		Principle of development - Wroughton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns - e.g doctors surgery, road capacity for further traffic and resultant impacts on existing residents</li> <li>- impact upon the countryside</li> <li>- impact upon wildlife</li> <li>- in conflict with neighbourhood plan</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Q1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support principle of simplifying/consolidating policies</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		RA1 removal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ra1 should be carried over</li> </ul>
Science Museum Group	Land owner	Pegasus	RA2 removal	Wroughton Science Museum	Objects to removal of SMG boundary and policy wording Council should strengthen the SMG element of Policy RA2 to identify how "it will support the expansion of collections management facilities and activities, science and technology research and development, renewable energy generation and other high quality related activities and enabling development, providing the benefits of the development are delivered sustainably and are aligned with the other policies of the Local Plan".
Members of the Cross Party Climate Working Group	Local councillors		Renewable energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Areas suitable for renewable energy should be identified in the Local Plan</li> <li>- there should be a requirement for a proportion of on-site renewable energy generation</li> <li>- the feasibility of district heating should be considered in relation to all new developments</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Renewable energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- developers should be required to offer an option for solar pv to be pre-installed on roofs.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Renewable Energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- low carbon options for new buildings e.g heat pumps should be considered</li> <li>- Or ensuring that buildings are adapted in future - e.g. provision in design for air source heat pumps, or ground source heat pumps</li> <li>- should consider wood fired heating</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Renewable Energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- policies should include a requirement for solar panels/ heat pumps</li> <li>- should encourage use of new technologies - e.g energy from roads</li> </ul>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
4 x respondents	resident		Renewable Energy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- draft contains no requirement for proportion of onsite renewable energy</li> <li>- district heating should not be dropped - feasibility should not be excluded, particularly for areas where there is heat source and large heat demand e.g swimming pools/leisure</li> <li>- plan should identify areas suitable for renewable energy, and support Neighbourhood plans to identify specific locations. e.g Blackpool and Melton similar policies</li> </ul>
Thames Water	infrastructure provider	Savills	residential site options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thames Water provide an Excel sheet with comments on specific sites</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		retail/business parks		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-object to further retail/business parks - empty units in existing</li> </ul>
Cllrs Ford and Martyn	Local councillors		Site comments	s0071 and s0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sites are isolated and remote from services disincentivising walking and making new residents reliant on cars causing carbon and particulate emissions;</li> <li>- existing TransWilts service is poor 1 bus per hour at most</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site comments	S0071, S0072 and S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if all of these sites are progressed, should require similar services to East Wichel, as will be of a similar size.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071, S0072 and S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- traffic concerns on Moormead road - used by Nationwide staff and vehicles cutting through to J15. resultant amenity concerns from traffic for residents.</li> <li>- Suggests bypass route to Nationwide/J15</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		site comment	s0071/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- coalescence with Swindon</li> <li>- until roundabout is installed they ask for 4mph traffic sign to be moved further north</li> <li>- impact of access on Swindon/Croft Rd</li> <li>- distance to shops and services in the centre of the village and lack of a safe cycle route</li> <li>- car dependent development</li> <li>- construction of a noise bund would be needed</li> <li>- new gateway roundabout needed which is constructed to slow traffic and is sites further east of Swindon Road to avoid the Thames Water underground junction leaving a green buffer for existing residents on the west site of Swindon Road and Woodland View.</li> <li>- a minimum of 12 parking spaces should be made available for existing Swindon Road residents</li> <li>- grass verges to be left unmown to grow wild and managed sustainably</li> <li>- reduce highway clutter</li> <li>- use alternative surfaces to tarmac on footpaths</li> <li>- provide superfast broadband</li> <li>- provide land and/or buildings for Wroughton Parish Council Grounds Team</li> </ul>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		SA1 Whichelstowe	SA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- para 4c should refer to a walk and bike safe routes across the Junction 16, which take priority over cars (it is currently very dangerous and the recent expensive improvements made very little provision for cyclists and pedestrians)</li> <li>- para 6 can the canal be used for flood risk mitigation</li> <li>- affordable housing requirement should be reinstated into policy</li> </ul>
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		SA1 Whichelstowe	SA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- amend para 4.b. to refer to adding a link to NCN route 45</li> <li>- paras 4.c. and 4.d. should refer to cycling provision alongside these motor vehicle routes. A cycle route to Royal Wootton Bassett should be created</li> <li>- para 6 the route should be wide enough for walking and cycling alongside canal</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		SA1 Whichelstowe		Point 2h(iv) - this policy should not require health facilities only in central neighbourhood - should be provision in all of the 4 local centres to increase viability of local centres.
1x respondent	resident		SA1 Whichelstowe		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the affordable housing requirement does not need to be stated, suggests there is a reference to policy Dm15</li> <li>- does not support leaving mix of housing to be determined by developers</li> <li>- in what's changed box - requests further description of 'average density'</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		SA1 Whichelstowe		- prefer that the wording 'in accordance with' the flood risk policy remains in this policy
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		SA2 Kingsdown	SA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- para 4e Neighbourhood masterplans should incorporate active design to make taking public transport, cycling and walking easier/cheaper and driving and parking harder and more expensive</li> <li>- 4a Walking and cycling should be prioritised on the bridge and safely separate from traffic.</li> <li>- reference to community renewable energy should be reinstated</li> </ul>
Highways England	Statutory consultee		SA2 Kingsdown	SA2	- policy should refer to transport mitigation on SRN particularly at A419 Blunsdon junction, further mitigation may be required because of changes to baseline
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		SA2 Kingsdown	SA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be a masterplan for the development, which shows provision for public transport, cycling and walking.</li> <li>- para 4.a. this bridge should include segregated provision for cyclists, as part of a continuous, legible provision to Swindon town centre.</li> <li>- para 4.e. Cycling connections should include Kingsdown Lane to South Marston Industrial Estate, and to Highworth.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Tarmac	Landowner	Heatons	SA2 Kingsdown	SA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tarmac have an existing operational concrete batching plant and associated aggregate storage area on land at 21 Turnpike Road, Blunsdon, Swindon, SN26 7EA.</li> <li>- Whilst Tarmac do not wish to object to either the Allocation or Application, they would like their concerns around the potential for land use conflict between their operations at the concrete batching plant and the proposed residential development directly adjacent addressed</li> <li>- The concrete batching plant generates noise from two main sources; fixed plant (the batching plant which operates continually between the opening hours of 08:00 – 18:00) and mobile plant (loaders moving, trucks arriving and trucks leaving – up to 30 vehicle movements a day).</li> <li>- para 182 NPPF agent of change principle should be applied</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		SA2 Kingsdown		part 4 e should also reference Highworth
1 x respondent	resident		SA2 Kingsdown		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support removal of community approach to renewable energy</li> <li>- suggests requirement for terraced housing, and that 40 dph requirement is not considered high density</li> </ul>
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		SA2 Kingsdown		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- re-write to include sub-headings as per NEV policy</li> <li>- ask for confirmation of density of 30dph</li> <li>- question removal of reference to children's centre, temporary accommodation at primary school</li> <li>- include reference to a secondary access from the B4019 into Kingsdown to take traffic from Broadbush to the new vehicular bridge into Groundwell</li> <li>- bridge over A419 needs to be built before construction on Kingsdown starts</li> </ul>
Persimmon	Developer	Pegasus	SA2 Kingsdown		The Council's proposal to amend the policy which establishes the principles for the masterplanning of this site is therefore a concern, as this could have potential to frustrate an already protracted determination period. On the other hand, however, the specific changes proposed by the Council to this policy are generally not worthy of objection and in some cases provide a useful update on

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
					the local infrastructure requirements. Persimmon Homes would welcome the opportunity to discuss this revised policy in more detail with the LPA.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	SA3 New Eastern Villages	Land north of A420 (NEV)	<p>Generally, the intention to make the fairly lengthy policy clearer through the addition and grouping around sub-headings is supported, however we have a number of more detailed comments that are set out under the following subheadings. The quantum at Rowborough should therefore be updated to 'some 1,900' to better reflect what has been agreed as part of outline application S/13/1555/OUT. The majority of policy inclusions remain as presented in the current adopted Plan to 2026, however bullet (m) appears to be a new transport proposal, stating "management strategies will be required and agreed to secure the long-term management of infrastructure prior to development". It is not clear what transport items this point relates to within the bullet list, and therefore who is responsible for the production of such strategies. In terms of reference to ongoing management, as most of the identified transport works are to the highway network, it is considered that long-term maintenance will be the responsibility of the Local Highway Authority and/ or Highways England as appropriate. therefore question the relevance/ need for bullet m. Considers that proportionate design control should be provided at the appropriate stage and through an appropriate mechanism relative to the nature and scale of the development. As drafted the policy inflexibly draws no distinction between the particular forms of reserved matters applications, some forms of which in relation to infrastructure may need limited design guidance. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF refers to the level of design detail and degree of prescription which should be "tailored to the circumstances in each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified". Wording is required to introduce flexibility that allows an appropriate alternative mechanism in addition to the more structured Design Code, which better responds to the differences in the nature and form of reserved matters and their proportionate reliance placed on a design</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>framework to guide such matters. The NPPF uses “should”, and “where practicable”, which allows for due consideration of an effective alternative. Suggests that point 6 is amended to read:  “Following outline permission being granted, detailed design submissions including reserved matters applications should be guided by an overarching design approach that is set out in through design codes, or appropriate alternative mechanism including Design and Access Statement(s) in appropriate circumstances. Objects to the inclusion of a proposed new requirement as set out at 7(b) for a 30% net increase in tree cover, to support the aims and objectives of the Great Western Community Forest. NEV Planning Obligations SPD already sets out a requirement for development within the NEV to make proportionate financial contributions towards NEV Community Forest project, and as such HHT have committed to this approach that is secured through obligations within the S106. Bullet 7(b) duplicates that requirement and should therefore be deleted. Whilst support the creation of a high-quality development including the public realm, the policy as drafted at 7(c) assumes the inclusion of public art for all development within the NEV. Wording is required to introduce flexibility that allows an appropriate response having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed. Suggests bullet 7(c) should be amended to read:  “High quality public realm, in accord with Policies DM1 to DM4, including outdoor civic public space and public art, where considered appropriate”.</p>
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	SA3 New Eastern Villages	Land north of A420 (NEV)	“Development at South Marston shall be in <u>general</u> accordance with the South Marston Neighbourhood Plan”.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	SA3 New Eastern Villages	S0461	The indicative area of non-coalescence is carried forward from current policy NC3, to emerging policy SA3. This seeks to preserve the character and identity of settlements and land between the New Eastern Villages. It is inappropriate to carry forward a blanket policy restricting development within this area, without appropriate assessment of the character and landscape within the locality. This has not been completed as part of SBC's evidence base to support this policy context
Capital Land	Land promoter	Wood	SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in para 3.2 reference to 1000 space park and ride should be amended to 600 spaces.</li> <li>- para 4 does not reflect what has occurred on the ground in relation to the provision of employment land at the NEV. Similarly, the retail function of the District Centre does not reflect available land or the current retail market. The list of community facilities to be provided at the District Centre does not take account of the available land at Great Stall West (see 2.6 above) and does not justify the provision of a leisure centre and 25m swimming pool</li> </ul>
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to para 3i should be added: measures that make car ownership and driving more difficult and expensive and less desirable</li> <li>- para 5f Pa swimming pool and leisure centre (as well as the local housing) has a high heat demand and may make a district heating scheme feasible. At a minimum associated community facilities should not increase emissions.</li> <li>- para 6b It is estimated that to sequester CO2e emissions emitted since the start of the industrial revolution, requires the planting of the equivalent of 189 trees per person. A 30% increase, while extremely welcome is insufficient for SBC's contribution and should be scaled up and required of all developments and not just this one.</li> <li>- para 14h what are these 'sustainable transport measures'? Clearer require any new road of any kind to have associated separate cycling and walking routes.</li> </ul>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Highways England	Statutory consultee		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- policy should refer to transport mitigation on SRN particularly the A419 White Hart and Commonhead junctions and M4 J15, further mitigation may be required because of changes to baseline
Liddington PC	Parish Council		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- Support policy
Oxfordshire County Council	local authority		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- want to work together on modelling to ensure that if the NEV requires mitigation on A420 in Oxfordshire this is reflected in the IDP - seek that the policy is reviewed to require additional sustainable transport measures
South Marston Parish Council	Parish Council		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- para 7 Remove the specific reference to connecting the River Cole corridor with Nightingale wood. The presence of the railway and the A420 make this not feasible. - at 12. k Add 'to include fibre cable' after 'utilities' - would be helpful to see more mention of SM Neighbourhood Plan in this policy to confirm its place in shaping development in SM. A case in point is to ensure how development off Highworth Road, which has no footways, can be flagged up as unacceptable. - happy with concept of combining two policies RA3 and NC3 but want discussion with Forward Planning to ensure that the existing village and remainder of the parish is covered appropriately
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- para 3.a. The cycle network should be designed to London Cycling Design Standards, and on major roads should be segregated from pedestrians and vehicles. A link should be provided along Wanborough Road between Covingham and Wanborough - para 4.g. support - para 14.h. 14 h. Sustainable transport measures should include cycling provision. The developer should demonstrate a densely-interconnected network of cycling provision which connects to the rest of the NEV and to existing provision in Swindon.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Woodland Trust	National organisation		SA3 New Eastern Villages	SA3	- para 7b is supported, but seek developer contribs to manage additional recreational impact on Warneage Wood
1 x respondent	resident		SA3 New Eastern Villages		part 3 - suggests 'cycle skyway' (enclosed elevated cycleway) linking eastern villges to Swindon Railway - 3d - add Highworth - part 14 g - should add cycling access to Highworth
Danescroft and David Wilson Homes	Land promoter	Alder King	SA3 New Eastern Villages		- It is noted that the emerging NEV policy SA3 is easier to navigate and read than extant NEV policy NE3, and this is to be welcomed. - the new requirement to deliver 30% net increase in trees throughout the development (criterion 7.b (and draft policy DM29)) is difficult to understand; it represents an added unforeseen requirement. It is understood that the existing green corridors through the NEV and the amount of green space retained as part of the allocation would be sufficient to ensure good tree coverage despite the development. For example the woodland areas on the Foxbridge site can be retained and where possible enhanced with additional green infrastructure to be incorporated in line with extant policy NE3. Accordingly it is requested that this requirement for 30% net increase in trees is removed for established site allocations. - policy SA3 at subsection 5.b (Community Facilities) proposes to increase the number of required primary school forms of entry (FE) from 8FE to 13FE. It is understood that this increase is based on an uplift in pupil yield as set out in the decision notice of the Council's Cabinet meeting from September 2017. Notwithstanding this, such an increase of over 60% of required FE is significant and we fail to understand the basis for this despite the information set out in the aforementioned Cabinet note. The required 13FE appears to be based more on an assumed mix generated by outline applications instead of any definitive proposed housing mix. As such the figures are based on conjecture and assumption instead of a detailed and fixed housing mix ratio. The

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					Council needs to produce more robust evidence for requiring the 61% uplift in primary school form entries. Likewise, we need to examine the evidence for whether there is genuine need for a 2FE primary school. Crucially there is also no indication of the structure for delivery of the schools across the NEV nor the timings of delivery to understand how children of such development will be able to attend where and when. If such money and/or land budget is required to be spent on schools without adequate justification, what then is the implication for how other contributions are measured for all other infrastructure requirements?
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		SA3 New Eastern Villages		- bridge should still be referred to as 'green bridge'
Sainsburrys Supermarkets	Land owner	WYG	SA3 New Eastern Villages		supports the continued mixed-use allocation of the NEV, which includes a high-quality district centre, comprising the existing Sainsbury's store as the anchor foodstore
Extinction Rebellion	Local organisation		SD1 and SD3 removal		- policy SD1 and SD3 should be carried forward
Science Museum Group	Land owner	Pegasus	SD1 removal	Wroughton Science Museum	The decision to not carry forward Policy SD1 is contrary to the Council's obligations to prepare a development plan document with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development
4 x respondents	resident		SD1 removal		- should be reinstated as it is a foundation of the local plan - acknowledges need to assess climate change impact of all development proposals.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
4 x respondents	resident		SD2		- draft policies incomplete - replacement SD2 has not been published. SD2 should be published with adequate consultation period
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site comment	s0030	For part of the site our data shows that there are authorised landfills, as well as a main river (River Ray), Flood Zones 2 and 3. Therefore a sequential approach should be used to direct development into the areas of Flood Zone 1, and all development should be located outside Flood Zone 3b. We would seek for at least an 8m buffer zone to be established between any built development and the main river.
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support, but would need convenient access to A419</li> <li>- any means that would allow the existing inter-urban service 51 to be routed much more rationally between Cricklade and Groundwell, using the old Ermine Street and thus allowing it to additionally serve the western part of Broad Blunsdon, would greatly benefit recent consents in this area</li> <li>- possible location for a public transport interchange with 'park and choose' and possible long distance buses stopping</li> <li>- Funding to pump-prime an improvement of service 51 to every 30 minutes needs to be considered to help support the delivery of a credible bus mode choice at an early stage</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0036	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least within credible walking and cycling distance of development west of A419</li> <li>- a diverted bus 51 could serve with 30m frequency</li> <li>- a new service through Kingsdown could be extended here, but would need contributions to pump priming</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0050	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- can be seen to represent a logical rounding out and consolidation of village</li> <li>- manifest lack of credible sustainable travel choices, and consequential very high level of car dependency</li> <li>- Turnpike junction constraints are starting to impact on reliable and effective operation for Stagecoach services 9</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					and 51 - if it is necessary to consent small sites in Blunsdon contributions to bus services should be sought
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site comment	s0054	- The village in no way offers sufficient size, even with expansion opportunities including this site, to support a bus service regular enough to be relevant, on a commercial basis.
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site comment	s0055, s0056 and s0069	- These sites are directly adjacent to our service 9 on Lady's Lane. However, in the absence of bus stops to safely access the service, this is of little real benefit. - SBC should take all opportunities to remedy the highly deficient legacy of the previous consent at Abbey Farm, in terms of providing appropriate safe walking and cycling routes, as well as high quality bus stops - would need to come forward as part of a wider comprehensive development
1 x respondent	resident		Site Comment	S0071	- in combination with S0072 would be preferred Wroughton site if any houses are to be allocated in Wroughton - However would have impacts on the road network and facilities/services/infrastructure - Would require sound buffer from M4
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0071 and s0072	- support - our inter-urban service 49 does continue to run along Swindon Road, directly past this site. We consider that with additional demand from this part of Wroughton, and looking at the committed development in Devizes, there is a particular opportunity to uplift this service to operate every 30 minutes. - we consider that a combination of a half-hourly 49 with a local service could allow potential to offer a combined 15-minute frequency along this direct route to Swindon town centre, though there is a dependency on how we evolve the network in the Wichelstowe area. - consolidates existing development east of Swindon Rd

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is exceptionally close to the major employment at Pipers Way, the Nationwide HQ in particular, which is eminently accessible by walking or cycling. This presents an eminent advantage over any other site in Wroughton.</li> <li>- We consider that this site, along with s0072 to the south, offers particularly strong merits in terms of its conformity with the transport and accessibility requirements set out in NPPF 2019 at Chapter 9 and commend the promotion for further detailed consideration.</li> <li>- developer funding should be sought to kick-start 15 minute frequency running</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council	local authority		Site Comment	s0073	- want ongoing discussions as potential impacts on Oxfordshire road network
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site Comment	s0078	- there is a principal aquifer and historic landfill (Pinkcombe House) on this site. Therefore any development on this site must ensure that any contamination from the landfill does not pollute groundwater. It is possible that remediation would be required.
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0102	- support site
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0128/s0129/s0140/s0443	- support site
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site Comment	s0221	- site quite close to the spring line this may cause issues for both drainage and possible groundwater flooding in the future.
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Site comment	s0221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- main concern expressed is access and need to remove mature trees</li> <li>- development needs to be sensitive to setting of Upper W'boro Conservation Area</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site comment	s0239	- The main river Kingsdown Brook runs along one of the site boundaries. Therefore we would seek at least an 8m

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					ecological buffer zone to be established between any residential development and the main river.
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Site comment	s0293	- consider to be most suitable site. Main issue is access. Prefer access onto Lechlade Road
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site comment	s0314	- recommend altering site boundary to ensure no development within FZ3
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee		Site comment	s0368	- Parts of the site are within 250m of a COMAH (Swindon / B&Q Distribution Centre) and so the safety of any occupants should be taken into account. This would fall under the remit of Health and Safety Executive.
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0368	- The site is too distant from existing or potential high quality public transport, and we see no obvious way to address this issue.
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Site comment	s0401/2	- support as employment or retail site
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site comment	s0403	- We note the site is the subject of a live planning application S/OUT/19/0294, for 43 dwellings. We would urge that this is taken forward only once there is clarity as to how appropriate public transport serving the village could be appropriately and effectively secured
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		Site comment	s0425 and s0459	- both sites are within the setting of the AONB and great emphasis should be given to the conservation and enhancement of the protected landscape. Both sites should be landscape led in terms of shaping the scale/density.
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	S0427	- concerns regarding proposed density - cumulative impacts on traffic of this site in combination with permitted marlborough road, berkely farm sites, and mcarthy and stone site
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	S0427	- better placed than S0071 and S0072 for pedestrian/cycle access into village centre. - Extends into slopes of escarpment - impact upon AONB. - eastern edge close to burderop wood SSSI - traffic concerns onto Marlborough Road - development should ensure it adds no further traffic onto marlborough road.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					- development on east of marlborough road should ensure coherence with other ad hoc development
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	S0427	- concern about size of site. Hospice not using current facilities to capacity.
Cllrs Ford and Martyn	Local councillors		Site comment	s0427	- concern about creating safe access and the ability of narrow roads to cope with the additional traffic
CPRE	National organisation		Site comment	s0427	If the travel patterns from this site join all other users of the A4361 using the B4005 Brimble Hill route, there will be a serious congestion problem.
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		Site comment	s0427	- encroachment of development on the AONB, in particular the cumulative impact given the number of recent developments approved/allowed in close proximity to this site. Part of the site may be acceptable, the irregular shape does not help, part could be given to woodland.
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site comment	s0427	- Most of the comments related to s0071/s0072 apply equally to this site, though it is clearly that much more distant from employment north of the M4. Again we would offer our support to this promotion, particularly in combination with s0071/0072.
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		Site comment	s0427	- concern about unsuitability of the access stretching 100m from the Three Tuns roundabout - safe pedestrian crossing points needed, planning and highways officers should make a site visit to discuss with WPC and ward members where crossings should be positioned
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	S0427	- concerns of increased pressure on Swindon Road, Marlborough Road, Moormead Road - Unsafe access on road bend - would require traffic management - Insufficient pedestrian crossings across Swindon Road - high density housing unsuitable



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development on east side of Wroughton - separated from facilities by busy A4361</li> <li>- development to the east may impact landscape/character of village - landscape impact study should be carried out</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may help offer critical mass to a shorter-term bus service extension or enhancement to the village, funded by proportionate contributions.</li> <li>- in the long run relies on spine road through Kingsdown SDA to be in place for 30m frequency service</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- essential ped and cycle access at least through the development to the east is provided</li> <li>- It is much less well-related to existing and potential public transport than the other three options, though, that said, walking distances to bus stops on Perrys Lane and Swindon Road, as well as to other key facilities within the village, are well within what could be considered credible as a sustainable travel choice. Schools are adjoining the site, which is very helpful.</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0460	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This site appears less attractive than other options in terms of its relationship to the existing village and the future SDA</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s0467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support directly served by service 7 operating seven days a week and providing direct links not just to Swindon itself, but the major employment available at South Marston Park.</li> <li>- at the bottom of a substantial hill, mitigating somewhat against walking and cycling for local trips to the town centre and the Secondary School on the hill top, the very high frequency of bus and short journey time offset this substantially</li> <li>- one of most evidently sustainable options</li> </ul>
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Site Comment	s379/32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- generally supportive but route into Swindon town centre needs to be improved.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site comment	SO066	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- preferred site compared to S0459. Small number of dwellings would be acceptable</li> <li>- no play area in village - development could provide</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site is rather off-line any existing or potential bus service and hard to integrate into any service. Alone, not of sufficient scale to support bus service</li> <li>- given distances to key local destinations, including the need to cross the A419 to access secondary education, we consider it less likely that walking and cycling would represent attractive and well-used choices for day-to-day travel requirements. The site is more inherently car-dependent, and measures to address this across the whole site could be contrived, costly, and less effective than other development options</li> <li>- disjointed pattern of development, impression of urban sprawl</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- northern part is affected by motorway noise and tends to fill the gap between Swindon and Wroughton</li> </ul>
Stagecoach	infrastructure provider		Site Comment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the recent delivery of a 11-18 Secondary School adjoining the site, and now two additional special schools, represents a very significant opportunity to reduce the need to travel, and maximise the use of sustainable modes.</li> <li>- all roads needed for an initial bus service are already in place</li> <li>- It is essential that development facilitates a simple extension of the current TGV service, maintaining a simple and relatively direct route.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Comment	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capacity proposed is too large - fewer dwellings would be more in keeping with character of hamlet</li> <li>- materials used should be sympathetic to the area</li> <li>- development should provide access path along boundary</li> <li>- boundary treatment should consider hedgerows rather than brick/fences</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- density/capacity proposed nor proportional to size of village - impact upon community</li> <li>- no public transport links - increase in cars using the narrow roads</li> <li>- smaller density/capacity of 15 dwellings would be more appropriate to the scale of village</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of playing field - only open space in village</li> <li>- infrastructure capacity concerns e.g. sewage, water supplies</li> <li>- surface water drainage concerns</li> <li>- additional traffic concerns, and resulting air pollution and noise pollution increase</li> <li>- amenity/visual impact for existing dwellings</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- loss of playing fields - well used by community for recreation. Plans for community project at this site</li> <li>- suggests any development retains playing fields/is situated to south of playing fields</li> <li>- concern at increase of cars as a result of development</li> <li>- density/capacity proposed is out of proportion with rest of village - 40% increase in dwellings</li> <li>- concerns at infrastructure capacity to accommodate development</li> <li>- no facilities/services in Castle Eaton - new residents will be reliant on car usage</li> <li>- additional traffic concerns - cumulative impact with traffic serving Poplar business park and RAF fairford.</li> <li>- A419 junction to Castle Eaton capacity concerns</li> <li>- amenity impacts on existing dwellings</li> </ul>
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Site objection	s0030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose site, distant from bus service network, and capacity at A419 Cold Harbour/Broad Blunsdon Junction</li> </ul>
The Ramblers	National organisation		Site objection	s0030	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object to the site on the basis that it would cause considerable harm to the landscape. Site is assessed as worst performing in the interim SA. Charles Potterton's assessment is that landscape harm can't be mitigated. Claim site is suitable for development flies in the face of the evidences.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0034	- does not support within non coalescence area -
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0034	not supportive - landscape impact -not needed given future availability of Honda site
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0034	- support reasons for rejecting site
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	S0036	- Land set as rural buffer in BENP to ensure non-coalescence with Kingsdown/Swindon - Significant impact on traffic, congestion and air quality
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	S0050	- rural buffer in BENP - concern about coalescence with Kingsdown - significant impact on traffic, congestion and air quality
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0066	- within conservation area - not in keeping with settlement pattern - amenity impacts on existing dwellings
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0066	-outside settlement boundary - within Conservation Area - productive agricultural land - amenity impact for existing dwellings - infrastructure capacity concerns e.g sewer capacity - withdrawal of similar shelaa site at New town lane - suggests removal of this site for consistent approach
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	- does not support - existing parking issues - impact on views - impact on wildlife - impact on house prices

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- will cause coalescence of Swindon and Wroughton/loss of green buffer between Wroughton and Swindon.</li> <li>- will lead to development along entirety of eastern boundary (in combination with S0072)</li> <li>- highways concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-knock on traffic impacts on to Wroughton high street</li> <li>- used as through route from other villages into Swindon</li> <li>- traffic impact upon to Swindon Road</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing development to the north of Wroughton will erode non -coalescence area</li> <li>- development on east side of Wroughton - separated from facilities by busy A4361</li> <li>- development to the east may impact landscape/character of village - landscape impact study should be carried out</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- causes coalescence concern - covered in government policy</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsustainable location - long walk for any future residents to Wroughton facilities/Wichelstowe/Old Town.</li> <li>- will isolate future community.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access from Swindon Road. Heavy traffic.</li> <li>- no safe walking route to existing facilities/amenities in Wroughton</li> <li>- limited access to public transport from this location</li> <li>- greenfield land</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access and infrastructure concerns</li> <li>- in combination with S0072, and S0427 - large amount of development to east of Swindon Road</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- not allocated in Wroughton Neighbourhood plan</li> <li>- productive agricultural land</li> <li>- contributes to biodiversity of the area</li> <li>- perimeter well used by runners/walkers</li> <li>- development would have a negative impact on the amenity of residents on Swindon Road and Moore Close.</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Swindon Road</li> <li>- impact on traffic on Swindon Road, High Street and Perrys Lane - demonstrated by recent Thames Water works closures</li> <li>- landscape impacts - East of Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in conflict with emerging policy SA1 regarding principle of coalescence between Wroughton and Swindon.</li> <li>- in conflict with emerging policies DM1 and DM22 due to distance from amenities in Wroughton and Swindon - will encourage car usage.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- light, noise and amenity concerns for existing residents</li> <li>- traffic and parking concerns</li> <li>- rural buffer between Wroughton and Swindon - questions as to how this 'law' can be removed</li> <li>- loss of greenfield land</li> <li>- loss of wildlife currently within site - questions as to how this will be addressed.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contrary to current policy RA2 - non coalescence area should be maintained - important for wildlife and community enjoyment</li> <li>- concerns about traffic management</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- cumulative impact of development with sites that have been permitted on Swindon Road</li> <li>- Traffic concerns</li> <li>- unsuitable route for pedestrians along Swindon Road - no pedestrian crossings</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less sustainable than 427</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- over 1km walk into village centre</li> <li>- poor public transport links</li> <li>- coalescence between Wroughton and Swindon urban area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- contrary to policy RA2 regarding gap between Swindon and Wroughton to be retained</li> <li>- important for biodiversity, hedgerows etc. and for residents to enjoy</li> <li>- Difficult road access</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not within walking distance/ well located for easy access to facilities in East wichel or Wroughton village centre. Inadequate footpaths and cycle routes</li> <li>- Proximity to motorway - would require bund</li> <li>- concerns of increased pressure on Swindon Road - would exacerbate bottleneck issues. Would require new roundabout at village entrance and access road.</li> <li>- Loss of rural buffer - would cause coalescence with Swindon</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0071	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor access for pedestrians across busy Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing development to the north of Wroughton will erode non -coalescence area</li> <li>- development on east side of Wroughton - separated from facilities by busy A4361</li> <li>- development to the east may impact landscape/character of village - landscape impact study should be carried out</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>-causes coalescence concern - covered in government policy</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsustainable location - long walk for any future residents to Wroughton facilities/Wichelstowe/Old Town.</li> <li>- will isolate future community.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- contrary to policy RA2 regarding gap between Swindon and Wroughton to be retained</li> <li>- important for biodiversity, hedgerows etc. and for residents to enjoy</li> <li>- Difficult road access</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access from Swindon Road. Heavy traffic.</li> <li>- no safe walking route to existing facilities/amenities in Wroughton</li> <li>- limited access to public transport from this location</li> <li>- greenfield land</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not within walking distance/ well located for easy access to facilities in East wichel or Wroughton village centre. Inadequate footpaths and cycle routes</li> <li>- Proximity to motorway - would require bund</li> <li>- concerns of increased pressure on Swindon Road - would exacerbate bottleneck issues. Would require new roundabout at village entrance and access road.</li> <li>- Loss of rural buffer - would cause coalescence with Swindon</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in conflict with emerging policy SA1 regarding principle of coalescence between Wroughton and Swindon, but to a lesser extent than S0071</li> <li>- in conflict with emerging policies DM1 and DM22 due to distance from amenities in Wroughton and Swindon - will encourage car usage.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- light, noise and amenity concerns for existing residents</li> <li>- traffic and parking concerns</li> <li>- rural buffer between Wroughton and Swindon - questions as to how this 'law' can be removed</li> <li>- loss of greenfield land</li> <li>- loss of wildlife currently within site - questions as to how this will be addressed.</li> </ul>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contrary to current policy RA2 - non coalescence area should be maintained - important for wildlife and community enjoyment</li> <li>- concerns about traffic management</li> </ul>
2 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in combination with S0071 would be preferred Wroughton site if any houses are to be allocated in Wroughton</li> <li>- However would have impacts on the road network and facilities/services/infrastructure</li> <li>- Would require sound buffer from M5</li> </ul>
2 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- will cause coalescence of Swindon and Wroughton/loss of green buffer between Wroughton and Swindon.</li> <li>- will lead to development along entirety of eastern boundary (in combination with S0072)</li> <li>- highways concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-knock on traffic impacts on to Wroughton high street</li> <li>- used as through route from other villages into Swindon</li> </ul> </li> <li>- traffic impact upon to Swindon Road</li> </ul>
2 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-does not support</li> <li>- not allocated in Wroughton Neighbourhood plan</li> <li>- productive agricultural land</li> <li>- contributes to biodiversity of the area</li> <li>- perimeter well used by runners/walkers</li> <li>- development would have a negative impact on the amenity of residents on Swindon Road and Moore Close.</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Swindon Road</li> <li>- impact on traffic on Swindon Road, High Street and Perrys Lane - demonstrated by recent Thames Water works closures</li> <li>- landscape impacts - East of Swindon Road</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less sustainable than 427</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- over 1km walk into village centre</li> <li>- poor public transport links</li> <li>- coalescence between Wroughton and Swindon urban area</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- access and infrastructure concerns</li> <li>- in combination with S0071, and S0427 - large amount of development to east of Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0072	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor access for pedestrians across busy Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Part of conservation area</li> <li>- contains significant unscheduled ancient monument</li> <li>- important communal greenspace - contains well used PRow</li> <li>- Biodiversity/wildlife</li> <li>- impact upon character of village</li> <li>- Will affect businesses</li> <li>- dangerous access - sharp bends, no pavement</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Conservation Area and impact upon historic environment</li> <li>- Significant unscheduled archaeological feature</li> <li>- non-coalescence area</li> <li>- outside of rural settlement boundary</li> <li>- important green space - important to character of village and for recreational use</li> <li>- inc conflict with draft neighbourhood plan</li> <li>- traffic concerns</li> <li>- potential to expand Hoopers field onto this site</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Site is a valued greenspace - development would impact character of Wanborough and rural setting</li> <li>- Designated area of historical interest</li> <li>- forms rural buffer area around Wanborough</li> <li>- Sets precedent for further development outside of boundary</li> <li>- Area is significant unscheduled archeological feature - should be protected/preserved</li> <li>- impact upon Lower Wanborough Conservation Area</li> <li>- well used Public RoW crosses site</li> <li>- Part of site within non-coalescence area with NEV.</li> <li>- borders Woodland Trust land.</li> <li>- Against policies in current local plan.</li> <li>- Poor access through narrow cul de sac, no pavement at access point. Poor visibility onto high street</li> </ul>
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Site objection	s0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object to site due to archaeology, heritage impact, impact on PROW, part of site within non-coalescence area, impact on Warneage Wood, inappropriate access from Hewers Close</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust	National organisation		Site objection	s0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object. concerned about impact on adjacent Warneage Wood concerned about cumulative impact alongside existing schemes</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- within Conservation Area</li> <li>- biodiversity/wildlife in site</li> <li>- well used PRoW (route to Hoopers Field) runs through site</li> <li>- Important green space well used by community</li> <li>- rural setting around Hoopers Field</li> <li>- there are intentions to expand Hoopers Field</li> <li>- Within non-coalescence area</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- rural buffer between Swindon and Wanborough, and Wanborough and NEV</li> <li>- within setting of AONB - landscape and traffic impacts</li> <li>- site may have drainage issues</li> <li>- potential for surface water flooding</li> <li>- amenity impacts on residents in Hewers Close</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Important site for biodiversity, wildlife and landscape</li> <li>- well used PRoW runs through site</li> <li>- impact upon rural setting of Wanborough</li> <li>- Important green space</li> <li>- development here would urbanise Wanborough</li> <li>- in conflict with policies in the Swindon Local Plan</li> <li>- covers land designated as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conservation Area</li> <li>- Significant Unscheduled Archaeological Feature</li> <li>- Non coalescence area with NEV</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- That the site was included in the neighbourhood plan should be disregarded - unresolved objections to the plan</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Contradicts policies in the current LP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non coalescence area with NEV</li> <li>- Conservation Area - important green space</li> <li>- significant archaeological feature on site</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Important green space well used by community</li> <li>- access via Hewers Road unsuitable</li> <li>- contradicts draft wanborough NP - policies including - protecting historic landscape, preventing highways impacts, protect land for leisure, ambitions to expand Hoopers field, protecting Conservation Area, protect open spaces</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- contradicts with policies in current LP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- within Conservation Area - important green space</li> <li>- contains significant unscheduled ancient monument</li> <li>- within area of non-coalescence with NEV</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> </ul> </li> <li>- contradicts policies in draft Wanborough NP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- protection of historic landscape</li> <li>- preventing highways impacts</li> <li>- protect land for leisure</li> <li>- potential expansion of Hoopers Field</li> <li>- protection of Conservation Area</li> <li>- protection of Open Space</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- important green space in village</li> <li>- well used PRoW runs through</li> <li>- Important for biodiversity/wildlife</li> <li>- development on this site would interrupt green corridor through to adjacent woodland trust</li> <li>- conflicts with current local plan policies</li> <li>- covers land designated as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conservation Area</li> <li>- significant unscheduled ancient monument</li> <li>- Area of non - coalescence</li> </ul> </li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- access via hewers close unsuitable - poor visibility. Alternative access from rotten row also unsuitable due to unscheduled archaeological monument</li> <li>- poor drainage</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- adjacent conservation area</li> <li>- unscheduled ancient monument</li> <li>- within non-coalescence area between wanborough and nev - compromises rural buffer and encroachment on Wanborough</li> <li>- impacts upon well used PRoW that runs through site</li> <li>- amenity and lighting impacts upon residents at Hewers close, rotten row and high street</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0083	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- infrastructure capacity concerns - schools, doctors surgery - long waiting times</li> <li>- traffic/access concerns - development will exacerbate traffic in the area</li> </ul>
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0185	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development of site opposed. Site considered It is considered to be a 'Green Lung' in a very built-up area</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
10 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Outside settlement boundary contrary to SD2</li> <li>- steep topography - flooding/run concerns. Poor drainage could increase flooding in the Marsh. May require attenuation chambers.</li> <li>- part of visual separation between upper and lower wanborough. This features in draft Wanborough neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>- landscape impacts - important visual gap separating upper wanborough CA from coalescence with 80/90s development in lower wanborough. Supported by appeals on Church Road (APP/U3935W/17/3168667) + (APP/U3985/A/10/2141558)- arguments here on rural character of fields which contribute positively to Upper Wanborough CA and that development would adversely impact green space</li> <li>- biodiversity impacts - meadow, important wildlife habitat (deer, birds, badgers)/ wildlife corridor bounded by Kings Lane track - which is a pedestrian route</li> <li>- stream runs through</li> <li>- in conflict with upper wanborough CA appraisal - views from CA into wider landscape area contribute to rural setting.</li> <li>- in conflict with EN10</li> <li>- Unsuitable access. fast traffic and busy junction into Beanlands and Primary school.</li> <li>- Kite Hill access unlit, narrow pavement. difficult to cross road near to site entrance.</li> <li>- tree lined bank at access - would be removed to facilitate access</li> <li>- development should be situated away from field boundaries to protect surrounding trees, and away from Kings Lane route.</li> <li>- Should be unlit so not visible behind houses along Kite Hill</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					- Will set precedent, loss of green gap between Lower and Upper wanborough.
Whitworth Road Residents Association	Residents Association		Site objection	s0239	- objection to loss of park and ride. Request the park and ride is made operational again to address air pollution
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	- objection - wildlife corridor, links Coate Water to Lawns. Should be protected - Loss of greenspace from previous development in Old town area
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	- objection - valued greenspace, should be retained - home to wildlife inc. foxes, rabbits, badgers - used for recreation, walking



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- well used for recreation</li> <li>- wildlife present on site</li> <li>- amenity value</li> <li>- Not a need for development on greenspace</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- loss of greenspace</li> <li>- important for wildlife</li> <li>- important community asset - well used for recreation</li> <li>- environmental and social benefits</li> <li>- - large amount of development has taken place in area e.g. Badbury Park</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- public opposition to development at this location</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- loss of habitat and wildlife including foxes, birds, bats</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- well used for recreation</li> <li>- road safety concerns - will exacerbate congestion on Queens Drive and Marlborough Road</li> <li>- Amenity impacts on existing properties</li> <li>- large amount of recent development in the area e.g. Badbury Park, Wichelstowe, Broome manor</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- important wildlife site</li> <li>- important amenity space for existing residents</li> <li>- important recreation space, well used by children</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- well used greenspace for recreation</li> <li>- important for wildlife and trees</li> <li>- questions need for development of green space at this location considering developments at badbury park and Marlborough park</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- valuable wildlife corridor between Coate Water and Lawns</li> <li>- evidence of archaeology - ridge and furrow</li> <li>- suitable site for community forest</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection - loss of valuable green space - setting of Coate water. Health and wellbeing impacts of loss of greenspace</li> <li>- concerns size of site would lead to cramped development and provide inadequate parking and road facilities</li> <li>- heritage impacts upon Coate</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- loss of trees and wildlife</li> <li>- Would cause increased air pollution from further traffic in area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor linking Coate and Lawn woods.</li> <li>- enjoyed by walkers, residents.</li> <li>- Importance of open spaces for mental and physical health and wellbeing</li> <li>- Access via busy roads - either Marlborough road or Queens Drive.</li> <li>- Set precedent for further development on urban green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- green corridor from Coate water to Lawns</li> <li>- traffic concerns - existing difficulties for pedestrians crossing Queens Drive - will be exacerbated</li> <li>- impact on local wildlife and loss of mature trees</li> <li>- set precedent for further loss of green space</li> <li>- Not a need for further development in this location</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- important wildlife corridor</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- large amount of development has taken place in area e.g Badbury Park</li> <li>- green corridor and site for local wildlife - should be protected</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- used for recreation</li> <li>- large amount of development has taken place in area e.g. badbury park</li> <li>- traffic concerns on Coate roundabout and into shell garage, will be exacerbated</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- green space should be protected</li> <li>- well used by all ages for recreation, relaxation, observing wildlife</li> <li>- safe area for children to play</li> <li>- air pollution benefits of green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- environmental benefits of site - wildlife and mature trees present onsite.</li> <li>- amenity value</li> <li>- health and wellbeing benefits for residents. In particular old people's home adjacent</li> <li>- large amount of development has taken place nearby e.g. badbury park, Wichelstowe - therefore no need to develop this site</li> <li>- Green corridor</li> <li>- will set precedent for loss of further urban green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- important greenspace for wildlife and residents</li> <li>- development of this site will cause deterioration in air quality</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor linking Coate water and Lawns</li> <li>- well used for leisure by local residents</li> <li>- amenity value, important visually for perceptions of town for those travelling into Swindon</li> <li>- would cause severance in green corridor/wildlife corridor</li> <li>- wildlife present, including bats.</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- will set precedent for similar proposals</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- well used by residents</li> <li>- Potential site for Wiltshire Wildlife Trust forest meadows project (in partnership with SBC?)</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife</li> <li>- Traffic concerns</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor</li> <li>- Busy roads on either side of development - air pollution impacts on residents</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- important wildlife corridor</li> <li>- important green space, well used by community</li> <li>- traffic in area has been worsened by current developments, will be exacerbated by further development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- density proposed not suitable for site size</li> <li>- important greenspace</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor should be protected</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- large amount of recent development in the area e.g. Badbury park</li> <li>- loss of greenspace - valuable community asset for</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					residents. Social and environmental benefits - important for wildlife
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	- objection - protected green corridor - linking coate water and lawn woods - other more suitable locations for housing that would result in loss of open space
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	- questions need for development in this area considering recent development at Marlborough park, Wicchelstowe, Badbury park - traffic concerns - have been exacerbated by recent development at Badbury park. - access via Queens Drive or Marlborough Road unsuitable due to existing traffic. Danger to pedestrians and cyclists - Protected green corridor - Development would cause loss in mature trees and loss of wildlife habitat - - amenity/overlooking concerns - impact on quality of life for existing residents - existing allocations e.g. Wicchelstowe should be built out before allocating land on protected green space
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	- objection - loss of greenspace, amenity and wildlife habitat

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- impact on quality of life from loss of green space</li> <li>- Road safety concerns</li> <li>- Privacy/overlooking concerns for existing residents</li> <li>- questions need for development in this area considering recent development at Wichelstowe, Badbury park, and Broome Manor</li> <li>- will set a precedent for development on greenspace</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>-open space well used for recreation</li> <li>- questions need for development at this location considering recent development in the area. More suitable sites around Borough</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- green corridor from Coate Water to Lawns</li> <li>- sewage overflow relief tank for Badbury park development near/within site</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- quality of life impacts - loss of green space, increased traffic and pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>- questions need for development in this location considering developments at Wichelstowe, Badbury park and Broome Manor/Marlborough Park</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- valuable green space</li> <li>- proposed density would increase congestion on busy roads and roundabout</li> <li>- questions need for development in this location considering developments and Badbury Park and Marlborough Park</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-objection</li> <li>- well used green route from Lawns to Coate Water</li> <li>- important site for wildlife</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- important site for wildlife. Number of mature trees</li> <li>- well used for recreation and pedestrians</li> <li>- Concerns regarding access via Queens Drive or Marlborough road due to existing traffic. Potential impact on Coate roundabout</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- protected green corridor linking Coate Water to Lawns</li> <li>- wildlife corridor</li> <li>- loss of green space in Old Town area from recent developments</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- access via Marlborough road, near to Coate roundabout unsuitable - traffic hazard</li> <li>- Developments at allocation such as Wichelstowe should be built out before allocations on open space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- loss of habitat</li> <li>- effect on quality of life</li> <li>- lack of privacy/amenity impacts on existing residents</li> <li>- density proposed not suitable</li> <li>- road safety concerns</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic concerns on Marlborough road and queens drive</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- impact on local air quality</li> <li>- loss of green space</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- questions need in this area given the recent development in this area</li> <li>- road infrastructure capacity concern - Coate roundabout, Marlborough road etc</li> <li>- Congestion and resulting air quality concerns</li> <li>- Parking concerns</li> <li>- drainage issues on site should be considered</li> <li>- loss of well used green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- unsuitable access via Queens Drive and Marlborough Road - heavy traffic will be exacerbated</li> <li>- loss of green space/wildlife corridor</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- flood risk concerns</li> <li>- existing allocations should be built out before allocating development on green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- designated strategic Gi corridor</li> <li>- wildlife habitat for number of species</li> <li>- well used by residents</li> <li>- aspirations for community orchard on this site</li> <li>- widespread local opposition</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- visual amenity impacts on existing residents</li> <li>- density proposed not in keeping with surrounding area</li> <li>- parking concerns</li> <li>- traffic concerns on Marlborough Road and Queens Drive</li> <li>- precedent for loss of green space</li> </ul>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- well used by community for recreation. Mental and physical health benefits</li> <li>- loss of mature trees - climate change impact</li> <li>- loss of greenspace</li> <li>- road infrastructure capacity - traffic concerns on Marlborough Road, Queens Drive and Coate Roundabout</li> <li>- widespread public opposition</li> <li>- loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- privacy/amenity concerns for existing residents</li> <li>- density proposed unsuitable</li> <li>- questions need in this area given recent developments at Badbury park, Wichelstowe and Marlborough Park</li> <li>- precedent for development on open space/green corridor</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- traffic concerns</li> <li>- questions need in area given development at Badbury park, Pipers Way, Queens Drive</li> <li>- high density of housing in area</li> <li>- important greenspace for community</li> <li>- wildlife corridor</li> <li>- potential loss of mature trees onsite, offset air pollution</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- important green space will be lost for future generations. Comments that there is a lack of investment in green space in the wider borough e.g. coate water, lydiard park</li> <li>- brownfield should be built on before open spaces</li> </ul>
2 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- loss of wildlife habitat/wildlife corridor</li> <li>- Potential site for Wiltshire Wildlife Trust forest meadows project</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- valued open space, health and wellbeing benefits</li> <li>- valuable habitat for wildlife, flora/fauna</li> <li>- public bridleway runs through site</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns - great western hospital</li> <li>- additional cars/traffic and resultant air pollution</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of green corridor</li> <li>- loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife habitat</li> <li>- used for general recreation.</li> <li>- traffic concerns along Queens Drive and Marlborough Road due to development at Badbury Park, which will be impacted by southern connector road for NEV. development on this site will exacerbate.</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- Wildlife corridor linking Coate Water to the lawns.</li> <li>- Wilts Wildlife Trust potential plans to deliver forest meadows project at this site</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor linking Coate Water to Lawns</li> <li>- well used site for recreation, and as a through route for pedestrians</li> <li>- access route from Queens Drive will intercept cycle route to Coate Water/GWH</li> <li>- potential flood risk</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- traffic concerns at Coate roundabout</li> <li>- loss of greenspace</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- greenspace well used for recreation - quality of life, mental and physical health impacts</li> <li>- greenspace is valuable asset to the town, may affect inward investment</li> <li>- important for wildlife including butterflies, birds, rabbits, foxes, hedgehogs F266</li> <li>- SBC partnership with Wilts Wildlife Trust to deliver forest</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					meadows project, including at Lawns. Development at this site would sever link between Coate and Lawns
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object</li> <li>- lack of public support</li> <li>- loss of mature trees</li> <li>- loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>- designated green corridor</li> <li>- effect on quality of life from loss of green space - well used for recreation</li> <li>- Highways concerns - unsafe access via busy Marlborough Road or Queens Drive</li> <li>- amenity/privacy issues for existing residents</li> <li>- Unsuitable for high density</li> <li>- Large amount of development recently built in the area, e.g badbury park, marlborough park, wichelstowe</li> <li>- will set precedent for further development on open space/green corridor</li> <li>- community aspirations for community orchard on this site</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	Resident		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Objection</li> <li>- Few green spaces left in Swindon</li> <li>- Prefer brownfield sites to be developed</li> </ul>
Robert Buckland MP	MP		Site objection	S0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- wildlife corridor linking coate water to Lawns - should be protected</li> <li>- SBC have recently partnered with Wilts Wildlife Trust to deliver Forest Meadows Project, which includes 12 sites in the borough, including Lawn. Development at this site would conflict with those aims</li> <li>- important greenspace for community</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0293	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- well used recreation ground</li> <li>- flood risk concerns - drainage issues onsite</li> <li>- traffic concerns via Pentyland lane and Grove Hill - potential for rat running through Pentylands lane. Also cumulative traffic impacts on new Aldi on Roundhills mead and A361 would need to be considered</li> <li>- visual/amenity impact to existing residents on Crane Furlong</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic concerns - Moormead road. Cumulative impact with Marlborough Road site.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic concerns onto Marlborough Road for commuters and residents</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor access for pedestrians across busy Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- unsuitable access e.g. heavy traffic on Moormead and Swindon Road</li> <li>- no safe pedestrian access</li> <li>- in combination with S0071 and S0072 - large amount of development to east of Swindon Road</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- important for biodiversity, hedgerows etc. and for residents to enjoy</li> <li>- Difficult road access</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access from Swindon Road. Heavy traffic.</li> <li>- no safe walking route to existing facilities/amenities in Wroughton</li> <li>- greenfield land</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- traffic/highways concerns. Congestion corresponds to school times, and resultant pollution concerns. overspill of parking onto adjacent lanes.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Blunsdon PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rural buffer set out in BENP policy 3</li> <li>- views from east affected</li> <li>- should be a buffer with Kingsdown</li> <li>- existing woodland should be enhanced to provide buffer to village</li> <li>- Stubbs Hill ACC should be enhanced</li> <li>- escarpment slope should be rural buffer</li> <li>- impact on traffic, congestion, air quality</li> </ul>
The Ramblers	National organisation		Site Objection	s0429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object to the site on the basis that it would cause considerable harm to the landscape. Site is among the worst performing in interim SA. The assessment acknowledges that the fields around the Castle Hill ancient monument (identified as Fields A, B &amp; C in the Charles Potterton assessment) are undevelopable. Claim site is suitable for development flies in the face of the evidences. If site is carried forward, boundary should be re-drawn to remove fields A, B and C.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- development would remove trees and hedgerows - biodiversity impact and increased air pollution from tree removal.</li> <li>- development is of an inappropriate scale to the context of Badbury</li> <li>- potential parking overspill onto lanes</li> <li>- loss of productive agricultural land</li> <li>- Lots of opposition from Badbury residents</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- potential parking overspill onto lanes</li> <li>- loss of productive agricultural land</li> <li>- development size - too small for open space benefits such as allotments - no opportunity for local food growing</li> <li>- Proximity to the motorway - noise and pollution impacts upon new residents</li> <li>- Lots of local opposition to site</li> <li>- not deliverable</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- development size - too small for open space benefits such as allotments - no opportunity for local food growing</li> <li>- potential parking overspill onto lanes</li> <li>- development of capacity proposed would greatly increase size of Badbury</li> <li>- in conflict with Badbury Conservation Area appraisal e.g layout and street pattern, rural setting, tight settlement boundary</li> <li>- ref to Conservation area appraisal which states the character of the area is vulnerable to unsuitable development particularly where it would be visible from roads and footpaths. development would be visible from north.</li> <li>- will affect views towards Berricot lane</li> <li>- proximity to listed buildings</li> <li>- not in keeping to linear character of hamlet</li> <li>- impacts on wildlife within site.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- density and non linear form of development at this site would impact upon character of Badbury and AONB</li> <li>- would exacerbate parking problems</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- capacity proposed is too large and not in keeping with linear settlement character</li> <li>- would exacerbate parking problems near pub.</li> <li>- would cause increased traffic and accidents</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- density inappropriate within AONB</li> <li>- conflicts with principles of AONB</li> <li>- capacity proposed is too large and would greatly increase size of Badbury</li> <li>- would cause parking problems - overspill onto other roads in village.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- would not be in keeping with AONB and Conservation Area</li> <li>- not in keeping with existing linear settlement pattern</li> <li>- capacity proposed out of proportion to size of village.</li> <li>- impact upon listed buildings</li> <li>- would damage the views into and out of the village</li> <li>- would cause parking overspill</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- capacity proposed out of proportion with the size of the rest of the village</li> <li>- proximity to motorway - noise and health impacts on new residents</li> <li>- adjacent lanes dangerous, narrow, unlit, no footpaths</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Dangerous access - on long bend, fast traffic - 30mph limit ends near the entrance to the site (goes to 60mph)</li> <li>- conflicts with proposed policy DM33</li> <li>- within aonb</li> <li>- adjacent to Conservation Area, nearby to listed buildings</li> <li>- the capacity proposed is not in proportion to the size of Badbury</li> <li>- site is too small too make a meaningful contribution to housing need</li> <li>- will cause parking overspill onto roads - landscape impact</li> <li>- sites at opposite end of village would be more suitable, closer to shops, schools, public transport and could provide linear development</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- conflicts with proposed policy DM33</li> <li>- In conflict with Conservation Area appraisal</li> <li>- adjacent to Conservation Area</li> <li>- not in keeping with existing linear settlement pattern</li> <li>- Northern part of Conservation area contains listed buildings which define historic perimeter - development on this site would obscure these buildings from surrounding open spaces and footpaths, contrary to CA appraisal and recommendations from AONB.</li> <li>- contrary to NPPF in terms of sympathetic to local character and landscape</li> <li>- not sustainable - not within walking or cycling distance to facilities</li> <li>- capacity proposed out of proportion with size of Badbury (notwithstanding existing permissions)</li> <li>- currently productive agricultural land</li> <li>- wildlife corridor - red kites, deer, foxes</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not sustainable - lack of facilities and access to public transport in Badbury. Development would be reliant on private car usage</li> <li>- insufficient road capacity - roads narrow with no footpaths, used for ratrunning. Additional traffic will exacerbate existing safety issues</li> <li>- infrastructure capacity concerns, e.g schools, doctors surgery</li> <li>- Within Aonb - contrary to NPPF - impact upon character of village</li> </ul>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- scale of development at this site is inappropriate</li> <li>- not supported by national and local policy</li> <li>- Will cause coalescence with Badbury Park and set precedent for similar development in AONB, linking developments across M4 at junction 15</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- adjacent to Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings/buildings of significant interest - impact upon character of CA</li> <li>- within the AONB</li> <li>- development would greatly increase size of Badbury</li> <li>- capacity proposed at site considered major development in AONB</li> <li>- linear nature of village should be protected</li> <li>- site contains services (overhead cables/Thames water main pipeline) - need to be factored into viability</li> <li>- difficult access on to site - berricot lane is narrow and Badbury lane has high volume and fast traffic.</li> <li>- site contains wildlife</li> <li>- Proximity to the motorway - noise and pollution impacts upon new residents.</li> <li>- impact upon character of village</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- not in keeping with linear nature of Badbury.</li> <li>- scale of development inappropriate to size of development</li> <li>- development abuts the AONB</li> <li>- adjacent to Grade II listed properties</li> <li>- there are other locations in the Borough better able to provide larger development which could provide more infrastructure and homes for first time buyers</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- capacity proposed is too large</li> <li>- Within AONB and Conservation area</li> <li>- Will impact biodiversity</li> <li>- large modern development would impact nearby listed buildings</li> <li>- affordable housing at site would still not be affordable when compared to average swindon wages</li> </ul>
Chiseldon PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- impact on conservation area, conflict with linear character of village</li> <li>- lack of footpaths, public transport, streetlights lead to car dependency</li> <li>- should be considered major development in AONB</li> </ul>
North Wessex Downs AONB	Local organisation		Site Objection	s0432	<p>- A development of 15 houses in a hamlet setting would in my opinion represent major development as it would significantly increase the number of properties in this remote location. This hub of housing is characterised by large gardens, 15 houses within the proposed allocation would not meet this characteristic or the loose knit pattern. There are interconnecting views between the site and Liddington Hill. The site should be removed as a strategic allocation. If retained any application should include a sensitivity assessment to define e developable area.</p>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0432	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- impact on Conservation Area and Listed buildings</li> <li>- impact on AONB</li> <li>- impact upon character - modern houses would not be in keeping. will not reflect linear pattern of development</li> <li>- additional traffic - health and safety concerns - questions whether traffic management plans will be undertaken/how developers will consider this</li> <li>- no public transport/suitable footpaths for pedestrians/facilities/services - development will be reliant on cars</li> <li>- Amenity impacts on residents during construction</li> <li>- Visual impacts</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- unsuitable capacity proposed - small site</li> <li>- resulting density would be out of character with rest of village</li> <li>- access would be dangerous - via narrow road with blind bend, poor visibility. Unsuitable for increased traffic from proposed 30 dwellings</li> <li>- increased traffic</li> <li>- impact character of area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Difficult access, narrow, blind corners - would struggle with additional potential 60 cars.</li> <li>- would increase parking issues</li> <li>- No footpaths on access lanes, increased traffic would be danger to pedestrians, schoolchildren</li> <li>Proposed size/density out of character with village</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary - detached from village</li> <li>- would harm rural character</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via narrow road</li> <li>- density/capacity proposed is not sustainable</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0459	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> </ul>
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0459	<p>oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site completely detached from village</li> <li>- access narrow and unsuitable with no footpaths</li> </ul>
Highworth TC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose: too far from town centre; Roundhills Mead natural boundary to town; conflicts with hilltop settlement; size of site too large for town's infrastructure; landscape and visual harm</li> </ul>
National Trust	National organisation		Site Objection	s0467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in particular from the village of Coleshill and the Grade II* listed Home Farm, housing on this site would be clearly visible and would break the skyline. As such the proposed development would be detrimental to the landscape character and setting of the Buscot and Coleshill Estates</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					both during the day and at night, when light pollution may well be intrusive.
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- objection
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- objection
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - Playing fields heavily used e.g football teams, Junior school, informal recreation - loss of greenspace
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - Field is well used by residents and groups - unsuitable access/road infrastructure surrounding site
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - unsuitable access/road infrastructure surrounding site - potential highways safety issues, particularly given the nearby school and school traffic. Pupil safety concerns. - will cause parking issues near school - playing fields well used by community, sports teams and for more informal recreation. Demand for pitches cannot be fulfilled by remaining pitch sites in Wroughton - Loss of playing fields - impact on health and wellbeing
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - playing fields currently leased to Wroughton Youth FC, used for training and matches. Large demand for pitch sites. Loss of this site will mean teams will have to relocate. - Loss of Sport and recreation space - already below local plan standard - Unsuitable access - heavy traffic at school times. Concerns about pupil safety - Inadequate parking - will be exacerbated by development and also proposals to expand junior school site (nearby) to incorporate infant school.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Inverary road. Heavy congestion at school times. Concern over increase in traffic accidents/pupil safety.</li> <li>- Air quality concerns from increase in traffic in this area.</li> <li>- Playing fields well used for leisure and by local football teams. Loss of important pitch site may impact football club viability.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable, dangerous access via Inverary Road. Congestion will be exacerbated</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity would need further investigation - e.g doctors surgery at capacity</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Highways constraints - access road could not support additional development</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Well used greenspace by community/groups</li> <li>- Road infrastructure insufficient to accommodate development proposed</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-does not support</li> <li>- Traffic concerns - development would disrupt bus routes.</li> <li>- Potential increase of disruptive behaviour by loss of greenspace well used by youths.</li> <li>- Infrastructure/facilities/services at capacity e.g. schools, doctors surgery, could not accommodate additional development proposed</li> <li>- loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic concerns on Inverary Road, particularly at school times. Causes traffic to be backed up to Moormead roundabout.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- dangerous access via Inverary Road. Heavy traffic due to access to Ridgeway School and Wrouhton Junior School. Further traffic cannot be accommodated. Concerns an increase in traffic would cause danger to pedestrians/residents.</li> <li>- playing fields well used by community for recreation, e.g sports teams, fitness groups, sporting tournaments, dogwalkers. Lack of access to open space linked to obesity and health issues.</li> <li>- Contrary to Sport England's playing pitch protection policy</li> <li>- Development would lead to loss of wildlife, trees and ancient hedgerow present on site</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Traffic concerns on Inverary road - development would exacerbate and cause disruption to existing residents</li> <li>- Will cause road safety issues for children accessing schools, which may increase number of parents who drive and add to traffic issues.</li> <li>- playing fields well used by community for football matches/training, fitness classes, dog walks, informal recreation etc. Loss of green space for young people to meet/use</li> <li>- will disrupt wildlife adjacent to fields.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Highways concerns regarding existing heavy traffic on Inverary road - serves schools and ridgeway health club, that would be exacerbated by development. Resultant air pollution concerns.</li> <li>- Insufficient parking for school traffic causes overspill into adjacent streets.</li> <li>- playing fields well used by the community for recreation, by football teams, Wroughton Junior school. Concerns about increasing loss of green space.</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - designated for recreational use
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	-does not support - Neighbourhood plan identified insufficient sports facilities in Wroughton. Objection to loss of well used facility - Inverary road school traffic would be exacerbated by new development.
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - Inverary road access concerns - busy at peak times and school times - overspill of traffic into residential roads would be exacerbated - road safety concerns should the road become a through route - School does not have adequate parking - parking issues would be exacerbated - Emergency vehicles may have difficulty accessing - Well used recreation ground for sports teams. - shortage of green space in Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- Some support for site - whilst there would be a loss of playing fields, the area is no longer well maintained and investment could improve the remaining area/school. - However, concerns regarding loss of playing fields, heavily used by local sports teams. Questions as to how the demand for playing fields by these teams is being considered/alternative options for them to relocate - Concerns also regarding inverary road access, traffic particularly during peak/school times will be exacerbated. Safety concerns for pedestrians/cyclists. Alternative access would be required

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>does not support</li> <li>- Inverary road traffic concerns, particularly at school times and with multiple school buses. dangerous for pupils. Will be exacerbated if/when infant classes provided on junior school site.</li> <li>- Parking issues on inverary road.</li> <li>- Not allocated within Neighbourhood plan</li> <li>- Playing fields well used for general recreation, dogwalkers, users of all ages, football teams, and as a route for children walking to school.</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife</li> <li>- Playing field at (Wroughton Junior?) earmarked for building for clubs, preschool, and youth building.</li> <li>- Coalescence with Swindon concerns - 'urban sprawl' of Swindon into Wroughton.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- well used for recreational use</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>-Insufficient infrastructure to accommodate development e.g doctors surgery</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns (e.g. schools, surgery and local amenities) to cope with additional development at this site</li> <li>- loss of valued green space</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Inverary road - overspill into adjacent residential streets</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- unsuitable access via Inverary road - busy particularly at school times</li> <li>- Not close to existing bus routes - encouraging car usage in congested area</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- designated recreation area</li> </ul>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	does not support - loss of open space
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - additional traffic concerns (Inverary road and perrys lane)
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - traffic/parking concerns
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - traffic and parking issues on Inverary road, particularly at school times. Buses have difficulty negotiating road. Will be exacerbated by further development - Infrastructure/services capacity concern e.g doctors surgery long waiting times, schools at capacity. - playing fields well used for football, exercise, general recreation, cyclists etc. Concern regarding loss of green space
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - Traffic and parking issues on Inverary road, particularly at school times. Will not be able to accommodate additional development - Concerns increased traffic/parking will obstruct emergency service access to existing/future development - well used recreation ground. Provides health benefits and activity for younger people.
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	-does not support - traffic /parking concerns Inverary Road and adjacent residential streets. Concerns regarding safety and danger to pupils. Restricted access for emergency vehicles. Further development will exacerbate
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - traffic and parking concerns surrounding the school. Obstructs residents using roads to access/leave their dwellings. Dangerous for pupils, pedestrians, cyclists, those with mobility difficulties. Would be exacerbated by further development - Air pollution concerns from additional traffic.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- objection
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- objection - playing field well used by Junior school, football teams and for general recreation. Loss of green space.
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	contrary to current policy RA2 - non coalescence area should be maintained - important for wildlife and community enjoyment - concerns about traffic management
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - unsuitable access - shared with two schools. No crossing points - parking issues will be exacerbated - well used for recreation, by football clubs/teams, fitness groups etc - impact on adjacent woodland -
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- does not support - unsuitable access serving two schools - congestion at school times. Danger to pupils and pedestrians
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- Loss of playing fields - given increased obesity rate, this site provides free exercise facilities to the community - 'green lung' between M4, Wichelstowe and Wroughton- - will exacerbate existing traffic problems in North Wroughton
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	- well used for recreation - unsuitable access via busy road

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- dangerous access via Inverary road, close location of junior and senior schools - high traffic to accommodate increasing pupil numbers - safety concerns for residents and school children</li> <li>- Parking issues will be exacerbated - insufficient parking, cars parking on pavements</li> <li>- poor quality road surfacing due to high traffic volumes - will be exacerbated</li> <li>- air quality concerns due to traffic volumes</li> <li>- well used playing fields by schools, community, sports clubs/teams, fitness clubs, and for general recreation</li> <li>- will set precedent for development on open space</li> <li>- contrary to green space policies in current plan/emerging plan</li> <li>- approved sites in borough not being built out</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Inverary road.</li> <li>- traffic concerns - existing congestion, particularly at school times, will be exacerbated</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Additional houses would increase number of cars on Inverary Road, Perrys Lane, Kerrs Way, Dunbar Road. Cannot accommodate further traffic - used heavily during school times by resident, school buses.</li> <li>- traffic impact on residents on Inverary road - driveways blocked by those using the school will be exacerbated by development</li> <li>- Road accident concerns</li> <li>- playing fields well used by community for recreation, should be retained for future generations.</li> <li>- House price concerns</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Ridgeway school field to Inverary road - bridleway - unsuitable for development</li> <li>- existing traffic flow causes obstruction to residents.</li> <li>- Public open space - well used by dogwalkers, ramblers association, local football clubs and teams.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- objection</li> <li>- Highway/traffic concerns - narrow roads and small junctions unable to accommodate additional development at this location</li> <li>- Environmental/biodiversity impact</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- in conflict with draft policy DM30 - used by sports and community clubs</li> </ul>
2 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- well used recreation grounds by community and Wroughton FC (19 youth teams). Limited availability of pitches elsewhere in village to accommodate demand.</li> <li>- unsuitable access via Inverary Road - heavy congestion at school times.</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- contrary to policy En3, NPPF para 97 and emerging policy DM30 regarding protection of open space including playing fields. Well used by local sports clubs and as a general public open space. No evidence that preconditions for considering development of playing fields have been investigated.</li> <li>- Questions evidence of deliverability, in reference to requiring the approval of the Secretary of State for education for the disposal of playing fields (section 77 of school standards and framework act 1998) Also reference to DfE advice on 'The protection of school playing fields and public land 2012: advises that 'Authorities and schools should first investigate and exhaust all other means of funding before considering the sale of school playing fields. [...] The SoS expects applicants to demonstrate that</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>they have explored all reasonable options prior to making an application to dispose of playing fields. where there is community use of playing fields, the applicant must demonstrate to the SoS that that use has been taken into account and reasonable alternative arrangements offered.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy RA2 in LP2026 states there should be provision for more sports pitches in Wroughton: which will be compounded by additional development</li> <li>- within non-coalescence area (NC1), local plan review policy SA1.</li> <li>- Unsuitable access and traffic congestion impacts on Inverary road</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Inverary road traffic concerns, particularly at school times. Access via this road would exacerbate problems.</li> <li>- sports field use - not surrounded by surrounding housing as per other playing fields in Wroughton - ideal for sports usage.</li> <li>- large open space well used for general recreation, dogwalking, for sport. Other smaller pitch sites in Wroughton not able to accommodate such levels of usage due to smaller size</li> <li>- Adjacent to Common Farm woods - potential biodiversity impact</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Highways concerns - traffic using Kerrs way as cut through. Narrow and unsuitable for further traffic</li> <li>- Inverary road traffic, heavy use due to schools and leisure centre. overflows onto Perrys Lane. Insufficient capacity for development. Increased risk of accidents on inverary road and Kerrs Way</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Inverary Road. Congestion/traffic at school times. Danger to pedestrians, school children. will be exacerbated by development.</li> <li>- existing parking issues near school would also be exacerbated by development</li> <li>- Playing fields well used by football teams/clubs and by community for recreation, and sport. Demand will increase due to recent development of scout facilities on Maunsell Way.</li> <li>- Infrastructure capacity concerns e.g doctors surgery at capacity, insufficient parking at shops, Swindon Road congestion</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- less sustainable than 427</li> <li>- outside settlement boundary</li> <li>- over 1km walk into village centre</li> <li>- poor public transport links</li> <li>- poor road links into village - existing capacity concerns at Inverary road, perrys lane and surrounding roads. Link to Swindon road through Hills site could mitigate - however should not be a through route into village.</li> </ul>
4 x respondents	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Traffic pollution concerns, in particular for pupils accessing the schools. More houses will increase air pollution at this location. Request for pollution levels to confirm they are below the safe limit.</li> <li>- Congestion on/around Inverary Road will be exacerbated. Cars often mount pavement due to volume of traffic. History of accidents between pedestrians and vehicles. Buses cannot negotiate the road due to the volume of traffic - can sometimes cause damage to parked vehicles when trying to get through.</li> <li>- Issues of high speed vehicles causing risk to pedestrians/school children</li> <li>- emergency vehicles would not be able to get through to new development in times of high traffic</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fields well used by Junior school for community events.</li> <li>- Valuable greenspace for community for leisure/relaxation.</li> </ul> <p>Mental/physical health impacts of loss of public green space.</p>
Cllrs Ford and Martyn	Local councillors		Site Objection	s0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inverary Road must not be used as an access for more housing, there is already traffic congestion, parking and accidents on this road</li> <li>- loss of playing fields of which there is a shortfall</li> </ul>
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		Site Objection	s0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- oppose vehemently due to traffic levels, air quality, access issues (congestion and traffic safety)</li> <li>- loss of sports pitches leased to Wroughton Youth Football Club and open space, there is a shortage of sports pitches in Wroughton as noted in Policy RA2</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- playing fields well used for leisure and sport. Well used by school, primary schools and sports clubs (Wroughton FC)</li> <li>- Unsuitable access via Inverary road - congestion coincides with school times. Further traffic will cause danger to pedestrians, students, cyclists</li> <li>- loss of playing fields, impact on health and wellbeing</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- traffic concerns on Inverary road - could not support development at scale proposed</li> <li>- playing fields are well used for recreation, walkers/dogwalkers, and Wroughton Junior school</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife</li> <li>- Loss of greenspace</li> </ul>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Main recreational space/playing fields in Wanborough.</li> <li>- Unsuitable access - heavy congestion that coincides with school times</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- playing fields well used for recreation, leisure and by the community.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- Playing fields well used for recreation, leisure and by the community and sports teams/clubs</li> <li>- Pressure on infrastructure from no of dwellings proposed. E.g . Doctors surgery, capacity at local schools</li> <li>- will cause traffic problems in village</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ridgeway school will require expansion - land relating to education should be removed from allocation</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- contrary to policy RA2 regarding gap between Swindon and Wroughton to be retained</li> <li>- important for biodiversity, hedgerows etc. and for residents to enjoy</li> <li>- Difficult road access</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>-Unsuitable access from Inverary Road - heavy traffic from school use</li> <li>- greenfield land</li> </ul>
Wroughton Youth Football Club	Community organisation		Site Objection	S0479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>-Wroughton Youth Football Club currently play on playing fields. 19 teams in total.</li> <li>- Whilst there are other pitch sites in Wroughton, all are needed to accommodate the size of the club. Demand increasing due to new recent development in Wroughton means a requirement for more pitches.</li> </ul>
Woodland Trust	National organisation		Site Objection	s32/379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- object. very concerned about this site which includes ancient semi-natural woodland at Upper Widhill Copse</li> </ul>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
2 x respondents	resident		Site objection		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- lack of evidence of local housing need</li> <li>- lack of evidence of how it would support vitality of rural community</li> <li>- quantum proposed inappropriate to size of village, disproportionate to size and function. Increase of circa 50%.</li> <li>- impact upon character of village</li> <li>- impact upon Conservation Area should be assessed.</li> <li>- would increase reliance on car for access to facilities, services, employment</li> <li>- designated recreation ground/open space - should be deducted from developable space</li> <li>- amenity impacts on existing residential properties</li> <li>- loss of Grade 2 best and most versatile agricultural land</li> </ul>
White Horse Federation	Landowner	DPDS	Site Objection		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site promotion - improvement of leisure and education facilities</li> <li>- would require flexibility with regards to proposed policy DM30.</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Objection	SO066	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does not support</li> <li>- rural feel - few residential properties nearby. New dwellings out of character</li> <li>- Roads nearby - high level of through traffic, speeding vehicles and accidents. New development would exacerbate and increase danger to pedestrians.</li> <li>- density of proposed site will affect the character of the area.</li> </ul>
Homes England	Land promoter	Wood	Site Promotion	379/32	Site promotion
Primegate Properties	Land Promoter	Origin 3	Site Promotion	Hook south	Site promotion: The Hook Street site is well positioned on the edge of Swindon and in close proximity to Junction 16 of the M4 and should be considered as an appropriate location for meeting the employment needs of the Local Planning Authority in the emerging Local Plan. A series of baseline assessments have been undertaken for the site which have demonstrate that the site has significant development potential

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Firecracker Development Ltd	Developer	DPDS	Site Promotion	Land adjacent to Honeyfield Alpacas	Site promotion
Gladman	Land promoter		Site Promotion	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	Sites promotions
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Site Promotion	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	site promotion
Mactaggart & Mickel Strategic Land	Land Promoter	DPDS	Site Promotion	Pry Farm	Site promotion: the site also has the potential to deliver improvements to recreational facilities, including Mouldon Hill Country Park, a reinstatement of large sections of the former Berks and Wilts Canal and to develop the River Ray parkway leisure corridor.
On behalf of	Owner	DPDS	Site promotion	s0017	Site promotion
Hills	Land promoter	Pro-vision	Site Promotion	S0020	Site promotion. If the site had been considered in the SA it would demonstrated the benefits would outweigh the potential adverse impacts on Day House Lane. Hills are confident that an arrangement can be reached to enable the Site to be accessed as an extension to Badbury Park. Further technical work undertaken by Hills has confirmed that in terms of landscape, and visual impact, heritage, ecology and contamination, the Site can be developed with appropriate mitigation without unacceptable harm.
W O Clarke Trust	Landowner	Strutt and Parker	Site promotion	s0030	- site promotion - residential/strategic scale employment/mixed use - large scale allocation could justify highway improvements at Cold Harbour

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	Site Promotion	S0032	Site promotion: including heritage, ecology. Constraints, flood risk, availability and deliverability
Sonning Developments Ltd	Developer		Site promotion	S0034	- support turley's representations for site
Wasdell Properties Ltd	Developer	Turley	Site Promotion	S0034	- site promotion - high tech business 'hub'
Hollins Strategic Land	Land promoter	Emery Planning	Site Promotion	S0036	Site promotion
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	Site promotion	s0050	- site promotion
Church Commissioners for England	Landowner	Deloitte	Site Promotion	s0066	- site promotion
Balmoral Land	Developer	The Urbanists	Site Promotion	S0071 S0072	site promotion
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Site Promotion	S0073	Site promotion (employment)
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Site Promotion	S0076	Site S0076 continues to be promoted by our client for employment purposes for the emerging Local Plan and further technical evidence will be submitted as it becomes available to demonstrate the suitability of the site for this land use
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Site Promotion	S0078	Site promotion
Hannick Homes	Developer	Pegasus	Site Promotion	S0079	Site promotion
One Swindon Ltd	Land promoter	Turley	Site Promotion	S0097	Site promotion: the site represents a suitable location for residential development and should be allocated through the Local Plan Review process for up to 400 dwellings
CJV Properties Ltd	Landowner	Impact	Site Promotion	s0101	- supported/ site promotion, description should be changed to 'mixed town centre uses A1 A3 and residential'
	Land owner		Site Promotion	S0301	Site promotion: Area A is only submitted therefore no landscape constraints as documented in Area B

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
Castlewood Commercial Developments	Land promoter	Turley	Site promotion	s0368	- site promotion
Kingsdown Nurseries	Owner	Turley	Site Promotion	s0380	Site promotion; would form a logical extension to the Kingsdown urban extension as it is delivered. Indeed, if the urban extension is delivered by a consortia of housebuilders, its construction is likely be sporadic in nature. By virtue of the allocation of the Kingsdown new settlement the Council have themselves acknowledged that it will represent a sustainable location for development. Opportunity to improve setting. Proposed highway improvements. Masterplan and Vision documents
Prospect Hospice	Land owner	Projec-Technique	Site promotion	S0427	-site promotion
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	Site Promotion	S0429	Site promotion incl detailed traffic modelling and assessment and Vision Document
Bower Mapson	Developer	DPDS	Site Promotion	S0432	site promotion
On behalf of	Land owner	Impact Planning Services	Site Promotion	S0454	Site promotion - ecology, heritage considerations
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Site Promotion	S0455	Site promotion
On behalf of	Owner	Impact Planning Services	Site promotion	S0458	The site at Croft Yard is adjacent to the current settlement boundary and the arbitrary assessment of the application of this policy is noted as this site is current promoted as a residential site option within the local plan proposals map.
On behalf of	Owner	Impact Planning Services	Site promotion	S0458	National policy provides detailed guidance on the approach to be taken in determining application which affect the historic environment. Any duplication of this guidance should be avoided unless considering the impact or enhancement on a specific asset. In this context we would support the review of all Conservation Area appraisals and guidance documents, to provide up to date consideration of the relevant characteristics. The Conservation Area was designated in May 1973. The

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					Appraisal and Management Plan may be accorded some limited weight, however it is acknowledged that they are particularly aged having been readopted in 2006 and is now some 13 years old.
Church Commissioners for England	Landowner	Deloitte	Site Promotion	s0459	- site promotion
Bell Way Homes	Developer	Wood	Site Promotion	S0460	site promotion
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Site Promotion	S0462	Site promotion/ is unclear why such small sites have been omitted from allocations within the development strategy, when small scale proposals play a clear role in the delivery of sustainable housing within a short term and interim timescale. The Emerging Strategies Report does not include any assessment as to why this site has been omitted.
Fairhurst UK Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Site Promotion	S0463 and S0467	Site promotion. It is unclear why such small sites have been omitted from allocations within the development strategy, when small scale proposals play a clear role in the delivery of sustainable housing within a short term and interim timescale. The Emerging Strategies Report does not include any assessment as to why this site has been omitted.
The Thomas Freke and Lady Norton Charity	Landowner	Savills	Site Promotion	S0467	-site promotion
On behalf of	Land owner	Savills	Site Promotion	Spittleborough Farm	Site Promotion: is low-lying, well-contained and is free of any notable landscape and ecological designations. The site has excellent accessibility to M4 Junction 16, with good local access and exceptional links to wider destinations including London, Bristol and South Wales. It is these physical and locational advantages, coupled with an identified need for new B8 development which adequately justify that the site should be allocated for a new logistics hub

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
1 x respondent	resident		Site support	S0066	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- preferred site in village</li> <li>- well contained and surrounded by development on three sides</li> <li>- may be suitable for 4-5 dwellings</li> <li>- should respect location within Conservation Area</li> </ul>
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Site support	S0066	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parish Council supports site in principle</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site Support	S0301	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support</li> <li>- well located next to existing dwellings and community facilities e.g. park, pub/brewery</li> <li>- good access</li> <li>- provides opportunity for younger families to stay in village</li> <li>- near to bus stop</li> <li>- utilities - close to sewage pipe connection, existing electricity access</li> <li>- village has range of facilities making it a sustainable location for development</li> <li>- village has affordability issue</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Site support	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support - improved facilities at Prospect would benefit community</li> </ul>
2 x respondents	resident		Site support	S0427	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although outside settlement boundary, most sustainable Wroughton option - closer to village centre and greater size could lead to more infrastructure improvements. Provides opportunity for better access into Marlborough road site.</li> </ul>
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Site support	s0458	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parish Council consider site to be suitable and deliverable, provided development is sensitive</li> <li>- development must include proposals to improve parking for adjacent doctors surgery</li> </ul>
1 x respondent	resident		Small sites		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small development sites will not be able to deliver infrastructure to support the locality</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Ob behalf of	Land Owner	Impact Planning Services	Spatial Distribution	S0455	<p>There is a clear requirement to allocate smaller more flexible sites which do not depend upon large infrastructure items to increase the rate of completions within a shorter time scale. Although the Emerging Strategies document suggests at 4.10 '<i>homes have been planned to meet close to 90% of anticipated needs to 2036</i>' this is not accepted. This statement needs to be countered by 1) the need to add and make up the significant shortfall from the current Local Plan due to the past failure of delivery and to take into account the wider strategic issues for the economy and transportation, and 2) the failure of the strategic sites over a number of years and the uncertainty that this has introduced to the Plan, whereby there are insufficient smaller housing sites allocated thereby failing the tests of soundness- it will not be positively prepared and nor will it be effective. The Broad Spatial Options are not wide enough as they have been heavily influenced by the options in the Sustainability Appraisal. Only four options are considered and these overlap one another. A much more comprehensive initial assessment needs to be prepared with a more distinctive range of opportunities which should include the idea of free-standing settlements as well as a more evenly balanced provision with a larger number of smaller sites in the rural areas and the main urban area to deliver new homes more swiftly and assist in making up the clear shortfall from the previous Plan. There is no recognition of the need for higher value, lower density housing. In addition, there is a clear need for more specialist housing for older persons.</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact Planning Services	Spatial Distribution	S0458	<p>There is a clear requirement to allocate smaller more flexible sites which do not depend upon large infrastructure items to increase the rate of completions within a shorter time scale. Although the Emerging Strategies document suggests at 4.10 '<i>homes have been planned to meet close to 90% of anticipated needs to 2036</i>' this is not accepted. This statement needs to be countered by 1) the need to add and make up the significant shortfall from the current Local Plan due to the past failure of delivery and to take into account the wider strategic issues for the economy and transportation, and 2) the failure of the strategic sites over a number of years and the uncertainty that this has introduced to the Plan, whereby there are insufficient smaller housing sites allocated thereby failing the tests of soundness- it will not be positively prepared and nor will it be effective. The Broad Spatial Options are not wide enough as they have been heavily influenced by the options in the Sustainability Appraisal. Only four options are considered and these overlap one another. A much more comprehensive initial assessment needs to be prepared with a more distinctive range of opportunities which should include the idea of free-standing settlements as well as a more evenly balanced provision with a larger number of smaller sites in the rural areas and the main urban area to deliver new homes more swiftly and assist in making up the clear shortfall from the previous Plan. There is no recognition of the need for higher value, lower density housing. In addition, there is a clear need for more specialist housing for older persons.</p>



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Fairwater Homes Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Spatial Distribution	S0462, S0457 and S0461	<p>There is a clear requirement to allocate smaller more flexible sites which do not depend upon large infrastructure items to increase the rate of completions within a shorter time scale. Although the Emerging Strategies document suggests at 4.10 '<i>homes have been planned to meet close to 90% of anticipated needs to 2036</i>' this is not accepted. This statement needs to be countered by 1) the need to add and make up the significant shortfall from the current Local Plan due to the past failure of delivery and to take into account the wider strategic issues for the economy and transportation, and 2) the failure of the strategic sites over a number of years and the uncertainty that this has introduced to the Plan, whereby there are insufficient smaller housing sites allocated thereby failing the tests of soundness- it will not be positively prepared and nor will it be effective. The Broad Spatial Options are not wide enough as they have been heavily influenced by the options in the Sustainability Appraisal. Only four options are considered and these overlap one another. A much more comprehensive initial assessment needs to be prepared with a more distinctive range of opportunities which should include the idea of free-standing settlements as well as a more evenly balanced provision with a larger number of smaller sites in the rural areas and the main urban area to deliver new homes more swiftly and assist in making up the clear shortfall from the previous Plan. There is no recognition of the need for higher value, lower density housing. In addition, there is a clear need for more specialist housing for older persons.</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Fairhurst UK Ltd	Developer	Impact Planning Services	Spatial Distribution	S0463 and S0467	There is a clear requirement to allocate smaller more flexible sites which do not depend upon large infrastructure items to increase the rate of completions within a shorter time scale. Although the Emerging Strategies document suggests at 4.10 ' <i>homes have been planned to meet close to 90% of anticipated needs to 2036</i> ' this is not accepted. This statement needs to be countered by 1) the need to add and make up the significant shortfall from the current Local Plan due to the past failure of delivery and to take into account the wider strategic issues for the economy and transportation, and 2) the failure of the strategic sites over a number of years and the uncertainty that this has introduced to the Plan, whereby there are insufficient smaller housing sites allocated thereby failing the tests of soundness- it will not be positively prepared and nor will it be effective. The Broad Spatial Options are not wide enough as they have been heavily influenced by the options in the Sustainability Appraisal. Only four options are considered and these overlap one another. A much more comprehensive initial assessment needs to be prepared with a more distinctive range of opportunities which should include the idea of free-standing settlements as well as a more evenly balanced provision with a larger number of smaller sites in the rural areas and the main urban area to deliver new homes more swiftly and assist in making up the clear shortfall from the previous Plan. There is no recognition of the need for higher value, lower density housing. In addition, there is a clear need for more specialist housing for older persons.
Ellipsis Farms Limited	Owner	Strutt & Parker	Spatial Distribution	S0477	option H1 – a strategic scale expansion site at St Andrews/Blunsdon combined with the allocation of land at the higher tier settlements of Highworth or Wroughton – offers an excellent opportunity to meet this need, and any additional housing should the Council increase its overall housing requirement. If the Council decides to proceed with housing option H2 – graduated dispersal including

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					allocations being made at the largest rural settlements of Highworth and Wroughton – then it is apparent that our client's land would still represent an appropriate location to accommodate a proportion of the housing need.
Ellipsis Farms Limited	Owner	Strutt & Parker	Spatial Distribution	S0477	While it is acknowledged that the land does fall away from the edge of Highworth down towards Hampton, it is considered that the site has been unreasonably discounted at this relatively early stage of the Local Plan review process.
Homes England	Land promoter	Wood	Spatial Options	379/32	Highways England believe that a spatial strategy based on H1, which includes growth north of Swindon, is the most sustainable and deliverable land use solution, for the following reasons: Better Place-making Opportunities: H1 provides the best opportunity to integrate new homes with the successful development of Tadpole Garden Village and other recent investment in community infrastructure to the north of Swindon, such as the new primary and secondary schools and enhanced public transport within close proximity to the Highways England land. Future Proofing the Plan: new development as described in H1 provides a logical extension to the north of Swindon, and could form part of a longer-term growth strategy, potentially extending beyond the Plan period which would support the Council's historical strategy of extending Swindon as the Borough's main service centre with excellent access to the associated higher order services and facilities. Comprehensive and Planned delivery: a focused growth strategy with some larger sites provides the best opportunity to comprehensively plan for the delivery of a mix of housing and associated infrastructure improvements. Small scale development can be piecemeal and tends to be unable to deliver or make contributions towards community infrastructure provision such as on-site children's play areas, recreation and open space.

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>Committed Delivery Partners: Highways England and Homes England are two Government organisations with a remit to support sustainable growth in Swindon. Both public sector agencies are committed to working with the Council and adjacent landowners to ensure a comprehensive approach is taken to housing and infrastructure delivery in this location.</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Homes England	Land promoter	Wood	Spatial Options	379/32	<p>Appendix 1 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) 2019 provides an assessment of each of the four options proposed and concludes that H2 is the most sustainable. This conclusion is not fully justified. It neither considers adequately the potential mitigation measures that are more likely to be incorporated and delivered through a larger scale strategic development, as proposed in H1, nor does it accurately compare the options. Spatial Distribution: the strategy of the adopted Local Plan, which the Council considers a sustainable strategy, is to focus development at Swindon making the best of the opportunity to support the role of Swindon as the main service centre in the District. To move to a radically different strategy of dispersal across a large number of small villages and towns, would not support the sustainable strategy that the Council has been working to deliver over recent years. Housing Diversity: the appraisal states that since H1 "... would likely be a volume housebuilder site, it also offers the lowest potential to diversify the range of type and size of homes being built". This is at odds with experience across the country where the evidence shows that a wide range of house types, styles, sizes and tenures can be delivered on a large strategic development. Indeed, a reliance on delivering housing on smaller sites risks limiting the ability to deliver the necessary mix of market and affordable housing required to meet local needs. Transport Infrastructure: the appraisals conclusion that H2 would disperse traffic onto the highway network, whilst H1 would be limited by the capacity of the Cold Harbour junction. This does not take into account the reality of traffic movements across the network, or reflect that all the options will affect traffic movements along the A419 corridor. A strategy which relies on dispersal will still inevitably be reliant on additional car trips to the main service centres in the district. Agricultural Land: the appraisal states that "all alternatives have the potential to</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<p>lead to the loss of significant areas of best and most versatile agricultural land and so are assessed as having a likely significant negative effect.” It is recognised that this is the case for the majority of land around Swindon being Grade 2 agricultural land and, therefore, applies to all of the options. However, the St Andrews/Broad Blunsdon settlement appraisal states that sites within this area “are categorised as Grade 3 (good to moderate), with sites 379/32 and 55/56 comprising a mix of Grade 3 and Grade 4 (poor quality).”</p>
Gladman	Land promoter		Spatial Options	Land at Shrivensham Road, Highworth & Land at Eastrop, Highworth	<p>In addition to these options, Gladman would recommend a further option is taken into consideration. At this stage, Gladman would support the ‘Graduating Dispersal’ Option, as it provides the opportunity to complement the growth that is already committed at Swindon through the new communities by distributing development across a range of sustainable settlements. An increase in the number of settlements with allocations for residential development will support an approach to development that serves a wider range of market needs and demand. This in turn will boost the rate of housing completions and as a result the ability to maintain a fiveyear housing land supply. The Local Plan should be looking to identify housing that can readily come</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					forward to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and meet development needs.
Hallam Land, Hannick Homes & Taylor Wimpey	Land Promoter/Developer	David Lock Associates	Spatial Options	Land north of A420 (NEV)	<p>Considers that a development of 500 dwellings at St Andrews/Blunsdon (H1) is unlikely to provide sufficient critical mass nor attract sufficient investment to deliver sustainable transport options and community and education infrastructure and could, without careful planning, create pressure on existing facilities. The Interim SA is silent on the option to focus additional growth at the NEV, either through expansion of the allocated boundary, or through density review.</p> <p>Consider that additional development at the New Eastern Villages (NEV) should be appraised as alternative housing distribution Option H5 as part of this Local Plan review, to comply with the legal requirements to consider reasonable options for Plan preparation. Indeed, this option could be combined with the graduated dispersal option to provide a range of sites for delivery throughout the plan period. Land is available at the NEV which could complement development already committed and further support investment, viability and delivery of the NEV scheme. Plan LHL005/510 identifies the extent of land Green Land East, some 50 hectares, immediately adjacent to, and adjoining the NEV. Indeed, this land once formed part of the NEV boundary (formally Eastern Development Villages – EDA), identified through initial masterplanning work undertaken on behalf of the Council by LDA in 2009, however it fell away in favour of the inclusion of Redland Airfield. Additional planned growth at the NEV, masterplanned and delivered within the adopted design and delivery</p>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					framework set out in the site SPD's would perform well against the sustainability topics presented in the Interim SA report, particularly with regard to population and housing, healthy and inclusive communities and transport. Application of the principles set out in the NEV SPD's (Green Infrastructure, Island Bridge, SUDS) will ensure appropriate mitigation to deliver positively against the biodiversity, water resources and landscape SA topics
Hills	Land promoter	Pro-vision	Spatial Options	S0020	The broad spatial options fail to consider further small/medium sized extensions to Swindon's built area which is a more sustainable pattern of growth
Linden Homes	Developer	Turley	Spatial options	S0032	In order to address the immediate housing needs of the Borough, meet the residual requirement, and to reinstate a five year housing land supply, the Council should look to allocate a range of sites at a range of sizes through the Local Plan Review, including Grove Farm.
One Swindon Ltd	Land promoter	Turley	Spatial Options	S0097	owing to the excellent transport options offered in Swindon, we consider that the Council should seek to meet its residual housing requirement in Swindon as far as is possible It is our view that the SHELAA fails to take account of other suitable, available and achievable sites within the settlement boundary of Swindon, including our client's site at Newburn Sidings.



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Spatial strategy	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	further options should be introduced that test the potential for further apportionments to the towns and villages within the Swindon Borough. In addition, it is also recommended that the Local Plan Review tests the potential for additional allocations within Wiltshire Council's administrative area, where this falls with the Swindon-HMA. Indeed, the proposal to divide the Swindon HMA by administrative boundaries is considered to artificially diminish the potential for delivery issues (which have characterised the part of this HMA that falls within the Swindon Borough) to be effectively understood and addressed. Towns such as Royal Wootton Bassett have a clear functional relationship with Swindon, both in terms of access to higher order services and education facilities, but also in respect of travel to work patterns. Indeed, RWB lies within the 'M4/Swindon Functional Economic Market Area', as identified in the ' <i>Swindon and Wiltshire Functional Economic Market Area Assessment 2016</i> ' ('FEMA') <sup>10</sup> . It is also the case that RWB is comparatively free of physical or statutory constraints, resulting in it having markedly greater potential for growth when compared to other locations within the Swindon-HMA. The Swindon and Wiltshire SHMA (2017) and the Swindon and Wiltshire FEMA (2016) identify clear functional relationships between Swindon and surrounding settlements. The findings of these reports have not ceased to be relevant and should not be disregarded. In this context, the Local Plan Reviews (being prepared respectively by both SBC and Wiltshire Council) present an opportunity for housing delivery issues to be addressed more effectively and across administrative boundaries.
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed to brownfield sites before greenfield
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be focussed on brownfield sites/regeneration sites before greenfield/villages

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed to brownfield sites before greenfield
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed towards brownfield sites before greenfield
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed towards brownfield sites before greenfield
1 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed to brownfield sites before open spaces/green corridor
2 x respondent	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed to brownfield sites before greenfield - e.g disused industrial space (e.g Dorcan), - good examples of development on brownfield: Ivy hotel, Pipers way retirement
2 x respondents	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed towards brownfield sites/redevelopment sites before greenfield/building on open space/green corridor
2 x respondents	resident		Spatial Strategy		Greenfield sites with significant heritage should not be considered for housing
4 x respondents	resident		Spatial Strategy		Development should be directed towards brownfield sites before greenfield
Clifford	Landowner	DPDS	Spatial Strategy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Swindon should look west with a large scale strategic expansion to the west of the town</li> <li>- doesn't support any of the spatial options. Considers there is a need for a hybrid 5th option which would involve combining a portfolio of smaller sites around Swindon Borough (Option H2) with a sustainable strategic site to the west of Swindon. This allows for a steady stream of housing delivery across the Borough early in the plan period as well as opportunity to unlock much needed strategic and sustainable growth to the west of the town to meet the needs of the Swindon HMA.</li> <li>- westward expansion should be looked at as an alternative spatial option</li> </ul>
On behalf of	Landowner	Impact	Spatial Strategy	s0456	- argues Swindon has failed to provide a sufficient supply of sites for homes for the managers / directors of local companies ' and that is why it is a working class town

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					- Borough should encourage higher value lower density homes around attractive villages
Bishopstone PC	Parish Council		Spatial Strategy		suggest retention of SD2 settlement hierarchy
Cooper Estates Strategic Land Ltd	Land promoter	Terence Orouke	Spatial strategy		- should be planning for Swindon HMA level and should engage with Wiltshire Council to make west of Swindon an option for meeting 1,000 homes residual - options for expansion at towns and villages in Swindon Borough will be less sustainable particularly in terms of commuting than a western expansion to Swindon
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		Spatial strategy		- the Local Plan should incorporate new Urban Villages on the outskirts of the Swindon Borough. Such developments would prevent piecemeal housebuilding and will have the ability to revitalise Swindon's satellite towns-like Highworth and Wroughton.
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	Spatial Strategy		Policies should support redevelopment of brownfield sites
Telereal Trilium	Developer	Turley	Spatial strategy		- strategic sites slow to deliver required housing - should not be relied on to deliver short term needs - support allocation of small and medium sites
Wanborough PC	Parish Council		Spatial strategy		- SBC should allocate housing development to locations with infrastructure or development should improve infrastructure, Wanborough needs: Measures to prevent "rat running" through the village; · Measures to improve and reduce the speed of traffic through the village; · Measures to improve the problem of parking along Church Road and High Street; · Improved cycle paths and footpaths; · Improved bus service; · Provision for a shop and Post Office;
1 x respondent	resident		Specialist Housing topic paper		- suggests number of changes to specialist housing topic paper
1 x respondent	resident		Specialist Housing topic paper		- suggests number of changes to specialist housing topic paper

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
1 x respondent	resident		Speculative site suggestion		- suggestion of allocations directed to general Princess Alexandra Hospital area (no specific site)
1 x respondent	resident		speculative site suggestion		- suggestion of allocations on 2 x brownfield plots - vacant employment land. 1 - Mead Way, Shaw. 2 - Faraday Road - Dorcan
L&Q Estates	land Promoter	Pegasus	Sustainability appraisal	S0429	the Sustainability Appraisal of options is not only methodologically flawed, it assesses sites illogically and inequitably and does not recognise the opportunities to address any issues which could even provide betterment. However, the Sustainability Appraisal of sites does not appear to be subject to the same criticisms and so this could be used instead.
On behalf of	Land owner	Savills	Sustainability appraisal	Spittleborough Farm	the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) does not appropriately take into account the findings of the Swindon and Wiltshire Functional Economic Market Area Assessment (FEMAA, 2017). There is limited justification within the SA as to why certain locations outside of, but well-related to, the Swindon administrative area have not been considered as part of the interim assessment
Crest Nicholson	Developer	Savills	Sustainability appraisal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- on the air quality and environmental pollution topic strategic site and broad blunsdon sites should be rated equally</li> <li>- climatic factors: all options are geographically distant from town centre</li> <li>- lanscape: option 1 should be assessed as better than option 3 because there is already built development in this location</li> <li>- scoring on housing objective is refuted because this option can be combined with housing at higher tier rural settlements and Tadpole Garden Village shows the potential to diversify housing within a strategic site e.g. custom build</li> <li>- health and inclusive communities, 1 and 4 should be equally top performing</li> <li>- transport topic: failure to consider how larger development could mitigate the Coldharbour junction</li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Go South Coast	infrastructure provider		Sustainability appraisal		- suggests thresholds for bus distances should be those in the CIHT publication "Buses in Urban Development"
Highways England	Statutory consultee		Sustainability appraisal		- it is unclear if the Interim SA assessment included consideration of existing SRN performance constraints or the likely scale of impact of each of the broad options on the SRN. Further clarification in this respect would be welcome. It is also not clear whether any further high-level transport assessment has been undertaken to support the Interim SA and the identification of broad options for the spatial strategy.
1 x respondent	resident		Telecommunications infrastructure		-developments should be expected to provide latest communications technology i.e superfast broadband, 5G
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		town centre		- However, significant and urgent efforts are needed to regenerate the town centre. The disincentive for town centre footfall is the continual ratcheting up of parking charges.
Swindon Catholic Deanery Justice and Peace Group	Local organisation		town centre		- Redevelop the Town Centre and other urban areas so that homes (and thereby people) are at its heart. In addition, we would like to see policies which encourage more sharing of space by businesses
1 x respondent	resident		Town Centre		- Swindon has outgrown having a single centre - plan needs to retain flexibility to adapt to ongoing situation at town centre
Civic Voice	Local organisation		transport		- rail and bus services are excessively expensive and bus service is not good enough - lack of mention of mobility scooters
Haydon Wick Parish Council	Parish Council		transport		- Thamesdown Drive/Purton Road junction is a congestion problem - road access to the Tadpole Farm development is inadequate including Oakhurst Way, Tadpole Lane and Tadpole Bridge
Highways England	Statutory consultee		transport		- the planned infrastructure to support the Local Plan 2026 allocations may not have sufficient capacity for the cumulative impact of allocated and speculative development sites. This means that additional infrastructure may need to be identified to support

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					allocated sites where unplanned/speculative developments have been allowed in advance of the allocations - development strategy should focus on sustainable transport and improving local roads, not SRN
Highways England	Statutory consultee		transport		- site allocation policies should signpost requirement for applications to be accompanied by a TA and travel - the Plan is to satisfy the requirements of NPPF, it would need to be supported by an assessment of the infrastructure necessary to ensure that traffic impacts are not severe.
Oxfordshire County Council	local authority		transport		- plan should support improved public transport on A420 corridor between Swindon, Science Vale and Oxford
Swindon Cycling Campaign	Local organisation		transport		- council should adopt a sustainable development strategy replacing LP2026 policy SD2 which emphasises the benefits of sustainable transport -
1 x respondent	resident		transport		- electric buses should be considered - developers/SBC should engage with bus providers to deliver this
1 x respondent	resident		transport		- - additional traffic and road usage should be discouraged - Swindon has become dormitory town - policies should stipulate housing is linked to employment opportunities
1 x respondent	resident		transport		- road layouts need to be wide enough for emergency and service vehicles

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
4 x respondents	resident		transport		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- all references to minimising emissions from transport have been deleted and should be reinstated</li> <li>- targets for zero transport emissions should be included</li> <li>- sustainable transport hierarchy should be specified and adopted</li> <li>- cycle paths and green corridors should be supported</li> <li>- reducing car usage and stopping new road building should be key principles</li> <li>- provision of quality public transport should be key principle e.g. Greater manchester spatial framework draft</li> <li>- refs to 'enabling provision of an express bus network connecting strategic allocations to Swindon Town Centre' and a 'high frequency bus network' have disappeared, also in draft NEV reference has been watered down. These refs should be reinstated</li> <li>- refs to EV charging points should state that they will enable vehicle to grid charging e.g. cheshire wests local plan</li> <li>- provision of car club spaces should be set out according to size of development and parking standards area. Should be encouraged to be EVs</li> <li>- any ref in local plan to car parking should be superseded with 'cycle and walking paths and associated infrastructure.'</li> </ul>
Swindon Labour Group	Local organisation		University		-believe it is important to retain CM1 support for a university
David Wilson Homes	Developer	Boyer Planning	Unmet need	Land to the East of Royal Wootton Bassett	If more realistic assumptions are applied in respect of the delivery potential of the New Communities, or if the identified level of housing need increases, then there may be a corresponding requirement to identify alternative sites to accommodate potentially thousands of dwellings. As much of the Swindon Borough is constrained by flood risk and the AONB, there is a case for meeting part of Swindon's housing needs in less-constrained, sustainable, and more readily deliverable locations in Wiltshire. Regard should therefore be had to the positive effects on housing

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Agent if applicable</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Site ref. (if applicable)</b>	<b>Comments - summary points</b>
					supply (across the HMA), which could be facilitated by delivering sustainable development within Wiltshire and at RWB specifically. In view of the findings of the SHMA 2017 and FEMA 2016 (and the identification of functional, and cross-boundary, housing and economic relationships <sup>13</sup> ), there is a clear requirement for genuine co-operation between SBC and Wiltshire Council. (DTC)
4 x respondents	resident		waste		- community sharing, reuse and recycling, waste management plans, mineral plans etc should be incorporated into Local Plan
1 x respondent	resident		waste		- no reference to reducing waste in plan



Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Cllrs Ford and Martyn	Local councillors		Wroughton/infrastructure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- there should be no development within Wroughton other than on sites which residents have already identified within the NP as being sites where they would be prepared to see development take place</li> <li>- destruction of Wroughton's separate identity</li> <li>- traffic gridlock and detrimental effect on living standards of current residents</li> <li>- lack of GP capacity</li> <li>- without prejudice to their objection, the councillors identify the following infrastructure needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- any development on eastern edge must include safe controlled crossing points to enable safe crossing of Swindon road</li> <li>- s106 and CIL ring-fenced for youth provision e.g. youth outreach/worker</li> <li>- investment in a sustainable bus service that would serve North Wroughton using a clean, energy efficient vehicle</li> <li>- development should incorporate ICT</li> <li>- homes to be energy efficient</li> <li>- meaningful POS to enable children and young people to play, outdoor gym equipment should be provided</li> <li>- any s106 generated should be ring-fenced to be spent on Wroughton junior and infants schools, not part of a central pot for Swindon schools and spaces for all children provided in Wroughton schools.</li> <li>- s106 and CIL ring-fenced for local community facilities within the village centre</li> <li>- increase in recreation space/public open space especially sport pitches</li> <li>- development to be tenure blind</li> <li>- wildflower planting on verges</li> <li>- all developments to include EVCP</li> <li>- no additional parking on existing roads</li> <li>- noise bund to protect sites from M4</li> <li>- cycle path to join with southern flyer to allow new residents to cycle in and out of village</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- new residents offered a free month's travel on local buses starting the day they move in</li><li>- new residents offered a discount to buy cycles</li></ul>

Respondent	Type	Agent if applicable	Issue	Site ref. (if applicable)	Comments - summary points
Wroughton PC	Parish Council		Wroughton/infrastructure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- need to extend Ellendune Health Centre</li> <li>- need to rebuild Ridgeway Secondary School</li> <li>- if additional houses are to be build there is a need to extend the primary school to a 4FE school or 2 X 2FE schools</li> <li>- housing should include a variety including affordable, social housing, starter homes and self-build plots</li> <li>- provision of a safe cycle path which links the Southern Flyer route in Wichelstowe to the heart of Wroughton village</li> <li>- improved bus service on Swindon Road</li> <li>- dimming schemes to reduce light pollution</li> <li>- additional shop in east Wroughton</li> <li>- provision of additional land for play, leisure and sport</li> </ul>