

APPENDIX A - Summary of Representations Received Southern Connector Road (S/19/0703)

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
<i>External Consultees</i>		
Environment Agency	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development falls within flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone. Therefore the development application is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and its associated Planning Practice Guidance. Absence of an adequate FRA. Aspects of the FRA need to be updated reflecting the current status of the updated flood modelling. Explanations are required of flood modelling updates undertaken. Further details are required in relation to the FRA to demonstrate the Area of development effects on floodplain. Floodplain compensations need to be clearly demonstrated.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterate previous comments.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the submission of a technical note providing clarification on the Sequential and Exception Tests, the Environment Agency have no objections subject to conditions.
Highways England	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend that planning permission not be granted for 3 months. The primary concern relates to the operation and safety of the SRN, which in proximity to the proposed road scheme includes the A419 Commonhead and M4 J15. A review of the model outputs has identified several issues that

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>indicate the model does not follow best practice and is likely to overestimate capacity of the junction. The information presented in the TA cannot therefore be relied upon to inform the acceptability of the scheme. Further work is therefore required in order to demonstrate the significance of any traffic impacts on the SRN.</p>
	<p><i>Revised (July 2019)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that planning permission not be granted for 6 months. • Design concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns arise from departures from standards design guidance and advice - Further information required to complete a full assessment • The review has identified several issues that indicate the model does not follow best practice and is likely to overestimate capacity of the junction. Without more detailed review of the design it cannot be determined that impacts would not be severe.
	<p><i>Revised (September 2019)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that planning permission not be granted for 6 months. • Points required to be addressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design incompliance with appropriate standards, or suitable departures' resolutions are secured - LinSig modelling of proposed junction does not satisfy the sufficient capacity concern - Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not been carried out to reflect the effects on HE network - Non motorised users assessment and review are still outstanding - There is increasing uncertainty relating to the modelling that has been used, including whether it is based on the most recent

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>versions of the SATURN model. This includes the schemes (and their coding) and background growth that the model incorporates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Because of aforementioned points, Highways England now requires that the VISSIM model incorporating A419 Commonhead Roundabout is used to assess the junction.
	<i>November 2019</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following ongoing engagement with the Council, Highways England have a high level of confidence that a safe and sufficient scheme can be agreed in the near future. • Highways England are committed to working positively and proactively with SBC to resolve the outstanding highway matters at the earliest possible opportunity. Should the Council be minded to approve the application at the forthcoming committee in December 2019, Highways England would be satisfied with a resolution to grant consent subject to the satisfactory agreement of strategic highway matters (to be confirmed in writing by Highways England).
Historic England	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. Any decision on this application should be delayed until the following issues have been resolved or information supplied <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Settings assessment of Wanborough Roman Town - Review and updating of Archaeological Mitigation Strategy to resolve red line issues and ecology and landscaping mitigation. We therefore consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 189, 193 and 194. • The proposed route for the new Southern Connector Road (SCR) is in

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>proximity to a number of designated heritage assets, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Scheduled Monument recorded as 'Site of Roman town, W of Wanborough House' (National Heritage List for England ref 1004684); - The Conservation Areas of Upper and Lower Wanborough, encompassing buildings listed at grades I and II; - Five grade II listed buildings to the east of the route and in the area of Wanborough Marsh and Foxbridge Farm. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We also note the presence of several undesigned but highly-sensitive archaeological sites along the route. These are depicted on Figures 9.1 and 9.3 (Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 9, Cultural Heritage) as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Romano- British Roadside Settlement (Mitigation Areas 1/5) - Romano-British Farmstead B and associated field systems, (Mitigation Areas 2 and 16) - Bronze Age Cremation (Mitigation Area 7) - Medieval Farmstead C (Mitigation Area 9), - Iron Age/ Romano-British Farmstead A and associated field system (Mitigation Areas 11 and 13) • The proposed road will directly impact a number of the Heritage Assets (designated and un-designated) listed above, and these impacts are recognised within the Mitigation strategy of the ES. However the red line boundary within Chapter 9 of the ES does not correspond to the red line boundary of the scheme (Proposed Route Overview Plan Dwg No. NEVSCR - ATK-HML-SCR-DR-D-0019). Therefore the Areas of Archaeological Mitigation drawing and assessment needs to be

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>updated to reflect the actual proposed scheme. It is not currently possible to provide detailed advice on the mitigation measures as they do not cover the same area as the project scheme. For example Mitigation Areas 7, 8 and 9 appear to no longer be within the red line of development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the SCR crosses Wanborough Road (Ermin Street) it is proposed that a traffic lighted junction will be installed. The proposals have the potential to result in a loss of significance to the designated heritage assets noted above via a change in setting. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment in section 16. Paragraph 190 refers to the conservation of heritage assets and notes that effects can arise from both a physical change and a change in setting. • The Setting Assessment (ES Chapter 9, Appendix 9.5) provides an assessment of the potential changes in setting to most of the designated assets set out above. The setting of the Wanborough Roman Town Scheduled Monument is not considered in the Setting Assessment. There is no explanation as to why this was not assessed. • As you approach the Roman town from the south along Wanborough Road you pass through a landscape of isolated, roadside dwellings with glimpses of open fields behind. The road is rural in character with no footpaths or lighting and bounded closely by grass verges and hedgerows. The straightness of the road as it approaches the town is typical of a Roman Road a trait recognised by most people. The

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>proposal will cause harm to the Wanborough Roman Town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation proposed for the roadside settlement includes an area of preservation in situ for the archaeology (Area 1). This is welcome but is contrary to the Environmental Mitigation Proposals Sheet 5 of 5 (NEVSCR-ATK-ELS-SCR-Dr-L-0123 PO3) which shows the area east of the road in Area 1 to be planted with trees. This is not a suitable way to preserve archaeology as the roots of the trees will damage the buried remains. This conflict needs to be resolved by either the planting being removed or the archaeology fully excavated. • We also disagree with the conclusions reached in the Setting Assessment in respect of the Upper Wanborough Conservation Area, and the grade II listed buildings known as Moat Cottage (Figure 9.3 ref.3), Wrightsbridge Farmhouse and Coach House (ref. 5), and Foxbridge Farm Farmhouse (ref. 6). In each of these cases we consider that the proposals will result in a harmful change in setting. This is because the SCR will bring urbanising features closer to the rural settings of these assets, which in our view contribute to their significance. That harm is at the lower end of the scale of 'less than substantial harm' in terms of NPPF paragraphs 194 and 195. • This development will cause harm to heritage assets. The harm cannot be fully assessed by anyone with the current supporting documentation; this is contrary to NPPF paragraph 189. Any harm to a heritage asset needs clear and convincing justification and should be wholly the exception for designated assets (NPPF Paragraph 193 and 194).

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. Any decision on this application should be delayed until the following issues have been resolved or information supplied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised setting assessment for Durocornovium Roman Town - Revised archaeological evaluation report and cultural heritage assessment informed by a full and appropriate analysis of the outstanding elements of post-excavation work detailed above. Extent of archaeological mitigation and preservation in-situ proposals for elements of nationally-significant archaeology. We consider that this application does not yet meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular, paragraphs 189, 193 and 194. • Setting Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The installation of traffic lights at the proposed junction with Wanborough Road will erode the ability to appreciate the experience of the Roman road in a rural milieu by introducing an urbanising element to the landscape. - Conclusion drawn was that this will cause harm to the nationally-significant remains (whether Scheduled or not) of Durocornovium Roman Town. - The level of harm is considered to be less than substantial in terms of NPPF paragraph 193 but nevertheless requires a clear and convincing justification as per NPPF paragraph 194. • Addendum to the Cultural Heritage chapter of the Environmental Statement.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting: Concern relates to statements about the potential impact of the development upon the setting of the Roman town (Operation - Non Physical Effects, paragraphs 9.6.6-9.6.9). - Treatment of buried archaeology: Concerns here relate to incomplete assessment of evaluation results; extent of archaeological mitigation areas; extent of archaeological preservation in-situ areas. The nature of archaeological preservation and significance within the scheme area needs to be adequately understood in order to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inform preservation of archaeological remains strategies in accordance with current Historic England Guidance 'Preserving Archaeological Remains' (2016) ○ Understand the impact on nationally important archaeological remains in line with NPPF paragraph 189. • Incomplete assessment of evaluation results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The evaluation has not fully considered the biological potential of the site or the preservation conditions within the Scheduled area of the Roman town. ○ The site includes areas identified within evaluation as including palaeochannels. These do not appear to have been assessed or dated and their relationship to the archaeological deposits or features has not been considered. ○ The remains of the block lifted Middle Bronze Age cremation urn and whole earth samples need to be assessed as they

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>will contain information about preservation conditions on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is recommended that the processing, assessment, conservation and reporting of outstanding archaeological materials and whole earth samples is undertaken. ● Extent of archaeological mitigation areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns that the extent of archaeological excavation area 5, and strip, map and record areas 4 & 6, Areas of Archaeological Mitigation, are drawn too tightly. Consideration should be given to enlarging the mitigation areas to encompass the area of a larger roundabout than currently planned. ● Extent of archaeological preservation in-situ areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns about soft landscaping proposals in Area 1, such as tree planting, which could have detrimental impact upon archaeological remains preserved in-situ.
	Revised (September 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No objection, subject to planning conditions.
Natural England	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Your decision should be guided by paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework which gives the highest status of protection for the 'landscape and scenic beauty' of AONBs and National Parks. For major development proposals paragraph 172 sets out criteria to determine whether the development should exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is very hard to form a judgement as to whether a net gain is indeed anticipated, and thus whether the proposals are consistent with local and national policy, as the gains, losses, target condition of new habitat creation, risk and time frames of achieving such condition are not systematically presented. In order to judge this, we advise that a recognised metric is used to assess whether a net gain should indeed be anticipated. Highways England have adapted the “DEFRA metric” for use in their highways schemes and it may be worth seeking to use their assessment tools. I can supply a Highways England contact if needed. There is no mention of this in the biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement, which seems strange as this seems to be a more effective means of achieving biodiversity mitigation than landscape and visual mitigation. Moreover, without tight specifications regarding seedbed preparation (principally around soil nutrient status) and post establishment management (principally around cut and remove management) it would be inappropriate to anticipate a high value biodiversity rating for this land for the purposes of any metric used.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterate previous comments.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterate previous comments.
Network Rail	Original	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the proximity to Network Rail assets and suggest a condition.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
	(April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon a further review, they have no further comments.
North Wessex Downs AONB Board	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection in principle.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection in principle to the proposed development. • Development proposal that effect views into and out of the AONB need to be carefully assessed to ensure that they conserve and enhance the natural beauty and landscape character of the AONB. • The interpretation of the finding in the planning statement is poorly done, it can be seen as underplaying the impact of the new development on the local landscape. This to be taken on board. • The setting includes the surroundings outside the AONB and although outside its boundary its extent is not fixed and may change over time. This applies to the open fields providing views up to Upper Wanbrough and the spire of St Andrews Church and of Liddington Hill. • The detailed design fails to reflect the country lane appearance in the proposed route. • The road should use low kerbs that allow the grass verge to creep over, as large roundabouts standards dependent on the speed limit of the road, it is preferred to include landscaping scheme to the junction. • Footpaths are encouraged complying with highways safety and sustainability, however, alternative paving materials are preferred over tarmac. There should only be one footpath along the lane. • The current planting scheme compromise the inwards/outwards views of the AONB and its setting i.e. solid line of trees. A condition

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>requesting a detailed landscape plan should be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant concerns of the junction's lighting columns, in particular the roundabout whereby a number of columns are proposed on each of the roads approaching the roundabout which will increase the level of light spill and suburbanise this rural locality.
Thames Water	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection, subject to conditions.
Woodland Trust	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Woodland Trust strongly objects to the proposed development on account of direct loss and detrimental impact to several trees recognised as ancient or veteran specimens. • In accord with NPPF Para 175 (inc footnote) there is no wholly exceptional reason for the development in this location and therefore it should be refused. • It is essential that no trees displaying ancient/veteran characteristics are lost as part of the development, due to the potential wider implications this could have on other nearby veteran trees and species.
Internal Consultees		
Archaeology	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased with the proposed mitigation plan, however have noticed some discrepancies between the development plan and mitigation plan. • It means that the two plans do not match exactly and some areas appear to have no archaeological mitigation proposed. • Area 17 now needs to have mitigation proposed.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterate previous comments and request that further detail be provided in an outline Mitigation Strategy.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the areas of archaeological remains identified as being preserved in situ remain as such. • Construction methods for temporary impacts to have minimal ground disturbance wherever possible. • No objection, subject to planning conditions.
Conservation	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of heritage asset categories based on criteria, rather than a 'holistic approach' as advocated by Historic England where on a need to understand the value and contribution of the setting to the asset. • It is also noted that there is no discussion of tranquillity and the openness of the setting, as well as the actual impacts caused by the physical nature of the road and associated lighting which will change the experience of the countryside particularly at night time. As such, it is difficult to understand how the majority of listed buildings and monuments such as Liddington Castle have been rated as 'negligible/none' for the effect of the road to their significance which would derive from impacts to their setting. • It is considered that the assessment is not robust nor has it thoroughly identified the amount of harm caused which is also applicable to the conservation areas and other designated and non-designated heritage assets. It is also noted that whilst the Historic England guidance to setting is cited in the documents, the step by step criteria is not actually followed or detailed anywhere within the report. This type of

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>assessment would demonstrate how the road would affect the setting of these assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed route is likely to have the least impact on the heritage assets of all the routes, and also accommodates the route of the canal. The application suggests the use of underpasses, however there are not details how the proposed development will safeguard the route at the crossing points ie. in the cross sections.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns remain with the proposed methodology for the assessment of heritage assets, which in the Officers view fails to take a holistic approach to understanding significance and its setting. The assessment of harm primarily focuses on views when assessing the impact on setting, and does not consider intangible values and historic associations. Officers consider this to result in an underestimation of the harm, and that this should be reviewed in accord with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
Ecology	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of veteran trees could potentially be harmed by the proposed development. No evidence is provided to explain how the route selection has tried to avoid these trees, as identified in the NPPF (Para 175c). The proposed development could significantly impact on the ability of species to move through the landscape, as well as the loss of trees which include bat roosts. There is no justification to evidence how the proposed route selection has avoided protected species. The assessment of effects needs to consider whether there will be any effect on European sites.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is needed on how biodiversity net gain will be achieved, in accordance with the NPPF. The report acknowledges that hedgerow loss cannot adequately be compensated for. The applicants should consider whether off-site compensation should be provided. Further surveys are being undertaken for dormice, it is suggested that these be conditioned. The proposed bridges and culverts should be designed to allow for safe passage of species. A biodiversity off-setting payment is proposed, specifically for lapwing and skylark, and in principle agreement is required
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One veteran tree will be removed, but the Consultation comments contradict the revised ES impacts on further veteran trees. Clarification is required. It should be noted that the scheme has been re-designed to reduce impacts on veteran trees: originally up to five veteran trees were assessed as potentially affected. Including responses to Woodland Trust and cross-referencing against the Woodland Trust's list of ancient and veteran trees affected.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further clarification should be provided in relation to the veteran tree to be removed. Suggest a planning condition to ensure an appropriate Landscape and Ecological Management plan is submitted.
Environmental	Original	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the potential presence of arsenic concentrations in the Lower

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
Health (Contamination)	(April 2019)	Greensand sandy soils, consideration needs to be given to any potential reuse of this soil.
Environmental Health (Pollution)	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection, subject to four planning conditions requiring additional details relating to noise, dust, construction hours and lighting.
Landscape	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is not acceptable in its current form. • Further clarity is required on the justification for the 'Landscape Study Area'. In particular this relates to how the boundary was selected; why elements of the study area to the north-east have been discounted; whether prominence has been given to views from/outside the LSA. • Images presented in LVIA 10.3 should be referenced to plan. • GLVIA standard nomenclature should be used for Significance of effects. • Appendix study 10.4 'Assessment of Effects on Landscape' should at least set out why the remaining 7 LCA's that are present in the study area are not part of the detailed discussion. The creation of a new 'Marlborough Downs' LCA type without any explanation is not acceptable. It is unclear whether this comprises of the 'Downs Plains', 'High Downs' and 'Scarp' LCA's or not, or a mix of other LCA's entirely. • The Vale of White Horse LCA will be adversely impacted upon, regardless of mitigation. Whilst I agree this will be less keenly felt as the mitigation planting matures, the context of the NEV development that the proposals serve, is a key consideration. Irrespective of this, appropriate mitigation at the interface of the Wanborough and connecting Scarp LCA's to the south is key. I'm unsure if this has been achieved.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity is required on the terminology when referring to impact of the proposed development. • Whilst it is acknowledged that substantial planting is proposed (4.7 times that which is lost), further consideration should be given to effective tree planting mitigation. • The Environmental Mitigation Plans suggested the earthworks are part of the mitigation, when in reality it is primarily the planting and seeding. Please can these be revised towards the roundabout in the south, additional tree planting should be provided to the north east and tree planting should be considered instead of grass (SRG) for more effective mitigation and management purposes. • Sheet 1: Further consideration should be given to the design of the proposed roundabout, to create a gateway feature to the NEV. • Sheet 2: Further planting should be considered to the east of the SCR. • Sheet 3: The proposed submission should consider the creation of a wetland woodland area and additional woodland on the western embankments. • Sheet 4: Additional woodland planting on northern banks. • Sheet 5: Additional woodland planting. • Endorse the Ecology Officers comments. Proposals should also include opportunities to enhance wetland areas.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is not acceptable in its current form. • Images presented should be referenced to plan. • Advising not to use terminologies different to GLVIA standard

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>nomenclature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vale of White Horse LCA will be adversely impacted upon, regardless of mitigation. Whilst I agree this will be less keenly felt as the mitigation planting matures, the context of the NEV development that the proposals serve, is a key consideration. Irrespective of this, appropriate mitigation at the interface of the Wanborough and connecting Scarp LCA's to the south is key. I'm unsure if this has been achieved. • Sheet 1: the narrow proposed woodland planting to the north and north eastern side of the roundabout is inadequate and should be of a similar width shown to the south and east of it; and Allowing for more planting space has not appeared to have a discernible material impact on mitigation planting around the lit Pack Hill roundabout. • Sheet 2: The road appears to be quite elevated, which will have a detrimental impact on nearby residential and PRow receptors. The proposed woodland that is shown to the north east of the proposed road needs increasing to the south. A very small amount is shown in this revision which is welcome, but is inadequate to offer meaningful mitigation, especially given the elevated nature of the road; and Chevrons need to accurately demonstrate the landform gradient direction of proposed swales. • Sheet 3: Drawing note or similar to confirm the agricultural buildings shown in an area as 'Potential Additional Archaeological Constraint' have been scoped out/similarly addressed through the assessment;

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>Increase woodland cover on western embankments to mirror those on the east; and</p> <p>Investigate creation of wet woodland project in floodplain woodland area to the south of Liden Brook for flood mitigation/biodiversity/amenity benefit, adding drawing note to ensure this is picked up at later detailed design stages as mentioned in the 'Summary of Changes'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheet 4: Include woodland blocks in the road corridor in addition to the welcome increase of standard trees, particularly in the wider, steeper northern embankments. • Include woodland blocks in the road corridor in addition to the welcome increase of standard trees.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection, subject to conditions. • Whilst the reference to non-standard nomenclature is not considered ideal, the submission of Appendix 10.2 assists with the review of the application. • It is clear that the proposed development is likely to have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area, and further mitigation planting should be proposed. • The proposed development is likely to have a visual effect on the surrounding area, and further woodland planting and vegetation should be proposed. This could potentially be off-site. • Further information is required with respect to off-site mitigation for ground nesting birds.
Lead Local Flood	Original	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information required. There are currently concerns with the

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
Authority (LLFA)	(April 2019)	<p>proposed discharge rates, and further clarity is required on these to ensure they are in accord with the SuDS Vision for the NEV SPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In line with the SuDS Vision SPD attenuation features must be provided above the 1 in 100 year +cc flood level. Whilst we acknowledge this will be difficult for some of the length of the SCR due to it going through or adjacent to the flood plain, we feel there are locations where the final attenuation features can be moved away from the flood plain edge to achieve this or provide a less restricted outfall. • We note that one attenuation feature is labelled a 1.2m deep, 3m wide ditch with 1 in 2 slopes. This will not be acceptable. All attenuation features must be a minimum 1 in 4 slope. A shallower feature should be considered. • Whilst the majority of the indicative features seem like they can come forward in line with the SuDS Vision SPD through detail design, there are further swales shown on the General Arrangement plans which are raised up? These are not shown on the drainage plans so it is not clear what these are for and why they need to be raised if they are not providing an attenuation function. • There are concerns regarding the height of the proposed road and the bridge and culvert crossings and the width of the embankments which we feel are not required and add significant cost to the scheme. • As well as the majority of the road which is outside of the flood plain, the bridge and culvert heights are significantly higher than they need to be for adequate freeboard over flood levels and for adequate access for maintenance.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed discharge rates have been revised, however the FRA appears to still refer to the original rate of 5l/s.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following further clarification on the location of the attenuation features, the LLFA raise no objection subject to conditions.
Local Highway Authority (LHA)	Original (April 2019)	<p>Transport Assessment:</p> <p>The alignments should be confirmed for a full application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been concluded that there are no footways at present along Wanborough Road, however such provision has been secured against the Redlands development on Redlands Airfield and hence any assessment of the SCR should give consideration to this future baseline provision. It is important that the crossing of the SCR at PROW 1 should include future provision for the application of a signal controlled crossing. The network design or the areas where accidents occurred are subject to change as part of this proposed scheme to mitigate accidents. A confirmation of the temporal nature of the peak is requested and whether this is a peak for the Local Road Network and/or the Strategic Road Network. The proposed SCR scheme of improvements at Commonhead should be assessed without the elements associating the scheme with Junction 15 improvements in place.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary Construction Access for the scheme needs to be subject of a planning condition due to the sensitivities of the rural highway network. • Should the count information of the traffic resultant by access availability from SCR to the Marsh and onto Wanborough illustrate an increase in traffic above natural growth consultation will be undertaken to establish whether access between the SCR and the Marsh should be 'stopped up' to vehicle egress. • Clarification is sought in regards to the housing trajectories used in the tested scenarios. As well as a justification of peak hour chosen for the test. • Clarifying that this application is for the infrastructure delivery and whilst it will alter surrounding traffic flows, this will not be to the same degree as the impact derived from the NEV development. • Percentages of HGV flows should not dictate the construction of the road and it is advised that the determining axle loading should be taken from the A420 which may represent similar scale road infrastructure. • No further concern is raised given that modelling of the junction operates on fixed time settings. • Further assessment is required to determine the operation of the junction without the improvements to be delivered by other parties. • Assessment of the Inlands Farm impact upon SCR and Pack Hill roundabout will need to be undertaken for that application and

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>any upgrade of the proposed junction carried out at a cost to that developer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that Pack Hill junction is reassessed with HGV percentages input, but for the 2036 Cumulative scenario only. • General Arrangement Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designer should provide full plans of Commonhead and illustrate lane allocation and how best to utilise access to the A419. • The design of access from the roundabout to Pack Hill should be altered as the merge is considered short. • Concern is raised for the extended length footways beyond the tactile paving crossing points on Pack Hill Roundabout. • The allocation of SCR with two lane which will likely be directed towards Pack Hill single lane exit needs to be addressed and be supported by an appropriate Road Safety Audit. • With regards to design, the application of stone pitched revetments may prove to be a stark application in the rural area. • Because the SCR will accommodate a footway/cycleway, it is important that the parapets are no less than 1.40m in accordance with advice from Sustrans. • Clarification is sought to determine the most appropriate location of Vehicle Restraint Systems.
	Revised (July 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarification is required in relation to the WCHAR report. • It should be highlighted in the supporting material how the proposed

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>speed limit would be appropriate for the design of the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The crossing of the SCR at PROW 1 should include future provision for the application of a signal controlled crossing including all necessary ducting to avoid future developers from being required to excavate the newly surfaced road. • For robustness given that an erroneous output has been identified, the model should be re-run to document HGV impact on queue length. • There are some outstanding matters to be addressed. The Local Highway Authority therefore considers that the scheme and accompanying submissions requires further refinement before they are able to support the proposals. It is accepted that outstanding matters may be dealt with by way of further submissions which would enable the Highway Authority to recommend appropriate planning conditions.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection subject to conditions.
Public Health	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology used in this chapter appears to be sound using the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) supported by Atkins own methodology to support professional judgement. The DMRB is now getting old but it is accepted as the industry standard. It would be useful to have a definition of health included, i.e. as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO), "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." • Is there evidence to suggest that the numbers of users on the existing

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>RoW's is relatively low?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The populations in 14.3.44 and 14.3.45 are out of date. The Swindon figure is over 10,000 higher than at the 2011 Census and estimates are available for Swindon and LSOAs for 2017 currently. The danger of using 2011 Census stats for the core and wider study areas is that they obviously won't reflect any housing development since then. E.g. population densities may be very different and this should be reviewed. • The human health chapter does not appear to comment much on the impact on the amenity and safety of NMU of the existing road network. The DMRB and the IEMA guide provide guidelines on how to assess this. • Can it be confirmed if this has been consulted on by healthcare providers – given the proximity to the Great Western Hospital. • An assessment to include consideration of the need for monitoring may be appropriate with this application and I am happy to support with this if needed.
	<p><i>Revised (July 2019)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query whether a number of assumptions are correct including the usage levels of the PRoW and whether a number of buildings within the vicinity of the site are occupied. • Requests that the population data is updated. • The human health chapter does not appear to comment much on the impact on the amenity and safety of NMU of the existing road network. • I have noted the Construction mitigation embedded in design suggestions and in particular those agreed with SBC Environmental Health Officer. These mitigations will also support mental wellbeing in

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		the community assets affected by this development.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comments.
Rights of Way Officer	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that further clarification be provided in relation to the links between the proposed scheme and existing RoW. These include details for proposed gates, materials surfacing and crossing points. • Additional clarification is also requested in relation the environmental mitigation proposals, which appear to conflict with existing RoW. • The RoW Officer also requests that the proposed scheme provide a pedestrian bridge over the A419 to reduce the barriers to pedestrians in the area.
Members & Parish Councils (Swindon Borough unless stated)		
Cllr Kevin Parry	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am disappointed that the Southern Connector road has not be put down to be dualled and that the Great Stall bridge is still on the plan. • I will not be supporting the Great Stall bridge as it is a complete waste of money and it would add little value. The Southern Connector road must be dualled to stop Covingham and Stratton having massive traffic problems and to allow the volume of traffic to move much more freely. The money saved on the bridge would pay for this piece of work. • I also will not support no left turn traffic coming onto the Wanbrough

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		Road to push all traffic into Covingham.
Cllr Barbara Parry	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am disappointed that the Southern Connector road has not be put down to be dualled and that the Great Stall bridge is still on the plan. • I will not be supporting the Great Stall bridge as it is a complete waste of money and it would add little value. The Southern Connector road must be dualled to stop Covingham and Stratton having massive traffic problems and to allow the volume of traffic to move much more freely. The money saved on the bridge would pay for this piece of work. • I also will not support no left turn traffic coming onto the Wanbrough Road to push all traffic into Covingham.
Wanborough	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeology: Raise concerns as to whether the proposed mitigation is sufficient to protect the archaeological remains. • Heritage: There is no mention of Great Moorleaze Farm, which is a local heritage site, within the ES. In addition it states that there will be no or a negligible impact on the Lower and Upper Wanborough Conservation Areas. • Canal: Want to ensure that the route for the canal is safeguarded. • Foxbridge: Request further clarity on how the SCR will connect with the Foxbridge development. • Flooding: Request further clarity on the proposed management and maintenance of the SuDS features. • Inlands Farm: Concerned that the proposed Science Park has been included as a development site, given it is not allocated within the Local Plan. • Construction: Request that a details construction plan, including

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		mitigation measures be included.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterate previous comments.
Ashbury	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposed development on the grounds that it would impact the community.
Bishopstone	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposed development in principle, however raise the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Measures should be incorporated in to the design to protect the Ridgeway Villages from through traffic. ○ The capacity of the key road network should be robustly reviewed by the LHA. ○ A Construction Traffic Management Plan with construction traffic not using Wanborough Rd and Pack Hill.
Covingham	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the proposed SCR as it will form an essential link between NEV and M4. • Request that the SCR be constructed before the development starts to avoid construction traffic using roads in Covingham. The existing TRO is in place and is likely to be removed for construction traffic. • There are concerns the proposed design and construction of the SCR could act as a dam, increasing the flood issues for Covingham.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comments.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
Liddington	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that the proposed works to the highway network are carried out in a logical sequence to minimise the disruption to road users. There are concerns that the SCR would increase rat-running through Liddington, and further mitigation should be proposed to protect this.
South Marston	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge that the concerns relating to the RoW network have been resolved. No objections to the scheme.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comments.
South Swindon	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed development on the grounds that the safeguarded route for the W&B Canal is obstructed by the placement of the new roundabout on Pack Hill. In line with Swindon Local Plan policy EN11, the development must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure that development protects the integrity of the canal alignment and its associated structures; and ensure that where the canal is affected by development, the alignment is protected or an alternative alignment is provided; and ensure associated infrastructure of development does not prejudice the delivery of the canal. A viable alternative route for the W&B Canal must be shown in the plans, and should be agreed with the W&BCT.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterate previous comments.
	<i>Revised</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comments.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
	<i>(September 2019)</i>	
Stratton St Margaret	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that a presentation is given on the proposed scheme.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that adequate provision for drainage to prevent flooding is provided.
	<i>Revised (October 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorse comments made by Wanborough Parish Council and the Woodland Trust.
Third Party Representations		
Alder King (on behalf of Danescroft and David Wilson)	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not object to the principle of the SCR and welcome its timely delivery. A large proportion of the Foxbridge development is likely to be delivered with access directly from the SCR. Further work is ongoing with the canal trust to ensure the wider masterplanning of Foxbridge can accommodate appropriate alignments for both the canal and SCR. Pre-application discussions and consultation is proposed to take place over Summer 2019, with a view to an outline application for Foxbridge being submitted late 2019.
	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the principle of the scheme. Concern of speed limit 40mph whereas the road alignments and widths are more in line with 50-60mph, without traffic calming

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>measures this encourages excessive speeds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gradient design of the road results in significant lengths of elevated road embankments. • The road corridor appears overly wide.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danescroft raise no objection, however the objection from David Wilson remains • Reiterate previous comments. • SCR positioning makes it difficult for our clients to deliver suitable development. • Requested a consideration for future access connection for the Foxbridge Village development. • Coordinate with landowners with respect to safeguarded canal alignment through Foxbridge development.
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	<i>Revised (July 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary concerns with the proposed development relate to the lighting levels. Further consideration should be given to ensure these are minimised and consider the surroundings. The following should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lower level columns with smart lighting and environmental sensing ○ Part time lighting ○ Low level post top mounting cone lamps • Considerations should also be given to the potential impact of Inlands Farm and how the traffic is managed on to Commonhead Roundabout.
David Lock (on behalf of Hannick)	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hannick support the principle of a Southern Connector Road and

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
Homes)		<p>recognise its role as part of the wider transport strategy to serve the NEV development, as identified in Swindon Borough's Local Plan 2026.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They also raise concerns on the proposed alignment, in particular the impact it would have on the ability for an appropriate scheme to be masterplanned.
Residents (Object)	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed road is not in scale with the surrounding area and will ruin the character of the existing countryside and overwhelm the existing infrastructure. • It will be highly visible and have an adverse impact on the landscape and AONB. • The proposed changes to the road layout will increase the probability of flooding in the surrounding area. • The new traffic on the road and construction vehicles would cause significant disruption in terms of noise, light and air pollution, thereby impacting sleeping and health. • Sections of the road could have a harmful impact on archaeological remains which are just below the road surface. • The additional traffic would also raise safety concerns when entering existing properties. • The proximity of the proposed road and new pedestrian pathway would have an impact on existing privacy levels. • Many of the residents have requested that The Marsh be shut off, however it is not clear whether this will in fact happen. In the event that The Marsh is not stopped up, please can the following happen: A

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>weight restriction 7.5t be added; 20 mph speed limit; and pinch points or speed humps to be installed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed bridge spanning 31m is a massive overdesign, and could potentially have implications on the cost of delivering the canal. The finished road level is also unnecessarily high and would impact residents in terms of visual and noise pollution. • In the event that further ground material is required, this should be taken from the excavation of the canal to lower costs for both proposals. • Any CPO for land for the SCR should also include that of the canal. • Traffic lights on the SCR would cause additional traffic and queueing. • A bypass road from Commonhead through the NEV to A420 should be provided to minimise queueing and danger to residents.
	<p><i>Revised (July 2019)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the raised road levels would have an impact on amenity levels of existing residents, particularly with noise and light. Whilst the proposed screening would assist, additional screening and other mitigation such as mounds should be considered. • Existing roads such as The Marsh and Burycroft are already used for rat-running, there are concerns that this could get worse. It is suggested that these roads could have a weight limit introduced, pinch points and/or 'no through road' signs. In addition, the speed limit for these roads should be reduced to 30mph and a speed limit for Wanborough Road to 20mph. • The tree and shrub barriers should be mixed deciduous and evergreen offset planting to a depth of at least two trees i.e. 20 to 25 feet

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>alongside the SCR and Wanborough Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential visual impact of the proposed development is not clear from the proposed submission.
	<i>Revised (September 2019)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over the increased traffic noise and lights pollution. Proposing alternative measures of mitigation other than natural screening. • Install calming measures on The Marsh & Burycroft similar to the proposed on SCR to prevent rat running. • Extend 30mph speed limit for the full length of The Marsh and on the southern approach to Lydiard Park to reduce excess speeds. • Introduce weight limit of 7.5 tonnes on The Marsh & Burycroft; and provision of No Through signs at each end of these roads to be installed to dissuade motorists from cutting through the village. • Delay building SCR until the other schemes are in place.
Swindon Cycle Group	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the principle of the provision for walking cycling along the SCR. • The path network should connect effectively with the path network at Lotmead. • The addition of a shared footway/cycleway should be extended along Wanborough to connect with the Lotmead access.
Wanborough Anti Flood Group	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is critical to ensure the SCR is delivered at the right time and to meet the future demands of the NEV. • There are concerns with the size and capacity of the proposed roundabout at Pack Hill. This should however to designed to potentially

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>take traffic from Inlands Farm development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the structural improvements, flood water could get trapped between the SCR and the properties at Moorleaze. • To save costs, the SCR and canal should be constructed alongside one another. • Further enhancements should be proposed to the design of the junction at The Marsh.
Webb Paton (on behalf of various landowners)	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The non-provision of suitable accesses and crossings to the land we farm to the west and east of the road corridor are not suitable for modern day agriculture or equestrian use. • The non-provision of cattle handling pens within our retained land. • The non-provision of suitable gateways, box culverts capable of taking 44 tonnes for farm machinery. • Non-provision of dropped kerbs and suitable angles to the accesses. • Non-provision of a 3m wide bridlepath either side for the road for safe horse crossing. • Field water provision needs to be provided for horses and livestock. • Temporary access to land during construction is required. • Concerned that some of the existing fields will not drain effectively after the SCR is in place. • Request for further clarity on what type of fencing will be used, to ensure it is appropriate for horse and cattle. • Concern that the SCR will not be designed to meet health and safety regulations.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to ensure access to The Marsh is retained. • Would like further clarity as to how the proposed raised road levels will impact our land. • There is a concern that the road noise from new vehicles and construction could impact horses and stables. • To ensure customers are not lost to the small scale horse businesses, it is essential to have information on the temporary access etc. • Want to ensure that dust pollution will not occur and impact crops. • Have concerns that the proposed new accesses from the SCR are on archaeological findings. • There are concerns that the location of the canal is too close to the SCR and therefore is not practical. • The submitted details do not seem to provide an access to our land off the Marsh. • The application suggests a site compound will be located on top of horse stables, however there is no provision for temporary/replacement. • There are concerns that the mitigation to take flood water under Wanborough Road is not sufficient to protect Hinton's House. • Access will be required from the proposed roundabout to allow for combine harvesters. • The proposed development does not appear to consider the Science Park application. The roundabout also appears to take up more land than is required, and therefore a CPO will be challenged.

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that the planning documents have not always been available for download. • The application is not clear how light mitigation will be mitigated. • Part of the application site is located within the AONB and close to a number of heritage assets. • The proposed road is located within the area of non-coalescence and is therefore contrary to Policy NC3. • Request that retained land has access to Wanborough Road to enable access for horses. • Concerned that proposed attenuation ponds will block access to retained land.
Wilts & Berks Canal Trust	Original (April 2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept the principle of the SCR, however object to the proposed SCR development on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The scheme fails to adequately safeguard the route of the Wilts & Berks canal as per Policy EN11. ○ The scheme has been designed considering the requirements of the road only whereas both road and canal pass through the same corridor which offers challenging conditions and constraints. Consequently, it fails to adopt the best options for alignment, integration of environmental mitigation, land take and drainage which would be beneficial to both schemes and therefore does not provide best value for the community. • The application does not refer to any canal bridges or allowance for them. • Parts of the proposed footway/cycleway are duplicated with those to

Consultee	Application Submission	Comments
		<p>be along the canal, costs could be saved if some are removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed canal could assist with the wider drainage of the NEV. • Mitigation planting should be provided along the SCR to enhance the experience for canal users.
	<p><i>Revised (September 2019)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Trust has been able to revise the canal route over the length between Pack Hill and Wanborough Road and thus significantly reduced the potential for mutual interference between the road and canal schemes. • A road connection to Commonhead Roundabout is seen as vital to the successful development of the Eastern Villages. The canal route will become a key component in the leisure and environmental resources of the communities in the Eastern Villages whilst providing the long-distance connections and environmental corridor to adjacent communities. The maximum benefit to the communities will be achieved by careful integration of the two schemes where they interact. • The Trust is working to develop the best possible option for the canal route and is ready to co-operate with others to achieve the best results for the community.
<p>Womble Bond Dickinson (on behalf of Mr A Brickell)</p>	<p>Original (April 2019)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the proposed development on the grounds that it does not appropriately facilitate development of adjoining land and the lack of consultation with the landowner.