

**S/OUT/19/0582**  
**Appendix A: Summary of Consultations**

- **Parish Councils**
- **Adjacent local authorities**
- **Statutory and other consultees**
- **Neighbours / local residents / other representations**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Response received</b>	<b>Summarised Comments</b>
<b>Parish Councils</b>		
<b>Ashbury Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Bishopstone Parish Council</b>	3 June 2019 and 20 March 2020	Object to the application as it currently stands, pending satisfactory resolution of Highways England's concerns and the addressing of suitable mitigation measures to avoid "rat running" through adjacent villages. Concerned that the initial phase of 200 homes would be served solely from Wanborough Road, ahead of the necessary infrastructure improvements required for this development, both from the fully developed site and related NEV infrastructure improvements including the Southern Connector Road. The Parish Council considers that allowing the development of the first phase of the site ahead of necessary infrastructure would lead to unacceptable traffic impacts within Wanborough and, in turn, lead to higher volumes of traffic in the surrounding villages to the east seeking access to the A420. Councillors have read the concerns raised by Wanborough Parish Council in its letter dated 23 May 2019 and concurs fully.
<b>Bourton Parish Council</b>	No	N/A

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
<b>Compton Beauchamp Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Covingham Parish Council</b>	19 May 2020	<p>There must be a robust system to ensure that whoever has the responsibilities for the maintenance of the SuDS and other drainage systems continues with proper maintenance for all time.</p> <p>The development should not be allowed to proceed until the Southern Connector Road has been constructed, and all construction traffic must use the SCR as the only route to the site. When the phase two houses are built there must be a robust method of ensuring that these houses cannot access the Wanborough Road in the direction of Covingham. This is to prevent a rat run through Covingham.</p> <p>Major issues are currently being experienced at school drop off and pick up times at the junction of Kingfisher Drive, The Harriers and St Pauls Drive due to parents driving to and from the school, which is causing severe congestion, irresponsible parking and sitting in their cars at inappropriate locations with the engines idling. It is unreasonable to expect children to walk from Lotmead, therefore the problem will be made worse. The Parish Council has no choice but to object to Covingham Park School being used for this development unless mitigation measures can be put in place to ensure that the situation does not worsen</p>
<b>Great Coxwell Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Faringdon Town Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Liddington Parish Council</b>	10 May 2019	<p>Updated comments awaited</p> <p>Liddington Parish Council requests that for the construction phase there are detailed travel</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		plans completed to reflect the need to mitigate rat running through the rural villages. Due to the increased traffic as a result of this development, it would also be beneficial for the proposed future traffic calming and measures to reduce rat running be delivered early i.e. at the beginning of the construction phase rather than when the development has been completed. Also concerned about the provision of GP surgeries as the current situation is very worrying. A development of this size can only result in an increase in demand and make the situation worse, if adequate facilities are not made available.
<b>Longcot Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Nythe, Eldene and Liden Parish Council</b>	8 May 2019 and 7 May 2020	No comment or objections.
<b>Shrivenham Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>South Marston Parish Council</b>	19 December 2019, 18 March 2020 and 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2020	<p>We welcome the plans for the green infrastructure, footpaths and cycleways both on site and off. We do not agree with the maintenance proposals on page 107 of Part 6 of the Design and Access Statement, which read: "The Developer will provide a mechanism for the long-term delivery and stewardship of public open space and commercial buildings on the Site. Their role will be managing the Site in accordance with an agreed Management Plan." This does not address or comply with the tests set out in the draft revised Swindon Local Plan at SP1 4 and DM28 6. Also we would expect Parish Councils to be consulted on matters and decisions concerning Green Infrastructure maintenance for developments within their area of interest. Additionally, there is no reference to the maintenance for off-site POS. Achieving a cohesive, sustainable and robust regime is a major challenge that has yet to be resolved.</p> <p>Would like the southern connector road to be in place and established prior to any other</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		development work beginning.
<b>Stratton St Margaret Parish Council</b>	Extension of time requested	No response received
<b>Wanborough Parish Council</b>	8 October, 17 December 2019 & 25 March 2020 and 13 May 2020	<p>The majority of the original concerns still apply and make the following comments:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application is still proposing a first phase of 200 homes off the Wanborough Road. The proposed access off Wanborough Road is in an area which regularly floods but there is no indication as to what measures would be put in place to mitigate this problem.</li> <li>2. Wanborough Road is the old Roman Road, it is an area of high archaeological interest, within close proximity of the scheduled monument. If this is to be the only access for construction traffic for the first phase then there needs to be careful consideration of the impact on this areas historic value.</li> <li>3. The first phase of 200 houses will result in an isolated development which is unsustainable with no community facilities. Residents will be forced to use their cars in order to reach important facilities such as schools, doctors and shops. This is contrary to policy SD1 of the adopted Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 which is the basis of standards and requirements that all new developments should meet.</li> <li>4. Any construction vehicles should not access the site via Wanborough as the rural roads will not cope with this amount of construction traffic. Parish Council would like to see a detailed construction traffic programme to demonstrate how this will be prevented.</li> <li>5. The development should not commence until the Southern Connector Road (SCR) and improvements to the White Hart Roundabout have been completed. It is completely unacceptable for Lotmead Village to use Wanborough Road as the main access to this</li> </ol>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>development site.</p> <p>6. There needs to be a clearer understanding as to how the first phase will be able to access the Southern Connector Road (SCR) without having to travel through Wanborough or Covingham. The design and access statement figure 5.8 shows the SCR “sweeping around the northern edge” of the first phase (Wanborough Green), but other than the one road which will become a “bus lane” there are no access points onto the SCR. Traffic travelling from Covingham along Wanborough Road towards the SCR can only go “straight on” at this crossroads towards Wanborough, this will force traffic from the first phase to either travel through Wanborough or Covingham in order to reach A419 or M4. This is contrary to SBC’s Local Plan and for this reason the first phase off Wanborough Road should not be allowed.</p> <p>7. The proposed road between Wanborough Green (First phase) and Lotmead Farm will be become a “bus only” road. However this will make it difficult for residents within Wanborough Green to access facilities within other areas of Lotmead Village such as Primary School, GP etc. If SBC agree to allow an area of development off the Wanborough Road then Parish Council urge SBC to close off the Wanborough Road access as soon as the second phase at Lotmead Farm starts which will then link into the SCR. This is the only way that the development will work with the SCR. Ideally there should be no development off Wanborough Road and Lotmead Village should only be started once the SCR is in place.</p> <p>8. In addition to points 4&amp;5 above, the Design and Access Statement states (page 84) “Wanborough Road Access – once the first phases of the development are completed, this access will be dedicated as a bus lane”. This contradicts other parts of the application and indicates that the Wanborough Road access will be used for construction traffic for multiple phases and not just Wanborough Green (first phase). This is clearly not acceptable.</p> <p>9. Parish Council would like the D&amp;A changed so that the bus gate comes into operation prior to any construction within phase 2-7 and not prior to the first occupation of those properties as this is too late. Contractors or construction workers for phase 2-7 should only be using the Southern Connector Road (SCR) to access development within phase 2-7 and the only</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>way to prevent them from using Wanborough Road is to ensure the bus gate is fully operational prior to commencement.</p> <p>10. The bus gate proposal and how it will work for residents within Wanborough Green (Phase 1) is extremely complicated and Parish Council question whether it will work effectively and whether it will be monitored and enforced. It is extremely important that Wanborough Road doesn't become a "rat run" for traffic from the NEV and the only way this can be done, as stated in previous comments, is for the access onto Wanborough Road to be closed off prior to phase 2-7 and once the SCR is constructed.</p> <p>11. Wanborough Green (first phase) of 200 houses is proposing to use Covingham Primary School as an interim measure until the primary school is built in the second phase. However Covingham School is not within walking distance and therefore residents will have to use their car. Parking around Covingham and Wanborough Primary School is a major problem and any additional cars within this area will make the problem even worse and is therefore not a sustainable interim measure. In addition the Design and Access Statement (page 71) states "The transfer of the land to the Council for the first primary school in Lotmead Village will be provided at an early stage and is expected to be within early phases of the development"</p> <p>12. Design &amp; Access Statement page 71 – Phasing strategy. There needs to be confirmation of the trigger point for the school, details currently stated are too vague. The SCR should be delivered prior to construction of Phases 2-7. Wanborough Road should not be used for any construction traffic within phases 2-7. It states that the two primary access points to the north A420 and through Great Stall East will not be delivered until phase 7 &amp; 8 which is very late within the whole development. This means there will be a considerable amount of construction traffic using the SCR to Commonhead roundabout. Parish Council raise a concern as to whether Commonhead Roundabout will cope with the amount of additional construction traffic and would like to see the two other primary access points brought forward to help ease the impact on Commonhead Roundabout. The sports hub is not delivered until</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>phase 5 of the development. This will mean there will be a large number of dwellings built prior to any sports provision. Funding to improve sports facility within Wanborough should be provided to cover provision until facilities are delivered.</p> <p>13. Parish Council have seen no documentation that indicates a proposed bus network through the NEV that does not use Primary or Secondary routes. Parish Council would like to see the bus strategy for the NEV as they question whether a bus corridor through Wanborough Green is actually needed.</p> <p>14. The flood mitigation proposals for the whole development site included a number of SuDs and drainage systems. It is important that there is a comprehensive plan as to how these SuDs and drainage systems will be maintained after construction has been completed. It is important that the developer works with Parish Council's at an early stage to ensure this is in place.</p>
<b>Watchfield Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Western Villages Parish Council</b>	No	N/A
<b>Adjacent Councils</b>		
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>	13 December 2019	<p>Developer contributions are required towards: delivery of bus services; and contribution to bus priority measures linking routes serving the New Eastern Villages and the A420 route S6 from Oxfordshire with Swindon Town Centre.</p> <p>With regard to flooding, Swindon surface water drainage policy to be aligned with that of Oxfordshire County Council. The LPA should consult the South and Vale Drainage team for</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>advice before issuing any approval related to this application.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (TA) does not assess any of the junctions along the A420 northwards of the Swindon Borough Council boundary. However, traffic generated by this development will impact on junctions along this route, which would include (but not be limited to) the A420/Townsend Road, the proposed roundabout along the A420 north of Shrivenham (planning ref: p15/V2541/O), the A420/Faringdon Road/Majors Road, the A420/Coxwell Road (to be signalised), the A420/Park Road (to be upgraded), the A420/Stanford Road and the A420/A415. This omission is a concern as the impact of this strategic housing site on Bourton, Shrivenham and Watchfield within Oxfordshire has not been fully assessed to confirm if suitable mitigation measures are required along the A420.</p> <p>The trip distribution appears to be based on census data from 2011, which does not capture the significant growth in employment provision within the Science Vale area in Oxfordshire. As a result, the proportions of trips travelling north along the A420, as identified in the TA, are unlikely to reflect present day and future travel to work patterns and consequently, underestimates the impact of traffic generated by the development within Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Neither the TA nor the technical notes in Appendix F outline how (or if) the SATURN base model was validated and to what validation criteria. It is also unclear what data was used to create the base model, although it appears the data may be from 2006, which is not sufficiently recent. Therefore, OCC cannot confirm that the SATURN base model is suitable for usage to assess future years. Due to the uncertainty regarding the base model, OCC has not reviewed the future year methodologies such as trip generation within the SATURN model.</p> <p>Public Transport - Very concerned about the volume of additional traffic that is expected to use the A420 towards Faringdon and Oxford, especially for journeys to work. The public transport strategy for this site and the New Eastern Villages requires much greater definition and certainty. Not only does this site require the provision of high frequency bus services to/from Swindon Town Centre, but this service also needs to be routed either to the Stratton Park area or to the proposed Park and Ride site to the east of the proposed 'green' rapid transit link,</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>where seamless interchange can be made with the Swindon-Oxford S6 Premium Route service.</p> <p>Appropriate bus priority measures should be required as part of a S106 agreement. Other initiatives to transfer people from cars to public transport should be pursued, especially for daily travel to work locations with significant employment opportunities for new residents along the congested A420 corridor. The growing Science Vale area of Oxfordshire, especially Harwell Campus and Milton Park, will provide employment for some of the new residents.</p> <p>Travel Plan - The Travel Plan submitted with this application does not contain enough detail on the impact the development or to encourage sustainable travel within Oxfordshire. In addition, the document is written as a framework plan covering the whole development and will need to have supplementary travel plans produced for the different land uses on the development site. Specifically, the document does not have suitable targets or actions to mitigate the impact of single use vehicles from the development site.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way - It appears that the impact of additional pedestrian movements on public rights of way have not been considered within the submitted TA or mitigation measures proposed.</p> <p>Education - It is important that the new schools planned, both the primary schools within the development and additional secondary school capacity outside the development, are available in time to meet the demands of the pupil generation from this application. It should be noted that there is no spare capacity in nearby primary and secondary schools in Oxfordshire.</p>
Vale of White Horse District Council	No	N/A

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
<b>Wiltshire County Council</b>	No	N/A
		<b>Statutory and other consultees</b>
<b>Arboricultural Officer</b>  (Paul Maher)	19 December 2019	<p>The new Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (EMMF) does not provide support for features of arboricultural value as an overarching aim. Instead, the overall aim is to ensure the application site supports ecological features of Local to District Level nature conservation value (EMMF2.13). To omit the arboricultural principles misses the opportunity to imprint a standard for how the future development of the site will be progressed.</p> <p>The increase in the proposed areas for woodland establishment is welcomed.</p> <p>It would appear that there are inconsistencies between the Preliminary Management Recommendations in the “Tree Survey Schedule” where trees are not flagged for removal, and the Tree Retention and Removal plans in the same document, where certain trees and tree groups are highlighted for removal or partial removal. Despite the inclusion of the TPO document in the Arboricultural Assessment, it has not highlighted which trees and groups are covered by TPO in the “Tree Survey Schedule” and so would be subject to removal. Comparing the AIA and the TPO documentation indicates that there are a significant number of trees with TPO’s that would be removed? This needs absolute clarification before any decision can proceed.</p> <p>Tree Preservation Order No. 1 2014 (Land at Eastern Villages, Swindon) covers the whole of the application site and includes individual and grouped trees on the site.</p> <p>Trees along the avenue from Wanborough Road up to the existing industrial units are valuable trees, the loss of which would be significant. As such Tree Preservation Order No. 5 2015 (Land at the Entrance to Lotmead Industrial Estate, Swindon) covers the avenue of trees from Wanborough Road along the private access to the Lotmead Business Village.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
<b>Biodiversity and Community Forest Officer</b>  Jonathan Wilshaw (Community Forest / Biodiversity Officer)	19 December 2019	<p>There is a need to illustrate a more cohesive Green Infrastructure network, consistent with aspirations set out in GI SPD and to be informed by WWT proposals. Doing so should include more inclusive representation of small wetlands, ponds and manipulation of watercourses. A more cohesive approach will help overcome issues of habitat fragmentation and will also aid more effective, sustainable management. The masterplan needs to clearly set out 'zones' e.g. of high public use and nature reserve areas and show how these areas integrate with those outside the red-line.'</p> <p>There is a need to illustrate on the masterplan how tree canopy cover extends/is integrated consistently into development cells. A minimum target figure of 20% canopy cover has been suggested by England's Urban Forestry and Woodlands Advisory Committee. The increase in woodland cover shown is welcome, as is the commitment to off-site planting. Concerned that the masterplan illustrates the woodland fully enclosing the water-course on the eastern boundary of the site. I think this can be designed carefully to allow for sufficient open space along the watercourse but needs to be illustrated on the master plan and considered within the LEAMP. Also need to indicate that the woodland will be (largely) publically accessible.</p> <p>The application needs to clearly demonstrate how a net biodiversity gain will be achieved particularly in light of what appears a significant diminution of 'semi-natural' GI in comparison with the NEV GISPD. - In line with the NEV GISPD, the Central Lakes Nature Reserve (CLNR) will be key to the wider ecological network. Emerging work from the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust should inform the proposals for the CLNR and wider river meadows network.</p>
<b>Conservation Officer</b>		No comment received.
<b>Contaminated Land Officer</b>	16 April 2019 (9 September 2019 & 2 December 2019 & 3 March	No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions as previously proposed. Previously raised concern of the likely presence of suspected contamination on land adjacent to the existing Lotmead Business Village is now mentioned. It is not clear that this has been adequately assessed but it is expected that the developer will carry out the necessary

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
	2020)	assessments to ensure that this land is suitable for use.
<b>NHS Swindon</b>	17 May 2019 and 20 March 2020	<p>Reiterate the importance and need for Healthcare Services to this large scale development. These dwellings will support a population increase of 5,750 (assuming an average of 2.3 people per dwelling). All of whom will need to access health services. The application site sits within the GP Primary Health Care contractual boundary of 2 GP practices: Elm Tree Surgery and Merchiston Surgery. As at April 2019, these practices already have a combined patient list size of 21,088 people, and as a result it has a residual capacity of circa 686. This residual patient list capacity of 686 is split across 2 GP locations covering their GP contractual boundary and falls within Swindon, Shrivenham and some of the Oxfordshire border. In addition, the 2 nearby GP practices Victoria Cross Surgery and Eldene Surgery which might reasonably be expected to meet some of this surplus currently but do not have a legal contractual requirement to provide for this population as it falls outside of their provider boundary. They currently have a combined current list size of 17,105 with a residual combined capacity of circa 587. As they do not have a legal requirement to provide for this population, it cannot be assumed that they will do so, and as such this element of the existing residual capacity has been discounted. As such, there is a need to provide additional capacity to accommodate a further 5064 people and that without the provision of additional facilities and services it will not be possible to accommodate the health impact of the development from within the existing available provision. As a consequence of the way in which the CCG are funded, they cannot obtain any funding for the first two years of the development. There will be additional costs arising from the primary health care needs of the residents of the new development.</p> <p>The calculations show that there is a need to provide additional capacity to accommodate a further 5064 people and that without the provision of additional facilities and services it will not be possible to accommodate the health impact of the development from within the existing available provision. The increase in patients also results in a need for an additional 500m<sup>2</sup> of healthcare accommodation. Therefore, funding for the first two years of occupation would cost £177,611 with accommodation costing £1,135,500 which results in a total, combined financial</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		contribution of £1,313,111.
<b>Public Health</b>  (Chris Woodward)	14 May 2019  (No further comments 2 October 2019 or 16 December 2019)	<p>Normalise a smoke free lifestyle – The Swindon Tobacco Control Strategy sets out the aims and objectives for Tobacco Control in Swindon. One of the aims is to increase the number of smoke free places in Swindon. Having communal areas, such as play parks, local centres etc., as smoke free places with no outside smoking areas would support the aims and objectives of this strategy.</p> <p>The proposal does not assess the impact on health or social care services. The sports hub will provide outdoor sports and changing facilities – are details of the changing facilities available to confirm that they will meet the needs of all. The proposal does not appear to include space for indoor activities which may benefit residents who would not take part in traditional field games however I understand that these may be included in the new indoor leisure centre which will hopefully be located in the NEV district centre.</p> <p>Access to open space and nature - The proposal does provide a range of children’s play areas. I have noted the suggestion from Sport England about exploring the possibility of connecting the play area (NEAP) with the sports pavilion with the applicant. The open and natural spaces should aim to be welcoming and safe and accessible for all. The proposal does not set out how the open spaces will be maintained and managed.</p> <p>Accessibility and Active Travel - The proposal does not include connectivity with the proposed Redlands Village to the South East of the development – road or walking and cycling. Could this please be checked. The design and access statement references green routes for walking and cycling. I have noted the detailed travel plan.</p> <p>Access to Healthy Food - New allotments (up to 2.6ha) will also be delivered on the site to serve future residents of the villages. The proposal does appear to facilitate the supply of local food, shops including classes are outlined.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Access to Work and Training - The proposal will provide employment opportunities.</p> <p>Social Cohesion and Lifetime Neighbourhoods - The proposal does include a mix of uses and a range of community facilities. It is not clear if the proposal will provide opportunities for the voluntary and community sectors. It will be good to have community involvement included as the proposal develops.</p> <p>Climate Change - The proposal should ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures i.e. ventilation, shading and landscaping.</p> <p>I note the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary includes Chapter 8: Socio-Economic and Human Health. This chapter references the Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) tool from the Healthy Urban Development Unit – has a Rapid HIA been completed by the applicant and could this be shared?</p>
<p><b>CPRE Wiltshire – The Countryside Charity</b></p>	<p>9 December 2019 &amp; 15 May 2019</p>	<p>To propose 3, 5 storey, marker buildings and 9, 4 storey ones, in what is described in all the rest of the descriptive texts as ‘villages’ seems wholly inappropriate and out of context of the aim of creating a semi-urban village. What is shown is an urban entity.</p> <p>Our main concern is with the integration of the phasing of the housing development of this site with Great Stall East in relation to the main connector road, the Park and Ride delivery, and the secondary and primary schools. The triggers for these must be explicit in the context of commencement and delivery of the housing phases. Commencing near Wanborough Road would result in construction traffic severely disrupting the current use of this road. When completions come forward, it will encourage occupants to continue to use that road by car for commuter journeys. Suggest that the area around the primary school be the first phase. This would enable new occupants to access the secondary school in Great Stall East and use the P&amp;R site for commuters along the A420, as well as access the other proposed facilities. The internal connector road and the bus services along it, must be established ahead of the delivery of sizeable numbers of dwellings.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>With regard to flooding and water conservation - as in Gt Stall East, the figure which should be used for flood risk is 1 in 25 years, not 1 in 100. The speed at which new Climate Change data is coming forward indicates that planning for this part of Lotmead and the wider adjacent areas should prepare for flooding as well as installing radical water conservation schemes within the developments. Swindon is a water stressed area despite heavy recent rainfall. There should be underground water tanks to collect most of the surface water rather than losing it through complicated SUDS systems.</p> <p>It is extremely important that each phase of Lotmead can be agreed in Design terms from the outset. How all the Phases harmonise with each other in terms of layout, design and materials, rather than evolving as separate chunks of housing with no overall design and layout continuity yet avoiding repetition. The Borough Master Plan and Design Code information does not detail the nature of each village identity in terms of overall design and materials.</p> <p>Effects on Soils in the wider area - We do have concerns with the issues regarding the complexity of building on land where there are historic issues of flooding, and contains many water courses, and subsequent soil contraction particularly in dry conditions, combined with the overall cumulative effect of soil capping such an extensive area with development.</p> <p>Transport - It is anticipated that the whole site will not be completed for 20 years. Whilst it is important that building roads for the immediate village traffic flows must be considered, there should not be over provision for vehicles. The future, where live/shop/work patterns will have changed due to technology, healthier lifestyles and concerns for the environment will grow, will need less tarmac not more. Internet shopping has reduced journeys to centres and more people can work flexibly from home. The designs for internal village roads and links to employment sites should acknowledge and have regard to these factors.</p>
<b>Woodland Trust</b>	8 October 2019, 21 May 2019 & 26 March 2020	The Woodland Trust's 19 hectare/47 acre Warneage Wood, Wanborough (OS grid ref: SU 206 835) is situated just over 1km from the application site. The Woodland Trust is particularly concerned about the proximity of a substantial development close to this popular woodland site

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>and the likely effect of extra demands on it, including the following:</p> <p>Intensification of the recreational activity of humans and their pets cause disturbance to the habitats of breeding birds, vegetation damage, litter, and fire damage;  Surrounding development can isolate the wood by eliminating wildlife corridors viz. hedges along which the more mobile elements of flora and fauna can redistribute themselves. This may result in the gradual decolonisation of the site, and such corridors are essential to the biodiversity of a living environment being sustained;  Increased pedestrian useage causes path erosion, increased litter and deterioration of entrance furniture as well as the possible need for more secure entrance arrangements to deter vandalism.</p> <p>The application does not appear to have provided an open space appraisal in accordance with Policy EN3.</p> <p>We would like to see an obligation for developer contributions to be levied in order to compensate for increased management costs and habitat disturbance that will affect Warneage Wood as a result of implementation of this planning application. Indicative calculations show a required commuted sum to be £2,000 per annum, which equates to an endowment sum, at 3% perpetuity, of £67,000.</p> <p>From a wider perspective, we support the need for more detail on how new green infrastructure tree planting to benefit the development will be delivered in order to achieve the England Urban Forestry and Woodland Advisory Committee's minimum target of 20% canopy cover ('England's Urban Forests').</p> <p>Concern about the potential impact of the proposed development on several trees with sizeable girths and/or which display veteran characteristics including T19, G150, T153, T177, T183, T192 and T237. Whilst the Trust acknowledges that it is stated within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment that the applicants will adhere to the 15x stem diameter recommendations</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		highlighted within the Standing Advice, we have concerns over the calculation of the Root Protection Areas. A 15m buffer is to be provided, but for trees with a larger girth this may not necessarily be adequate to protect them from the impacts of the surrounding development. As such, the Trust asks that these trees are provided with a full, un-encroached RPA in line with Natural England's Standing Advice.
<b>Council's Archaeological Advisor</b>  (Melanie Pomeroy-Kellinger)	18 December 2019 and 6 April 2020	<p>Outline Archaeological mitigation Strategy and Heritage Management Plan awaited.</p> <p>The construction access route for the first phase is a highly sensitive area in terms of archaeological remains. Groundworks or widening to accommodate the construction traffic, would require further archaeological mitigation, and the outline mitigation strategy will need to be updated accordingly.</p> <p>December 19 - The draft archaeological mitigation strategy has been updated. However, I have number of comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 1.4 I am still not content with the wording in the first part of this paragraph. I suggest the first sentence is removed</li> <li>2. Section 5 needs to specify that all stripped areas will be scanned with a metal detector as well as all spoil</li> <li>3. The plan attached to the end of the document that shows the 5 mitigation areas, does not have a key that indicates the excavation areas are indicative, to be refined and agreed within the SSWSI for each area</li> <li>4. We need confirmation that Swindon Museum has been notified of this project and agreed to take the archive. I was looking for the Heritage Management Plan for the Scheduled Area of the Roman town that fall within the development area. However, the document under this title appears to be another copy of the draft mitigation strategy. Could you please forward the</li> </ol>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Heritage management Plan and I will comment on this separately?</p> <p>Once I am content that the mitigation strategy has been amended in line with my comments, I will be in position to give my final advice on this application. It is likely that I will require the following three archaeological conditions to be attached to any grant of consent:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Archaeology – final detailed mitigation strategy A final detailed archaeological Mitigation Strategy is required to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any submission of reserved matters application.</li> <li>2. Archaeology SSWSIs - After approval of the Outline Mitigation Strategy and prior to any development commencing within the red line the following information is required to be submitted: a) Written programmes of archaeological investigation (site specific WSIs ) that shall be in general accordance with the mitigation strategy set out in the Detailed Mitigation Strategy will be produced for each mitigation area. They should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results and a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority; and b)The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.</li> <li>3. Archaeology Management Plan - No development shall take place in the red line area of application site until a detailed management plan to ensure the preservation in situ of the areas of archaeological remains (non-designated) has been submitted and agreed in writing by the LPA. The development shall be carried out in accordance to the approved details, and the obligations for this should extend to any other owner or management agency the land is passed to.</li> </ol>
<b>Crime and Disorder Manager</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> May 2019	In view of the fact that the size alone of the proposed development is very likely to impact significantly on the policing of the new area, I will be grateful if I can be included in any future meetings or discussions that may have a bearing on designing out crime and disorder.

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
Wiltshire Police	21 May 2019	Suggest that the development be built to Secure by Design standards.
DEFRA	No	N/A
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority / Drainage Engineer</b>  (Richard Bennett)	19 September 2019	<p>Objection. Environment Agency have objected to the application. We need to understand that the revised model extents have been approved and all development including attenuation features will be outside the approved extents.</p> <p>We have reviewed the FRA Addendum technical note dated 22/08/19 and confirm that this has addressed our concerns raised previously regarding the surface water drainage and watercourses through the site being retained. Whilst we see that the landscape parameter plan has also been updated to show additional drainage features, this does not seem to show all the drainage conveyance features shown on the Surface Water Management Strategy or their continuation to the main rivers.</p> <p>It is good to see that the parameters have been set for a number of catchments so that the attenuation and conveyance features for these areas can be provided within the individual parcels coming forward and delivered in line with the SuDS Vision SPD. We hope that some of the larger parcels can also be split down further through reserved matters to ensure a number of smaller flow rates are provided. However, we do need to understand that the modelled flood extents are acceptable to the Environment Agency before we can remove our objection to ensure any proposed development including attenuation features will be located outside the approved flood extents.</p>
<b>Environment Agency</b>  Michelle Kidd	13 January 2020, 14 October 2019 and 7 April 2020	The Addendum to the March 2019 Flood Risk Assessment (reference 27970/4003/TN001, dated 22 August 2019 and prepared by Peter Brett Associates) demonstrates that flooding would remain within the proposed floodplain restoration scheme for the increased climate change allowances. Residential development is located within the current 0.1% and 1% AEP outlines which form the current flood map but the floodplain restoration scheme has revised these outlines shown in drawing number 27970_016_MI013. The floodplain restoration scheme will need to be fully implemented prior to any development within the current flood outlines to

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
(David Griggs)		<p>avoid an increase in flood risk elsewhere. The proposed development will meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to flood risk if planning conditions require the following:</p> <p>The scheme for the restoration of the floodplain to the Liden Brook be submitted, approved and fully implemented;</p> <p>The development be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment;</p> <p>Floor levels shall be no lower than 300mm above the calculated climate change flood level;</p> <p>The design of main river crossings be agreed and implemented;</p> <p>An agreed site wide watercourse enhancement scheme be implemented;</p> <p>An agreed scheme, including protection during construction and a financed management plan for a minimum of a 10 metre wide ecological buffer zone alongside the River Cole and its tributaries shall be carried out as approved to ensure the area is free from built development, footpaths, lighting, domestic gardens, non-native species and formal landscaping;</p> <p>An agreed landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules, shall be carried out as approved;</p> <p>An agreed remediation strategy to deal with any contamination shall be carried out as approved`;</p> <p>An agreed scheme to dispose of foul drainage shall be implemented as approved.</p>
Education Place Planning and Admissions Swindon Borough Council	3 June 2019	<p>A scheme of 2,500 dwellings would require 4FE of primary school places with land provision of 4.4ha to permit expansion to 4.40FE to cater for the additional need. An appropriate solution would be two 2FE primary schools each with 26 part time place nursery with one school located at Lotmead and one school located at Lower Lotmead.</p> <p>A suitable serviced and accessible site of 2.2ha for a Primary School would be required from first occupation of any dwelling on the site. In addition to this, financial contributions towards education provision would be required. Trigger points for contributions should be established as necessary. Trigger points for the provision of a suitable serviced and accessible site of 2.2ha for the second Primary School and the opening and continued operation of the second</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>school would be established as necessary. It should be noted that the Council recently developed baseline designs and costs for new schools based on the Class Solutions model used across a number of new and existing schools in Swindon. The result of the exercise has been to increase the baseline cost of a new 2FE primary school from £6.5m to £7.74m and therefore contributions towards the construction of new facilities will be sought at the new higher level.</p> <p>Prior to the opening and continued operation of the first primary school, provision would need to be made to cater for the education needs of the occupants of the initial dwellings. There is currently capacity at Covingham Park Primary School and the developer should make arrangements for primary students to attend there on a temporary basis until the first new, on-site Primary School is continually operational at an appropriate trigger point. A safe and attractive route would need to be provided from the site to Covingham Park Primary School. At present, whilst there may be spare capacity at Covingham Park Primary School, this school is located 1.5 miles from proposed phase 1 of the application. The current access route is not perceived to be safe or attractive as the route is unlit, narrow in places, with most vehicles seemingly exceeding the speed limit along Wanborough Road. Only an uncontrolled crossing has been suggested within the outline application. Further assessment of this route is currently being undertaken. Pupils from the application site attending Covingham Park Primary School would only be seen as a temporary measure and only appropriate in the context of a long term solution of new Primary Schools being provided on site at a later date at agreed trigger points to meet the education needs of the development.</p> <p>Secondary School Pupils - The proposal would generate a requirement of 1.67FE of secondary aged children. The NEV will require a minimum of an 8 form entry 11-16 secondary school. To achieve this, SBC require a plot of land in the order of 9 hectares within the NEV. Depending on the ultimate development yield, the size of the secondary school may increase in size to a minimum 10 form entry secondary school requiring circa 11 hectares of land. Financial contributions towards the provision of this secondary school would be required. SBC have considered alternative solutions such as expanding existing secondary schools within Swindon.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>This option would not provide a whole solution to the New Eastern Villages and would produce a fractured and unsustainable provision not in line with a new sustainable community. As there is an expectation that secondary aged pupils can travel further to access school places, in the interim period prior to construction of the secondary school, it would be expected that secondary pupils from the development would utilise Dorcan Academy providing capacity is available until a suitable trigger point is reached.</p> <p>Location of Private Nursery Provider - The proposal for up to 2,500 dwellings would result in 675 pre school children. From Autumn 2017 the Government will change the free entitlement for Early Years provision, by doubling the current 15 hours to 30 hours for working families. This will reduce the capacity within the nursery classes attached to schools. In addition to the nursery classes at each school, the wider development should have a centrally located space that a private nursery provider can operate from. Therefore, a private nursery provider space is to be centrally located within the application site.</p>
<b>Environmental Health</b>  (Tobi Parker)	27 June 2019	<p>The development is acceptable in principle subject to conditions requiring: a Construction Management Plan; that dwellings be designed to ensure noise limits are not exceeded; that existing properties do not experience unacceptable noise during construction; that measures be put in place to protect properties from noise from the commercial units; that the artificial lighting associated with the sports pitches be designed, installed and maintained in full compliance with The Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP): Guidance Notes for The Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011; that the sports pitch and pavilion shall not be used and the associated floodlights shall not be lit, outside the following hours:- 09:00 - 21:30 Monday to Friday and 10.00 - 21.00 Saturdays and Sundays; that the use of whistles in association with the sports pitches are not used after 1900 hours; details of the ball stop fencing surrounding the sports pitch be agreed and put in place; and in conjunction with other mitigation measures, the approved fencing shall achieve a maximum noise level of 57dBLAmax(fast) at the façade of the nearest dwelling.</p>
<b>Planning Policy</b>	No	N/A

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
Highways England	<p>27 April 2020</p> <p>Other responses received on:</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 (hold determination of the application);</p> <p>9<sup>th</sup> December 2019 (hold remains in place);</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019 (hold determination of the application); and</p> <p>15<sup>th</sup> May 2019 (no objection, conditions recommended).</p>	<p><u>27<sup>th</sup> April 2020</u></p> <p>No objection subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1. No more than 250 dwellings of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied or brought into use unless either; a) improvement works at the A420 Gablecross roundabout, as shown in drawing NEVG CJ-ATK-HGN-GCJ-DR-D-0006_P06 (A420 Corridor and Gablecross Junction Option 2A General Arrangement, dated 26 April 2019), have been implemented in full and are open to traffic; or b) an alternative scheme providing the same or greater benefit as a) has been submitted to and approved in writing by Swindon Borough Council in consultation with Highways England and has been implemented in full to ensure that the predicted traffic effects at the A419 White Hart Junction caused by the development are mitigated to at least the same extent as (a). Reason: in the interest of the safe and efficient operation of the A419 trunk road and the A420 between White Hart junction and Gablecross junction.</p> <p>2. No more than 200 dwellings of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until: a) The Southern Connector Road is complete, open to traffic and accessible to the development and; b) the scheme at A419 Commonhead Roundabout (Atkins Drawing Number NEVSCR-ATK-HML-SCR-SK-D-0015 or an alternative scheme of works which provides equal or better benefit to the Strategic Road Network) is complete and open to traffic. Reason: in the interest of the safe and efficient operation of the A419 trunk road.</p> <p>3. No dwelling for which planning permission is hereby granted shall be occupied unless and until:</p> <p>a) a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) has been appointed to secure the delivery of the Travel Plan in line with Swindon Borough Council's 'New Eastern Villages Framework Travel Plan Supplementary Planning Document'; or b) a S106 agreement has been entered into with Swindon Borough Council to secure the required financial contribution to be used towards the implementation and monitoring of the New Eastern Villages Residential Travel Plan to facilitate modal shift away from the car. Reason: in the interest of the safe and efficient operation of the</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>A419 trunk road and M4 motorway.</p> <p>4. No more than 730 dwellings of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until:</p> <p>a) a contract for the construction of the works for the improvement of Junction 15 of the M4 and the A419 has been let. The works shall include:</p> <p>i) A419 Commonhead southbound merge to M4 Junction 15; a TD22 Type E Lane Gain; to provide 3 lanes between Commonhead and Junction 15; ii) the removal of the bus layby on the A419 southbound carriageway on the approach to M4 Junction 15; iii) M4 Junction 15 roundabout – widening of the circulatory on the southern side between the off and on slips; and iv) M4 Junction 15 roundabout – provision of a dedicated left slip from the A419 southbound to the eastbound on slip</p> <p>Or:</p> <p>b) Details of an alternative scheme providing the same or greater benefit as a) in terms of offsetting the unacceptable impacts of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by Swindon Borough Council (in consultation with Highways England) and a contract for the construction of the works for the alternative scheme has been let and the approved scheme completed in full. It is the responsibility of the developer to seek confirmation at the appropriate time that the relevant contract has been let.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of the safe and efficient operation of the A419 trunk road and M4 motorway.</p>
<b>Local Highway Authority</b>	17 October 2019	No objection subject to the developer entering into appropriate legal agreements to provide transport related infrastructure under Section 278 and 38 of the Highways Act 1980 and Section 106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990, together with the highway conditions

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>recommended below:</p> <p>1) Design Code - Prior to commencement of the development, a Design Code shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Design Code shall include the means of achieving direct, safe and accessible connectivity to the rest of the NEV development and frontage development to the Southern Connector Road. Reason: To maintain a high standard of design and to ensure a high quality and consistent approach to development of the site in accordance with Policy SD3. Access to Wanborough Road</p> <p>2) No development shall commence until details of the layout and access to Wanborough Road, together with secondary access points, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority. The details shall be subject to a Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit and specify surface material treatment across Wanborough Road, visibility splays, vehicle tracking, signing and lining. Reason: To provide an aesthetic gateway feature to the development, reduce vehicle speeds and improve highway safety and to ensure development complies with Policies TR1, TR2 and NC3 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026.</p> <p>3) No more than 200 dwellings shall be served by vehicular access to Wanborough Road. Prior to the commencement of development of the 201st dwelling, details of the means to restrict vehicular access from Wanborough Road to no more than 200 dwellings, together with details of additional access points, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Highway Authority and carried out in full accordance with the approved details. Reason: To prioritise access to the site by way of appropriate route which restricts inappropriate through traffic from entering the adjacent villages and the eastern side of Swindon.</p> <p>4) No development shall commence until a traffic calming scheme for Wanborough Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority. The scheme shall be subject to a Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit and incorporate carriageway narrowing, provision of a 3 metre footway/cycleway, surface material treatment of the carriageway, drainage, gateway features, signing and lining and a scheme for street lighting. Pedestrian and cycle connectivity shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>development. All other elements of the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the 100th dwelling. Reason: To increase safety for all highway users, to reduce the attractiveness of the route for inappropriate through traffic, reduce vehicle speeds and to ensure development complies with Policies TR1, TR2 and NC3 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026.</p> <p>5) No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until the bridge parapets on the Wanborough Road Bridge over the A419 have been raised to a height of no less than 1.4 m in accordance with contemporary trunk road design standards. Details of the works first shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and Strategic Highway Authority. Reason: To enhance safety for cyclists and in the interest of safety on the strategic road network.</p> <p>6) No more than 795 dwellings shall be occupied on the site until improvement schemes for the M4 junction 15, together with the A419 White Hart junction are complete and open to traffic. Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network. Access to schools</p> <p>7) For each phase of the development details shall be submitted to the local planning authority of measures to facilitate a safe pedestrian and cycle route to schools on and off site. No development shall take on each phase until the measures have been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of any dwelling in each phase and shall be retained thereafter. Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport and highway safety. Southern Connector Road</p> <p>8) No development shall commence until plans detailing the alignment and design of the Southern Connector Road through the site, including frontages in accordance with the Design Code, is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Reason: To ensure satisfactory connectivity and road provision is provided as part of the development to deliver and connect to the Southern Connector Road in accordance with Policies TR1, TR2 and NC3 of the</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026. Highway provision and construction</p> <p>9) Within each phase of the development, the construction of proposed estate roads and footways and associated utilities, services and street furniture shall not commence until details of their design and construction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Reason: To ensure all roads, including any not offered for public adoption, are laid and constructed to an approved standard before buildings are brought into use.</p> <p>10) No building shall be occupied until that part of the internal service road which provides access to the building is constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The service road as constructed shall be retained thereafter. Reason: To ensure that the development is served by an adequate means of access to the public highway in the interests of highway safety, convenience and amenity. Parking and Turning</p> <p>11) No dwelling or non-residential building shall be occupied until space for car parking, manoeuvring and turning has been provided in accordance with Swindon Borough Council parking Guidance. The parking space, including garage space (where provided), shall thereafter be kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwelling and their visitors and for no other purpose. Reason: To ensure vehicle parking provision is made in accordance with the Council's adopted and emerging standards in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.</p> <p>12) No dwelling or non-residential building shall be occupied until bicycle parking has been provided and made available for use in accordance with Swindon Borough Council parking Guidance. Once provided the bicycle parking facilities shall thereafter be retained and kept available at all times for those purposes. Reason: To ensure suitable bicycle parking is provided in accordance with the Council's adopted and emerging standards for occupiers of the dwellings.</p> <p>13) No development shall commence unless and until details of electric vehicle charging points have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Provision shall</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>be made for the charging points to all dwellings and additional charging points for non-residential and communal usage. Reason: To ensure adequate facilities are provided to enable the use of electric cars and to improve air quality. Utility Provision,</p> <p>14) No development shall commence until a scheme for street lighting and street furniture has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority. The scheme shall include a detailed design specification and details of the appearance of street lighting and other furniture, together with a specification and timetable for installation. Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety and to ensure a high quality and consistent design for common structures throughout the Swindon New Eastern Villages.</p> <p>15) No dwelling shall be occupied until broadband has been provided on site and made available to each dwelling. Reason: To ensure access to appropriate broadband infrastructure in accordance with Policy IN3 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 and avoid impact of any retrospective installation on the operation of the local Highway Network. Refuse storage and Collection</p> <p>16) The development shall commence until details of waste storage and collection areas have been submitted to and agreed with the local Highway Authority. The waste storage and collection areas shall be retained thereafter at all times. Reason: In the interest of amenity and Highway Safety. Construction Traffic</p> <p>17) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition or site clearance, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and adhered to throughout the construction period. The Construction Method Statement shall provide for: a traffic management plan, which shall include construction vehicle routes to and from the site, arrangements for recording construction vehicle movements to and from the site and making available those records for inspection, details of temporary access points and parking areas for construction vehicles, site operatives and visitors, and a construction workers travel plan; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; a scheme for the on-site maintenance and</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>repair of plant, equipment and machinery; details of a procedure for wheel washing and vehicle wash down of all construction site traffic leaving the site; details of a procedure for removing debris from the highway at all times; temporary buildings enclosures and staff facilities; details for the erection and maintenance of security and acoustic hoardings; measures to control the emission of dust, smoke, fumes and debris; contact details for the site manager and a liaison procedure with the local community. Reason: To reduce the potential impact on the public highway during the site preparation and construction phases of development.</p>
<p><b>Historic England</b></p> <p>Melanie Barge Inspector of Ancient Monuments</p>	<p>18 December 2019, 1 October 2019 and 24 May 2019 and 31 March 2020</p>	<p>No objection to the application on heritage grounds subject to conditions and the agreement of a mitigation strategy and scheme of investigation.</p> <p>We note that the current access route to Lotmead Farm will be used as the main construction route for this phase of the development. This was something we missed in our previous consultations. The route although not included within the scheduled area does pass through and over potential nationally significant archaeology, close to Wanborough Road. If this road needs to be upgraded to accommodate construction vehicles this may require excavation and relaying of the current road. If this will be required then the methodology and archaeological mitigation to undertake this work will need to be agreed with Swindon Borough Councils Archaeological Advisor and us.</p> <p>The site contains the buried remains of a Roman settlement protected as a scheduled monument, and is potentially within the setting of a number of Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas. The majority of the development proposed for the site will not impact significantly on the setting of the scheduled monument. The housing on a small portion of the site south of Lotmead Farm is of concern. The proposed dwellings on this field, although away from the Monument boundary, will impact on the rural setting of the Monument and therefore its significance. Any undesignated archaeology would need to be protected or fully recorded prior to development.</p> <p>The illustrative masterplan shows that the southern edge of the development will be screened from the monument with a new hedge and the development behind will be set away from the</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>edge with a road and front gardens. The development density in this area would also be low. The dwellings in this area would also be of a maximum of 2-storeys. In these circumstances, the harm to the setting would be less than substantial. Furthermore, the development will deliver an improvement to the part of the monument used as a Fruit Farm/ Pick Your Own. The owner has already improved the condition of the monument by removing cultivation from the centre of the site. Further improvements and interpretation will be undertaken through a finalised management plan which should be secured through the Section 106 agreement. The improved management of the scheduled monument through a management plan would be a positive benefit to the monument and support the application.</p> <p>Subject to archaeological excavation in advance of development, the retention of low density development as shown, and the implementation of an appropriate management plan, agreed by Historic England, then there is no objection in principle.</p>
<b>Housing Officer</b>	18 April 2019 (unchanged at 9 September 2019 & 18 December 2019)	<p>Supportive of the proposed 30% affordable housing resulting in 750 units being affordable. Suggest mix to be: 112 x 1-bed 2 person flats (15%); 375 x 2-bed 4 person houses (50%); 225 x 3-bed 5 person houses (30%); and 38 x 4-bed 7 person houses (5%). The mix of units should be in a 70/30 split between Rented (Social or Affordable) and Intermediate (including Low Cost Home Ownership initiatives). i.e. 525 rented and 225 Intermediate units.</p> <p>Units to be tenure blind and not visually distinguishable in terms of build quality, materials, external appearance, levels of amenity space and privacy. To be arranged in clusters of 10-15 units and be fully integrated with the open market housing. The clusters are to be completely detached from one another; the use of roadways, paths and other access ways will not be considered as sufficient separation between clusters. The tenures within each cluster to be mixed. The car parking provision and arrangements should be at least equal to that provided for the open market housing. This also includes parking arrangements i.e. if the open market units have driveways and curtilage parking then so should the affordable units. Courtyard parking is not favoured and should be avoided.</p> <p>Preference for semis with rear access to gardens and on-plot parking, but if terraced properties</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		are to be provided then careful design input will be required as they can be problematic with regard to rear access, wheelie bin/recycle box storage etc which should be considered at the early design stage to avoid long alleyways to access the rear gardens and to design out the potential for 'bin blight' at the front of the properties. The provision of 2% (50 units) to be wheelchair accessible units required.
<b>Leisure</b>  David James (Leisure Officer)	19 December 2019 & 27 September 2019 & 19 December 2020	<p>There has been no further comfort provided that a functional, viable layout can be accommodated without some adjustment to the indicative masterplan. I note that the sports hub is indicated to come forward before the adjacent local centre. In reality, these will need to be designed together and I request that reserve matters for the centre are not approved prior to the approval of a satisfactory sports hub layout.</p> <p>Previous comments made remain unchanged: 'As regards the revised proposals I note the following concerns;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage – in the design and access statement figure 4.6 Flood Zones does not benefit from a key. The applicant is to clearly state the flood zone status of the proposed sports hub land.</li> <li>• Extent of sports hub – The Green Infrastructure parameters Plan contains an illustration that has the sports hub tone washing over part of the linear park and play grounds. The applicant should clearly show on a land use allocation plan or similar the land that comprises the 9.74ha stated as making up the sports hub broken down into the area of pitches (7.4Ha) and other recreational uses stated in the Design and Access Statement.</li> <li>• As regards the indicative layout of the sports hub the treatment of the east and west boundaries has improved. However previously stated concerns regarding the viability in terms of the ability to deliver the requisite number of useable pitches remain as the interface with the adjacent east west ditch/footpath and the local centre and sports pavilion remain unresolved.'</li> </ul>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Sept 19 - I note that the sports hub is indicated to come forward before the adjacent local centre. In reality, these will need to be designed together and I request that reserve matters for the centre are not approved prior to the approval of a satisfactory sports hub layout.</p> <p>Drainage – in the design and access statement figure 4.6 Flood Zones does not benefit from a key. The applicant is to clearly state the flood zone status of the proposed sports hub land.</p> <p>Extent of sports hub – The Green Infrastructure parameters Plan contains an illustration that has the sports hub tone washing over part of the linear park and play grounds. The applicant should clearly show on a land use allocation plan or similar the land that comprises the 9.74ha stated as making up the sports hub broken down into the area of pitches (7.4Ha) and other recreational uses stated in the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the viability in terms of the ability to deliver the requisite number of useable pitches as the interface with the adjacent east west ditch/footpath and the local centre and sports pavilion remain unresolved.</p> <p>With regard to the Central Sports Hub the quantum not only needs to comply with the requirements of policy EN3, but to do so in a useable form that can sustain a robust sports facility that is able to flex over time to ensure long term viability. The indicative layout aptly illustrates the fundamental concerns – the space is too tight and the ability to deliver a robust viable layout at reserved matters stage has not been demonstrated as there are still a number of unacceptable pinch points.</p> <p>Pinch points remain at the North West and South Eastern corners. Simply removing cricket does not address the lack of sufficient space. The indicative plan does not provide sufficient confidence that the sports surfaces will be overlooked by principal rooms of pavilion or the adjacent development to the west. While this is an outline application with the detail to be resolved at reserved matters I have no confidence that the spatial issues apparent can be resolved without a slight increase in the north south dimension of the principle area of pitches.</p> <p>Re-allocating some of the ‘potential local centre spill out zone’ will allow adequate room for sport surfaces. This also necessitates a re-alignment of the east/west swale. Similarly consideration</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>should be given to rationalising the number of north south hedge and path corridors that overly constrain the potential pitch layouts. It is accepted that the make-up and detail of the particular sports can be determined at reserve matters, if due consideration is given to the PPS, which has incidentally covered the current local plan period to 2026. Similarly the details of the pavilion can be left to reserve matters as it will need to reflect to actual uses and demand at the time.</p> <p>Though the indicative GIA and footprint of the pavilion is instructive and appears to be an appropriate mix of changing, hospitality and ancillary uses. Having said that a point of detail is that the team changing rooms should be direct access from the pitches to the changing rooms.</p> <p>The indicative layout does positively demonstrate where artificial surface and sports lighting can be accommodated and a Hockey surface would be welcomed. Given the high clay content of the native soils in Swindon it is worth giving consideration to hybrid pitch such the surfaces developed by SIS Grass and Desso Grassmaster as opposed to natural turf with primary and secondary drainage and consequently requirement for high levels of ongoing maintenance or a 3G artificial carpet. The benefit of a hybrid surface is that the surface can sustain higher levels of use and does not have to be for a specific sport or require fencing so potentially much more appropriate in a public open space setting.</p> <p>The inclusion of cross generational sports of wide appeal such as tennis/netball courts and potential for bowls is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>I am sure that this can be made to work when resolved at the detailed reserve matters stage once fundamental issues noted above are adequately addressed.</p>
<b>Landscape</b>  (Andrew Norris)	19 December 2019	<p>Broadly supportive of the submission, with the following concerns with regard to the submitted details:</p> <p>Reaction to the NEAP and LEAP drawings relating to the eastern 'Canalside LEAP': The following comments remain unchanged:</p> <p>'The inclusion of the 'Outdoor Fitness Area' is a welcome addition to the overall mix of</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>activity/play types described LEAP/NEAP hybrid, identified as a 'NLEAP' (Neighbourhood/ Locally Equipped Area for Play). This said however, the equipment identified should be augmented with more kinetic choices: these shown are all too 'static' to be properly engaging. It is foreseeable that inadequately engaging equipment of this type could well be subject to potential vandalism, especially in areas designed for older children/young people (not that outdoor fitness areas should be at all limited to this user group).</p> <p>A more appealing facility with more actively operated equipment is required here. Whilst the accompanying Bespoke Play Area Specification is useful, I am concerned that the approach and additional detail in the DAS for the Outdoor Fitness Area will be used in future specifications to validate a low cost/low interest approach. It is unfortunate, as the equipment choices for the fitness area appear at odds with the otherwise more engaging play equipment.'</p> <p>Whilst the detailed specification of this provision could be dealt with at reserved matters stage, I request an amended drawing setting out more engaging / proper outdoor gym equipment. Keeping the choices illustrated (Design Code 4 p3 of 46) is likely to create issues in future discussions. It should not be a big undertaking to amend these, and would create an improved position for the council going forward in ensuring a more engaging facility is delivered.</p> <p>Conclusions: The Outdoor Fitness Area needs to be more kinetic, with actively operated equipment choices - outdoor gym equipment, not just static bars/benches/multi units to be acceptable. Request amended equipment choices.</p> <p>Management of public access to 'Biodiversity Zones' needs resolving: The Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (EMMF) report includes a 'Parameter Plan Green Infrastructure' (PPGI) dated 08.01.19 which does not appear to reflect the Illustrative masterplan as set out in the 'DAS Including Design Code Part 2 4.4). This appears superseded by a later PPGI dated 28.03.19 - I assume the inclusion of the apparently superseded 08.01.19 plan in the EMMF is an oversight?</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of Floodplain Grazing Marsh in the EMMF (Plan EDP 2: Ecology</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Mitigation Strategy: Species Measures). However, as set out previously, information on how this is to function is missing, and required at this stage. Whilst it may be appropriate for greater detail on this to follow, there appears to be a potential fundamental conflict relating to spacial allocations that needs to be addressed now. My concern is that the areas identified for public amenity (E.g. the lake areas/public open spaces etc.) also exist to support key ecological mitigation functions. The land allocated for this purpose may not adequately support this. A statement is required to clarify how this potential conflict is to be addressed.</p> <p>The following comments therefore remain unchanged: 'The EMMF does not appear to offer information on how areas that appear to be amongst the main destination GI resources for the development will be managed in the context of Ecology and Public access and amenity, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The lakes in the NE of the development are located in a 'Biodiversity Zone'</li> <li>- Play facilities are located in the 'Core Great Crested Newt Zone'</li> <li>- Floodplain Gazing Marsh positioned in a 'Biodiversity Zone', in the centre of a Public Open Space (etc.)</li> </ul> <p>These designations appear (potentially) incompatible and need addressing.'</p> <p>Conclusions: The allocation of land uses to support both public amenity/leisure and biodiversity /conservation functions, has the potential to be the source of conflict if they are not adequately considered at the earliest stage (now). It is entirely appropriate for the outline to set out these potential conflicts for consideration now, and not left for later, more detailed submissions. This could take the form of a matrix and/or statement, and would be invaluable in ensuring any potential land use conflicts are flagged now.</p> <p>Previous detailed comments relating to Neighbourhoods: The DAS appears to structure additional detail of the development around 6 distinct neighbourhoods. The following detailed comments appear valid and need addressing in the DAS. I have therefore structured reactions to these neighbourhoods accordingly:</p> <p>3.1 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood 'Wanborough Green' The following comments remain unchanged: 'The play facility shown against the perimeter of the 'Village Green' area and 'The</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Common' is far too isolated, and appears to be wrapped in vegetation with no natural surveillance. This is unacceptable'. Whilst I accept that the pedestrian/cycle route running north/south will offer some level of natural surveillance, I remain of the opinion that this vegetation 'wrap' is less than desirable for fostering a successfully self-monitoring space, in particular given the level of intervening vegetation between the housing located to the east and the facility. 'The Common' rectilinear space to the south is a preferable alternative location for the play area, without the visual 'disconnection' demonstrated by the current location.</p> <p>The following comments remain unchanged: 'There is a wedge shaped area of open space, 'Village Green' that the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (GIPP) shows as 'Proposed Vegetation', and designates as a 'Biodiversity Zone'. The 'Illustrated Masterplan' does not appear to reflect this. In addition, there are existing hedgerows in the southern corner of 5.8 that appear to cut over proposed paths and are unacceptably close to development blocks. These two drawings need to be reconciled and remain mindful of Policy EN2: Community Forest.'</p> <p>I'm unclear why the Illustrative Masterplan does not reflect the aims of the GI Parameter Plan here. The Illustrative Masterplan needs to show this planting. Housing around the play facility is separated from it by tree and hedgerow planting, which diminishes the natural surveillance potential this proximity might otherwise bring. This lends weight to the recommendation above, to relocate the proposed play facility to 'The Common'.</p> <p>Conclusions: Relocate play facility to a more visible/secure location, eg. to 'The Common'.</p> <p>3.2 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood 'Lotmead Village - Lotmead Farm'</p> <p>The green space in the centre north of the Lotmead Farm neighbourhood is designated as a 'Biodiversity Zone', containing a LEAP. I understand that the waterbody located close to the LEAP is likely to have restricted access to it, created by fencing/planting, as set out in the Bespoke Play Area Specification (Local Equipped Area for Play with Ecological Enhancements). As concerns raised in 2.0 above, the location of a fenced waterbody next to a</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>play area presents acute health and safety issues. There should be much greater distance between the two – a water body is highly likely to prove irresistible to children using the space - fencing this off is likely to enhance its appeal, and make it more difficult to monitor. Even with greater distance between the two, high natural surveillance of the waterbody / emergency access is also required.</p> <p>Conclusions: Locating a waterbody behind a fence / planting with restricted visibility is not compatible with a play area in close proximity. The waterbody needs relocating further away from the play area.</p> <p>3.3 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood 'Lotmead Village - The Meadow' Sections E-E and F-F illustrates existing retained hedgerow with SuDS swales in close proximity. This reduction of existing levels in the vicinity of the hedgerow needs to be undertaken with sufficient space to ensure the hedges longevity. Conclusions: Keep any reduction in existing levels away from retained hedgerow.</p> <p>3.4 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood 'Lower Lotmead Village - Southern Parkland' Whilst the detail on this can be addressed at reserved matters stage, it is still incumbent on the applicant - at this outline state - to demonstrate that the LEAP play facility here can function with acceptable levels of natural surveillance. It is far from clear whether this is achievable in the configuration shown. Previous comments therefore stand: 'The LEAP is far too isolated and appears to be wrapped in vegetation with no natural surveillance. This is unacceptable.'</p> <p>Whilst the following comments remain unchanged, I defer to the Leisure Officers comments regarding the operation of the Sports pitches: 'The applicant also needs to demonstrate how emergency vehicles can access both the facility and the pitches in this area. The proximity of the LEAP to the goal line could present an issue if not addressed in the detailed design. This also appears to be an issue where the Sports Pavilion, Local Centre and surrounding public realm sit directly behind the goal lines of two pitches and cricket squares. I can identify no mechanism (like a more closely planted tree avenue/ball stop fencing etc.) that addresses the risk to the public and property from stray footballs or cricket balls. This is a fundamental design</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>issue that needs to be resolved at this stage.’ NB: Both sections are East - West: there are no sections that describe the relationship between the Sports Pavilion/Local Centre/public realm and the sports pitches North - South, which would be invaluable in addressing this. 3.4</p> <p>Conclusions: The LEAP shown in the ‘Southern Parkland’ neighbourhood appears to have unacceptably low natural surveillance. This needs to be improved.</p> <p>There is a foreseeable conflict with the Sports Pavilion/Local Centre/public realm and the sports pitches with regard stray cricket/footballs. It is best demonstrated now that this is a hazard that has been acknowledged in the design, (this is currently unclear) and not left to Reserved Matters stage to resolve.</p> <p>3.5 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood ‘Lower Lotmead Village - Northern Parkland’ Previous comments remain unchanged: ‘I am concerned about the hedgerow that surrounds the square ‘Neighbourhood Space’ as described in Section I-I and the perimeter residential development. It appears to be much too close and needs to sit further back. In any case am I correct in thinking that this ‘Neighbourhood Space’ is actually the Primary School grounds?</p> <p>Sections I-I and J-J do not appear to bear any relation to their source plan Fig 5.5. This is not acceptable and the plan and sections must accurately correspond.</p> <p>A change to the road treatment is required at what will be a well-used desire line / road crossing linking the play facility and the residential development. The proximity of the play facility to the road does not mean that the proposed hedge removes the need for a different treatment.</p> <p>This is a very important location at the edge of the wider development where a driver might naturally want to accelerate. The presence of the play area means there is actually a need for increased vigilance and a reduction in speed.’</p> <p>Conclusions: The development against hedgerow surrounding the square ‘neighbourhood</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>space' is far too close, and needs to be set further back. Sections I-I and J-J need to more accurately reflect the source plan. The road corridor needs to reflect the presence of a play area located at its edge. Whilst the presence of a proposed hedge could play a role in controlling access to it, it could also conversely hide it - and its users - from traffic at a point where speeds are likely to be increasing at the edge of the development.</p> <p>3.6 Lotmead Village Neighbourhood 'Lower Lotmead Village - Canal Edge' Whilst this development area does not appear in the NEV SPD, I am broadly supportive as long as the open space it removes from the overall quantum is represented in a clear commitment to the implementation of the interventions mentioned above. That needs to include, for example, 'Central Lakes Nature Reserve' and woodland planting along the southern canal embankment to the site boundary etc. This also needs to be accommodated in the 'semi-private courtyards' that are strong defining features of this neighbourhood. More needs to be done to prevent the experience of these becoming a set of tight, difficult to navigate car parks. A strong vision/landscape prescription is essential for these spaces, and it is currently totally lacking.</p> <p>Planting of large flowering trees and trees with intense autumn colour around the squares would enhance the sense of place, particularly if it was further reflected in the selection of other vertical elements. For example, a distinctive lighting column and lamp choice should be used in these spaces along with a modular surfacing treatment (e.g. granite setts). I accept these are details for later reserved matters, but the 'direction of travel' of the current proposals is currently too unclear.</p> <p>Conclusions: Any loss of wider NEV GI/open space as a result of this development area needs to be effectively mitigated both outside the development area, (eg. with woodland planting of canal embankment as reflected in the Illustrative Masterplan) and within it. Particular regard needs to be given to the treatment of the neighbourhood squares and semi-private courtyards, which the application currently does not illustrate.</p>
Local Highways	13 June 2019	Comments on Transport Assessment –

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
<b>Authority</b>		<p>The isochrome data is presented for the phase 1 development only. Whilst this is helpful for the determination of accessibility up front, further studies of phasing will be necessary to determine what on-site amenities need to be triggered as the development extends to phase 2 and beyond.</p> <p>Figure 3.1 and 3.2 are also presented at such a small scale that determination of walking time accessibility is very difficult.</p> <p>A network of private lanes and footpaths have been cited and it would be helpful to have these mapped so that the masterplan can incorporate them</p> <p>Broad brush statements of cycling being appropriate on-street in Covingham and along Merlin Way is misleading and absence of segregated provision does not justify this assertion.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.3 suggests that 3000sqm of Office is included in the assessment carried out, based upon previous work, and yet the subsequent paragraph suggests 2000 sqm</p> <p>The reported office trips to not correlate with the given trip generations and the delivery of 2000sqm of office development as stated in paragraph 4.5.2 which further conflicts with 4.1.3</p> <p>On internalisation, the number of workers that live and work in an area is proportionate to the opportunities to work in that area. It may therefore be concluded that should Census MSOA areas 020, 023 and 013 be used as a comparable, then the Lotmead development should provide proportionate working opportunities. With this in mind, these Census areas have a workplace population to dwellings ratio of 0.722 workplace employee per dwelling, whereas Lotmead may generate 0.067 workplace employees per dwelling. In this regard, the application of 10% as an internalisation rate is massively over calculated for Lotmead as a standalone development. Furthermore, Table 5.7 infers that Census MSOA areas 020, 023 and 013 have identical populations, which would allow the percentage internalisations to be added; this is not the case.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>A street lighting scheme will need to be submitted that meets the approval of SBC's Street Lighting Officer. This scheme may not include full specification lighting, but a scheme to intersperse lighting and areas of no lighting as necessary.</p> <p>Full specification of phase 1 mini bus service will be required for S106 engrossment. Subsequent PT demand should also be illustrated to better direct PT contributions</p> <p>Design codes to be agreed for all internal roads.</p> <p>The Wanborough Road access includes visibility splays of 150m rather than the 43m suggested. Whilst 150m is considered excessive, SBC consider 43m to be too short, given the historical fast use of the road to implementing proposed measures. Visibility splays accommodating 37.5MPH should be applied and illustrated on the access drawing.</p> <p>The road into the site from Wanborough Road will serve both the proposed primary school (initially) and a bus gate. With the primary school forming public utility and bus service provision requiring access via highway maintainable at public expense, this road will need to be subject of a S38 agreement to be secured via S106, rather than it being implied that an agreement will be entered into. A S38 road adoption strategy will need to be agreed for phase 1 and access to other access points prior to the S106 being signed. Flexibility on route choice through reserved matters will be acceptable, but the strategy will need to illustrate how ransom of other sites will be avoided and unfettered connectivity achieved; this should form a layer of the illustrative masterplan.</p> <p>The FULL NEV results should be assessed at the access points and additional housing added to these results</p> <p>The pedestrian priority zone north of Lotmead Business Park may not be included in the developments SATURN coding as Lotmead traffic appears to not be suppressed from using the Symmetry Park access. Road Access through to Redlands development is not illustrated</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>and this should be shown to address the requirements of the Island Bridge Vision.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the proposed housing delivery, an infrastructure delivery plan should also be provided. This should include delivery of access to Great Stall East/Symmetry Park which should be provided against triggers of necessity to be determined through TA assessment. Access to Great Stall East and access to Redlands should also be illustrated upon first occupation of the proposed Secondary School.</p>
<b>Go South Coast (Bus operator)</b>	15 April 2019	<p>Support the principle of development but suggest conditions or developer contributions to ensure: improved bus services as set out the NEV Travel Plan SPD including required new public transport infrastructure, development of a Bus Rapid Transit Route, Park and Ride facility as well as proportional contribution towards Sustainable Transport Solutions including the Great Stall Bridge.</p> <p>That the width of the carriageway along the secondary access is 6.5m not 6.1m as proposed to meet the requirements of CIHT guidance on buses in new development and to allow for suitable access and flow of buses.</p>
<b>Stagecoach West and Swindon Bus</b>	3 October 2019	<p>It remains that the timing of the primary highways links, and therefore the achievement of the “express bus network” is evidently not under the applicant’s control. Even having proper regard to the financial contributions that may be provided by this and other developers towards a more substantial and effective bus service, there remains a very real prospect that some kind of service operating on what would be largely a “bespoke” basis and serving Lotmead and Foxbridge only via the SCR, would be the only thing deliverable in the foreseeable future. We have always been clear that such a route running from NEV southwards via the SCR, connecting the site to the Great Western Hospital and via Queens Drive to central Swindon, was likely to represent a very important component of the long-term bus service strategy for NEV, especially the southern parts of the site south of the River Cole, including Lotmead in particular. This still remains the case and we suggest that the bus provision is secured by the developer in agreement with the Council.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Concerns over phasing of the highways elements and the three main access points to the site. It is not clear at which stage which of the phases would come forward - the lack of clarity remains unhelpful. We would contend that this needs to be scoped out before S106 so that certainty can be had of the style and substance of service coming forward, and when.</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b>  (Charles Routh)</p>	<p>23 September 2019 &amp; 21 May 2019 &amp; 14 April 2020</p>	<p>With reference to the provided GI parameters plan Natural England notes there is a loss of overall greenspace provision due to increase proposed planting with access either, restricted or managed. Notes that the provision of recreational lakes falls within the delineation of biodiversity zones' and welcome the aspiration for multiple ecosystem service provision here but would like to see a detailed monitoring strategy that targets recreational impact on the proposed biodiversity zones and the interests within them.</p> <p>North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Meadows SAC consists of a series of unimproved grasslands, managed as pasture and hay meadow, and containing a rich variety of species-rich grassland types, with notably large populations of rare plants like Snake's head fritillaries. North Meadow is also a National Nature Reserve, owned and run by Natural England, and we encourage engagement with nature and with science at these sites, as does Wiltshire Wildlife Trust at Clattinger Farm.</p> <p>Growing visitor numbers in recent years has led to an increase in trampling. This has been particularly evident at North Meadow during April and May when many people come specifically to see the fritillaries in flower. Visitors during April and May can exceed 6000 per month and most visitors during this period arrive by car – the site is easily accessible from the A419 - and are thought to typically live within a 20 minute drive. Trampling leads to vegetation community change and paths have incrementally grown wider over the last ten years and has been identified as a threat in the Site Improvement Plan. While the total area of North Meadow affected by trampling is a small proportion of the overall site area it has a direct effect on features for which the site is designated. Visitor management techniques have been refined over this period with some success in limiting effects, but it is now clear that scope for further improvements in visitor management on-site is minimal, even if resourcing were unconstrained.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Natural England considers that increase in recreation is primarily driven by increases in local population (rising at circa 1.7% pa. for Swindon) rather than increased propensity to visit the site. Natural England considers that major new housing developments within a short travel distance of the North Meadow are likely to add to the existing visitor pressure and trampling effects during April and May. Ensuring that major housing schemes in Swindon properly contribute to green infrastructure and green space requirements set out in policy and SPD will, as a general rule, help manage pressures at sensitive nature conservation sites. That said, given that many of the visitors to North Meadow in April and May come specifically to see the fritillaries it is unlikely to be as significant a factor as would normally be the case. We consider, therefore, that while green infrastructure provision onsite is a critical first step in planning for major housing development in Swindon, that alone will not be effective in this case and more targeted measures will be necessary.</p> <p>We welcome the opportunity to set out our views on this issue but expect that Council, as the planning authority, and Competent Authority in any Habitats Regulations Assessment for proposals that could cause harm to the SAC, will form its own view on which measures form an effective, proportionate and deliverable response to the issue.</p>
<b>Consultant Ecologist</b>	4 September 2019, 19 December 2020	<p>19 Dec There is a need to illustrate a more cohesive GI network, consistent with aspirations set out in GI SPD and to be informed by WWT proposals. Doing so should include more inclusive representation of small wetlands, ponds and manipulation of watercourses. A more cohesive approach will help overcome issues of habitat fragmentation and will also aid more effective, sustainable management. The masterplan needs to clearly set out 'zones' e.g. of high public use and nature reserve areas and show how these areas integrate with those outside the red-line</p> <p>4 sept - More detail is needed for the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (EMMF) before determination of this outline application. The EMMF needs to form an overarching plan which informs the individual LEMPs. It needs to set out specific overarching prescriptions which will provide a clear sense of direction for each LEMP. The level of detail</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>provided now should be equivalent to that in the Wichelstowe Nature Conservation Management Framework. Unless this happens my opinion is that a lot of time and effort will be duplicated as the LEMP for each individual parcel is brought forward. That would not represent the most efficient use of resources, and would be likely to slow down discharge of individual Reserved Matters applications.</p> <p>The EMMF needs to include proposals for the 'Central Lakes' nature reserve, including visitor facilities. It needs to explain indicative costings, and how this will be paid for, including details of any payment which will be required from developers of other parts of the NEV, as my understanding is that this is to be a shared resource.</p> <p>Appendix 2 of EMMF (GI Parameters Plan, Planit Intelligent Environments, 28.3.19) of the report shows discrete and separate "biodiversity zones" within the green space. The implication is that the EMMF applies only to the biodiversity zones. The green space as a whole must be managed for biodiversity to restore and enhance ecological networks, following the principles agreed in the EMMF, even though core biodiversity zones may also be appropriate. Reassurance is needed that all the green infrastructure at Lotmead will be managed for biodiversity alongside public access and informal recreation, even if the balance between the two varies.</p> <p>With regard to the Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework (The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd, August 2019) additional, specific information is needed.</p> <p>Specification for how Root Protection Areas will be safeguarded in accordance with the relevant British Standard, with reference to additional measures for veteran trees and trees with veteran features in accordance with Natural England's Standing Advice. If this information is provided now it will not need to be duplicated in each individual LEMP, reducing time and potential delay to discharge Reserved Matters applications.</p> <p>Mention potential alternative of GCN District Licensing scheme.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Overall design of green infrastructure should be agreed now, so provide ecological coherence as each parcel comes forward.</p> <p>The report needs to confirm that the “strategic green corridors” accord with the indicative dimensions shown in SBC Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD.</p> <p>New bat/bird boxes should be specified as a minimum level of one per two dwellings or as specified in legislation such as the forthcoming Environment Act. Add a lighting Strategy in accordance with guidance published by the Institute of Lighting Professionals or as superseded keeping areas of vegetation retained for wildlife in darkness unless safety considerations require otherwise.</p> <p>A number of new bird and bat boxes should be specified now, expressed as a ratio of new boxes per dwelling (not “per building”). This should be at a minimum level of one per two dwellings or as specified in legislation such as the forthcoming Environment Act. New bird boxes should be clustered for communal nesting species such as swifts, so 5 swift boxes may be on one house for example, with none on other dwellings. Bat and bird boxes should be included on all other non-dwelling buildings within the development e.g. schools, retail units.</p> <p>A figure needs to be specified for Bat boxes. Can details be provided now of how roads through green space will be kept dark? i.e. by using shorter lighting columns and / or gaps in street lighting where roads cross linear features used by bats such as tree lines and hedgerows?</p> <p>Specify how the proposed dormouse habitat relate to proposals for neighbouring sites (as far as is known), and how this will maintain ecological networks for dormice out into open countryside.</p> <p>I am not sure that gully pots near ponds can ever be designed so they don’t act as pitfall traps for wildlife. Can SUDs be prescribed for roads within 250m of ponds and water- filled SUDs? Gully pots without sumps and which discharge directly via a short pipe into suitable terrestrial</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>habitat may be suitable. This specification should include the northern access roads, which pass within 250m of un-surveyed ponds, and which may contain great crested newts. What evidence is there for amphibians using amphibian tunnels, and their effectiveness for mitigation?</p> <p>Can new ponds also be provided, close to existing ponds, to increase GCN breeding opportunities?</p> <p>Floodplain grazing marsh. Details are needed (located elsewhere in this report) on how the necessary infrastructure will be provided (e.g. access for cattle and tractors, fencing, corralling facilities, water troughs etc). Recommendations should be agreed now so the whole area can be managed and 'farmed' as a coherent whole once built.</p> <p>Indicative planting lists should be included now, to save duplication of time and effort in each LEMP.</p> <p>All culverts need to be otter-friendly, with design principles for achieving this agreed now.</p> <p>More detail of proposed public access is needed now to achieve overall coherence as each parcel comes forward, and to reduce duplication.</p> <p>Monitoring principles and access arrangements should be agreed now, described as an obligation for the developers which will be conditioned, and with annual reports submitted to Swindon Borough Council. The requirement for monitoring, and landowner / land manager consent for access for monitoring visits should be automatic, and not dependent on them being made via Swindon Borough Council staff.</p> <p>Appendix EDP 2 GI Parameters Plan – Planit Intelligent Environments shows “biodiversity zones” separated by green space. How do they relate to each other? While it would be appropriate to have core zones for biodiversity, the green space as a whole must be managed</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>for biodiversity to restore and enhance ecological networks.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain (The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd, August 2019) A biodiversity calculator is an 'emerging' and still relatively crude tool for demonstrating whether biodiversity gain can be achieved on a development site. It attempts to make an objective judgement about data which is by definition quite subjective. I am grateful to EDP for providing this calculation, which, subject to the caveats above, does indicate that modest biodiversity gain could be achieved at Lotmead. The submission of this calculation responds to one of Natural England's comments in their consultation response of 21.5.19. The output data brings into focus Natural England's earlier comments regarding replacement of hedgerows on a 1:3 basis. How is this reflected in the biodiversity calculator?</p> <p>Illustrative Masterplan (Plant Intelligent Environments Ltd, 17.1.19) Swindon Borough Council will need to satisfy itself that Green Infrastructure is being provided in accordance with Swindon Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Document (July 2017). If green infrastructure is provided in full, it will help towards mitigating impacts from increased visitation to protected sites, and towards meeting the test in the NPPF for restoring and enhancing ecological networks (NPPF, para 174b). Habitats Regulations Assessment Discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust has observed that the Root Protection Areas of the veteran trees/trees with veteran features at Lotmead should be protected in accordance with Natural England's Standing Advice. The Ecological Mitigation and Management Framework needs to show how that will be achieved.</p> <p>17 May 2019 - Key information is missing or out of date.</p> <p>Concerned about the potential impact on the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which has been screened out solely on the basis of distance (ES Main report, para 3.9, 12.40, 12.41). This application needs to demonstrate with evidence that there will be not be an effect on the SAC or any other Sites of Special Scientific Interest, such as from increased recreational impact. The North Meadow part of the SAC is approximately</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>11.5km away from Lotmead (Figure 12.1 Study Area, The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd, 18.01.2019). North Meadow is 13 minutes driving time from Lotmead and 14.2km by road (according to AA Route Planner). North Meadow is vulnerable to increased recreational pressure (SAC Site Improvement Plan).</p> <p>The ES records (Table 12.2) four SSSIs within 5km of the Site, but impacts on these have also been screened out of further assessment. These also need to be assessed for indirect/direct impacts.</p> <p>Protected species identified on site have been scoped out and not taken forward for assessment (ES Main Report 12.71). These are listed as brown long eared bat roost, foraging bat assemblage, dormouse, otter, water vole and breeding bird assemblage. These are based on 2013 survey data, so the data is well out of date (Ecology Baseline Report, Appendix 12.1). It is unclear how the ES relates to the Update Phase 2 Survey (Appendix 12.2) report which was written to support the planning appeal, and which contains incomplete summary survey data from 2017.</p> <p>The status of all protected species present on the site needs to be assessed within the ES before the application is determined. There is currently insufficient information for Swindon Borough Council to be confident that the ES complies with legal requirements for protected species. The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (06/2005) ODPM Government Circular, para 98).</p> <p>Assessment of effects has not been undertaken for species including brown long eared bat roost, foraging bat assemblage, dormouse, otter, water vole and breeding bird assemblage, (as identified at para 12.71 of ES Main Report). This assessment is needed prior to determination. In-combination (cumulative) ecological effects have not been assessed (ES Main Report paras 12.148-49). The Outline Landscape, Ecology and Arboricultural Management Plan (LEAMP) (The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd, February 2019, ES Appendix 12.4) currently</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>contains insufficient information to be able to determine the application. It is currently little more than a proforma document. While it is not essential to tie down all the details at outline, clear commitments do need to be made setting out what will be achieved, based on clearly expressed principles.</p> <p>The information provided so far does not yet provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that ecological impacts can be compensated within the green space on site, or biodiversity net gain can be achieved to meet the test in the NPPF. As a result Swindon Borough Council does not yet have sufficient ecological information to be able to determine the application.</p> <p>The LEAMP needs to make a clear link with the specific recommendations in the ES, following completion of ecological assessment. It does not yet do so. The LEAMP needs to include management of the existing pond and proposed wetland nature reserve. Currently it does not. Much survey data (Ecology Baseline Report, Appendix 12.1) is six years old and is out of date. These surveys need to be repeated before this application is determined, and the ongoing validity of 2017 survey data needs to be assessed, as the distribution of species may have changed in the interim.</p> <p>Survey results from 2013 is provided for hedgerows, breeding birds, bat roost assessment of trees, bat activity surveys, dormouse surveys (and continued into 2014), water voles, otters, badgers, white clawed crayfish. Reptile data is from 2014. If surveys are more than three years old the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management says The report is unlikely to still be valid and most, if not all, of the surveys are likely to need to be updated (Advice note on the lifespan of ecological reports and surveys, CIEEM, May 2019)</p>
<b>Network Rail (No objection)</b>	14 May 2019 and 9 April 2020	Network Rail has no objection in principle to the above proposal. Recommends measures for the applicant to take into account to ensure the development does not adversely impact on the safety, operation and integrity of the operational railway.
<b>North Wessex Downs AONB</b>	None	No response received

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
Unit		
Planning Obligations		No response received
Ramblers Association	28 April 2019	To create a safe walking route to Covingham, a pedestrian-controlled crossing of Wanborough Road must be provided, funded by the developer. The proposed development will result in a significant increase in the volume of traffic using Wanborough Road. The existence of a 30 mph speed limit is not a valid reason for not requiring a controlled crossing. We would also point out that a shared surface crossing of the type proposed is dangerous for visually impaired people who are unable to make eye contact with drivers.
Rights of Way Officer		None received
Sport England (Bob Sharples)	17 September 2019 (no further comments 2 December 2019)	<p>Sport England does not raise an objection to the granting of outline planning permission subject to a suitable Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The sports hub has the potential to be a focal point and an asset to the proposed housing. The difficulty is that the hub may not come forward for many years and the requirement for specific sports may change and therefore at this juncture, it is difficult to be precise on the composition of the sporting mix. It is important that the wording in the Section 106 agreement should allow both the flexibility and provide the necessary resources to ensure the vision of the sports hub can be delivered in a way which reflects the formal and informal sporting needs at the time of delivery. This is also relevant to the pitch configuration which could change to reflect the actual sport need at the time when the pitches are to be provided. It should be noted that the costs for the different pitch configurations could change. It is important there is sufficient funding made available for this eventuality, as well as for the ongoing maintenance costs.</p> <p>A pragmatic solution may be to have the mathematical solution, but to allow 10-15% increase to meet any uplift in space standards and to accommodate the sports which may actually use</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>the facilities. It could also allow for additional space for increased secondary spend which could be required to ensure that the sports facilities are self-financing. Finally with regards to the pavilion, I believe it is important to ensure that the design addresses 'green construction' and renewables. This will have a higher capital cost, but lower running costs which will be important to ensure the facilities are self-funding, which in turn would be an important factor for the future management of the sports hub.</p> <p>I assume that electric charging facilities will be provided in the car park. Some of the parking could be on Grasscrete or a similar surface to avoid the visual expanse of hardstanding. A specification regarding the tennis courts and other sports facilities should be tied to relevant National Governing Body's standards by suitable wording in the Section 106 with regard to the submission of the reserved matters applications.</p> <p>Consider that the management strategy for the sports facilities should be determined prior to the application for reserved matters, as whoever is to manage the hub, should have a say in what is to be provided to ensure the long term financial sustainability.</p>
<p><b>Thames Water</b>  Conditions</p>	<p>23 September 2019 and 24 April 2019</p>	<p>Thames Water have identified that some capacity exists within the water network to serve 49 dwellings but beyond that upgrades to the water network will be required. An appropriately worded planning condition should ensure that development does not outpace the delivery of essential infrastructure.</p> <p>The existing foul water network infrastructure cannot accommodate the needs of the proposal. Conditions are therefore required to require network upgrade before occupation of the development.</p> <p>As surface waters will NOT be discharged to the public network there is no objection.</p> <p>Thames Water are currently working with the developer to identify and deliver the off-site water infrastructure needed to serve the development.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		As strategic water mains run through the development, Thames water advises that these must be respected.
<b>Wilts &amp; Berks Canal Trust</b>  (RJ Hacker)	4 October 2019, 12 December 2019 & 23 March 2020	<p>Accept the proposals to deal with the corridor for the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal with the provisos that the proposed enlargement of the flood storage zone alongside Liden Brook should not compromise the canal route; and that the point of exit from the applicant's land at the southwest end can be revised to reduce the impact on the adjacent developable plot. This change is noted in the planning inspector's report (para.10.97). The paragraph refers to the acceptance of this revision to be made at the detail design stage as described in the notes submitted as evidence to the inquiry on 16th November 2017 by Ms Amy Hensler of the applicant's team.</p> <p>A further observation is that the drainage and flood protection provisions remain unchanged from the previous application when the trust argued for an improved protection by using the canal to assist flood alleviation throughout the Eastern Villages area and adjacent lands. It is very disappointing that this opportunity continues to be overlooked.</p> <p>We also note that the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to several features of the proposed drainage plan, which suggests that there is an opportunity to revisit use of the canal. The trust continues to recommend construction of the basic canal infrastructure at the time of developing the project in order to aid local drainage, enable environmental mitigation measures such as planting to be implemented and reduce disturbance to residents occupying the nearby, new properties. There is also potential gain for the developer by the excavation of material suitable for raising the land on which to build.</p>
<b>SBC Urban Design</b>  (Peter Garitsis)	10 June 2019	<p>The Illustrative Masterplan and accompanying Design &amp; Access Statement set out a strong, legible urban design strategy for the site. The fundamental principles are structured according to a robust relationship between the future development and landscape character and Green Infrastructure of the site. My recommendation in design terms is that the future design codes are required to align themselves closely with the design principles that have been successfully illustrated and justified through this outline proposal. This is in the interests of achieving high quality design, achieving the shared vision for the site as set out in this application and</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>achieving a series of distinctive character areas across the site and for each neighbourhood within each 'village'.</p> <p>A second layer of character creation begins to emerge through the public realm structure set out by the series of legible and connected streets and public spaces. This is an element of the plan that is very powerful in urban design terms and creates the bones for establishing the parameters of a vision and how to achieve this vision through a series of neighbourhoods that relate to each other and to the 'wider whole'. I would recommend that because this plan achieves a good interpretation of 'vision' of place in a way that also achieves our urban design policy objectives, we expect the forthcoming design codes to align themselves with delivering future reserved matters applications within this context.</p> <p>Requirement for future Design Codes - In line with the requirements of Local Plan Policy Theme 1 – High Quality Design and Sustainable Development; prior to the submission of any future reserved matters applications, a Design Code relating to each proposed phase of development shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Any future reserved matters application must accord, and future development must be carried out in accordance with the approved Design Codes.</p> <p>Sub Sections - No reserved matters applications pursuant to this permission, excluding the Proposed Primary Streets on the approved Master Plan, shall be submitted until details of the proposed subsection applicable to that reserved matters site and its wider area of context has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The subsections shall divide the site into smaller parts in order to phase the development.</p> <p>Reason: To inform the design coding process and ensure the approval of the development coincides with supporting infrastructure in agreed phases. Design Codes The Design Codes shall develop and interpret the approved illustrative Masterplan identifying and defining existing development, topography, existing and proposed levels, different green infrastructure elements and other guiding principles and strategies to support the urban development. The Design Codes will set out how the subsection will conform with the approved outline masterplan in</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>terms of the public realm structure, legibility and connectivity of block structure. The Design Codes will also set the aspects of urban design, landscape design and architecture necessary to create and establish distinctive character across each subsection. The Design Codes should essentially provide more detailed design guidance on each of the guiding principles and structuring elements of the 2 distinct villages (Lotmead and Lower Lotmead) as set out in the D&amp;A Statement and the Defining Neighbourhoods section (p73 – 92) in order to achieve real character and distinction of place (summarised below):</p> <p>Overall guiding principles &amp; structuring elements 1. Fusing landscape and townscape - development parcels; landscape influences; recreational spine; SUDS / surface water management; development blocks; heights and density. Outline schemes for the landscaping and equipping of all Green Infrastructure areas and typologies including details of trees and hedgerows that are proposed to be lost and retained will be provided with a programme which sets out the implementation of the Green Infrastructure. 2. New landscape boundaries, edges and habitats to GI. 3. Access &amp; Movement including strategic roads, street typologies, details of internal highways, cycle ways and footpaths; street lighting strategy, parking, permeability and street landscaping including street trees. 4. Permeable and connected villages and neighbourhood which favour pedestrian movement. (Green routes – pedestrian and cycle). 5. Sustainable Transport – 5 walkable neighbourhoods across both villages.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Design Principles - In addition, as part of the ‘fleshing out’ of these principles and in light of the agreed vision for this site, the design codes should be informed by the Neighbourhood Design Principles of the D&amp;A Statement and in so doing, provide more detailed requirements to include information on the following:</p> <p>Appropriate housing typologies – their ‘grouping’ and general form, scale and massing characteristics, edge characteristics (enclosure and design including boundary treatments), choice of materials, colour and texture, and any distinctive architectural features that may be developed such as: chimney / heat stacks, bays, window proportioning, rhythms and roof forms.</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		<p>Reason – defining the unique characteristics of these neighbourhoods under these headings will inform the visual appearance of buildings, streets and spaces. The general uses and higher-level characteristics have all been set out in the D&amp;A Statement and Illustrative Masterplan.</p> <p>As a starting point, the Design Codes should set out where they intend to deviate from the intentions of the D&amp;A Statement, its vision and principles and the defining characteristics of the neighbourhoods. It will be expected that an equal (or higher) level of design aspiration will be expected of a design code in setting out the parameters required for future reserved matters applications.</p> <p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Design Codes in order to ensure high quality design is achieved as per the requirements of Local Plan Policy DE1, the Residential Design Guide SPD, the NPPF and the need to achieve distinctive character and differentiation of character across the wider Lotmead site.</p>
<b>Wiltshire Bridleways</b>	No	N/A
<b>Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service</b>	18 April 2019	No object to the application subject to conditions to ensure the provision of water supply and fire hydrants.
<b>Wiltshire Wildlife Trust</b>	No	N/A
<b>Wanborough Anti-Flood Group</b>	19 May 2019 & 17 October 2019	Object. It has been shown and demonstrated where the site floods. The Inspector dismissed the previous proposal and advised that only 200 houses should be constructed which without new infrastructure would be folly. In 2007 and 2008 the entire area was flooded to waist height except the small area to the side of Lotmead House which was used as a sanctuary for

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		animals. Raising footings will not overcome this problem. Water escape is limited by Acorn Bridge and the culverts under the railway. This will result in backing up of water. The existing access is a known flood area. Thames Water will not be able to provide sufficient water to the site.
<b>Beaumont Hamel</b>  <b>Wyndham Road</b>  <b>Salisbury</b>  <b>SP1 3AA</b>	13 April 2019	<p>Wiltshire Swifts: Whilst there has been an increase in the detail and number of nesting sites provided, the number is still woefully inadequate - 2500 dwelling plus other associated buildings with provision of only 325 integral bird bricks + 40 boxes to be sited on mature trees . Other Councils, such as Exeter, are moving towards 1 bird and 1 bat brick per dwelling. As a guideline a minimum overall average of a built in nest/roost site per residential unit should be provided. However, some locations in the development might be more suitable than others and provision could be more concentrated on appropriate residential units. Also your County Ecologist recommends 'a minimum level of one per two dwellings' plus additional 'Bat and bird boxes should be included on all other non-dwelling buildings within the development e.g. schools, retail units'. Swifts bricks are also used by other small birds such as the red-listed house sparrow, blue tits and great tits and are therefore a cost effective way of enhancing wildlife. Due to population decline, swifts are expected to be reclassified as a 'red-listed' species on the UK list of Birds of Conservation Concern in 2021 when the next official list is released.</p>
<b>Swindon Cycle Campaign</b>  <b>(Support)</b>	7 September 2019 & 14 May 2019	<p>We support the provision of a cycle route from the development along the Wanborough Road and in to Covingham and the cycling provision described in the Design and Access Statement. Page 61 of this describes cycling provision along primary streets as "Pedestrian cycle routes 4m wide where possible and if segregated, but no less than 3.5m". All pedestrian/cycle provision along primary streets should be segregated.</p> <p>The design shows several pedestrian priority zones. Cycling provision passes through these zones: cyclists should not be prohibited from cycling in these zones. (See Figure 4.6 Movement Framework in the Lotmead Farm Villages Design And Access Statement.)</p> <p>We support the provision of walking and cycling access to Covingham along Wanborough Road, recognising the constraints on making this provision. We suggest that a shared footway /</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
		cycleway should be extended along Wanborough Road to the junction with the proposed Southern Connector Road. This would helpfully increase connectivity in the footpath and cycle network.
		<b>Neighbours and local residents</b>
<b>Mount Pleasant House, Horpit</b>  Mrs Rosalind Elmes	10 September 2019	<p>Objects: As the Front Garden development in Swindon has never been completed and has roads that lead nowhere, there is no justification for a further huge area of Swindon's precious green belt, to disappear for a development of this sort. Front Garden should be completed first before any major new development around the town.</p> <p>The demise of the Honda factory in 2021 is estimated to result in a loss of 7,000 jobs in Swindon. While this is a very sad decision, it will undoubtedly reduce the need for further houses in the area. The council should also consider the development of that site for further houses as well as employment before allowing building to occur on Lotmead.</p> <p>Wanborough is a small village which will be swallowed up by this proposed development. There will be chaos on the surrounding roads. The main road through the village is already used as a rat run to the motorway. As one of the many horse riders in the area, it will become even more dangerous to ride on the roads. There is never any inclusion of additional bridle paths in these developments. There is already a plan for development of the nearby Redlands Airfield. That should be the limit until the impact of that and Honda's closure has been assessed and all other developments around Swindon have been finished.</p>
<b>Mrs A Woddy</b>  <b>Old Post House, Bourton</b>	23 April 2019	<p>With the South Swindon/Wichelstowe site barely developed as planned - why not consider fulfilling this uncompleted development before stretching beyond the reasonable boundaries of Swindon. Wanborough is NOT Swindon and should not be considered as such. Swindon has already swallowed up Purton and many neighbouring small parish villages. With the expansion of Shrivenham and Faringdon, the edge of Swindon and West Oxfordshire is blurred and disappearing fast. Where and when will Swindon stop expanding and swallowing up the countryside?</p>

Consultee	Response received	Summarised Comments
<p><b>C J &amp; Barbara I Parnell</b></p> <p><b>Beech House, High Street, WanboroughSw indon SN4 0AD</b></p>	<p>9 September &amp; 8 May 2019 &amp; 9 March 2020 &amp; 19 May 2020</p>	<p>We strongly object to any traffic having access from the Lotmead Site, New Eastern Villages onto the road leading through High Street, Wanborough. The High Street already suffers traffic congestion from street parking and volume of traffic. All traffic from the proposed new development should be funnelled onto the Southern Connector Road.</p> <p>Development massively out of scale and would overwhelm the local area and the village of Wanborough with cars driving onto pavements. Through traffic along Wanborough is already substantial and causing problems particularly during morning and evening rush hours. It is already congested and potentially dangerous, particularly at peak times. There should be no access to Wanborough Road from any Lotmead development. The road along Burycroft and The Marsh is so narrow and winding this it is wholly unsuitable as a route for additional traffic to Lotmead and Commonhead Roundabout. New Roads must be in place before building commences and it is essential SCR built before the first phase of 200 houses is erected.</p>
<p><b>Sands Farm, Shellingford</b></p> <p>Michael J Green</p> <p>(Comment)</p>	<p>March 2020</p>	<p>Not concerned with Lotmead but with the links to the A420 given that it is already at a standstill at peak times. Suggests a new road from Shrivenham to Common Head Roundabout or SCR to take traffic from the A420 away from its busiest sections west of the railway line. This would also allow the railway station to be moved to the A420 area to reduce congestion within Swindon.</p>