

Appendix A

Great Stall East S/OUT/17/1990 Planning Committee report

Consultation responses

Consultee	Application Submission Date	Comments
<i>Statutory and External Consultees</i>		
Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service	Original (24.05.2018)	<p>To meet the Fire Authority's requirements to deliver an effective response, the impact of the development and whether it would impose an additional burden on existing infrastructure has been assessed, to identify additional site-specific infrastructure requirements necessary.</p> <p>The Fire Authority may object to the application proposal, as the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Swindon Borough Council's adopted Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (March 2015) adopted policies SD1: Sustainable development Principles, IN1: Infrastructure Requirements and DE1: High Quality Design, as it fails to adequately mitigate its specific and direct impact on the Fire Authority or promote the development of a safe community as evidenced by the adopted Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service Community Risk Strategy for Swindon Borough 2006-2026 (March 2011).</p>
	Revised (n/a)	No further responses have been received.
Environment Agency	Original (24.01.2018)	<p>Object; the crystal moss animal (Lophopus crystallinus) is a protected species under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (S41). The proposal may have a detrimental impact on the species and its habitat along the River Cole and associated wetlands and the application does not include adequate information about the measures proposed to protect the crystal moss animal and the potential severity of the impact to this rare species. With respect to Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) it is not clear what arrangements are in</p>

		place to encourage developers of individual parcels to link up to develop SUDS strategically. It is a concern that without a strategic approach to SuDS, developers may propose oversized pipes or cellular solutions (both underground and of no biodiversity value) due to space constraints. There are additional comments regarding flood risk a condition is recommended.
	Revised (21.06.2019)	Object; since commenting previously the applicant has reviewed the previously submitted hydraulic model and hydrology to inform the updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for this scheme. The model and hydrology are not suitable to inform the FRA and the Council's decision and in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) an objection is raised to this application and it is recommended that planning permission is refused.
	Revised (14.10.2019)	Object; the updated model files and associated reports in response to the concerns on flood risk have been reviewed and while improvements have been made to the modelling, there are remaining concerns in relation to the age of the survey data being used and potential inaccuracies with some cross sections within the model. An additional structure has been identified that needs to be surveyed and included within the model and additional surveys should be undertaken and the model revised accordingly. As a result the current model is not suitable to inform the Flood Risk Assessment supporting this planning application and the objection to the application is maintained and it is recommended that planning permission is refused.
	Revised (10.07.2020)	No objection, subject to conditions and the applicant's modelling is accepted and the level and extent of fluvial flooding presented is appropriate for use within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. The development is at minimal risk of flooding during a 1% annual probability event with a suitable allowance for climate change. It has been demonstrated that the site can be developed to ensure that no built development will take place within the 1% annual probability flood extent (1 in 100 year event) with a 70% allowance for climate change. Indicative plans show that green infrastructure and open space will be located within this extent and it is important that no ground level raising takes place within these areas to ensure flood risk will not increase to the rest of the site or surrounding areas. A small area of the proposed school site is shown to fall

		<p>within the 70% climate change extent and again there should be no built development or ground level raising within this area. Previous advice given on 21st June 2019 is re-iterated, that any future expansion of over-flow of the park and ride site within flood zone 3b would not be acceptable. Car parking is classed as less vulnerable in accordance with table 2 of the Flood Zones and flood risk tables of the Planning Practice Guidance on flood risk and coastal changes and this type of development is not compatible with this flood zone and should not be permitted. Provided that the planning conditions recommended are included within the planning permission decision notice, the development will be acceptable, but without these conditions, the Environment Agency would object to the development, due to its adverse impact on the environment. Condition 1 requires the implementation of the development in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and that no land raising or built development shall take place within the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) plus 70% climate change extent; and finished floor levels shall be set a minimum of 300mm above existing ground levels within development phases adjacent to the flood plain.</p> <p>Condition 2 requires a scheme for the provision and management of a buffer zone of at least 10m width alongside the River Cole and ponds on site; the buffer zone shall be free from built development, including lighting, domestic gardens and formal landscaping. The scheme shall include the extent and layout of the buffer zone; the proposed planting scheme; details of the measures to protect and manage the buffer zone, including financial provision, the named body responsible and a detailed Landscape Environment Management Plan; details of any proposed footpaths, fencing , lighting, mitigation against pet predation and recreational disturbance.</p>
Highways England	Original (10.01.2018)	<p>Recommend that planning permission is not granted for a specified period (6 months) to enable the applicant to address Highways England's (HE) concerns regarding the operation and safety of the SRN (A419 and M4). HE has reviewed the Transport Statement (TS) accompanying the planning application, that builds on previous work for a Transport Scoping Report and Environmental Statement.</p>

		HE's concerns relate to the safety and operation of the SRN, in proximity to this site including the A419 White Hart and Commonhead junctions, and M4 junction 15. Further information / clarification is requested on the phasing of the development proposals, including phasing in relation to the wider development and infrastructure proposals; the SATURN model results for both the 2026 Base and 2026 Base + Development scenarios; and the provision of Personal Incident Accident data.
	Revised (09.07.2018)	Recommend that planning permission is not granted for a specified period (3 months) as above.
	Revised (09.10.2018)	Recommend that planning permission is not granted for a specified period (3 months) as above.
	Revised (07.01.2019)	Recommend that planning permission is not granted for a specified period (3 months) as above.
	Revised (04.04.2019)	No objection subject to planning conditions relating to improvements at the M4 J15 and the A419 White Hart Junction.
	Revised (13.11.2019)	Recommend that planning permission is not granted for a specified period (6 months) to enable the applicant to address HE's concerns regarding the operation and safety of the SRN (A419 and M4). This is to allow for further assessment of the application site and wider NEV allocation to be undertaken which will thereby enable Highways England to provide informed advice to the local planning authority.
	Revised (27.04.2020)	No objection subject to three planning conditions. These relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No more than 250 dwellings shall be occupied unless, either the improvements at the A420 Gablecross roundabout (or an alternative scheme that provides the same or greater benefit) have been implemented in full. ii) No dwellings shall be occupied until a travel plan co-ordinator has been appointed to secure the delivery of the Travel Plan (either in line with Swindon Borough Council's 'New Eastern Villages Framework Travel Plan Supplementary Planning Document' or through a S106 agreement with Swindon Borough Council to secure the required financial contribution for the implementation and monitoring of the New

		<p>Eastern Villages Residential Travel Plan, to facilitate modal shift away from the car; and</p> <p>iii) No more than 730 dwellings shall be occupied until a contract for the construction of the M4 Junction 15 and the A419 improvement works are let, or an alternative scheme providing the same or greater benefit (in terms of offsetting the unacceptable impacts of the development) is 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 is let and the approved scheme completed in full.</p> <p>Before November 2019, HE's recommendation was for a Grampian-style planning condition to be imposed on any consent that may be granted, to restrict the occupation of the development until planned improvements to the A419 White Hart Junction (WHJ) were complete and open to traffic. However, subsequently HE advised that following a number of material changes in local planning, background local development consents and A419 traffic growth since the application was submitted in 2017, an updated recommendation was appropriate, to allow for further impact assessment work to be undertaken, to ensure that planned strategic highways improvements remained sufficient to safely accommodate the planned growth yet to be brought forward. The improvement works at the A420 Gablecross roundabout include the provision of traffic signals, to be optimised to ensure the predicted traffic impacts of the wider NEV development at A419 White Hart Junction are safely managed. HE and Swindon Borough Council will need to enter into an operational agreement to set out the A420 Gablecross traffic signal timings and specification and a maintenance strategy, to ensure the traffic signals operate to prioritise the safe operation of the A419 at White Hart Junction.</p>
Historic England	Original (31.01.2018)	No comments, but it is suggest that the views of the Council's specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, are sought as relevant.
	Revised (29.03.2019)	Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds and considers that the issues and safeguards outlined (below) need to be

		addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraph 189 of the NPPF. It is recommended that the application reconsiders the potential impacts of the application to the grade II listed Longleaze Farmhouse. In the main, Historic England concur with the Cultural Heritage assessment (Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) that the proposals will not result in substantial harm to these assets via a change in setting, but disagree with the assessment of impacts to the grade II listed building known as 'Longleaze Farmhouse' (National Heritage List for England ref. 1299729). Chapter 8 of the ES (8.7.13) appears to suggest that the ' <i>publicly restricted views of the farmhouse</i> ' reduces the intensity of the proposed change in setting and is therefore contrary to our advice.
	Revised (29.11.2019)	On the basis of the revised information, no further comments and it is suggested that the views of the Council's specialist conservation and archaeological advisers is sought, as relevant.
	Revised (05.05.2020)	No objection; the presence of a number of sensitive, highly designated heritage assets in the landscape within which the application site sits are noted and as no such assets are within the application area, the application will not result in physical impacts to these assets. The application does have the potential to impact on the significance of highly designated heritage assets via a change in setting. The NPPF refers to the conservation and enhancement of the historical environment and paragraph 190 refers to the conservation of heritage assets and notes that effects can arise from a physical change and a change in setting. Historic England is familiar with the site, providing advice since 2016 and concurs with the Cultural Heritage assessment, that the proposals will not result in substantial harm to highly designated heritage assets via a change in setting. This is because of the distance between these assets and the application area, screening between the assets and the application provided by topography and vegetation and the form, height and design of the various elements. Historic England notes the Council's Conservation Officer's concerns regarding the setting of the grade II listed Longleaze Farmhouse, but this matter is beyond Historic England's purview.
Natural England	Original (15.01.2018)	It is noted that the application does not conform with the adopted NEV Green infrastructure SPD, as not only is the area allocated to green infrastructure significantly less than that in the SPD, but as a result, this is likely to render it

		<p>unviable to be managed agriculturally – a key aspiration of the SPD. Thus, from both a total area provided and management perspective, the application significantly delivers significantly less than is intended in the SPD. Consequently, Natural England advise that the application is not consistent with the Council's GI policies.</p> <p>It is also noted that the biodiversity information in the ES was not submitted, and as such the application's likely biodiversity impacts cannot be assessed and that the Council should not determine the application until such information is submitted and considered.</p>
	Revised (16.02.2018)	The submitted preliminary ecological appraisal concludes that further surveys are required to determine whether the proposed works will result in any significant residual impacts to protected species and habitats. Without this information it is not possible to determine whether the proposed works will result in any significant residual impacts to protected species and habitats, or whether the proposals are compliant with national and local policy.
	Revised (23.03.2018)	The basis on which the ES asserts that there will be net gain with respect to various biodiversity features is unclear. For example, based on one environmental receptor, hedgerow mitigation the proposals are not adequate to mitigate the proposed losses and mitigation in accordance with the DERFA metric suggests a 1:3 ratio should be applied where hedges are in good condition. This puts in doubt all the biodiversity conclusions within the ES.
	Revised (11.04.2019)	Maintain previous comments that it is unable to advise on whether this development will result in a gain or loss to biodiversity, and thus advise that there is insufficient information to determine the application.
	Revised (07.05.2020)	Natural England note that no additional information is provided on the local planning authority's Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) decision. Natural England have provided advice previously on the potential for the development to impact on North Meadow Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and any changes should be checked to see if any concerns mentioned at previous iteration have been addressed.

		In addition Natural England are working in conjunction with Swindon BC and Land Use Consultant to determine the extent to which developments within Swindon BC should consider Habitat Regulations Assessment. From initial meetings it would appear this proposal falls within the scope required assessment.
Network Rail	Original (15.01.2018)	No objection in principle to this proposal, subject to planning conditions.
	Revised (05.03.2018)	No objection in principle to this proposal, but as Network Rail has access points on the east and west of the underbridge and has concerns with ground stability. With respect to the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail's adjoining land and recommends that planning conditions and planning informatives to ensure that the proposed development has no adverse impact on the railway.
	Revised (n/a)	No additional comments received.
NHS/Swindon Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	Original (11.01.2018)	<p>Healthcare infrastructure is required to support the site within the larger New Eastern Villages development and the Borough Council has prepared a framework to secure developer contributions from all areas of the NEV towards the provision of additional health infrastructure that is vital to enable the delivery of Primary Care and other Healthcare Services.</p> <p>NHS Swindon Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) currently commissions Primary Care Services across Swindon and Shrivenham. Swindon CCG also commissions a full range of the health care services for this population, including hospital, community and other health support services.</p> <p>NHS Swindon CCG and NHS England have identified increasing pressure from developments within Swindon & Shrivenham that share surgeries and patients across boroughs and healthcare boundaries. This puts further pressure on neighbouring commissioners, for planning and sourcing GP resources and healthcare provision within their own regions; one of the neighbouring NHS commissioners is Wiltshire CCG.</p> <p>The population increased associated with the development requires access to</p>

		<p>Primary Care, equating to a 2.5 whole time equivalent GP Practice, plus associated services needed to support care delivered to those patients. Increased access will be required for other services, including Children's Services, Mental Health Services, Community Services and Acute Services including patient bed capacity.</p> <p>The demand for additional new health infrastructure, including the size, location and configuration of delivery is determined by various Department of Health policies and guidance from the NHS and Public Health England including the NHS 10-year plan on prevention, national strategic agendas, various guidance regulations relating to the provision of Primary Care facilities including local strategic priorities. The delivery of the procured service will be subject to the inclusion and availability of funding and developer contributions in conjunction with Swindon Borough Council.</p> <p>There will also be impacts on emergency services such as ambulance and A&E services. Swindon and Shrivenham have 3 main Primary Care provider groups across 21 locations including 2 standalone GP Practices, serving a registered list size of circa 213,000, plus unregistered patients. The two GP practices/ locations of the existing 23 located closest to the site will be impacted by the population increase on current list sizes and workforce capacity. In addition, 1 GP practice commissioned by Wiltshire CCG is within close vicinity of the development. All these practices currently are at a short fall of space for their current list size, therefore; the ability to increase the current patient list size to accommodate the growth from NEV will be unendurable.</p> <p>The existing District General Hospital, the Great Western Hospital is already experiencing significant pressure in terms of demands for services from the existing population.</p> <p>Additional information of the proposed phasing of this development in relation to the NEV is necessary to enable sufficient time for the procurement of a new</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Primary and Health Care Service and appointment, to help identify the point at which a new facility (or enhanced provision) would need to be delivered and be operational.</p> <p>Based on the increase in population associated with the development there is a requirement for additional GP capacity equivalent to 2.5 WTE GPs including the support services for Community & Mental Health provision covering a floor area requirement of 333m². Infrastructure consideration will be required linked to delivery of Acute Health Care Services. The impact of non-recurrent (capital) and recurrent (service provision) infrastructure costs as a direct result of new housing development are very significant. Therefore, developer S106 contributions will be required to deliver this additional capacity for Primary Care and this development should acknowledge that developer contributions will be a key source to enable the healthcare infrastructure delivery to meet the healthcare needs of the population increase.</p>
	Revised (n/a)	No additional comments have been received.
Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)	Original (12.01.2018)	<p>No objection in principle to the proposed development as part of the overall Eastern Villages allocation in the Swindon Local Plan, but an objection is raised as proper consideration has not been given to the potential transport impacts of the proposal on Oxfordshire, contrary to the Swindon Borough Local Plan policy TR2 and paragraph 32 of the NPPF. OCC remains committed to working with Swindon BC to ensure that individual applications properly assess the impacts of their proposals on the Oxfordshire highway network and provide appropriate transport mitigation measures. OCC expects Swindon BC to meet its commitment above in respect of the current application that will generate significant traffic movements, the impacts of which will require mitigation that should be funded by the development. OCC request that it is involved in any future discussions to re-route bus service 66 into the site as this would have implications for attractiveness of the service for existing users. Whilst there is no education objection, concern is raised that there should be timely delivery of both the proposed on-site secondary school and primary school and/or additional school capacity elsewhere within Swindon borough, to ensure that</p>

		pupils generated by early housing growth at the New Eastern Villages development does not increase pressure on Oxfordshire schools.
	Revised (27.03.2019)	The strategic comments in the original response of 12 th January 2018 continue to apply. In accordance with the Statement of Common Ground dated April 2014 between Swindon BC, OCC, Vale of White Horse DC and the Western Vale Villages, planning applications as this one should be supported by a Transport Assessment that takes into account the planned growth across the boundaries and provides the proper accommodation of its traffic consequences on the network.
	Revised (18.11.2019)	Maintains the strategic comments within the original response as these continue to apply, with the Education comments.
	Revised (19.05.2020)	Maintains the previous comments as stated in the previous response 18.11.2019) the strategic comments in the original response of (12.01.2018) continue to apply, as does the continued transport objection and Education comments.
Sport England(SE)	Original (03.04.2018)	<p>Object; the objection could be overcome if the application provided appropriate sport provision to meet the demands of the new population to ensure the provision would not be a financial burden to the local authority. The following specific concerns are raised, including that the application does not reference the adopted Swindon Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and the open space proposals referenced in the draft heads of terms refers to outdoor sports at 1.6ha per 1,000 population and that 1.2 ha should be playing pitches is contrary to the PPS and the NPPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) All the sport pitches are located within the school curtilage that will limit the use of the facilities. ii) The outline layout is too tight, does not allow for pitch rotation and therefore will require high maintenance if the pitches are to be used by the school and community. iii) The proposed Artificial Grass Pitches (AGPs) could be located too close to dwellings and the application should refer to Sport England's technical guidance (Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) Acoustics – Planning Implications).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) AGPs have a limited life and require their top surface or carpet to be replaced on average every 10 years, costing about 10% of the capital cost; they also require a high maintenance programme. v) It is not clear if the pitch provision is correct and the application should refer again to the PPS. vi) There are 3 existing athletics tracks in Swindon, one permanent grass, one cinder and one synthetic track and given the size of the population of Swindon, it is difficult to understand the need and sustainability for another synthetic track. Again these facilities have a high capital cost and ongoing maintenance costs. vii) The proposal does not address the impact and requirements of the new population for swimming pools and sports halls. There is a reference to a 'sports hall' in the design and access statement but no details. viii) There is also a lack of understanding on Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) as the same surface used for tennis and netball cannot be used for volleyball.
	Revised (28.03.2019)	Maintains original objection as the revisions do not address these concerns, including the adopted Swindon Playing Pitch Strategy; Sport England do not and have never accepted an AGP as equal to more than a single grass pitch. Concern remains that the masterplan layout locates the sports hub within the school's curtilage and daytime community use of the facilities would not be possible if the sports hub was part of the school estate. There are also concerns that only a two team changing pavilion is proposed, as this does not accord with supporting a single AGP.
	Revised (12.11.2019)	Sport England maintains their objection due to the splitting of the playing fields and lack of detail around parking and pavilion provision. This will cause an increase in maintenance costs and require separate pavilions to service the pitches on both sites. It is not clear if the master plan makes provision for parking or pavilions for the playing fields. The objection could be overcome if the application provided a single playing field location with a suitable pavilion

		<p>and level of car parking to support the playing pitches, whatever their configuration. Alternatively evidence is required to support approach proposing splitting the playing fields on two separate sites. The relocation of the playing pitches out of the flood zone is welcomed, noting that the AGPs previously proposed are omitted. It would be helpful to see a summer layout for the playing fields and for the application to address concerns raised on the built facilities issues.</p>
	Revised (21.05.2020)	<p>Whilst noting further improvement on the previous masterplan iteration for sport, Sport England maintains its objection to the granting of planning permission due to the lack of details, below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The pavilion is located in the middle of the playing fields which will only works by overlooking key pitches either side, which the layout does not, sterilising a large part of the playing fields; ii) There are still no plans of the pavilion and the mathematical build costs are not helpful, so it is unclear whether the pavilion and car park are both large enough. iii) The plan does not show how the allotment can be accessed by car and there may be a possible ball strike issue. iv) It is not advisable to locate a LEAP near a car park or pitches; v) The playing pitch layout is too tight and there is no cricket allowance necessary for a summer sports layout; vi) Without topographical or agronomical information it is not certain that the ground conditions/topology will not result in a reduction of available playing field area; vii) The proposals do not include details to future proof the site, for example to install sports lighting or a future Artificial Grass Pitch. viii) Have the maintenance requirements been considered, for example an on-site maintenance shed; ix) The proposals have not referenced an environmental sustainability strategy for the sports provision <p>Whilst the application has made significant strides to address the sports provision, it still lacks some fundamental details that could be resolved by</p>

		amendments to the design, as if outline consent is granted, based on this drawing, it may not be fully delivered, be fit for purpose or have extremely high running/maintenance costs and built-in obsolescence.
Thames Water (TW)	Original (08.01.2018)	With respect to waste water, due to insufficient capacity available for the new development and to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community, Thames Water (TW) recommend a Grampian planning to require a drainage strategy to detail on and/or off site drainage works, for approval by the local planning authority in consultation with TW the sewerage undertaker. No objection is raised to potable water infrastructure capacity.
	Revised (22.03.2018)	With respect to waste water, TW re-iterates its original comments and for water supply, recommends that existing infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. A planning condition is recommend to require an impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure for approval by the local planning authority (in consultation with TW) to determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point. TW require phasing details to ensure suitable water supply infrastructure is in place in time to serve the new development and that sufficient lead-in time is provided for such additional services.
	Revised (09.04.2019)	Following initial investigations, TW has identified the inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. TW contacted the developer to attempt to agree a position for foul water networks but has been unable to do so in the time available; TW recommends a planning condition with respect to wastewater network upgrades, required to accommodate the additional flows from the development being completed, as the development may lead to sewage flooding and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional flows anticipated from the new development. Alternatively, TW recommend that a housing and infrastructure phasing programme be agreed, to allow additional properties to be occupied. As the application indicates that surface waters will not be

		<p>discharged to the public network TW no objection, but approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. If the application subsequently seeks a connection to discharge surface water into the public network, then TW considers this a material change to the proposal, requiring an amendment to enable TW to review the position.</p>
	Revised (21.11.2019)	<p>TW re-iterates its previous recommendation with respect to the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the development. Due to the magnitude of this development, significant wastewater network and treatment infrastructure upgrades are required to accommodate the development and these should be controlled by a planning condition.</p>
	Revised (20.05.2020)	<p>With respect to waste water, TW recommends a planning condition relating to network upgrades required to accommodate the development; or due to the inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal, a housing and infrastructure phasing plan should be agreed to allow housing occupations. TW has contacted the developer in an attempt to agree a position for foul water networks but has been unable to do so in the time available. If the recommendation is considered inappropriate or is excluded from the decision notice, the Local Planning Authority should liaise with TW Development Planning Department prior to the planning application approval.</p> <p>For surface water, TW has no objection, as the application indicates that there will be no discharge into the public network, but approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. If subsequently a connection is sought to discharge surface water into the public network, as a material change and amendment to the proposal, TW would review the position.</p> <p>With respect to water supply, TW are working with the applicant to identify and deliver the off-site water infrastructure needs to serve the development. TW has identified that some capacity exists within the water network to serve 49 dwellings, but upgrades to the water network will be required for additional capacity. Work to understand this in more detail is on-going and TW</p>

		<p>recommend an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure development does not outpace the delivery of essential infrastructure. There shall be no occupation beyond the 49th dwelling until confirmation has been provided that either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) All water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or ii) A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation of those additional dwellings shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan. <p>If the Local Planning Authority does not accept the above recommendation or is unable to include this condition within the decision notice, TW recommend liaison with the TW Development Planning Department before approving the planning application.</p> <p>The proposed development is located within 15m of underground water assets and TW further recommend an informative relating to working near to water assets so that workings accord with the necessary processes. TW have commissioned a catchment study to determine the infrastructure requirements for accommodating the development as part of the New Eastern Villages development. TW request that the applicant contact Developer Services to discuss the options for connecting this site to the public foul sewer system through the TW pre-planning service.</p>
Vale of White Horse District Council (VOWH)	Original (18.04.2018)	<p>In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate and the published Statement of Common Ground (April 2014 to primarily support the examination of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026) the VOWH supports, in principle, housing growth proposed at the New Eastern Villages sites, as set out in Policy NC3 of the adopted Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026. The Statement of Common</p>

		<p>Ground (February 2018) was agreed between VOWH and Swindon Borough Council to support the Examination of the Local Plan 2031 (Part 2: Additional Sites and Detailed Policies). The application's intention to provide financial contributions towards the following infrastructure is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A420 improvements; further clarity would be welcomed regarding improvements to the A420 ii) West of A419 junction improvements iii) White Hart Junction improvements iv) Bus service provision v) Park and Ride provision <p>VOWH support this, subject to securing the timely provision of the infrastructure required to mitigate any significant impacts. As agreed in the Statement of Common Ground, both Councils continue to engage on cross-boundary strategic matters, including a joined-up approach to considering the cumulative impact of growth on the A420 and the supporting road network. Strategic growth is planned to come forward in both districts along the A420 corridor as set out in the VOWH Local Plan 2031 and Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026. The continued engagement between VOWH, Swindon Borough Council and Oxfordshire County Council has informed the preparation of an A420 Route Strategy, included in the Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031. Currently, the VOWH consider that the Transport Assessment/Statement submitted to support this development proposal should consider the cumulative impact of growth planned at settlements located along the A420 corridor, including in the VOWH. This should include both committed and emerging growth in the VOWH Local Plan 2031. It is unclear whether the Transport Assessment considers the potential for cumulative impacts associated with growth at these sites and other major development sites in this locality. Approval of the scheme should be accompanied by appropriate conditions and a legal agreement to set out the infrastructure requirements and how and when they will be delivered.</p>
	Revised (18.04.2019)	This revised response re-iterates the above original comments.

	Revised (22.05.2020)	<p>Noting that amendments have been made to the application, the VOWH Council state that in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate and published Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) (April 2014) for the examination of the Swindon Local Plan, the VOWH Council supports in principle, housing growth proposed as set out in policy NC3 of the adopted local plan. The SoCG agreed that both parties would continue to engage on cross-boundary strategic matters including a joined-up approach to considering the cumulative impact of growth on the A420 and the supporting road network. As noted in the previous response, the VOWH considers that the Transport Assessment to support this development should consider the cumulative impact of growth planned at settlements along the A420 corridor including within the VOWH district. This should include committed growth in the VOWH local plan 2031. The VOWH notes the objection by Oxfordshire County Council, with concerns raised regarding the consideration of the potential impacts to Oxfordshire. The VOWH continues to welcome opportunities to work collaboratively with Swindon Borough Council and Oxfordshire County Council on cross-boundary matters including planned growth along the A420 corridor.</p>
Internal Consultees		
Arboriculture	Original (16.02.2018)	<p>The removal of a number of existing hedgerows that currently form strong linear landscape features is a concern, as the hedgerow patterns are a key landscape features with high/moderate value that would benefit from enhancement. The accompanying Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan identify a number to be removed and clarification is required as to why, as very established landscape features, these are not subject to the Hedgerow Regulations</p> <p>Where hedgerows are retained, these should be better integrated into the open spaces, especially within narrow corridors that back onto development cells without movement networks. Narrow linear open spaces are not wide or robust enough to cope with the pressure of their new setting within residential developments, nor offer enough spatial amenity for both potential residents and</p>

		<p>wildlife.</p> <p>The application should demonstrate how the proposed removal of hedgerows is beneficial to the scheme and permissible under the Hedgerow Regulations. Where hedgerows are retained, the proposed development should positively address the space surrounding them, increasing the space either side, making their status as a public resource clear, including movement/connectivity infrastructure in the corridors created, and orientating the built form frontages toward them. The maintenance of these features in similar situations is frequently poor and is likely in time to succeed to poorly structured scrubland. The density of street trees should be increased and be located outside of hedge centres, as likely maintenance may lead to tree damage and /or prevent effective hedge maintenance.</p>
	Revised (26.04.2018)	<p>The submitted Hedgerow Assessment, indicates that all the hedgerows (apart from one very short hedgerow stub) are of importance under the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations and are very established landscape features.</p> <p>The Hedgerow Report now makes this importance explicitly clear, such that the removal of hedgerows is undertaken in the context of the Regulations to protect these important ecological and historical features.</p> <p>However, the proposed routine realignment and/or removal of hedgerows to facilitate a development, including those identified as important, is not supported, as successful developments integrate these important features within the layout and design. Where some hedgerow removal is necessary to not prejudice the best layout, appropriate mitigation is required, with appropriate, necessary and careful management. The Illustrative Masterplan does not demonstrate that important hedgerows are retained as important components of the scheme, nor demonstrate appropriate reinstatement/ mitigation measures, as replacing an existing important hedgerow with another hedgerow elsewhere is not a valid or acceptable replacement ratio for</p>

		<p>hedgerow of this significance.</p> <p>Other previous comments continue to apply.</p>
	Revised (25.04.2019)	<p>The level of tree planting on routes through the scheme is much improved, although to ensure it is achieved and is not schematic, the scale of the tree planting should be realistic, with details of the proposed tree sizes/species and specification. Concern remain that the Hedgerow Assessment has not demonstrated how proposed replacement/new hedgerow planting will adequately mitigate the removal of the overwhelmingly high quotient of important hedgerow. The replacement ratio is too low to mitigate the loss of important and long established hedgerows, including with respect to biodiversity gain, to demonstrate no residual impacts, given the urbanised change to their landscape setting. The revised master plan has integrated some of the hedgerows, but the poor integration of a number of key hedgerows remain a concern and earlier comments regarding the cumulative effects are re-iterated.</p> <p>The application does not demonstrate how the proposed drainage system will function without loss, fragmentation and disturbance of the existing features, resulting from the site's overdevelopment.</p> <p>The proposed removal of substantial quantities of hedgerow is not adequately mitigated, nor have acceptable levels of compensation been provided, due to the apparent overdevelopment of the site and poor integration with the site's existing drainage network.</p> <p>Previous comments, including retaining hedgerows as unconnected green walls within tight, narrow corridors of open space with little amenity/wildlife value still apply.</p>
	Revised (28.05.2020)	<p>Some elements of the scheme have been amended and a revised illustrative masterplan submitted, but the design does not address previous arboricultural concerns and previous comments (dated 18.12.2019) requiring specific resolution remain. For hedgerows the revised illustrative layout indicates that in</p>

		<p>some areas the retention of the hedgerows has been considered, alongside the land to which they juxtapose, resulting in a better appreciation of the need to sustainably integrate the hedgerows within the residential areas and, particularly, with the network of roads. The extent of cumulative hedgerow to be removed should be justified as there are frequent references to a net increase in hedgerows overall. A new north/ south hedgerow previously proposed to be planted along the length of the boundary between the two schools is omitted on the current layout, so it is unclear how the quantum of hedgerow is derived.</p> <p>The proposals for the road hierarchy and tree planting, described within the revised DAS, remain unchanged apart from a reduction in the width of the cycle/pedestrian route along one side of the avenues from 4m to 3.5m. This is disappointing, as further clarification, rather than amending the design may have addressed the arboricultural concerns, above, including that trees are proposed to be planted on only side of streets as described in the text, whilst planting on both sides is illustrated; trees are shown on roads within the master plan, but not within individual vignettes; and for lanes, trees are located in front gardens, whilst the text refers to trees for traffic calming. Other concerns relating to tree planting and proposed species have not been addressed.</p>
Archaeology	Original (Jan 2018)	<p>No objection subject to archaeological conditions to secure an agreed strategy for archaeological mitigation and secondly for the implementation of the agreed mitigation programme, to include the excavation of key areas of interest identified in the evaluation.</p> <p>The site is in an area of some archaeological potential and an archaeological evaluation by a desk assessment, geophysical survey and trial trenching has been undertaken, with the results reflected in Chapter 8 of the Environmental Statement (Cultural Heritage). The archaeological evaluation identified several areas of the site where there are features of archaeological significance that will require mitigation in the form of excavation prior to any ground works starting on site. A detailed mitigation strategy for the archaeological remains is not set out in the Environmental Statement.</p>

	Revised (15.04.2019)	Re-states original advice and recommendation requiring the implementation of an archaeological mitigation strategy to be secured by planning conditions.
	Revised (23.12.2019)	Re-states earlier advice and recommendation requiring the implementation of an archaeological mitigation strategy, to be secured by planning conditions.
	Revised (01.06 2020)	No additional comments and re-states that a programme of archaeological mitigation is required to be secured by planning conditions.
Conservation	Original (15.02.2018)	Object as the application underestimates the contribution of the setting of the grade II listed farmhouse and does not consider the contribution of existing buildings, or the surrounding land, comprising the open agrarian setting to this designated heritage asset and how that this is experienced, which is not limited to the north and east.
	Revised (13.06.2018)	The further assessment, to address comments by Historic England, that the development will result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed Farmhouse, is accepted. However, the suggested mitigation (i.e. not developing some of the land) does not preserve or maintain the setting of the listed farmhouse and the way it is appreciated; the Historic England advice is clear that this is not dependant on the land being publically accessible.
	Revised (01.05.2019)	Overall the proposed changes do not enable the application to be supported due to the harm to designated heritage assets, primarily the setting of Lotmead Farmhouse. The application's interpretation of setting provided is not accepted and as a result the proposed masterplan is based on an assessment that does not reflect understood national guidance. This was highlighted by Historic England (letter dated 29 th March, 2019). In addition other assets/features have are not considered and these have the ability to contribute to effective and appropriate and well-designed places. These issues and opportunities relate to re-working the masterplan to provide mutually beneficial outcomes.
	Revised (21.01.2020)	Overall the requirement to preserve the setting of the listed building in accord with the 1990 Act, has not been met. The revised documents and masterplan (revision E) the Environmental Statement (ES) addendum repeat the assessment previously made, but do not appropriately consider the setting of

		<p>Longleaze farmhouse in accordance with Historic England's Good Practice Advice (GPA) and previous heritage comments are still relevant.</p> <p>In terms of its overall approach to the contribution of the farmland setting to the significance the ES addendum lacks understanding of the concept of setting; whilst setting is often expressed by views, it is the 'experience' of the heritage asset which is not dependant on the ability to access the asset.</p> <p>The assessment does not consider the effect of other factors and features other than views from the north and east that may influence the appreciation of significance. Other features (non-designated heritage assets) that have associative value to the farmhouse may also aid the understanding and contribute to significance including its setting. However, the revised proposals conclude that the overall presence of the farmland does contribute to the significance of the listed building and that any development will erode or harm the setting of the farmhouse. It is recommended that there will be less than substantial harm, such that the harm is not so severe as to represent substantial harm, but the harm is greater than the level (slight) implied in the ES addendum assessment. The basis of the extent of the proposed off-set (40m) to development is unclear (e.g. scale, height massing, siting). Notwithstanding the assumed negative affect on the ridge and furrow feature, the proposed development of the adjacent playing field, is perhaps better than a built form, but has the ability to negatively affect setting. Currently the land makes a positive contribution to the setting of the listed farmhouse and the proposal to provide formal pitches is significantly different from the agrarian landscape. It is unclear as to whether the pitches will be lit, whether changing facilities are proposed, with lighting, car-parking, and access. These would have the ability to negatively affect setting but the assessment does not demonstrate these impacts or effects in accordance with the Historic England GPA.</p>
	Revised (19.05.2020)	The objection is maintained and previous comments referring to harm to the significance of the listed Longleaze farmhouse by virtue of development within

		<p>its setting will be caused by the proposal, are re-stated. The submitted assessment of setting and the conclusion that the harm will be 'slight' is not accepted and it is recommended that the level of harm is greater than that expressed in the ES addendum.</p> <p>Within the DAS addendum, the assessment of setting is limited to the immediate boundaries to the south and east and the design response relying on distance and views, rather than the experience of the asset or an assessment of associated assets as previously referred above is erroneous. The potential minimisation of harm is not appropriately considered nor responded to. The setting guidance provided by Historic England GPA3 is not fully appreciated or demonstrated within the assessment, the heritage analysis and overall design response.</p> <p>The proposed Framework parameter Plan (Rev H and previous) proposes built development sited very close (as cited in the DAS) on the eastern side that significantly impacts the acknowledged agrarian setting of Longleaze Farmhouse. As stated above in previous comments, whilst the siting of the sports pitches to the south (part) and west are, in comparison to new housing development, less harmful, the revisions do not include an appreciation of the development's response to the south (part) and east, both in terms of the siting of development or the overall design response, including height and scale with other factors such as topography. The building height plan indicates that the scale of buildings and the topography is that any built form will presumably appear greater. The siting of the large buildings and the arrangement of built forms located near to the farmhouse, will compound rather than minimise the negative effects of the development upon the setting of the listed building. As stated previously, the pitches and other factors have the ability to affect setting, including any proposed lighting, which has not been demonstrated.</p> <p>It is recommended that harm will occur to the significance of the farmhouse by development within the setting of the grade II listed building, that fails to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>preserve its special historic interest. The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act requires that 'special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'. In this context preserve means 'no harm'.</p> <p>The requirements of the 1990 Act are reflected in the NPPF, where 'great weight' should be afforded to the consideration of development upon heritage assets [paragraph 193]. This aids the requirement for sustainable development for the safeguarding of heritage assets (amongst other objectives). Where harm is identified, the NPPF requires that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification [paragraph 194].</p> <p>Following the "Barnwell Manor Wind Energy" judgement "considerable importance and weight" is required, as indicated in the NPPF where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use' [paragraph 196].</p> <p>Policy EN10 of the SBLP in accordance with the NPPF, states that Swindon's historic environment shall be sustained and enhanced. The policy further states that development in the vicinity of a listed building, shall not be permitted where there will be an adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic significance, including their setting.</p>
Ecology	Original (21.01.2018)	<p>The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal refers to further surveys being required before the application is determined, to assess whether there are any significant residual impacts to protected species and habitats and the application cannot be determined without these.</p>

		<p>The application does not accord with the adopted NEV Green infrastructure SPD as the area allocated to green infrastructure is significantly less than that proposed in the SPD; as a result, it is likely to be unviable to be managed agriculturally, in accord with a key element of the SPD.</p> <p>The application does not provide adequate information on the potential risks to the Crystal Moss Animal (<i>Lophopus crystallinus</i>) and its habitat. It does not propose suitable mitigating or compensatory measures for this protected species.</p>
	Revised (06.04.2018)	<p>It is not evident that the findings of ecological surveys and assessments undertaken are sufficient, or have informed the site layout, to accommodate protected species; significant additional information is required to show how protected species will be conserved within the site and net biodiversity gain achieved. The assessments focus on construction impacts rather than post-development impacts, which will be crucial to ensuring favourable population status in the long term for the protected species found on the site.</p> <p>The application should demonstrate how net biodiversity gain evidenced using SMART targets, will be achieved, to inform implementation through planning conditions as part of any planning approval. Overall, significant additional ecology information and ecological impact assessment is needed. The site layout does not accord with the adopted Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (2017) adversely affecting the green infrastructure.</p> <p>Further, detailed comments relate to the impacts on flora and fauna, including specific protected species (the white clawed crayfish, great crested newts, reptiles, bats, barn owls, dormice) and invasive species (Himalayan balsam). Key information is missing from the reports, including field survey results or evaluation of field surveys and information to accommodate sufficient terrestrial habitat for great crested newts. Details are required of agreement with Natural England for a mitigation licence and arrangements to provide terrestrial habitats</p>

		<p>for the newts. In view of the site's importance for bats, details are required of proposals to mitigate impacts and to demonstrate how net biodiversity gain will be achieved for bats.</p> <p>Robust proposals to show how dormice will be conserved within the site are required, including addressing how the proposed fragmentation of hedgerows used by dormice will not lead to their extinction. It is likely that a substantial area of linked new habitat for dormice will need to be provided within the site, to be accompanied by a long term monitoring programme, noting that the increased likelihood of predation (from domestic cats, and rats) is likely to adversely affect dormice.</p> <p>With respect to the river corridor survey and impacts on otters, water voles, white clawed crayfish and the crystal moss animal further work is required to assess the impact of development on these species. Details are required for the control of invasive species (Himalayan Balsam) on site.</p> <p>All hedgerows, apart from one, are classified as important as defined in the Hedgerow Regulations which indicates their high ecological (and historic value). Any hedgerows removed should be replaced on a ratio of 1:3 and Natural England's comments addressed.</p> <p>Surveys for reptiles were undertaken outside the optimum survey period during a short (autumn) period not through the whole summer survey season, so may have been undertaken too late in the year for the findings to be robust.</p> <p>Further work is required to assess impacts on badgers and their setts, as badgers could be left with insufficient feeding territories, even if their setts are located off-site.</p>
	Revised (18.04.2019)	<p>There is insufficient ecological information to assess the ecological impact of the proposals, with insufficient evidence to underpin the conclusions and recommendations including that biodiversity net gain will be achieved for the</p>

		<p>important ecological features identified.</p> <p>The potential recreational impacts of this development on North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation (SAC) have been screened out solely on the basis of distance, with no further explanation. This SAC of international importance, protected by European law is located about 14 minutes driving time away about 15km by road. The North Meadow part of the SAC is closest and is vulnerable to increased recreational pressure and the application should demonstrate with evidence that there will be not be an adverse effect on the SAC or other Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>The application proposes to reduce the proposed green infrastructure (GI) compared to that envisaged in the New Eastern Villages Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document. Local Plan policy EN4 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) requires that suitable alternative provision for recreational opportunities near the new homes, to offset increased recreational impacts on protected biodiversity sites. The application should demonstrate with evidence that the proposed green infrastructure can function as intended and that there will be no adverse effect on the SAC or SSSIs.</p> <p>Previous comments are re-iterated relating to the need to safeguard designated sites and ecological networks and providing sufficient green infrastructure to provide sufficient space for on-site ecological mitigation and compensation, or to achieve biodiversity net gain, as required by the NPPF. The biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement should properly assess the ecological impacts of this proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed Framework Landscape Ecological and Arboricultural Management Plan (FLEAMP) cannot be considered until the ecological impacts of the development proposals have been properly assessed, as the purpose of the FLEAMP is to set out the means by which ecological impacts will be mitigated.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>In addition, there are further detailed comments with respect to the proposed wet woodland, grazing of wet meadow, the river corridor, proposed tree planting to improve the landscape quality of the urban environment, and a greater sense of connection with the natural habitats adjacent and specific protected species.</p> <p>The FLEAMP should include a funding commitment for an appropriate period (25 years is recommended), for ongoing management and monitoring of the ecological features, timescales, an allowance for the review of the effectiveness of the proposed management and if necessary, a revision of the prescriptions.</p>
	Revised (12.06.2020)	<p>All previous comments (December 2019) remain outstanding and are not addressed, as the only change relating to ecology is text within the ES Addendum referring to potential impacts on the Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (as defined in the European Union's Habitat Directive). The proposals refer to proposed mitigation by way of new areas of Fritillary planting within the open spaces of the application site as a SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace). Presumably this is intended to attract visitors away from the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC.</p> <p>Advice from Natural England regarding Habitats Regulations Assessment of planning applications for the New Eastern Villages is evolving. The application site is located closer to North Meadows SAC than other sites within the NEV, so Great Stall East falls within the scope of recently clarified advice from Natural England regarding the potential for additional recreational pressures on the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC.</p> <p>The Council, as the competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) should carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the proposals to first determine whether they are likely to have a significant effect on the SAC either alone or in combination with other plans and projects and if so, to carry out an Appropriate Assessment</p>

		<p>to determine whether there will be an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC.</p> <p>It is recommended that the applicant should provide information of the predicted increases in recreational pressure that may result from the scheme, in the absence of impact avoidance and mitigation measures, to recreational use of North Meadow SAC, in combination with recreational pressure arising from other plans and projects. This will enable the Council to decide whether an Appropriate Assessment is required in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 63 (paras 1 and 2). This should be provided prior to determination of this application.</p> <p>If a likely significant effect on the SAC arising from the proposals either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, is likely then the Council should carry out an Appropriate Assessment to determine whether or not there will be an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC, taking into account at this stage the efficacy of any impact avoidance and mitigation measures that the applicant may propose. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide the Competent Authority with the information required to carrying out both the Screening and Appropriate Assessment stages of the HRA process.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed mitigation, although new areas of Fritillary planting proposed within the open spaces of the application site as SANG, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) judgement (for the 'People over Wind' case) and the inappropriateness of taking into account of mitigation measures at the screening stage of the HRA process should be considered. The efficacy of these proposed measures should be examined through an Appropriate Assessment. Subject to certain circumstances relating to imperative reasons of overriding public interest, a proposal can only be consented following an Appropriate Assessment, if it concludes that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of a European site.</p>
Education	Original (24.03.2018)	It is important that a sufficient choice of school places are available to meet the

		<p>needs of existing and new communities, in accordance with the NPPF. Local Plan policies CM1, NC3 and RA3 address the education provision required within the borough and specifically at the New Eastern Villages (NEV). Schools should be located within the heart of their communities and be designed to provide safe walking and cycling access. The policies require that provision is made for additional temporary primary and secondary school accommodation to manage the temporary demographic peak in pupils.</p> <p>The Swindon School Place Planning Study Update (November 2015), approved by Cabinet in September 2016 provides a methodology for the calculation of school places generated by new development. The study was updated in November 2015 and was subject to a statutory consultation. In October 2017 the Council adopted a revised pupil yield. This increased the ratio used to calculate primary pupils, decreased the ratio used to calculate secondary aged pupils and introduced a ratio to estimate early years pupils.</p> <p>A proposal of 1800 dwellings (note the original scale of development proposed) generates a requirement for 666 primary pupils, equivalent to a requirement for 3.17 Forms of Entry (FE). The application proposal generates a need for 252 secondary pupils. Therefore there is a requirement for proportionate provision equivalent to a 1.68 FE secondary school FE and for 414 early years' pupils.</p> <p>The provision of education facilities should comply with the requirement to be located within the heart of the community and co-located with other community facilities. The preferred solution would be for this development to serve its own primary education needs within the wider NEV. The requirement for this proposal is for a minimum 3FE primary school on a 2.9ha site and it should be located centrally within the site to ensure it is well located in relation to the community it will serve.</p> <p>For secondary and post 16 education in accordance with policy NC3 of the Local Plan, a minimum of an 8 form entry secondary school (ages 11-16) is required on a site of 9 ha site within the NEV to accommodate the campus. The</p>
--	--	---

		<p>size of the secondary school may increase in size to a 10 form entry secondary school depending on the final quantum of development at the NEV. Alternative provision for secondary school places, such as expanding existing secondary schools within Swindon would not provide a sustainable solution for the NEV and would lead to the construction of a large new community without a local secondary school.</p> <p>The adopted NEV Masterplan shows that the secondary school and post-16 education campus for the NEV are proposed to be located on the application site and all residential development within the NEV is required to make appropriate financial contributions to mitigate the impact of development through a Section 106 agreement. Proportionate financial contributions are required for the new secondary school, both for the land and for the building within the NEV and agreement to a payment structure.</p> <p>In the interim period prior to construction of the NEV secondary school, secondary pupils from the development could utilise Kingsdown School, if capacity is available, until the NEV secondary school is delivered. It is common for secondary aged pupils to travel further than primary school children to access school places. In accordance with the Local Plan, it is intended that post-16 education will be provided on the same site as the NEV secondary school.</p> <p>For Early Years provision, the application proposal generates the need for 414 early years' pupils. The entitlement for the provision of free early years places changed in 2017, doubling the current 15 hours to 30 hours for working families. As a result of this change, capacity within school nursery classes has been reduced and the Council's preferred 3FE primary school would provide sufficient space for all the early years provision, so it should be supplemented by additional capacity within a centrally located commercial floor space, for use by a private nursery provider.</p>
--	--	---

	Revised (28.11.2018)	<p>A 10 form entry secondary school, primary education provision and provision for early years is required in accordance with Local Plan policy NC3 (New Eastern Villages including Rowborough and South Marston Village Expansion) and the adopted New Eastern Villages Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (NEVPOSPD).</p> <p>The requirement to provide the maximum school site area, identified through the guidance is reasonable and necessary to ensure that the school has a site area available capable of expanding to respond to changes/increases in the school population. This is important, as it is common for the number of pupils to be higher than predicted/expected within a new development area, resulting in increased pressure on school places, due to phasing across a wider housing development. It must also be noted that the proposal for 1800 homes is expected to produce 36 primary aged pupils in excess of the capacity of the primary school, therefore, flexibility in site capacity is required to allow for the provision of temporary accommodation to meet pupil needs, if required. Swindon Borough Council has developed baseline specifications for new primary school provision and if the primary school is provided by the development, the school should be delivered in accordance with these standards. The Council's preference is for the school to be provided by the development, however, as an alternative, an obligation could also be agreed and discharged through a section 106 agreement, to deliver primary school provision through an agreed financial contribution.</p> <p>The inclusion of the proposed Artificial Grass Pitch within the primary school site is inappropriate as it results in a reduction in the overall school site area. The Council does not accept this approach as it is a significant departure from agreed school site areas, including national guidance and no financial information is provided to justify this approach, in addition to the construction costs of the school. This approach further reduces opportunities for flexibility on site, to meet changes in demand for school places as outlined above and the proposals to locate the sport provision from the development within the school site, is subject to an objection from Sports England.</p>
--	----------------------	--

		<p>The NEVPOSPD provides that Great Stall East shall provide a site (minimum 10 FE) for the secondary school and this is agreed within the revised description of development. As part of the section 106 agreement, proportionate financial contributions will be sought for secondary education and the Council will further be seeking a clause to transfer the total secondary school site (10.24 ha) at a trigger point to be agreed with the Council and the Council does not accept a proposed reduction of the overall site area.</p> <p>There are difficulties requiring community access to school sports pitches or other school facilities and an approach relying on the design and specification of the school to “sign-post” community use is not accepted. The proposed mechanism to secure community use through an Academy Funding agreement is not accepted as it does not provide certainty that requires and ensures that these facilities are fully available to the new community.</p> <p>The Council as the Local Education Authority will seek to co-operate with the Education and Skills Funding Agency as part of the process to seek an education provider for the school, but as the Secretary of State for Education, not the Council appoints the new school provider, the Council as Local Education Authority has no power to require that community co-operation and co-use is secured, or could be enforced in the future.</p> <p>Policy NC3 refers to the provision of sports and leisure facilities and the NEVPOSPD refers to the provision of a sports hub, not to community access arrangements. Therefore, an objection to the development proposal locating the required sports pitch needs of the new community within the secondary school site remains.</p>
	Revised (21.05.2020)	<p>No objection, provided that the full secondary school site is provided on land located outside of the flood risk area. The secondary and primary school sites to be transferred to the Council through the section 106 agreement. Any further or additional comments will be reported to the meeting.</p>

<p>Environmental Health (Contamination, Air Quality and Noise)</p>	<p>Original (02.02.2018)</p>	<p>With respect to air quality, as the New Eastern Villages (NEV) urban extension is a series of linked developments, that are anticipated to commence within a similar timeframe, assessments of air quality for any of the developments should consider each of the other schemes and whether it is necessary manage cumulative effects.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the air quality assessment modelled the road layouts indicated on the latest access plans or how the cumulative assessment considers impacts from the road. Further, the assessment does not apply the latest guidance (published by DEFRA) of the Emissions Factor Toolkit (EFT 8.0.1) that uses revised background data compared with data from 2015, updated fleet assessments and other “real world driving” changes. It is unclear whether the assessment has adjusted the selected average speed to allow for queuing due to existing and proposed signal controlled junctions/access points along the A420/419. The assessment largely relies on modelled data and the only reference to actual monitoring data appears to be the Council’s own passive diffusion tube information for 2016 and before. Since that time, Symmetry Park has been constructed including the new signal controlled junction. It is unclear whether this change was incorporated within the assessment, or how the real data was incorporated into the model; clarification is required. Real world data/measurements should be used in predicted worst-case locations, in this case close to A419 and proposals for baseline data collection. The air quality model appears to have included several assessment points located along the A420, but the diagrams are unclear if these relate to a proposed eastern access point for the development, as shown on the Illustrative Masterplan. The air quality assessment should be based on the access proposals that are shown on the Masterplan.</p> <p>The air quality assessment has not made any recommendations for environmental improvements to help reduce traffic emissions, so has not demonstrated that this is a key theme of sustainable development in accord with UK guidance and electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs) have not been</p>
--	------------------------------	---

		<p>included. A scheme to develop measures of this nature will be required.</p> <p>The comment that there are no predicted exceedances of the EU limit values anywhere in Swindon appears on the face of it to be untrue.</p>
	Revised (12.03.2018)	<p>With respect to air quality no further information has been provided and no further comments on response on aspects of air quality management in this development until these points are addressed.</p> <p>With respect to land contamination the testing results are consistent with undeveloped agricultural land making up the bulk of the development site. However an area to the north-east of the site, close to the A420 comprises the infilled canal channel, and it appears that this has not been investigated. However, the illustrative masterplan indicates that this is an area where both housing and landscaping are proposed. It is unclear whether the canal channel is completely infilled at this point, but this is an area where ground contamination is most likely to occur and affect the proposed development. This could be controlled by a planning condition, to require further site investigation and a remedial works.</p>
	Revised (14.06.2018)	<p>There is insufficient information on air quality to advance this planning decision.</p> <p>The further air quality modelling at the proposed junctions does not appear to have modelled the effects of emissions on the proposed development, suggesting that detailed consideration of the potential for exposure to unacceptable air quality at new homes in the vicinity of the access junctions would be carried out at the reserved matters stage. However it is necessary that this is modelling is carried out at the outline planning stage, as effects on new residential development is a material consideration for the planning decision process and assessment is required before the decision can be made.</p> <p>With respect to measures proposed to reduce traffic emissions, the revised information indicates that measures would be considered at the reserved</p>

		<p>matters stage. However, as these measures may be significant or may require revision to the arrangement of the development to accommodate features such as electric vehicle charging parks or to relocate vulnerable development the effects must therefore be considered at outline stage.</p>
	Revised (02.04.2019)	<p>Objection, due to the potential for significant impacts on the air quality of existing urban areas and the absence of mitigation proposals.</p> <p>In response to the revised air quality assessment whilst this report has addressed some previous objections, it has not addressed others. The revised report has applied the latest version of the DEFRA Emissions Factor Toolkit and the modelling takes account of particular junction locations on the master plan layout.</p> <p>There are concerns regarding the outcome of the air quality modelling. The operational impacts of increased traffic emissions arising from the additional traffic generated by the proposed development have been assessed, with concentrations predicted at 23 identified existing sensitive receptors and at other receptors covering the areas of the site adjacent to the A420. The assessment concludes that there is potential for the traffic generated by the proposed development to have a significant effects on local air quality and that it may be necessary to implement additional mitigation measures to ensure that the residual effects of the proposed development are not significant.</p> <p>The annual mean concentrations of nitrogen dioxide are predicted to exceed the national objective levels (in 2017) at three identified receptors in Covingham. The assessment identifies that concentrations at all other identified receptors are predicted to be below the annual mean objective. The modelling predicts that although there are existing (in 2017) impacts on the key areas by 2021 (the earliest date that the development will be occupied) only one location will exceed the objective levels. The development will worsen local nitrogen dioxide levels in the six identified areas, with impacts ranging from moderate</p>

		<p>adverse (13% worse), moderate adverse (15%), slight adverse (7%), moderate adverse (6%) and substantial adverse (5%).</p> <p>Due to the predicted effects on the locality, measures to mitigate these impacts are required, as the proposed masterplan appears to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the established development. However the assessment suggests that measures to mitigate these impacts would only be agreed at the reserved matters stage; this is too late if detailed changes are required to be made to mitigate the apparent significant impacts. The development should include measures to mitigate the development now as part of the proposals, to enable the predicted effects to be reassessed.</p>
	Revised (15.05.2019)	<p>In response to the revised Air Quality Assessment (J2835C/1/F1, 01 March 2019) an the proposals are not supported unless or until a workable scheme of mitigation is provided for the specific impacts that have been identified. The potential impacts to air quality during the construction phase are manageable and could be controlled by a robust planning condition relating to a Construction Environmental Management Plan, to be suitably implemented.</p> <p>With respect to air quality impacts during the operational phase, the assessment concludes that new receptors will not be affected by substantial air quality impacts from Nitrogen Dioxide, but all 23 identified existing receptor sites will be affected by a worsening of Nitrogen Dioxide levels when the scheme in place.</p> <p>Other impacts identified as non-negligible have been identified to five existing receptors and of these three are categorised as moderate adverse, with on that is substantial adverse. However, the air quality modelling predicts that most receptors will continue to enjoy relatively good air quality with the scheme in place however, despite the worsening.</p> <p>One receptor has been identified as breaching existing air quality limits and when the development is completed. Levels for nitrogen dioxide at one receptor</p>

		<p>have been are modelled as non-compliant with UK limit values in 2017 without the scheme, and whilst the proposed development does not cause the non-compliance, it does significantly worsen it.</p> <p>The assessment continues to suggest that potential air quality impacts from the scheme are significant, and that measures to mitigate these impacts will be required although potential mitigation measures are not discussed. The consultation response refers generally to potential measures that could be considered to mitigate the impacts and known identified constraints and limitations that may affect the possible measures.</p> <p>In terms of particulate matter, there are no objections with respect to operational impacts, as all impacts are modelled to be negligible.</p>
	Revised (13.12.2019)	No additional comments as no further air quality information has been submitted.
	Revised (18.06.2020)	<p>No objection, subject to a planning condition. The Air Quality information has been reviewed and whilst three receptors (E8, E9 and E12) remain at moderate adverse impacts from Nitrogen Dioxide, one receptor (E16) is at a substantial adverse impacts. The Council has carried out some air quality monitoring at receptor site E16 during August 2019 to December 2019 and found that the annual average levels were at 38.3µg/m³ (note that the 2020 Annual Status report has not yet confirmed by DEFRA). With an increase of 5% the predicted Impacts on Annual Mean Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations will result in the site reaching 40.2 µg/m³, this is above the annual objective and means that an Air Quality Management Area would have to be declared. The previous mitigation proposals would therefore not be disproportionate.</p> <p>The assessment has not considered the cumulative impacts on nearby third party developments that are reasonably likely to proceed both in the Borough of Swindon and within the Vale of White Horse District.</p> <p>Until the above impacts are considered, with an agreed scheme for mitigation of</p>

		the affected properties, the proposals are not supported. A planning condition is recommended to require further an assessment to inform proposals for mitigation of any impacts and future monitoring and reporting.
Forward Planning	Original (12.04.2018)	<p>The Local Plan establishes the general principle of development at this location. In relation to the quantum of residential development, consideration should be given to whether that quantum will result in a proposal not in accordance with the Local Plan, read as a whole and specifically with policy NC3. If, in consultation with relevant colleagues, the conclusion is that it does, there is harm to the development strategy when weighed against the benefits of the additional housing, and therefore a policy objection would be forthcoming. A policy objection is raised in relation to specific policy requirements, due to a lack of detail within the submitted application. Local Plan policy SD1 sets out a number of overarching sustainable development principles. Local Plan policy SD2 defines the development strategy and urban concentration supports the government's key objectives for sustainable development in the most accessible locations. Both policies focus development opportunities within the Swindon urban area, with SD2 focussing opportunities at allocated strategic sites including the New Eastern Villages (NEV) and this proposal accords with this approach. Policy SD3 reflecting the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development refers to a positive approach to considering development proposals. This means the local planning authority will work jointly with applicants to find solutions; therefore proposals will be approved wherever possible, to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental condition, and promotes health and well-being, for those people living and working in Swindon Borough.</p> <p>The potential number of dwellings at the NEV south of the A420 is some 20% above the policy requirement. The quantum of housing proposed at Rowborough (as part of S/OUT/13/1555) is 25% more than set out in policy. Other consented development within the NEV includes 70 dwellings on the former South Marston Hotel site. In total therefore for the whole of the New</p>

		<p>Eastern Villages (including Rowborough and South Marston expansion) is about 20% above the policy requirement. This is twice the conventional adjustment of $\pm 10\%$ when applying the 'about' element and whether the additional residential quantum significantly harms the development strategy for the Borough. The allocation of the NEV was largely informed by work for the then Regional Strategy for the South-West, specifically the Swindon Joint Study published in 2005. This assessed a number of alternative strategies and concluded that land to the east of the A419 was the most sustainable location for strategic growth at Swindon for development up to 12,000 dwellings. In this respect it could be viewed that additional housing would be in general accord with the strategic direction of growth at Swindon. The development strategy articulated through the Local Plan is to be read as a whole and is more than simply the location of development.</p> <p>The quantum of development east of the A419 allocated for development was tested through the Local Plan process, and subsequently through the public examination. Evidence demonstrated that about 8,000 dwellings was the sustainable quantum of development at this location (<i>The East of Swindon Evidence Base update 2011, and addendum 2012</i>). In particular, in order to create sustainable communities a design led approach should be taken.</p> <p>To meet the competing demands to minimise the loss of greenfield land, to provide the critical mass for key infrastructure, to meeting the long-term needs for housing in Swindon and to ensuring a sense of place and sustainable communities, a housing quantum of about 8,000 dwellings was appropriate. This judgement and conclusion was largely unchallenged by developers with interests in the land located to the east of the A419 at the Local Plan Examination.</p> <p>Policy NC3 sets out the subsequent design principles for the New Eastern Villages and in this respect define the development strategy in the context of the quantum of development set out in policies SD2 and NC3. Therefore, if the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>increased dwellings in this location compromise compliance with policy NC3 as a whole, both specifically at Great Stall East and across the wider NEV, then there is harm to the development strategy.</p> <p>Further comments relate to housing density, the five year housing land supply, to affordable housing, to wheelchair accessible housing, to the provision of a local centre, to points of access to the development, to green infrastructure and in accordance with the NPPF other key considerations, to design and waste facilities.</p>
	Revised (n/a)	No further comments received.
Highways	Original (13.02.2019)	<p>Object; the submitted Transport Statement is significantly insufficient in a number of areas. Given the proposed the scale of development, of 1800 dwellings plus a secondary school and associated local centre, the likely transport impacts are expected to be significant. The submission is contrary to Local Plan policy TR2. Further necessary information to meet appropriate standards for a Transport Assessment is required, to address the following.</p> <p>Details of baseline conditions, including surveyed junctions against which the development impacts may be assessed, including the highway infrastructure operation for all modes of transport.</p> <p>The transport submission should account for accessibility to sustainable modes of transport and the capacity of the road network. Without this assessment the proposals do not comply with Local Plan policies TR1, IN1 or NC3.</p> <p>The proposed new western access to the A420 is contrary to the adopted NEV Planning Obligations SPD and its incorporated Masterplan. Notwithstanding the proposed operational capability of this junction will be assessed including whether there are detrimental impacts to the A420 that cannot be further mitigated.</p>

		<p>The proposals do not demonstrate how compliance with the Council's adopted standards for car and cycle parking will be delivered nor illustrate a strategy for delivering acceptable and sufficient parking provisions.</p> <p>Details are not provided to address traffic generation, supporting calculations or scenario testing, as these are omitted from the Transport Statement.</p> <p>The assumptions on which the proposed assignment of external and internal trips is not provided and the transport submission focusses solely on the traffic impacts of the development, but does not acknowledge the development's incorporation into the wider NEV and the sustainable mode trips to the site. This includes the number of secondary school children likely to be drawn from development located north of the A420 (South Marston and Rowborough) and how the relevant distributed proportion could be accommodated by the eastern access within the traffic signal sequencing.</p> <p>The proposed western access represents a potential departure from adopted policy, that is only required should access through the Symmetry Park not be available. However, these roads are nearing completion and discounting this scenario is not considered appropriate, as access through this land is policy compliant. Access through this land and should be re-considered with appropriate triggers to either connect through this land or provide an alternative access arrangement; this should form part of a revised phasing strategy to consider the access arrangements.</p> <p>The transport modelling results do not demonstrate whether any particular scenario tested exhibits material congestion on the local road network; therefore it is not possible to assess whether any further additional traffic would be detriment. A more robust and policy compliant Transport Assessment is required to be submitted.</p>
	Revised (16.05.2019)	<p>The Local Highway Authority do not recommend that planning permission is granted, until the following concerns and issues are addressed. The highways technical submission does not meet the Council's policy requirements for a</p>

		<p>major development located on a key highway corridor as a major gateway to Swindon. The proposed access strategy to the site cannot be delivered within land within the control of the applicant and the necessary connectivity and accessibility to sustainable transport measures is not evidenced, with possible conflicts arising to adjacent parcels of land. Other main points relate to:</p> <p>The masterplan and the layout and orientation of land uses has not maximised the east - west core express bus route, as whilst the route bisects the site, there is no access to the school campus and local centre, the hub of activity for the site.</p> <p>The Masterplan has not made provision for a Park and Ride site, which is a key policy requirement for the operational sustainability of the development site. This is required to achieve modal shift of existing journeys along the A420 to bus transit, to reduce traffic flows through the Gablecross and White Hart junctions on to the town centre; to accommodate frequent routes between Swindon and Oxford and to create bus visibility through the NEV.</p> <p>The proposed cycle and pedestrian routes are not acceptable, for example the proposed secondary school has a single 3m shared footway cycleway on one side of the serving carriageway and a 2m footway on the opposing side.</p> <p>A multi-modal movement framework is required to assess available routes to plan the capacity of necessary transport infrastructure. The submitted Transport Statement does not adequately assess multi-modal connectivity or impacts and does not include the evidence underlying the assumptions that made, including transport model outputs or inputs.</p> <p>Details are required of the proposed access arrangements, including capacities and sufficient Road Safety Audits.</p> <p>The Travel Plan has not considered accessibility beyond the site's boundary, for example does not suggest the means of access to external public rights of way. The proposed western access, is contrary to the Local Plan and would also impact the A420 corridor due to the close proximity with the Old Vicarage Lane Junction. This is likely to attract southbound movements from the Rowborough village development, increasing right turning movements from Old Vicarage Lane in the AM peak and conversely the right turns at the Western Access in</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the PM peak. These additional right turn movements will add further delays to each junction, extending cycle times and creating corridor congestion. Insufficient protection of the bus only section of the core express bus link will result in a fast and direct duplication of the A420. This will add a significant quantum of traffic to this route, reducing its effectiveness as a public transport priority corridor and thus reducing the accessibility of the whole of the NEV to public transport.</p> <p>The proposed location of the schools and local centre departs from the indicative core express bus route illustrated on the adopted NEV masterplan (Planning Obligations SPD), resulting in a requirement for buses to leave this route to access the schools and local centre. A layout providing direct access from a bus only section of the Core Express Bus Route, would enable a more sympathetic urban design, as general traffic between these destinations is a further barrier to accessibility.</p> <p>Equivalent drop-off facilities are required for the primary school as for the secondary school, as primary age children are less independent relying on shared journeys made by parents to work, who will also wait for longer periods before and after the school day.</p> <p>As the design of the internal road network is dominated by long stretches of straight carriageway the design will not sufficiently reduce general traffic speed. Long straight stretches on other roads, could enable drivers to potentially bypass congested lengths of the A420, leading to large quantities of traffic entering the site diminishing the sustainability of the new community.</p> <p>There are concerns that some parcels of land have insufficient access for emergency vehicles as no more than 100 dwellings should be accessed from a single point of access from the internal primary road network, with no more than 300 dwellings served by a single all-vehicle access</p> <p>The proposed link and route to the south to the Lotmead site does not appear to correspond with the design proposed for that village; the masterplan should accommodate connectivity and multi-modal accessibility between the two development sites.</p> <p>Operational vehicle parking is required at each of the proposed allotment sites</p>
--	--	--

		<p>in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.</p> <p>The proposed footways/cycle ways indicated on the illustrative masterplan do not comply with the proposals for connectivity secured through the adopted Island Bridge Vision SPD. The proposals give limited consideration to connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists beyond the site boundary.</p> <p>Further detailed comments include in relation to other matters including the evidence base used to support the transport modelling and the proposed Travel Plan.</p>
	Revised (05.04.2019)	<p>The revised transport information lacks detail and with respect to the proposed western access, insufficient justification is provided, as incorrect modelling flows have been used. The submitted accident data is out of date and there is a need to assess accident data including for the strategic road network.</p> <p>The proposed design for the eastern access without an allocated merge, is not considered safe and requires a road safety audit. Details of the proposed crossings for pedestrians and are absent at the access to the Park and Ride. The detailed design of the western access is not provided as a full scale plan.</p> <p>Other points of concern include considering the justification for the reduced scale Park and Ride and turning movements close to the eastern access. The travel plan is not entirely compliant with the Council's adopted SPD.</p> <p>A movement strategy to assess pedestrian and cyclist movement within the development site and to surrounding destinations is required and is a key requirement within the site on the approach to the secondary school.</p>
	Revised (02.05.2019)	<p>In response to the submission of further transport evidence it is considered that although the proposal states that the western access is necessary to provide an alternative route to avoid congestion on internal roads and to avoid the eastern access exceeding capacity, the point at which the eastern access exceeds capacity has not been tested.</p>

		<p>Further clarification is required of the proposed park and ride, in terms of initial provision and phasing. More up-to-date data, including accident data is required and should be analysed. Further information is provided of the proposed car parking strategy and this can be controlled by planning conditions. Further information and evidence is required the modelling of traffic generation, including for all capacity assessments. It is agreed that the application does not need to consider the capacity of road junctions that are being improved by the Council, such as Gablecross and White Hart junction, but the scale of development proposed, much larger than anticipated at the Local Plan Examination in Public is a concern. However, the impact off the increased scale as an increase in NEV traffic approaching Gablecross on the A420 mainline carriageway may be mitigated through a reduction in traffic approaching Gablecross from the south from Great Stall West.</p> <p>The assertion that the proposed eastern access could accommodate 2,300 dwellings should be evidenced. The proposed junction design including the proposed signal staging and the approach from the A420 eastbound would be likely to be abused by drivers entering the right turn lane to overtake queues. As the entry stop line is 7.5m wide but the exit width is narrower at 7.25m, this would be likely to result in side swipe accidents. The design of the westbound approach also narrows from 6.35m to 6m, with both lanes being dedicated straight on and this is more likely to generate “side-swipe” accidents through design. The design may result in articulated trucks using the right had right turn ending in the nearside A420 lane, resulting in accidents. The design does not make appropriate provision for pedestrians to cross this junction. The design of the access to the Park and Ride is too narrow to accommodate bus access and to enable efficient east-west bus movement, bus stops may be required close to the access of the Park and Ride to ensure that high frequency strategic bus routes such as the S6 do not need to enter the Park and Ridge site to collect passengers.</p> <p>If a proposed western access is proposed, either on a temporary or permanent</p>
--	--	---

		basis, a full assessment is required including vehicle tracking, road safety audits and assessment.
	Revised (28.04.2020)	<p>The Local Highway Authority recommends no objection to the development subject to the completion of 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 various transport and highway conditions.</p> <p>The proposals have been subject to lengthy discussions with the local Highway Authority regarding access by all modes and the impact on the local road network. The further traffic modelling undertaken to support the scheme was undertaken on the basis of 1700 dwellings previously proposed. It demonstrated that traffic associated with that level of development would not have an unacceptable impacts. The current proposal for a reduced number of dwellings (1,550) would have a lesser impact during the network morning and evening peak hours than that already modelled. It is considered that overall, the proposals are acceptable to the local highway authority.</p> <p>The additional transport submissions include various access and tracking drawings, a revised Transport Assessment, a Travel Plan and a Technical Note to address previous objections raised by the local highway authority, supported by additional drawings and other technical evidence/correspondence.</p> <p>Further discussions have taken place between the applicant and Highways England, as a separate statutory consultee in relation to the strategic road network.</p> <p>The previous access proposals included two primary access points to the A420, but the revised proposals but the most recently submitted traffic modelling relates to only a single eastern access only to the A420, as links from the development area will be provided to the west via Symmetry Park and to the south, by Lotmead. The revised arrangements for access to the A420 and</p>

		<p>neighbouring development areas accepted by the local highway authority.</p> <p>Footways are absent from the A420 apart from a section serving part of the site frontage. Previously the Local Highway Authority requested a plan to show the intended location, route and indicative construction of the proposed footways. As this was not provided it will need to be considered further at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The proposed 450 space Park and Ride facility is accepted.</p> <p>With respect to trip rates, the Local Highway Authority previously raised concerns that the trip generation utilised for Great Stall East may be too low for the scale of development. The submitted Technical Note has confirmed that the residential trip rates are derived from the Council's (CH2M consultants) NEV Masterplan report, which included the trip destinations, including leisure and personal business, employment, the primary school and secondary school and retail. The Technical Note indicates that there would local be trip capture and that trip rates would not be inherently higher without the remainder of the NEV. Overall, the Local Highway Authority recommends that the trip rates used within the traffic modelling are acceptable given the location and facilities proposed as part of the development.</p> <p>The submitted traffic modelling was undertaken for 1700 dwellings, as originally proposed and demonstrated that the proposed access arrangements onto the local road network (A420) are sufficient to accommodate the entirety of the Great Stall East plus wider New Eastern Villages traffic. This continues to be the case with reduced level of development (1550 dwellings) now proposed.</p> <p>Personal Injury Accident data for the most recent 5 year period (60 months) has been provided for both the Council and for Oxfordshire County Council. It is accepted that the analysis has demonstrated that there is no evidence to</p>
--	--	--

		<p>suggest there are any inherent safety issues with the local highway network.</p> <p>The proposals have been subject to lengthy discussions with the local Highway Authority concerning access by all modes and the impact on the local road network. The traffic modelling undertaken to support the scheme has been undertaken on the basis of 1700 dwellings being provided. This demonstrated that traffic associated with that level of development would not have an unacceptable impact. The current proposal is for a reduced number of dwellings (1550) which would have a lesser impact during the network morning and evening peak hours than that already modelled. It is considered that overall, the proposals are acceptable to the local Highway.</p>
Housing	Original (05.01.2018)	<p>With regards to the affordable housing (AH) element, the submitted application documents refer to policy HA2 of the Local Plan and to the intention to provide AH on site. However, there is concern that within the proposed planning obligation Heads of Terms document there is mention of AH viability although this will be fully discussed in due course. As the application does not specify details of the AH, to be clear at this early stage the following would be expected for the AH element.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% of units to be AH. So based on 1,800 units being proposed, I would expect to see 540 AH units on this development. • The mix of AH units is to be in a 70/30 split between Rented (Social or Affordable Rented) and Intermediate (including Low Cost Home Ownership initiatives). So based on 540 AH units, I'd be happy with 378 Rented and 162 Intermediate units. • Based on present need to assist progressing the detail, the AH unit mix should be based on the following (this may need to be reviewed to reflect up-to-date need): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 15% x 1-bed 2 person flats or houses ii) 50% x 2-bed 4 person houses iii) 30% x 3-bed 5 person houses, possibly including a few ground floor

		<p>3-bed flats as we have Rented demand for level access 3-beds iv) 5% x 4-bed 7 person houses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AH units should be arranged in clusters of 10-15 units to be fully integrated with the open market housing. The AH clusters to be completely detached from one another, as separation by roads is not acceptable. The AH tenures within each cluster are to be mixed. • The AH units should be designed to be tenure blind so as not to be visually distinguishable from open market units, in terms of build quality, materials, details, levels of amenity space and privacy. • The car parking provision for the AH units should be at least equal to that provided for the open market housing, including parking arrangements, such as driveways and curtilage parking; courtyard parking is not favourable and should be avoided. • The AH should be semi-detached homes with rear access to gardens and on-plot parking, but if terraced properties are to be provided then careful design input will be required 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 AH units are to be delivered through a maximum of three of SBC's approved Affordable Housing Partners, so early discussions and input from these partners is advisable. • If a management company is to be employed to maintain green spaces (incurring an annual fee) then this fee will need to be capped at an agreed appropriate level.
	Revised (26.03.2018)	No additional comments as no further information has been submitted about affordable housing.
	Revised (19.03.2019)	It is noted that number of units proposed has been reduced from 1800 to 1700. The application does not yet specify the detail of the AH, so to be clear at this stage the following 'in principle' general advice, is provided regarding the requirement for AH.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% of units to be AH. So based on 1,700 units proposed, 510 AH units is required for this development. • The mix of AH units is to be in a 70/30 split between rented (social or affordable rented) and Intermediate (including Low Cost Home Ownership initiatives). So based on 510 AH units in total, results in 357 rented and 153 intermediate AH units. • Given the projected delivery over 18 years, in terms of housing mix based on present needs, the AH unit mix should be based on the following (this may need to be reviewed to reflect up-to-date need) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 15% x 1-bed 2 person flats or houses ii) 50% x 2-bed 4 person houses iii) 30% x 3-bed 5 person houses, possibly including some ground floor 3-bed flats, as we have rented demand for level access 3-beds iv) 5% x 4-bed 7 person houses • The AH units to be arranged in clusters of 10-15 units to be fully integrated with the open market housing. The clusters to be completely detached from one another as separation by roads is not acceptable. The tenures within each cluster are to be mixed. • The AH units are to be designed to be tenure blind to be visually indistinguishable from the open market units on site in terms of build quality, materials, details, levels of amenity space and privacy. • Car parking provision for the AH units should be at least equal to that provided for the OM housing, including parking arrangements, such as driveways and curtilage parking, as courtyard parking is not favourable and should be avoided.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AH should be semi-detached houses with rear access to gardens and on-plot parking, but if terraced properties are proposed careful design input is required to avoid long alleyways to access rear gardens and to design out the potential for 'bin blight' at the front of the properties. • The AH units should be delivered through a maximum of three of SBC's approved Affordable Housing Partners, so early discussions and input is advisable. • If a management company is proposed to maintain green spaces (incurring an annual fee) then this fee should be capped at an agreed appropriate level.
	Revised (12.11.2019)	It is noted the number of units of housing proposed has decreased from 1,700 to 1,550. As the application does not specify details of the AH, to be clear based on 1,550 units proposed, there is a requirement for 465 AH units. Other comments above, remain and are re-stated.
	Revised (n/a)	To respond to the proposed draft Heads of Terms, including the proposed affordable housing provision, further comments will be reported to the meeting,.
Landscape	Original (16.02.2018)	<p>Object, as the proposed development as illustrated on the masterplan bears insufficient resemblance to the adopted illustrative NEV GI Masterplan as (<i>NEVGIMP</i>) as the development of areas identified as Green Infrastructure (GI) have been substantially encroached, with little alternative provision in return. Tree planting and GI provision is confined to the southern/western river corridor edge of the application boundary, resulting in 'buffer' areas that will be difficult to maintain and of limited amenity and wildlife value, especially given the increased pressure from the proposed development.</p> <p>The development of the western edge of the site, in the location indicated on the NEVGIMP for a sports hub, and at the eastern edge, has a loss of a key substantial woodland block, of some 50% of the GI measured against the</p>

		<p>NEVGIMP.</p> <p>There are concerns resulting from the location of some GI within areas liable to flood, including about one third of the proposed allotments are within the flood zone, as is the majority of the general recreation open space provision. The proposed double counting of all-weather pitches is not accepted and the use of minimum standards for other elements, including formal children and teen play are not suitable benchmarks for a development described as landscape-led. On-site GI should be provided proportionate to the scale of the new village'. The country park is unacceptable in its current configuration, as inadequate detail is been provided as to how the River Cole corridor is to be integrated within the scheme, as insufficient space is allocated to the park, especially along its narrow central southern section. The inclusion of allotments in the park removes valuable public amenity land and no visitor centre or destination play area provided, critically important for the country park.</p> <p>The rationale resulting in relocating of the school/sports hub from their indicative location set out in the NEVGIMP is not provided. This has an impact on available public open space within the application area. Playing fields are an open space typology, but if their use is restricted to sports use, this should not be at the expense of general amenity space.</p> <p>The location of sustainable urban drainage features within the public open space is not acceptable, especially given the impermeability of the soils effectively removing functional open space. The footprint of the sustainable urban drainage features should be removed from the open space proposed. The proposals should increase the density of street trees proposed and locate trees outside of hedge centres as this may lead to tree damage and prevent effective hedge maintenance in this configuration.</p> <p>The application should demonstrate how the proposed removal of hedgerows benefits to the scheme and is permissible under the Hedgerow Regulations. Where hedgerows are retained, the proposed development should positively address the space surrounding them, increasing the space either side, making their status as a public resource clear, including movement/connectivity</p>
--	--	--

		<p>infrastructure in the corridors created, and orientating the built form frontages toward them.</p> <p>The layout appears to include a number of retained hedgerows as unconnected green walls within tight, narrow corridors of open space with little amenity/wildlife value. Historic maintenance of similar features in similar situations is frequently poor and is likely in time to succeed to poorly structured scrub. The Leisure provision is inadequate and the double counting of sports facilities is unacceptable, as is the location of natural turf pitches within the floodplain.</p> <p>With respect to the North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), more information is required to demonstrate that, proposed outward public views to the could offer a valuable sense of place and how the proposals accommodate and promote outward views to the AONB.</p> <p>The lack of woodland planting reflecting the scale of the development is unacceptable. On-site woodland planting could be augmented by off-site mitigation if necessary, but the woodland proposed is inadequate in size and scale against the substantial development proposed.</p> <p>The impact of the proposals on the existing residential dwellings will be significant and effective mitigation has not been proposed. The offset distance to residential properties should be substantially increased, with this separation to incorporate a planted bund, with a minimum width of 15m across the entire northern site boundary.</p> <p>Additional sections to demonstrate how this proposed planted bund will develop and look over 0-15 years would be welcome to demonstrate how short/medium term mitigation would be best achieved.</p>
	Revised (02.05.2018)	<p>In response to additional information submitted relating to the Hedgerow Assessment that the existing hedgerows are very established landscape features; the removal of hedgerows should be undertaken in the context of the Regulations to protect these important ecological and historical features.</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan does not demonstrate that all important hedgerows can be retained as important components of the scheme, nor that appropriate reinstatement/mitigation measures are proposed.</p>

		<p>Further the proposal should positively address the space surrounding retained hedgerows, increasing the space either side, to make their status as a public resource clear, including movement/connectivity infrastructure in the corridors created, and orientating the built form frontages toward them.</p> <p>The proposed layout includes a number of retained hedgerows as unconnected green walls within tight, narrow corridors of open space with little amenity/wildlife value. Historic maintenance of these features in similar situations is frequently poor and is likely in time to become poorly structured scrubland. Other Landscape comments made previously (above) are maintained.</p>
	Revised (25.04.2019)	<p>The revised proposals are not acceptable in their current format and the amended information has not substantially changed, due to departures from the NEV GI Masterplan (<i>NEVGIMP</i>). The revised illustrative masterplan bears insufficient resemblance to the Illustrative NEV GI Masterplan (<i>NEVGIMP</i>) and the proposed areas of built development increased, with a consequent decrease in land proposed for green infrastructure. For example, the proposed River Cole Corridor appears constricted along its length by development, is not a landscape-led component of the development, with areas of open spaces on a similar scale to the built form. The proposed width of the corridor containing a footpath/cycle way is likely to result in an area where agricultural management is unmanageable in practice along such a confined and well-used public corridor.</p> <p>The proposed areas of open space, includes land identified as general recreation land, including for local open space or major open space, irrespective of whether it is appropriately accessible and useable or not. This is not acceptable as to accord with Local Plan policy EN3 the application should identify the proposed various open space typologies and identify where various types of open space is located. For example, siting a play area within the community sports hub away from housing without natural surveillance is unacceptable. The proposals should demonstrate that the play facilities are accessible to residents illustrated on a drawing to demonstrates walking distances, in accord with adopted local plan policy EN3 and the adopted Open Space Standards. (SBLP Appendix 3).</p>

		<p>The proposed land budget for open space is improved, particularly the removal of allotments from flood zones, but overall a number of concerns remain relating to the location of the great majority of the general recreation open space within the flood zone (12.7ha of 17.4ha total). In accordance with previous comments, provision is required for areas for informal children's play. There are also discrepancies in terms of provision of outdoor sports (pitches). The double counting of all-weather pitches is unacceptable as it is impossible for teams to play simultaneously on the same pitch and the proposed outdoor sports provision is unacceptable. The proposed country park is unacceptable in its current configuration, as inadequate detail has been provided to show how the River Cole corridor is to be integrated, with insufficient space allocated to the park, especially along its narrow central southern section. Previous advice regarding the proposed co-use of school playing fields remain conclusions remain unchanged, as do restricting the use some recreation space for sports use, at the expense of general land for general recreational/amenity use.</p> <p>The level of tree planting on routes through the scheme is much improved and the quotient is more appropriate, the scale of the tree planting should be realistic, to ensure what is proposed is achievable, and not schematic. A tree sizes/species specification to detail the proposed planting is required.</p> <p>Revisions made to ensure that proposed and retained hedgerows have some adjacent green space on at least one side, overall the quantity is inadequate, with some hedgerows surrounded on each side by development. Previous comments regarding retained hedgerows as unconnected green walls within tight, narrow corridors of open space with little amenity/wildlife value are re-stated.</p> <p>More supporting information is required to demonstrate that, following proposing to utilise outward public views to the AONB to offer a valuable sense of place, the proposals should demonstrate in practice how the proposals accommodate and promote outward views to it. The lack of woodland planting</p>
--	--	---

		to reflect the scale of the development is unacceptable and although this could be augmented with offsite mitigation if necessary, the woodland proposed are inadequate in terms of their size and scale. Other comments relating to the impacts on existing dwellings, the visual domination and limited mitigation of proposed boundary planting are re-stated.
	Revised (18.12.2019)	<p>Earlier comments and concerns relating to the departure of the proposals from the NEVGIMP remain. In relation to open space provision, concerns remain regarding locating the great majority of the proposed general recreation provision within the flood zone (12.37ha of 16.83ha total, representing a reduction of .57ha from the previous proposed total of 17.4ha general recreation space. The proposals for 16.83ha fall short of the provision for green infrastructure set out in the NEV SPD. The proposed provision for equipped areas of play is unclear as double counting space within a Neighbourhood Area of Equipped Play (NEAP) is not accepted. Provision should be made for a NEAP within the western part of the site.</p> <p>Previous comments relating to the country park, to the school sports/sports hub provision, to the location of drainage features within open space, to street tree planting proposals, hedgerow retention, the design relationship with the AONB and proposed landscape mitigation are repeated.</p>
	Revised (20.05.2020)	<p>Earlier advice provided in January 2020 to relocate higher density residential areas to the west of the site, to benefit from co-location with the adjacent Symmetry Park development have not been brought forward. The central boulevard is inadequately integrated with surrounding development/ infrastructure. Whilst the presentation of the illustrative master plan is improved, the content remain broadly the same. Previous conclusions and advice relating to compatibility with the adopted NEV GI Masterplan are unchanged, as the site remain overdeveloped and the consequential impact on GI provision from that set out in the GI SPD is not acceptable. Whilst the ES 'Landscape Chapter Addendum' is useful, it would be more beneficial if it was reinforced by an overview drawing to demonstrate the changes between this and the previous iteration to interpret the changes made to the Masterplan.</p>

		<p>The overall open space provision is unchanged from the previous iteration, which remains a concern, although provision for equipped play is addressed by altering the location of the western LEAP. Whilst the minimum local plan spatial standards are met, the proposals for open space and green infrastructure in the NEV GI SPD are not addressed.</p> <p>Previous concerns relating to the river meadows country park are re-iterated, as are other points including the spatial arrangement of pitches in the sports hub, the co-location of drainage features within open space affecting its function and usability, the provision for street tree planting, the retention of existing landscape features, the development's orientation and relationship to the AONB, landscape mitigation and residual landscape impacts on neighbouring dwellings.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority	Original (04.01.2018)	<p>Object and recommend refusal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Surface Water Management Strategy does not accord with the Council's adopted Sustainable Urban Drainage Vision (SuDS) SPD and the National Planning Practice Guidance as the proposed strategy does not give priority to adequate SuDS. ii) The application does not demonstrate that the development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and therefore is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy EN6 of the adopted Swindon Local Plan 2026.
	Revised (16.02.2018)	<p>In response to further details regarding the proposed means of access to the site from the A420, the section of this road adjacent to the site is known to flood in significant rainfall events. A drainage scheme is required for the proposed eastern and western accesses and this will require a new robust drainage system to serve these parts of the A420.</p> <p>As was the case for the new Symmetry Park access to the A420, the</p>

		<p>attenuation system will be required within the development boundary, as an above ground, relatively shallow feature, to discharge at existing greenfield run-off rates to an existing watercourse. It is required to deal with all rainfall events, up to and including the 1 in 100 year event, plus 40% allowance for climate change and designed in accordance with the adopted NEV SuDS Vision. It must demonstrated that adequate space is provided within the development for the required drainage features.</p> <p>As there are open sections of the former canal alongside the A420 which may have a drainage purpose and are located in close proximity to the proposed western and eastern accesses, the proposals must demonstrate that the new accesses and associated works will not affect the existing canal sections, or it must be demonstrated that these sections no longer serve any drainage purpose or have any significant ecological value.</p>
	Revised (22.01.2019)	<p>In response to revised details. Including a drainage technical note the LLFA recommend refusal as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Surface Water Management Strategy is not in-line with the Adopted SuDS Vision SPD and also the National Planning Practice Guidance as the proposed strategy does not give priority to adequate SuDS. ii) The application has not demonstrated that the development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and therefore is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy EN6 of the adopted Swindon Local Plan 2026.
	Revised (09.08.2019)	<p>In response to revised details the LLFA raise and objection and advise that further information is required, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It has not been demonstrated that the development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and therefore is contrary to Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy

		<p>EN6 of the adopted Swindon Local Plan 2026.</p> <p>The revised information submitted has addressed the majority of the previous concerns raised, although further details are required of proposed site accesses. There are concerns regarding the drainage around Longleaze Farmhouse, as there is further drainage connectivity around this area that has not been shown and this needs to be fully understood. Overall the proposed site drainage elements could be controlled by planning condition and through reserved matters approval, although confirmation is required of the approved fluvial 1 in 100 plus climate change modelled outline, before the objection can be removed.</p>
	Revised (19.09.2019)	<p>The further revised information relates to fluvial flooding, not surface water drainage; therefore the above comments remain, although there is a need to confirm that the revised modelling extents have been approved by the Environment Agency (EA).</p> <p>There are concerns that the EA have objected to planning applications within the NEV and advise that it would be beneficial to meet with the EA modelling Team to understand the issues across the NEV and to liaise with and address their concerns by also providing initial. Once the EA's objections have been addressed, surface drainage matters can be controlled by planning conditions.</p>
	Revised (14.08.2020)	<p>No objection, subject to planning conditions, including a condition relating to further assessment of the watercourse flowing through the site (an un-named tributary of South Marston Brook) to consider the full catchment area, its capacity and the flood extents, including 1 in 1000 year storm events and proposals to mitigate and manage any affected areas.</p>
Public Health	Original (05.01.2018)	<p>Public Health welcome the opportunity to incorporate public health evidence to ensure that the New Eastern Villages create places that work better for everyone, with respect to the following public health matters.</p> <p>i) Whether the housing addresses specific housing needs, for example housing for older people, wheelchair accessible housing and</p>

		<p>affordable housing and how these should cater for the changing needs of local communities, such as the aging population.</p> <p>ii) The proposal does not assess the impact on healthcare services and does not include a dedicated healthcare facility, although local plan policy NC3 refers to a new health care facility (GP, dentist and pharmacy). The phasing of this development and other developments should be alongside the provision of health care facilities and where healthcare services are provided these should meet NHS requirements.</p> <p>iii) The proposal does not assess the capacity of social care.</p> <p>iv) To 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 and providing communal areas, such as play parks as smoke free places with no outside smoking areas would support the aims and objectives of this strategy.</p> <p>v) The proposal seeks to retain some of the existing trees, to provide sports facilities with the secondary school and a range of play spaces for children and young people throughout the development. Access to facilities for those who may not play traditional sports (on pitches) is also important with consideration to marked walking routes, outdoor gyms and multi-purpose space including ensuring this are accessible to people who are older or have a disability. Public footpaths should also be well lit and evenly surfaced. Access to high-quality and well-maintained green space promotes physical activity, positive mental wellbeing and healthy childhood development. Although the proposal includes some green space, these need to be accessible and attractive to families including siting away from main roads.</p> <p>vi) The proposals do not include proposals for the management and maintenance of open space.</p> <p>vii) A large number of the dwellings appear to be located alongside the A420 and the effects of air pollution and noise on health and</p>
--	--	---

		<p>wellbeing are significant and the buffer between residential housing and a major road should be sufficient to address this.</p> <p>viii) The proposals should seek to prioritise and encourage walking to reduce reliance on the private car and to encourage travel by more sustainable modes. More detailed information should be made available on this principle for this development.</p> <p>ix) The proposal does show cycle/pedestrian routes and includes a cycling framework, aiming to have more pupils walking and cycling to school. This should also be considered for staff, including appropriate number of secure cycle parking, changing and shower facilities on site at school.</p> <p>x) To encourage use of public transport it is recommend that dwellings are within 1500 metres of a bus stop.</p> <p>xi) The proposal does appear to facilitate the supply of local food, shops including classes and allotments are outlined and should avoid contributing to an over concentration of hot food takeaways in the local area.</p> <p>xii) As this proposal is phased over 18 years, opportunities should be considered to provide employment and training, such as apprenticeships, for local residents could be considered for this development. The proposal does not appear to provide child-care facilities for staff who may work in the area. The Environment Statement should include an assessment of positive impacts</p> <p>xiii) The proposal does include a mix of uses and a range of community facilities to promote social and community cohesion and to encourage social interaction, including providing opportunities for the voluntary and community sectors.</p> <p>xiv) This proposed density of 45 dwellings per hectare is higher than the average density of 40 dwellings per hectare within policy NC3 of the Local Plan. Further detailed information is required to consider whether the density is appropriate.</p> <p>xv) To address climate change, the proposal should ensure that buildings</p>
--	--	---

		and public spaces may respond to winter and summer temperatures, with suitable ventilation, shading and landscaping. As most dwellings have south facing roof spaces these could accept solar panels.
	Revised (27.03.2018)	In response to the additional documents, as these include the missing ecology chapter of the Environmental Statement and supporting ecology appendices and documents, there are no additional comments from a public health perspective.
	Revised (11.04.2019)	Previous comments (above) apply.
	Revised (16.12.2019)	<p>My previous comments are still valid in several areas and additional comments relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Housing quality and design; as detailed information is not included on the dwellings planned, it is not possible to comment whether the proposal addresses any specific housing needs. The reduction in the number of dwellings from 1,800 to 1,550 is welcomed. ii) Access to healthcare and other social infrastructure; previous comments in relation to health and social care services apply. iii) There is no information regarding the sports hub facilities which would be helpful to understand how this infrastructure will be used. The playing fields are now split over two sites so again this would be helpful to understand how this will work. The comments from Sport England are noted. iv) Access to open space and nature; further discussions should take place around the use and distribution of open space and play areas. Physical activity in youth is important for children's current and future health. Access to children's play areas can be affected by children's independent mobility, so consideration should be given to more integration of the play areas within the residential areas. v) Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity; air quality remains a potential concern with this development located alongside the A420.

		<p>The Healthy Neighbourhoods Team should be further consulted to ensure views and assessments on the environmental impacts are taken into account and any adverse impacts are minimised as far as possible.</p> <p>vi) Accessibility and active travel; in terms of the timescale for the park and ride to encourage active travel behaviour, it would be good to see this developed towards the start of this development.</p>
	Revised (19.05. 2020)	No further comments at this stage in response to the revised proposals and Public Health welcome the opportunity to be involved at this early stage.
Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Original (13.04.2018)	<p>The Design and Access Statement states that there are no public rights of way (PROW) within the application site, but Public Footpath 5 which crosses the south-western part of the site has not been taken into account in any part of the proposal. As an existing PROW it should not be obstructed by site fencing or any permanent structures or the proposed tree planting.</p> <p>The proposed network of pedestrian routes through the site are welcomed but the proposals should be developed to allow residents to safely access the wider PROW network by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The proposed riverside route should be extended to join with Public Footpath 5 to the south-west and Public Bridleway 21 to the north east; this route should be created as a public right of way. ii) The proposed north south route should be extended to link with Public Footpath 1 to the north and the above riverside route to the south; this route should be created as a public right of way. iii) Consideration should be given to the provision of safe means of crossing the A420 to access to both Public Footpath 1 and Public Bridleway 21. This may include the provision of footways to link Public Footpath 1 to the proposed primary access junction where pedestrians can cross via the proposed light controlled junction.

		<p>The construction details and the future maintenance responsibility for the proposed routes are not included within the application and these matters need to be agreed with the SBC Rights of Way Officer.</p> <p>As it is proposed that the development is phased over 18 years, if consent is granted, it should be conditional on the submission of a Rights of Way master plan being agreed with the Rights of Way Officer, before any detailed applications are submitted or granted consent.</p>
	Revised (n/a)	No further comments received.
Travel Plan Officer	Original (02.05.2019)	<p>The proposed Framework Travel Plan is not accepted as it contains flimsy interventions that will not achieve the mode share reduction targets. The Framework Travel Plan, should include a commitment to provide separate travel plans for each land use (residential / school and any employment use that reaches a trigger threshold.) As part of the NEV development, the Travel Plan and the sustainable action plan should be consistent across the NEV, as the interventions provided through the residential travel plan should be provided by applicants that do not join the NEV-wide Framework Travel Plan. These items should be specified within the Section 106 agreement to secure the travel plan and include the following revisions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide a fixed budget to implement the Travel Plan over the life of the development, plus 5 years post completion and include other objectives such as health of the residents, good air quality, safe and safe and attractive neighbourhoods. ii) Details are required of the proposed bus stop infrastructure and details of residential parking arrangements to ensure that on street parking is discouraged by design. iii) There is a requirement to provide a car club bay, vehicles to be provided by the developer per each 500 dwellings, free membership to the car club for occupiers and with electric vehicle charging points. iv) Additional monitoring of targets within the Travel Plan is required in the form of resident surveys and counts of pedestrians / cyclists

		<p>which should be reported to the Council's Travel Plan Officer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v) Provision should be made for covered and secure cycle parking for the local centre, schools and for residential properties and to the "Borrow a Bike Scheme" which is an effective intervention as is the Active Swindon Challenge for residents. The developer will be required to provide monthly prizes for this. Details of the Swindon Cycle Campaign (formally Swindon BUG) should be made available to residents as part of their travel packs and regular cycle events held to promote cycling (for example bike breakfasts and doctor bike sessions). vi) In terms of access to public transport a bus pass should be made available to all occupiers to be valid for take up by residents at any point within a year of occupation. There is a requirement to promote a car-share matching service and the existing and recognised car share matching service in Swindon could be promoted (www.carshareswindon.com). vii) Promoting and communicating with occupiers through travel information on the website, will be a key communication channel for the Travel Plan and social media (especially community groups) can be an effective tool. viii) The Travel Plan welcome packs should contain the most relevant information at the time of distribution, to be reviewed annually. ix) There is a requirement to hold promotional events at least each year and it is often appropriate to use national events such as bike to work day, catch the bus week or lift-share week to promote events.
	Revised (12.06.2019)	<p>In response to revised proposals, the Travel Plan Officer has provided further detailed comments relating to additional amendments that are required, including in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The aims of the Travel Plan. ii) The requirement for a car club bay and vehicle per each 500 homes. iii) Providing and promoting facilities for cyclists.

		iv) A commitment to a car-share scheme.
	Revised (02.08.2019)	<p>In response to revised proposals, the Travel Plan Officer has provided further detailed comments relating to additional amendments that are required, including in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The requirement to provide a car club vehicle and bay has continued to be ignored. ii) There are many minimum requirements still missing from the action plan. iii) If the applicant does not choose to join the NEV Residential Travel Plan scheme (contribution of £268 per dwelling) then it is necessary to commit to and to fund the range of measures and interventions that are required. At the present time there is no such commitment to fund the Travel Plan by the applicant.
	Revised (03.12.2019)	The proposed Travel Plan should be revised to include reference to the NEV Residential Travel Plan Package. Other amendments are required including for cycle and public transport measures.
	Revised (08.06.2020)	No objection to revised Framework Travel Plan and recommend that this is delivered through a clause within the section 106 agreement.
Urban Design	Revised (29.05.2020)	<p>The overall spatial conceptual design framework has been revised, to be more logical, with development block configurations that are more regular in shape, better connected and more simply laid out than the previous iteration of the masterplan. A key consideration is that connectivity is achieved for all modes of transport, with the highest priority afforded to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The nature and design of the primary route through the development remains a concern and should be developed to achieve low design speeds of 20mph, especially within the neighbourhood hub character area to ensure that it has a pivotal role to play in its place-making function.</p> <p>Density and character areas remain a concern as the dwelling numbers illustrated throughout as 'maximums' or 'up-to' figures are in some cases</p>

		<p>unprecedented on major development sites in Swindon. The overall development quantum of 1550 net dwellings relies on achieving the character area densities delivered as 'average' rather than 'up-to' figures across the site.</p> <p>Previous advice is reiterated, that as an important strategic site allocation the proposals should be considered at a Design Review Panel to further assist the applicant and design team to improve the design quality and character, the proposal's landscape, viability and highway impacts and sustainability through the approach to master-planning.</p>
<i>Parish Councils (within Swindon Borough unless stated otherwise)</i>		
Bishopstone	Original	No response received.
Bishopstone	Revised (n/a)	No response received.
Bourton (Vale of White Horse)	Original (01.02.2018)	<p>Object, as the transport implications are not thoroughly addressed in a Transport Assessment. The application should ensure that all necessary infrastructure is in place with confirmation of the phasing of development and key infrastructure. Bourton Parish Council has serious concerns about the effects of such a large development on the traffic flow along the A420 as the proposals are wholly inadequate in terms of putting forward measures to solve the present and future traffic problems on the A420 and do not mention mitigating measures to prevent the rat-running through nearby villages, especially Bourton. The Statement of Common Ground (April 2014 with Swindon Borough Council, Oxfordshire County Council, the Vale of White Horse DC and the Western Vale Villages) agreed that planning applications for major development within Swindon or the Vale of White Horse District that generate significant amounts of movement shall be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment to take account of the planned growth in both authority areas for the proper accommodation of the traffic consequences on the network.</p> <p>The submitted transport documentation for this application does not provide an</p>

		<p>acceptable assessment of the traffic impacts on the A420 and the local villages within Oxfordshire. It is therefore contrary to TR2 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 and paragraph 32 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Parish Council understood that the Planning Obligations SPD for Great Stall East indicated approximately 1100 houses on this site, but the application has increased this capacity to 1800 which is a 64% increase.</p> <p>Bearing in the mind that the proposed increase in the number of dwellings will have a significant increase in the amount of traffic to and from the site, SBC should consider whether the planned infrastructure proposals will accommodate this proposed increase in numbers. It is important that all the necessary infrastructure is in place prior to any large development within the NEV. There is no indication within this planning application as to the phasing of key infrastructure improvement, including the White Hart Roundabout, the Southern Connector Road and the M4 Junction 15 improvements. Clearly, without the correct phasing of development and infrastructure it will have an adverse effect on the surrounding areas, including severe “rat running” through the surrounding villages, particularly Bourton, as traffic into Swindon already queues past the Bourton Wharf junction on the A420 at peak times.</p> <p>The Masterplan does not indicate how the Southern Connector Road will link in with the route through the development area. This is a key piece of infrastructure which should link through this development and then onto the A420 and should therefore be shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>The application does not confirm which facilities will be available for the phase 1 occupants (275 dwellings), for example where will residents go to school, doctors etc. There is an assumption that there is enough spare capacity in the local area for community services, until the NEV provision is delivered, but there is no indication as to where this spare capacity exists, certainly not in Oxfordshire.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>There is no indication as to when the proposed land for the Primary School or Secondary School will be available. Further the proposed sports field playing pitches are all located within Flood Zone 2 but areas for sporting activity should not be allocated within a flood zone.</p> <p>The Parish Council cannot see how the applicant can state that 3 to 4 storey developments within the core of this development will not impact on the surrounding area bearing in mind this site is in the important lowland area to the North Wessex AONB. Also the proposed housing density for this development was supposed to be 40 dwellings per hectare, but the application refers to 45 which is totally out of keeping for this site.</p>
Bourton	Revised (06.12.2109)	<p>Previous objections still apply; Bourton Parish Council continues to have serious concerns about the effects of such a large development on the traffic flow and congestion along the A420. The Transport Statement is inadequate in putting forward measures to solve present and future traffic problems on the A420 and makes no mention of mitigating measures to prevent rat-running through nearby villages especially Bourton. There should be a joined-up approach to considering cumulative growth on the A420 but there is no mention of late developments in Oxfordshire (Kingston Bagpuize, Farringdon and Shrivenham. The NPPF refers to necessary liaison with adjoining authorities (Oxfordshire County Council) and the failure to consider impacts is counter to national policy and the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>The lighting for the Park and Ride site needs to be carefully designed to ensure that it does not create a huge source of light pollution on the edge of Oxfordshire countryside.</p> <p>Housing densities on the edge of the development closest to Acorn bridge and on the outer flank of the site where it meets open countryside are not accepted at 47 dwellings per hectare and the buffer zone to soften the development is inadequate. Housing densities adjacent to the surrounding countryside should not exceed 35 dwellings per hectare.</p>

		<p>The Parish Council object to the phasing of development commencing on the eastern side of the site closest to Oxfordshire and furthest away from Swindon. Development should commence closest to Swindon in a location where facilities are available for the occupiers as there is no spare capacity within Oxfordshire. The Parish Council object to the number of hoses proposes at this location as this development is being built on the flood plain of the River Cole that has seen serious flooding in recent years. More natural water catchment areas are required within the development to act a soakaways in times of sever rainfall. Other points set out above are re-iterated.</p>
Bourton	Revised (08.12.2019)	Previous objections set out above still apply.
Bourton	Revised (n/a)	No further comments have been received.
Covingham	Original (09.01.2018)	<p>The Parish Council is concerned whether the extent of the flood plain is understood, as sport pitches are proposed located within flood zones 2 and 3, given the flooding that took place in 2007.</p> <p>As the final design of the White Hart junction improvements are not yet known, any data is hypothetical as there is no way of assessing the full impact of the additional traffic, including development eastwards that will have an impact on the A420. The transport analysis does not take account of roads in close vicinity of Covingham and the effect of rat running due to stoppages on the main highways.</p> <p>The Parish Council is not opposed to development provided that the infrastructure is put in place to ensure that the already stretched local facilities in Covingham are not pressurised to the detriment of local residents. The NEV in its entirety should be assessed so that construction does not stat on individual development without any forward provision of services and infrastructure needed to accommodate the residents of the NEV</p>
	Revised (02.02.2018)	<p>Reiterates previous concerns regarding the extent of the flood plain and the location of sport pitches within flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>Reiterates concerns regarding the design of the White Hart junction and the assessment of traffic impacts.</p> <p>Re-iterates that the Parish Council is not opposed to development provided that the infrastructure is in place to ensure that the already stretched local facilities</p>

		in Covingham are not pressurised to the detriment of local residents. The NEV in its entirety should be assessed so that construction does not stat on individual development without any forward provision of services and infrastructure needed to accommodate the residents of the NEV
Covingham	Revised (24.05.2018)	<p>Re-iterates previous comments concerning the extent of the flood plain and location of sport pitches. Re-iterates previous comments concerning the final design of the White Hart junction improvements and the assessment of the traffic impacts.</p> <p>Re-iterates that traffic modelling should take place for the developments taking place to the east within Oxfordshire that will have an impact on the A420.</p> <p>Re-iterates that the Parish Council is not opposed to development provided that the infrastructure is put in place to ensure that the already stretched local facilities in Covingham are not pressurised to the detriment of local residents.</p> <p>The NEV in its entirety should be assessed so that construction does not stat on individual development without any forward provision of services and infrastructure needed to accommodate the residents of the NEV.</p>
Covingham	Revised (02.04.2019)	No additional comments.
Covingham	Revised 02.06.2020	No objection.
Liddington	Original (04.01.2018)	There is no water supply or sewage provision on this site. Traffic modelling for developments taking place to the east which will have an impact on the amount of additional traffic. There is no way of assessing the full or additional impacts of the additional traffic on the White Hart junction is unknown. There are concerns that the traffic analysis does not take account of the roads around surrounding villages and the effects of rat running.
Liddington	Revised (24.05.2018)	Re-iterates previous comments which are still relevant.
Liddington	Revised (15.04.2019)	The Parish Council requests that for the construction phase detailed travel plans are in place to reflect the need to mitigate rat running through the rural villages. If congestion occurs on the A420 due to Great Stall East works, traffic will use alternative routes via the Ridgeway Villages particularly via Bourton, Bishopstone, Wanborough and Liddington through to A419 at Commonhead. It

		would also be beneficial for the planned Park and Ride to be delivered early to minimise the negative impact during the construction phase.
Liddington	Revised (n/a)	No further comments have been received.
Nythe, Eldene and Liden	Original (05.01.2018)	No comment and defer to the local parish council.
	Revised (25.03.2019)	No objection, but comment that there are concerns that when the development commences, there will be a lag between the housing, people moving in and the infra-structure being available. So as an example, people from the parished area could be affected with schooling, so people when occupiers move in before provision for schooling is started the children require school places that could lead to children coming to Dorcan initially and increased school numbers due to the lag before new school places are provided..
Nythe, Eldene and Liden	Revised (28.04.2020)	No objections.
Shrivenham	Original (05.01.2018)	<p>Object; Although Shrivenham Parish Council is very concerned about 1800 homes being built so close to this village, the main purpose this response is to comment on the effects of such a substantial development on the traffic flow along the A420. The application states that traffic leaving this site will use the A420, but the submitted Traffic Plan will not mitigate the effects of the extra traffic from Great Stall East on the A420. Indeed, this document does not include a complete picture of the present problems with the A420 especially during peak hours.</p> <p>The Travel Plan is designed to serve the first 200 houses to be built and claims to reduce congestion and to encourage best use of existing highway capacity. It aims to do this by encouraging use of public transport by adding another bus stop on the A420, providing opportunities for "safe, active, healthy travel" by walking or cycling, by a car pool, through personalised travel plans with incentives to trial different travel modes.</p> <p>Whilst some people will use the 66 bus that runs between Oxford and Swindon, the addition of one extra bus stop will not do much to reduce the impact of an</p>

		<p>increase of at least 400 vehicles in the first instance and 3,500 subsequently. Whilst all attempts to provide opportunities for safe, active and healthy travel are to be encouraged, there seems to be little in the vicinity (except Sainsburys and the new school) to which one might feasibly walk. Nor is cycling a viable option. The Transport Plan contains little knowledge of the local problems on the A420 and the author will not have tried to cycle along the A420 during the rush hour. Cyclist that do occasionally choose to risk this journey adds to the traffic chaos that is a daily occurrence along the A420 between 0800 and 0930 and 1600 and 1830. On the face of it, car sharing would seem to be the most practical suggestion, though it remains to be seen whether such an arrangement will do much to reduce the amount of extra traffic on the A420 especially when the additional 1600 houses are built on this site. As for personalised travel plans, it is unclear what this entails, including incentives for the trial of different travel modes. There is no persuasive argument as to how these plans will encourage residents to use other modes of transport, given the limited choices available.</p> <p>The Parish Council is far from convinced that this plan will alleviate the extra input of traffic from this site onto the A420. Given the potential for over 3000 vehicles from the completed site plus the extra traffic from Symmetry Park and the South Marston/Rowborough development on the north side of the A420, this collection of simplistic, unsubstantiated ideas fails to convince. This Parish Council is seriously disturbed by the lack of any practical suggestions in this Traffic Plan to solve the present and future traffic problems on the A420.</p>
Shrivenham		No further comments have been received.
South Marston	Original (17.01.2018)	<p>The Parish Council is strongly opposed to the application and is disappointed that their concerns previously expressed have not been addressed.</p> <p>The Local Plan and the infrastructure planned for the New Eastern Villages is based on 8,000 homes and the application proposes to build 1800 homes compared to 1,100 suggested by the Council and to achieve this propose a combination of a higher density, discounting the risk of surface water flooding, removing the Park and Ride and a significant reduction in green infrastructure compared to that required by the Green Infrastructure supplementary planning</p>

		<p>document; this is particularly acute in the landscaping screening, for the Symmetry Park warehouse development, alongside the A420 and around existing housing along the A420. The overall impression is that the design, far from adopting principles of sustainable development is based on packing in the greatest number of dwellings that can possibly be accommodated on the available land, whether it is required for other purposes or not. This not only necessitates unacceptable departures from the NEV master plan, but results in an unacceptable road network, unacceptable repositioning of the school and lack of acceptable public transport routes.</p> <p>The secondary school has been re-positioned and it is now less central within the NEV as a whole and more remote from South Marston particularly those that would otherwise be encouraged to use the safe new footbridge over the railway (footpath number 5). The focus for pedestrian traffic across the A420 has been moved to the Carpenters Arms junction which is already known to be substandard in terms of pedestrian and cycle access. The school is also remote from the bus route that discourages pupils from using sustainable transport as cars are attracted to the only through route bordering the school entrance. The playing fields and sports hub is located close to the Cole and Liden in flood zone 2 which reduced their value in terms of sustainable development and appropriate community space provision.</p> <p>The Park and Ride site has been excluded apparently due to comments by Stagecoach that it prefers a location close to Sainsburys, but there is no evidence to support this view. Previous discussions with Stagecoach supported the site at the eastern edge of the NEV and a location closer to Gablecross is not supported as it would contribute to increased traffic and loses a rapid transit journey for residents into Swindon town centre. The Council's NEV master plan included a service loop bus route from the spine road south across the River Cole, but the layout includes either a winding route or a path which are more distant for the majority of residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not accept that the area designated for the Park and Ride site is suitable for housing as it is vulnerable to flooding and the proposed landscaping has been significantly reduced.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The flood risk map does not incorporate the surface water flood risk 1 in 100 from the Council's supplementary planning document for sustainable urban drainage, as it refers to the 1 in 1000 flood risk level and much of the housing would be under water. It is important that the total increase in housing within the NEV is used to model impacts on the A420, not only the proposed increase from 1,100 homes to 1,800 proposed in this application.</p> <p>The green infrastructure indicated on the Council's master plan at the western edge of the site adjacent to Symmetry Park has been moved to the fringes of the site resulting in an insufficient formal and informal green space provision within the car are and the loss of informal and recreation land at the south-eastern boundary. The overall effect is that insufficient usable green space is offered to meet the requirements of the Council supplementary planning document for green infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no adequate assessment of the effect of the development on Longelaze Farm and the limited hedge-width of landscape to the south seems unacceptable and unsympathetic, incorporating some 2.5 storey high density development.</p> <p>The inclusion of the second access onto the A420 between Symmetry Park and the Carpenters Arms junction refers to a lack of certainty of access west from the site and the need for construction access. This access is not included within the Council's master plan and it would require a further set of traffic lights along the A420. The justification for the lack of certainty is not understood and if this is required purely for the construction phased one option would be for it to be a temporary access only but this remains unsatisfactory. If it is essential then the Carpenters Arms junction should be re-located further west and this second road, located further to the east, through the redundant buildings at Longleaze Farm in the form of a single junction rather than two and compulsory purchase may be necessary.</p> <p>The response from Highways England fails to take account of development along the A420, particularly students crossing the road at peak times. A further factor that has not been considered is that vehicle traffic to the school will emanate from across the NEV, including north of the A420, not just internal</p>
--	--	---

		traffic.
South Marston	Revised (21.02.2018)	The Parish Council consider that the application should not be permitted as the revisions have not addressed the objections previously stated.
South Marston	Revised (17.04.2019)	<p>Although the quantum of development has been reduced from 1800 to 1700 homes to accommodate the Park and Ride site, this still exceeds the initial estimates of the level of development that could reasonably be accommodated compared to the NEV supplementary planning documents (SPD) and this has been achieved by a higher density of development, average of 46 rather than 35 as specified in the local plan and the NEV planning obligations SPD; by discounting the risk of surface water flooding in the area opposite the Carpenters Arm junction to the A420 in conflict with the SuDS SPD; the location of community facilities and green infrastructure within areas of know surface water flooding; and combining public and school use of sports and recreation facilities that reduces overall access to provision. The application has not adopted sustainable development principles and proposes unacceptable departures from the NEV master plan and results in unacceptable impacts on the A420. Whilst the design purports to encourage sustainable modes of travel, it is difficult to see cohesive cycle routes connecting well to the remained of the NEV.</p> <p>The Parish Council object to the increase in average density to 46 dwellings per hectare which is in conflict with the local plan NEV policy NC3.</p> <p>The secondary school has been moved further west from its original position, but the original concerns remain that is is too far to the east and is not consistent with the location for the school in the Council's illustrative master plan wher it was more central to the overall NEV and the catchment area it serves as it is more remote from South Marston pupils, particularly those who would otherwise be encouraged to use the safe new footbridge over the railway at footpath number 5. The focus for pedestrian traffic from South Marston remains switched to the Carpenters Arms junction which is known to be substandard in terms of pedestrian and cycle access and it will not encourage pupils to use sustainable means of transport along safe pedestrian routes. It is essential that a dedicated cycle way is provided from the exit of the cycle way</p>

		<p>around the north of Symmetry Park to the school.</p> <p>The Parish Council is disappointed that the 16-18 education provision within the NEV has been lost and it is vital that an appropriate transport strategy is in place to ensure that 16-18 year old students from the NEV can access educational facilities elsewhere.</p> <p>The playing fields and sports hub remain located too close to the junction of the rivers Cole and Liden in flood zone 2, reducing their value in terms of sustainable development and appropriate community space provision if the layout has underestimated the scale of flooding and an all-weather pitch is useless if it is under water.</p> <p>The proposed flood extent does not incorporate all areas within the flood risk area for the 1 in 100 year event; the land on the route of the old canal cannot be described as being served by a network of drainage ditches if it currently floods every year and a proportion of the proposed housing in this area, as well as allotments and green routes would be underwater. An improved analysis of sustainable drainage systems is required before this proposals is acceptable.</p> <p>The proposed second access to the A420 between Symmetry Park and the Carpenters Arms junction is said to be needed due to the lack of certainty over access west from the site and the need for a construction access. This would create a further set of traffic lights along the A420 which is unacceptable in the context of the current and expected extra traffic from the NEV and the other development along the A420 and junctions already planned. The Parish Council is not convinced that the traffic analysis has included the effects of pedestrians including school children using the signalised crossings over the A420 has been considered within the transport assessment.</p> <p>The Parish Council appreciates the current uncertainty in respect of traffic access west though Symmetry Park spine road, as envisaged in the NEV master plan, but this traffic is now being directed to the A420 rather than using the internal NEV roads. If the western access is essential then consideration should be given to joining up with a re-aligned Carpenters Arms junction, or a condition applied that the construction entrance will be closed should access through Symmetry Park be achieved.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The revised plan indicates that sports provision will be maintained by the school, but other community facilities are to be provided, including local open space and green infrastructure. The application refers to the adoption of these areas by existing community organisations or an experienced management company. The Parish Council has asked the Council to assess the acceptability of any long term arrangement for maintenance to ensure that these are able to deliver and appropriate service in the long term, provide value for money through local accountability and that the owner of the assets has an appropriate funding income stream. The Council in conjunction with the relevant parish councils should consider in further detail the long term maintenance plans for green infrastructure, public open space and sustainable urban drainage management.</p> <p>The Design and Access statement mainly focuses on internal routes for road and non-motorised transport links within the site, rather than links to the wider NEV and to the south to the neighbouring development. The bridge crossing should provide a safe and direct cycle link from both the eastern and western areas of the site, across the River Cole to connect with similar direct cycle ways to the south.</p>
South Marston	Revised (23.06.2020)	<p>Should the application be recommended for approval the parish council request that it is considered by the Planning Committee and the parish council would want to appear/speak at the meeting. The parish council appreciate that there has been much discussion with Borough Officers over the original submissions on this site, but there are fundamental flaws with the plan.</p> <p>Footpaths and cycle ways: There is no detailed consideration of footpath or cycle way routes for either utility or recreational use and no mention of how the internal routes coordinate with wider plans for the NEV. The need for residents both north and south of the A420 to access the community facilities in particular the school has received virtually no attention. In its place there is a strategy of creating road-side cycle ways and footpaths which are a poor replacements for safe off-road routes. Roadside cycle-ways require cyclists and pedestrians to constantly stop at junctions with internal estate roads, a big disincentive to switching from travel by car to sustainable transport modes. This is all the more</p>

		<p>important since the parish council and Borough Officers have worked to provide a safe off-road route to cross the railway line and A420 at footpath number 5. By taking the new route on the north and eastern boundary of Symmetry Park, users would have almost reached the original proposed site for the secondary school which was the intended route for all South Marston and Rowborough non-motorised traffic to access the school and other facilities on this site. Before permission is granted in principle an acceptable footpath/cycle-way route map should be provided through the site to take account of all NEV residents' needs.</p> <p>Access to facilities via footpaths and cycle ways: As the school has been moved further east it is a longer journey, particularly for Rowborough cyclists and walkers. There are two safe options for pedestrians to access the site, firstly using the footbridge now installed on footpath 5, or across the new controlled "tunnel" junction far to the east at Rowborough that may not be developed for many years. Pedestrian and cycle traffic should not be encouraged to use the substandard Carpenters Arms junction to the A420. The parish council request that a clear safe route joining the extended footpath around Symmetry Park with the school site with minimum crossings of estate roads and that contributions be made towards the second pedestrian bridge/tunnel towards Rowborough proposed as a solution to both the intermediate and longer term.</p> <p>Travel to work journeys: The river Cole parkways is an opportunity to create a direct cycle/footpath route that does not require numerous stops from the eastern access to the proposed green bridge route across the A419.</p> <p>Unfortunately since not dedicated cycle way/footpath movement plan is offered it appears that the application has only considered an almost circular recreational route for their own residents which is unacceptable. A dedicated cycle way and segregated footpath through the river parkway from the eastern access with the A420 to the western edge of the site is required.</p> <p>Balancing housing density with adequate GI and avoiding flood risk. It is clear that the application is intent on cramming the site with more dwellings than it was originally thought possible in the Council's master plan and to achieve this the application has increased the density beyond what should be allowable</p>
--	--	--

		<p>across the NEV; the application has narrowed the river Cole parkway planting and the screening for existing dwellings; and have planned house-building on areas known to flood every single year.</p> <p>Housing density: The housing density is greater than proposed in the NEV master plan, the local plan policies and supplementary planning documents (SPDs) and far from being a prestige development which looks more like shoe boxes and the overall number of houses has been achieved by reducing open spaces, using areas known to flood along the line of the old canal, reducing woodland cover and reducing the width of the country park none of which are acceptable.</p> <p>Landscaping and Green infrastructure (GI) There are SPDs that cover what would be an acceptable GI hectareage and it would appear that this has been ignored and shortfall is considerable. Since the number of dwellings has been increased from the original estimate by the Council of capacity on site, the shortfall in open space per dwelling is even greater. The parish council objects to the reduced width of the river Cole parkway, the lack of woodland planting and the inability to provide for an effective screening for existing residents alongside the A420.</p> <p>Flooding and hydrology considerations: The formal hydrology report on sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) requirements uses what is identified as the Environment Agency flood map that shows no flood areas other than alongside the river Cole and they imply that this shows the extent of flooding in 2007. Unfortunately a huge body of water existing along the route of the old canal bordering the south of the A420 and as residents have constantly reported this floods every year, often several times and photos have been provided to show the expanse of water on the northern edge of the site earlier this year. This is the area designed for densely packed new housing. The parish council is at a loss to understand how the application can produce an effective hydrology report if the existence of this flood water is lost from the calculations. It is important to not only assess the liability for flooding of this area, but also the capacity of the eventual destination of the flood water as vulnerable flooding points are on the A420 between old Vicarage Lane junctions and Acorn bridge</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and the river Cole culvert. An inaccurate flooding map, that fails to show the one flooding event in 2007 should not be used as the basis for safeguarding not only the existing but the proposed new housing. The parish council objects to the hydrology report as it is based on inaccurate data focussing only on the river Cole route and ignoring the northern end of the site. The parish council cannot see how the capacity of the site to disperse store water can be achieved given the degree of development and the location of facilities and housing and the flooding potential downstream on the site towards Acorn bridge has not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>The quantum of housing on the site is one of the main problems associated with the lack of land for adequate SuDS measures to be put in place. It is not appropriate for permission to be granted in principle for this number of houses before it is tested to see if such SuDS measures can be implemented. There does not appear to be a strategy for storing or dispersing flood water on the community sports hub site, despite its location in a vulnerable flooding area.</p> <p>Road access routes: There is virtually no mention of the extra construction road access onto the A420 towards the western end of the site that was within some previous revisions to counter the threat of the ban of traffic using the sine road through Symmetry Park. As a consequence there is not only one access to the A420 at the eastern end of the site plus the access at the south across the river Cole into other BEV parcels. The overall road plan shows the use of the Symmetry Park spine road as the third access. The applicant refers to an alternative strategy but without specifying what it is. The introduction of an additional road access of the A420 at the western end of the site, does not comply with the overall master plan for the NEV. If there is a risk that the route through Symmetry Park is closed to normal car traffic then this application should be considered on the appropriateness of one access onto the A420 at the eastern end of the site.</p> <p>Utilities: It is noted that Thames Water have stated that they have had no dealings with the applicant for the provision of an adequate water supply and foul water disposal and neither are currently available for use. It is usual to include a Grampian planning condition on any grant of permission in these</p>
--	--	---

		<p>circumstances, but the lack of communication on this matter is a concern.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure (GI) Management: As Borough Officers are aware the parish council is keen to see a sustainable management plan for the future maintenance of open space on this site. The parish council request that nothing should be included in any planning conditions attached to the planning permission that limits the potential solution to providing coherent management of SuDS areas, GI, rights of way and cycle ways.</p>
Stratton St Margaret	Original (15.01.2018)	<p>Objection; the Parish Council re-iterates the comments by Shrivenham Parish Council that the Travel Plan will not alleviate the extra input of traffic from this site onto the A420, Given the potential for over 3000 vehicles from the completed site plus the extra traffic from Symmetry Park and the South Marston/Rowborough development on the north side of the A420, this collection of simplistic, unsubstantiated ideas fails to convince. The Parish Council is seriously disturbed by the lack of any practical suggestions in the Traffic plan to solve the present and future problems on the A420.</p>
	Revised (09.04.2019)	<p>The development will increase the pressure on the White Hart roundabout and the parish council supports Highways England proposal to limit development to 551 houses until the M4 junction 15 is developed. The Great Stall Bridge should be open to all traffic and the Stratton halt railway station could provide ideal transport links to new developments.</p>
	Revised (n/a)	<p>No further comments received.</p>
Wanborough	Original (17.01.2018)	<p>The Parish Council wish to raise the following concerns.</p> <p>The NEV Planning Obligations SPD for Great Stall East refers to 1100 homes on this site and the application states 1800 homes, an increase of 64% is a significant increase in the amount of traffic to and from the site. Consideration should be given to the impact on infrastructure for the NEV arising from this increase in numbers. It is important that all the necessary infrastructure is in place prior to any large development within the NEV and there is no indication within this application as to the phasing of key infrastructure improvements including the White Hart roundabout, the Southern Connector Road (SCR) and the M4 junction 15 improvements. Without the correct phasing of development and infrastructure there will be an adverse effect on the surrounding areas</p>

		<p>including severe “rat-running” through the surrounding villages.</p> <p>The master plan does not show how access will be provided to the SCR and the route through the development area. This is a key piece of infrastructure that should link this development onto the A420 and this should be shown on the master plan.</p> <p>The application does not confirm the facilities that will be available for the phase 1 occupants (275 dwellings), for example schools, doctors and there is an assumption that there is enough spare capacity in the local area for community services until the NEV provision has been delivered but there is no indication as to where this spare capacity exists. There is no indication as to when the proposed land for the primary school or secondary school will be available.</p> <p>The parish council are concerned that the proposed sports field playing pitches are all within flood zone 2 and that areas for sporting activity should not be allocated within a flood zone. The parish council cannot see how 3 or 4 storey development within the core of this development will not impact on the surrounding area and the proposed housing density should be 40 dwellings to the hectare the application is for 45 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The parish council are not objecting to development at this site as Great Stall East is one of the allocated sites within the NEV in the local plan, but it is important that the applicant ensure that all necessary infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>The parish council would like to see this application deferred until the phasing of development and key infrastructure is confirmed.</p>
Wanborough	Revised (07.07.2020)	<p>Object and raise the following serious concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should be a joined-up approach to consider the cumulative impact of growth on the A420 and any proposed large development should take into consideration all other developments being built within Oxfordshire County Council, the Vale of White Horse and the Western Vale Villages, as otherwise traffic will divert and rat-run through surrounding villages. 2. With the outstanding legal appeal hearing pending for the access point via Symmetry Park to be confirmed, there is a possibility that this proposed access onto the A420 will not be available and until this is confirmed the application should be judged on the appropriateness of

		<p>one single access onto the A420 at the eastern end of the site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. It is important that the phasing of the services and facilities are provided early enough within the main build of houses to ensure that these are in place ready for the new residents when they move in. 4. Density and height of new houses should be lower around the outskirts and edges of the development to ensure that there is not detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside. It is clear that the applicant has increased the density of housing within the site to that higher than agreed as part of the Council supplementary planning document. The Parish Council strongly object to the proposed increase in density and could like to see this reduced especially around the skirting edges of the development site. 5. Bearing in mind the effects of climate change all around us, as the development is being built on the flood plain of the River Cole, which has seen serious flooding in recent years, the Parish Council object to the number of houses being proposed in this location. There is also concern that the playing fields for the school are within close proximity of the flood zone. It is extremely important that the likely impact of flooding within the River Cole areas is taken seriously and mitigating measures are put in place to ensure that the proposed new houses and facilities on this site are not a risk of flooding. In addition, the run-off from this site should not have any adverse impacts further downstream. The Parish Council would like to see a wider green buffer along the River Cole to take into consideration any possible flooding from the river.
Watchfield (Vale of White Horse)	Original (20.03.2018)	<p>Object due to grave concerns about the effects of the development on traffic flow and congestion on the A420 as well as the documentation provided as part of the application and the methodology used in the assessments. The Transport Statement is insufficient as it has not considered impacts on the A420 beyond the Swindon borough boundary.</p> <p>The Parish Council refer to the concerns raised by Highways England that all the committed development for the wider NEV as well as the infrastructure are</p>

		<p>included in the capacity assessment undertake. Given the current levels of congestion on the A420 the application should not be assessed on the basis of the trip rate data within the Transport Statement and there appear to be omissions in the data including the personal injury accident data for the wider area.</p> <p>The traffic assessment does not refer to the Swindon Borough agreed transport assessment, or the memorandum of understanding with Oxfordshire County Council and the Western Vale Villages (WVV) on improvements to the A420. The assessment does not refer to the Hindhaugh assessment carried out in 2013 and updated in 2015 on behalf of the WVV that concluded that flow rates west on the A420 at the morning peak and eastwards at the evening peak were already above the Department of Transport theoretical operating capacity for a route of this nature. This assessment was produced before major developments now in existence along the A420 corridor (within Oxfordshire).</p> <p>Stagecoach has highlighted concerns that there was no meaningful discussion with the authors of the Transport Statement and the plan does not refer to the in-development bus spine route to avoid congestion on the A420. The bus company has stated that it would only provide a bus service to the development if it had little impact on the timing/frequency of the 66 service which requires such a road. This indicates that Stagecoach believes that the A420 will be usable as an effective sole route. There is also no firm indication of the necessary Park and Ride site.</p> <p>The Transport Statement provides limited transport evidence to counter the advice in Swindon Borough's relevant adopted policies and supplementary guidance and does not conform with the NPPF. There is no evidence that the infrastructure mitigation package for the wider NEV will be delivered in full, or when.</p> <p>The Parish Council refer in detail to the consultation responses from Stagecoach with respect to congestion and delays on the A420, set out above. There are no credible sustainable transport options in the form of walking or cycling to off-site locations; cycling on the A420 is highly dangerous and causes significant delays due to the narrowness of the carriageways and there are no</p>
--	--	---

		<p>footpaths. In accordance with the NPPF residents should be provided with travel choices and this has not been provided and the A420 should not be considered to be a safe cycling or pedestrian corridor; there are no bus stops along the A420. The development has not firmly indicated the second access point required for the 66 bus service to flow through the site, so users would have to access the service from the A420 without bus stops.</p> <p>The application did not mention the cumulative impacts on traffic flow from development taking place along the A420 (Kingston Bagpuize, Farringdon and Shrivenham) that affect the A420 and traffic flow and necessary liaison with Oxfordshire County Council through the duty to co-operate is necessary as required by the NPPF.</p>
Watchfield	Revised (19.11.2019)	<p>The Parish Council continues to have concerns about the effects of this development on traffic flow and congestion on the A420, the documentation provided and the methodology used. Previous comments above are re-iterated. The quantification of bio-diversity gains is not realistic or credible within normal timescales. The inclusion of bio-diversity net gain must be scrutinised as the headline conclusions have not been adequately supported and the net gains do not take into consideration the timescales to achieve these gains; the likelihood is that habitat destruction and relocation will result in loss of fauna bio-diversity. As the projected target of 25 years to achieve created habitats and between 10 and 20 years for hedgerows, there is likely to be a net loss of bio-diversity up to that point, if fauna ever re-inhabits the area. Of the 62.92 hectares for habitat creation, 39.72 hectares is urban developed land with a sealed surface and no bio-diversity value. Responses to deal with inevitable increased cat predation are inadequate.</p>
Watchfield	Revised (n/a)	No further responses received.
Third Party Representations		
Canal Trust (the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal Trust)	Original (16.02.2018)	<p>The Wilts & Berks Canal Trust is restoring the complete canal including the main line through the Eastern Villages which is critical to the overall aim of restoring a complete, navigable waterway within an environmental corridor. The canal links Melksham to Abingdon and Cricklade with Swindon at the hub. The</p>

		<p>restoration of the canal is supported by Swindon's Local Plan Policy EN11: Historic Transport. The Trust object to the application as the impact on flooding throughout the catchment area has not been considered adequately.</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the complex drainage and flood protection of the whole of the catchment area between the scarp of the downs to the south and the railway line to the north. This area includes New Eastern Villages, some existing developments west of the A419 and Lower Wanborough. Flooding is already experienced throughout, including the 2007 inundation of houses in Covingham and the A420. It will not be improved and could be made worse by new development, leaving many properties at risk of flooding or at least isolation when flooding occurs nearby.</p> <p>The piecemeal provision of independent SuDS by each developer in the New Eastern Villages cannot be relied on to provide adequate flood protection on the assumption that there will be no cumulative effect. SuDS require considerable regular maintenance to ensure that they perform properly in the long term and there is mounting evidence that current practices are inadequate. The impact of each developer reshaping land within its control and ignoring the cumulative effect on the flood plain has not been considered.</p> <p>The advantage of the integration of the canal within the schemes for NEV developments as has been proposed is that it adds protection to the whole NEV development area rather than each individual development only and also to the wider flood plain. It may also enable the localised SuDS attenuation ponds to be optimized. The Trust has recommended to the local authority a comprehensive flood modelling exercise as an essential requirement before any development is approved.</p>
	Revised (26.03.2018)	In response to the further information, the Trust has nothing to add to the response dated 16th February 2018.

CPRE	Original (05.01.2018)	<p>Object due to the overall cumulative impact of this site in combination with the three Lotmead areas, Redlands, Foxbridge and ultimately Great Stall West. The impact of Symmetry Park is excluded as its nature and characteristics are very different to the new “villages”. The proposals are very different to those shown on Figure 10, the New Eastern Villages Inset Diagram, within Policy NC3, showing a very different lay-out of the development islands and open spaces between them. The overall form of the built, and open areas, has changed considerably. As a result, there are immediate concerns about how the following points contained within the text of the Policy will be addressed. Views to and from the North Wessex Downs AONB and land between the Eastern Villages site boundary and the existing villages. The Phasing Plan (figure 1.6) shows Construction Phase (Landscape) Year 0 as a belt of green. But the Environmental Statement (at 5.19.6, 5.19.7 and 5.19.18) and the protection of Bourton is only referred to in context of planting within the Country Park, current hedgerows and that the existing urban backdrop of Symmetry Park and Swindon would in any case diminish its separateness. Full details of the protective planting are required at this Outline stage.</p> <p>We would expect to see a Master Plan buffer planting requirement that each developer has to follow and deliver for each length of the eastern boundary of the development areas from the A420 to the southernmost Foxbridge tip, In fact this would follow the open areas shown on the Eastern Villages Figure 10 inset diagram. Instead it seems that for each “village” area the blocks, or band, of protective planting to the east will be haphazard and dependent on the landscape consultant of each developer. How will this deliver a consistent arboreal protection particularly when seen from the high ground on the AONB ? The SBLP review (November 2017 at 1.6.1 bullet 6) refers to new and improved open space and green infrastructure, but what does this mean in terms of delivery ? Is the green infrastructure simply a few hedging plants alongside a road/cycle path, or will it be tree planting within the development (village) area to break up the urban character? More detail is required at this preliminary stage.</p>

		<p>The effects of cumulative development over the whole Eastern Villages area needs to be considered in terms of not so much the views out of the developments, but the views towards and across the development area from the North Wessex Downs AONB and how the setting of this protected area is affected.</p> <p>The Policy refers (Under point 5.56) to the individual “villages” with separate identities but integrating with each other. The overall concept for the NEV of the construction, integration and yet separateness of not only the villages which will be contained within this application, but those to be delivered at the Lotmeads and other sites. Will a uniform agreement be put in place for the “green infrastructure corridors” between the developments or are the green infrastructure corridors just small roads linking the developments, or are they proper green corridors with a defined requirement for the amount of planting on either side, including their depth and height?</p> <p>How will open spaces between the villages be defined, in terms of size and nature? The whole of the Eastern Villages development area, when viewed from outside or experienced from inside, will only succeed as a whole if the layouts, landscaping of open spaces, green buffers and green infrastructure are harmonised throughout. Details of this should be required and agreed at this stage, not wait for the reserved matters stage since it is at that point that effective protective landscaping is open to being reduced for a number of reasons, cost being one.</p> <p>New development areas of this size should be required to follow a number of uniform Master Plan principles and requirements (housing styles and designs, estate layouts, internal landscaping) in the same way as the development of a new town. If not, the breaking up into blocks controlled by separate developers will lead to a series of separate concepts which do not form a satisfactory whole.</p> <p>There should be agreement at this stage, rather than waiting for reserved</p>
--	--	--

		<p>matters application for the sites to be built at higher density since they are green fields. This particularly applies to the centre of the villages where three story terraces can be attractively designed and softened with tree planting and deliver more on less land. The low density building at Coate Water/Hospital area with rows of two storey houses and garages is such a waste of land.</p>
	Revised (28.03.2018)	<p>The numerous desk top and field studies shows the area appears to contain a wide variety of species, albeit sparse in some instances. The various natural habitats of these species ranging from hedgerows, ditches, pastures and woodlands are to be lost, or certainly considerably diminished. To protect them to the greatest possible degree, their fluidity of movement must be maintained, not only through this area of development but into the adjoining development areas. Adequate mitigation against the cumulative effects and off-site impacts in the short and, more importantly long term, must be the retention or replacement of the maximum of the natural habits for both the flora and fauna. We do not consider that this scheme give sufficient confidence in the manner in which the retention, improvement and replacement of diminished habitats will be overseen, and monitored in the future. It is not a landscape led scheme. We have already written regarding our concerns on the depletion of the woodland and take no comfort from the mitigation strategy suggestion for arboreal, vegetal or water course managements. The natural links between types of habit must be safeguarded. Who will monitor the Green Infrastructure, EN1, to ensure its viability in the future ?</p>
	Revised (07.04.2019)	<p>The previous comments regarding highways and transport issues regarding the A420 set out in our letter of 14 February 2018 have not been allayed by these new amendments. We are opposed to any further access junctions to the A420 and believe that the original plan for major exit/entry points to the east and central sections of the development area are the most appropriate. Further sets of traffic lights will only serve to increase the queues along the A420. We have already expressed our concerns regarding the additional vehicle numbers likely to be using a road which will see increased flows not only from SBC but LPAs further east.</p>

		<p>The present situation regarding the possibility of future access for a haul route via Symmetry Park and a “potential western access” for GSE appears both uncertain and undesirable.</p> <p>It is most important that this development is phased with start dates, and conditions regarding the provision and delivery of a P&R and alternative transport routes ahead of commencement of the houses. This should be agreed before any reserved matters application comes forward, to ensure that the development stages are fully integrated regarding access issues and offer, in material fact, the alternatives to this being the usual car dominated series of estates.</p>
	Revised (09.12.2019)	<p>The Secondary School will serve both Great Stall East and Lotmead and both these sites have applications currently being considered. The application suggests that construction of the secondary school will only commence based on housing completion triggers. Is this based on the aggregated trigger figure of 600-700 homes from both sites ? The first phase of Lower Lotmead (application S/OUT/19/0582) shows 200 homes, but it is unclear when that phase will commence. It should be essential for the delivery of the phased housing in each of the sites to be in some kind of coordination in order to deliver sufficient school capacity so that the Lotmead children do not have to spend years being bussed to other schools with the GSE pupils filling all the first places and that the consequences of parental choice are taken into account.</p> <p>With this in mind the Gt Stall East Phasing Plan seems quite impractical due to hauling through completed areas in order to reach the eastern access. Why cannot Phases 2, 5 and 6 be completed, then 7 and the school (bolstered by Lotmead completions)?</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan (Fig 01) shows the principle access road through the developments to the A420, and Park and Ride, shown coming north from the</p>

		<p>Lotmead site. Will this connector road between the two developments come forward at an early stage ?. It should be under construction at the earliest stages in order to allow access to and from Lotmead to the north rather than using the Wanborough Road. Should the Lotmead first phase not be the area round the primary school ?</p> <p><u>The Park and Ride.</u></p> <p>It is stated that there will 1,000 parking spaces, however the application refers to 450 spaces, so will the site be delivered in two or more parts, or partly at Great Stall West and what are the triggers to provide the spaces. If the P&R is intended to capture what would otherwise be commuter traffic into Swindon from housing further east along the A420, plus those moving to GSE, potentially GSWest and the Lotmead areas, will this capacity be sufficient long term ?</p> <p><u>Flood Risk and Water Conservation</u></p> <p>Different measures have been used for calculating the base line used for assessing flood risk element, including 1 in 1000 years, 1 in 100 years and even 1 in 50 years. Given that this development area and those adjacent to it are looking to be completed over the next 20 years and the speed at which changes must be put in place in the light of recent data on Climate Change, we would have thought the realistic figure to be used should be 1 in 25 years.</p> <p>Water Conservation. Although reference is made to houses having water butts to collect roof runoff for garden use, why are underground tanks not being considered for installation in each area of development in order to capture some of the flood waters? Swindon is a water stress area. Water needs capturing rather than wasting to drains, ditches and rivers. Despite recent floods, average rainfall is decreasing.</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p>
--	--	--

		<p>It is essential that the quality bus corridors, and buses to run on them, (suggested in the draft review of the Local Plan) are synchronised in delivery terms with the phasing of housing. Similar to the school construction commencement triggers. If the alternative to the car is not already in place when new occupancy starts the habit of using a car will continue and any modal shift become harder to achieve.</p> <p>The Site Context map, (Section 2, page 6) demonstrates the importance of the interlinking of the phasing of Gt Stall East and Lotmead in terms of housing and school completions, transport options and their aims.</p>
Ramblers Association Swindon and NE Wiltshire	Original (04.01.2018)	<p>The provision of safe and convenient walking and cycling routes throughout the NEV for both leisure and practical purposes (e.g. to enable children to walk to the secondary school) is an essential component of the whole development including appropriate links to the safe crossings of the A420 agreed as part of the overall NEV masterplan to be provided by other applications. The application illustrative masterplan gives little indication that this issue has been adequately addressed and the application should demonstrate that an appropriate safe walking network including links across the A420 are provided.</p>
	Revised (27.03.2019)	<p>Overall, the revised plans appear to represent an improvement on the previous plans and we welcome the comprehensive network of walking routes shown on the map in section 4.3 of the Design & Access Statement. However, we believe that further improvements to this network are required. Section 2.4.4 of the DAS refers to the PRowS to the north of the A420 and says that they "could potentially be continued through the site to provide recreational routes". We believe the applicant should be required to make the necessary connections. The map at DAS 4.3 shows several connections across the River Cole to adjoining parts of the NEV development. We welcome this, but note that the positions of some of these connections differ from those shown in the NEV</p>

		<p>Masterplan. This risks the overall path network within the NEV becoming disjointed. We support the comments made by Martin Fry (Public Rights of Way Officer email dated 13.4.2018) that the riverside route should be extended to connect with Public Footpath 5 and Public Bridleway 21. There should also be a connection to Oxfordshire path 139/12. All these connections are shown in the NEV Masterplan. The connection to path 139/12 is important because it will give walkers access to Bourton and further into Oxfordshire without having to cross the A420.</p>
	Revised (28.11.2019)	<p>Within previous comments dated 27 March 2019, we identified several improvements to the proposed network of PRowWs which we would like to see. The applicant does not appear to have made any changes to the plans in this regard. We therefore reiterate our previous comments.</p>
	Revised (28.04.2020)	<p>The proposed network of walking routes within the development appears quite acceptable but earlier comments regarding the need for connections to neighbouring areas have not been addressed. For example, the pedestrian and cycle path within the country park needs to be extended northwards to the A420 to a point directly opposite the existing public bridleway SM7. Even more importantly, there is no indication what provision will be made for walkers (and cyclists) from South Marston and Rowborough, including students travelling to and from the secondary school, to cross the A420 safely. The Carpenters Arms junction is unsuitable because of the need to pass under the railway bridge and since this junction is opposite Longleaze Farm, which is outside the application site, it is unclear how this route could operate as an entry point to the development.</p>
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	Revised (17.04.2019)	<p>The Trust does not feel able to support this application as further work is needed to fully deliver sufficient essential GI components on the site, integrated with the proposed Central Lakes Nature Reserve identified in the SPD. There is concern that as presented, the application is not consistent with the ambition of the NEV Green Infrastructure SPD (2017).</p> <p>The application is not consistent with local plan Policy NC3 that seeks to ensure that development includes 'an extensive green infrastructure network that maximises opportunities for habitat connectivity and enhanced biodiversity</p>

		<p>including extending the River Cole green infrastructure corridor and connecting with Nightingale Wood’.</p> <p>The SPD sets a clear policy direction for biodiversity which aims to provide a net gain for Biodiversity for the NEV, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF). The allocation of Green Space in this application is inadequate and will not deliver a genuine net gain for Biodiversity. No evidence is provided in the application that it does.</p> <p>In relation to the SPD Biodiversity: GI and Key Principle 2 and the policy context of EN4 and the NEV Planning Obligations SPD, development will avoid direct and indirect impacts upon biodiversity and geodiversity sites at the NEV. All development, where appropriate shall protect and enhance biodiversity and provide net local biodiversity gain.</p> <p>The SPD (4.3 Biodiversity) refers to the creation of well connected, resilient, ecological corridors of floodplain meadow, marshland, wetland, woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside the River Cole tributaries.</p> <p>The provision of extensive Green Infrastructure, and enhancements for biodiversity providing for a genuine net biodiversity gain as a result of sustainable development needs to be ambitious and visionary. It needs to be integrated across the whole of the Eastern Villages strategic development site.</p> <p>The Trust has previously provided comprehensive comments both at the Local Plan EIP and in writing regarding the principles and requirement for an integrated Green Infrastructure plan providing wide ranging benefits for wildlife and people across the whole of the Eastern Villages strategic development site. This is fully in line with government guidance provided within the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF). The Trust was very pleased to see this ambition stated within the GI NEV SPD. However we don’t see this ambition being adopted within submitted planning applications, including Great Stall East.</p> <p>In our submission to the EIP we agreed and signed a Statement of Common Ground with Swindon Borough Council.</p> <p>In this we agreed a number of important very important principles, including;</p>
--	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is agreed the Council and the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust will work together to ensure development proposals sufficiently take into account wildlife and habitats in accordance with national and local policy. 2. It is agreed the Council will work with Wiltshire Wildlife Trust to enable the provision of education and visitor facilities for local access and interpretation of the natural environment within the Borough. <p>We are very happy with direction that the Council has set within the NEV GI SPD, but are concerned that this should be properly fulfilled and backed up in the decision making processes of the Council.</p> <p>With respect to the Local Industrial Strategy the Trust also believes that the development of the NEV site should align with recently published Government Guidance to Local Enterprise Partnerships, in the development of their required Local Industrial Strategy. This Guidance states that;</p> <p>LEPs should identify environmentally based, competitive advantage opportunities, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. investment that improves natural capital assets at a landscape scale to increase local competitiveness eg. clean water supplies, clean air, enhanced landscapes and biodiversity. b. the role of Green Infrastructure in making attractive, healthy places where people want to live, learn, work and visit and in helping to address the ageing society grand challenge. c. aligning with environmental net gain approaches supported through the planning system and environmental land management schemes. <p>Such extensive building plans as at Great Stall East (and the NEV overall) are clearly a key component of the LEP Local Industrial Strategy, and should therefore deliver comprehensively against such Government Guidance for incorporating the essential importance of Green Infrastructure. This</p>
--	--	---

		<p>development is immediately to the north of the River Cole and the indicated built development envelope includes land on its southern edge which has been identified by Swindon Borough Council as a key component of the proposed Central Lakes Nature Reserve, more detailed proposals for which are currently being drawn up.</p> <p>The provision of extensive Green Infrastructure, and enhancements for biodiversity, providing for a genuine net biodiversity gain as a result of sustainable development needs to be ambitious and visionary. It needs to be integrated across the whole of the Eastern Villages strategic development site. The Trust believes that well planned and thought out Green Infrastructure and access to nature is fundamental to people's health and wellbeing and must be integrated into any new plans for development in Swindon, including across the NEV Great Stall East site.</p> <p>Swindon Borough Council has the opportunity to set a benchmark for the standard of sustainable development it wants to see, including a visionary GI component, preserving the Natural Capital assets that will benefit the health and wellbeing of the new communities occupying the NEV in the future, with the needs of people and wildlife jointly provided for. We look forward to the opportunity to take this forward with Swindon Borough Council and trust that these comments will be fully considered and taken account of in consideration of this application.</p>
Wanborough Anti Flood Group	Revised (11.05.2020)	<p>The Wanborough Anti-Flood Group (WAFG) suggest that the site at The Great Stalls and Lotmead be addressed together for flooding purposes.</p> <p>The WAFG first identified the Thames Water problem at the Local Plan Examination in Public in 2014, in front of most of the developers at the NEV, where the Inspector for the secretary of State Mr Fox, for the biggest development of a green field site in the UK stated that without fresh clean drinking water "this is a show stopper"</p> <p>Nothing has changed since then, see the information below presented in 2014.</p>

		<p>The WAFG understands that a new reservoir will need to be constructed in the Faringdon area to cater for the people of Swindon and especially the needs of the NEV. Within Swindon and Oxfordshire: a dry year critical period is predicted (from -0.14 MI/d in 2020 to -32.7 MI/d by 2040). These changes are principally driven by the impact of climate change on groundwater sources and therefore a reduction in available deployable output.</p> <p>The issues raised by Thames Water relating to the supply of drinking water and the necessary upgrades required have not been addressed, to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.</p> <p>The issues raised by Thames Water (TW) relating to waste water requiring upgrades to enable additional properties to be occupied have not been addressed.</p> <p>Regarding flooding and sustainable urban drainage, the SuDS SPD for the Great East Stall parcel of the New Eastern Villages notes that “the drainage in this area is not fully confirmed. The drainage in this area will need to be fully understood and source controls measures must be incorporated into the development as well as further attenuation features to ensure final discharge rates are minimal”.</p> <p>Swindon Borough Council are the Local Lead Flood Authority and are responsible for allowing developers to build on a flood plain, so must enforce their adopted SPD and other SBC documents. The SuDS SPD also states that permeable paving should be considered for all non-trafficked hard-standing and parking areas, and that rain gardens, tree pits, swales, green walls and planted channels should be incorporated into the landscaping.</p> <p>The submitted drainage strategy drawing shows the flood water all going into a new swale/water course. However there no calculation for the total water</p>
--	--	---

		<p>volume discharging into the existing water course when exiting the site boundary.</p> <p>The WAFG respectfully point out that the wrong classification has been used throughout this document. To reduce the risk of off-site flooding, discharge from this catchment will be restricted to 1-year greenfield peak runoff rate for all storms up to and including the 1 in 100 per year climate change event. In case of concern relating to discharging SuDS water straight into the river, oil traps/rubbish weirs can be constructed, for example like the one coming off the M4 culvert that feeds the water into a triple (SSSI) stream at the top of Coate Water. As the culvert under the A420 is at capacity, is it certain that the Vortex pump drainage into the river Cole is wise, especially if you are to be responsible for the River Cole? Do Riparian duties apply in perpetuity and is the Council as LLFA still responsible for Fluvial flooding?</p> <p>It seems that the application has not really addressed the flooding situation on this site.</p> <p>The WAFG state that what should not happen, is for houses to be flooded by the build-up of flood water backing up on the north side of the A420, resulting in the culvert under the A420 reaching its maximum capacity. It is known that the river Cole has backed up right into Covingham, let alone flooding on the proposed development site. This situation is already known as it actually happens, it has been seen and there are photographs to prove it.</p> <p>The inserted typical section of swale/filter shows a 600 wide filter trench. The drawing indicates only a DN200 discharge pipe and the WAFG strongly recommend an extra outflow pipe or having larger diameter pipes to allow for leaves and silting up due to the clay content of the runoff water from the development. It is known that 50% of volume of most of the drainage pipes in this area become silted up, so the DN200 will not be large enough to cope with any major storm water event. It is mentioned on the drawing 2 of 2 that grass-crete might be used to build an extra overflow car park at the "existing ground</p>
--	--	--

		<p>levels". Who is going to be responsible and legally liable for this proposed extra infrastructure, when the flood water destroys it?</p> <p>The Wanborough Anti-Flood Group refers to documents previously sent to the Council on 4th May 2019, that show photographs of this area to understand the amount of flood water that does flow into the culvert on the A420. Other photographs are available to show the A420 culvert overtopping.</p> <p>The WAFG has put forward proposals for an Acorn Bridge Anti-flood scheme. It suggests that to relieve some of the flood water volume at the culvert on the A420, a secondary culvert is put back into operation. This would re-connect the Lenta Stream south of the A420 to the original network rail anti-flood lake north of the railway tracks. By doing this the flood water from the river Cole will be reduced thereby keeping the A420 culvert flowing.</p> <p>The existing culverts owned by Highways and Network Rail have been inspected and these are available and ready for use. Both are in agreement with the WAFG that this could be a solution to address the overtopping of the main A420 culvert. The WAFG strongly recommend that every stake-holder and developer, should agree a legal contract with the land owner to the north of the Network Rail ownership, to allow the reinstatement of the Lenta stream, and the anti-flooding lake, could be used for fishing. These anti-flooding measures should be in place before the NEV development is constructed.</p>
Residents (Object)	First neighbouring occupier original comments (02.01.2018)	<p>Object to the sheer size of the development and the nightmare scenario this will create on the already frequently gridlocked. A420. Having lived on this main road for thirty-five years the slow moving and often static traffic flow has been witnessed on a daily basis the additional sets of lights have created near the South Marston stretch. As more lights are now planned this will create major hold ups stretching back miles on the approach into Swindon. Air Pollution too is an extra worry that the residents experience.</p> <p>Another objection relates to the lack of consideration to the residents whose gardens run alongside this planned development. A wider green corridor is</p>

		<p>required than that shown on the plans is a requirement.</p> <p>The historic route of the Wilts and Berks Canal should be protected and the proposed footpath and cycle way is not acceptable due to the impact on the neighbour's privacy that should be considered, especially given the height of buildings near our homes.</p> <p>With heavy traffic thundering noisily past our property day and night, the housing should not be sited so close to the rear as shown and a play area as also shown on the drawing should definitely not be located as shown. As this is so close to the new warehouse development and the very busy A420, a play area in this location is unsafe.</p> <p>Within the local plan it is stated that locations for play areas should be centralised and developers should avoid locating areas of play on or at the edge of this so called village boundary.</p> <p>These objections should be considered more favourably for the existing residents who will lose so much due to this development. Not only will neighbouring properties be devalued, but the proposal will result in the loss of an area of much treasured wildlife and at present the only peaceful means of escape from living on this increasingly noisy and busy main road.</p>
	First neighbouring occupier revised (17.04.2019)	<p>Object in the strongest possible terms and comment that the original objection still stands. The revised new western access point onto the A420 is entirely unsuitable and there is still uncertainty that access through the Symmetry Park development will be allowed. The new application appears to look like a continuous stretch of junctions and traffic lights on this approach into Swindon with a series of stop/starts that will cause miles of tailbacks.</p> <p>Having lived immediately alongside the very busy and increasingly inadequate A420 for almost forty years, I can say without hesitation that to go ahead with this massive housebuilding project without seriously addressing and resolving the highways infrastructure first will cause enormous problems for years to come. The answer would be to divert much of the traffic from the Acorn Bridge area to Commonhead, which was suggested in the past, but of course it is all down to cost. However, with little money to spend on real upgrading, the</p>

		<p>developers appear to want nothing to do with the main road network that will need to be capable of accommodating thousands more vehicles that will inevitably turn into a major traffic headache.</p> <p>Swindon is attempting to comply with government demands for more housing but is not first prioritising the necessary infrastructure and this is a recipe for disaster on an epic scale.</p> <p>How will the already overstretched hospital and GP Services be able to cope with the thousands more inhabitants from these homes?</p> <p>A recreational play area is proposed to be located just a few metres from the neighbour's property and whilst there may be a benefit to the new inhabitants, the layout has not considered existing and present residents. Play areas on large housing developments attract anti-social behaviour amongst teens and are no longer suitable for younger children to play. An objection is raised to the position of this recreational area, as it is sited too close to the neighbour's property and the dangerous A420 with its pollution and noise levels. Also the Symmetry Park footpath and cycleway which is a disturbance being located so close to existing neighbouring properties and already this footpath is showing signs of anti-social behaviour. The track between Canal Cottage and Lower Copse is not a public right of way so cannot be included as a footpath and/or cycleway as one of the drawings seems to imply.</p> <p>The neighbour's cottage suffers the disruption of very heavy traffic thundering by all day and night and consequently the pollution, vibration and noise is continuous.</p> <p>The brightly floodlit Symmetry Park building now towers over the neighbour's property, which now covers what was previously a view of beautiful green fields and abundant wildlife. Neighbouring occupiers cannot be expected to tolerate the additional noise and disturbance of a kiddies/teens recreational playground very close to a residential garden and as that is totally unacceptable an objection is raised in the strongest possible terms.</p>
--	--	--

Mr and Mrs Taylor	Revised (03.12.2019)	<p>Raise deep concerned that the latest revised plan has ignored the neighbour's key concern. The objection is to the location of a LEAP (a recreational play area) in the corner of the development right behind the neighbour's cottage. This completely contradicts the initial study stating that existing properties along the A420 could to a degree expect that the privacy at the rear of the neighbour's home facing the development would be considered and protected.</p> <p>Not only is the huge Symmetry Park building towering over the neighbour to the right hand side with its wall of windows directly overlooking the neighbour's once private space, but major glaring light pollution from the same building spills across the garden and as another similar building that will be several times its size, is going through the planning process, this will be erected behind the first building. To make things worse a children's play area is proposed almost next to the neighbour's property, only broken by a thin landscaped area which will do nothing to alleviate the noise and the disturbance issues to be expected from such a facility.</p> <p>This is entirely the wrong location for children to play, being so close to the heavily congested A420, also running alongside the Symmetry Park footpath/cycleway which will encourage the use of non-residents, together with the gathering of antisocial behaviour/substance abuse etc., which unfortunately these recreational areas now often attract as we see throughout Swindon. It needs to be sited in a more central area under closer supervision within the development for obvious reasons.</p> <p>Please rethink the positioning of this facility in fairness and consideration to long established residents whose homes have already been ruined by the disturbing buildings which have been allowed far too near to the neighbour's and other neighbouring properties, to offer any kind of privacy.</p>
Mr and Mrs Taylor	Revised (19.05.2020)	<p>The revised drawing shows that there is a pedestrian/cycle link planned around the perimeter of the development near Symmetry Park, leading towards the neighbour's property but the line stops on the drawing at a point where there is</p>

		a gated private driveway to neighbouring dwellings (Canal Cottage and Lower Copse). There is no access point here to or from the development, so where will this pedestrian route/cycle way lead to
Mr and Mrs Taylor	Revised (21.05.2020)	<p>After viewing the new revised documents and drawings, we note that a pedestrian/cycleway is planned running the length alongside Symmetry Park towards the A420 which then comes to an abrupt halt by the track between Canal Cottage and Lower Copse. This is not a right of way but a private and well used driveway between the two properties and has been such for over sixty years and is used by the neighbour and the neighbouring occupiers for almost forty of those years and previous residents before us. The drawing does not explain where this route will lead to?</p> <p>The other objection is that near to the Symmetry Park side of the site there is a reference homes will be built, that are higher, possibly 3.5 stories high along this corridor. It is stated that this would partly provide some screening for all the other homes to be built on the Acorn Gate character area, as it will be called from the rather overpowering view of the Symmetry Park units (there is one in the pipeline yet to be constructed) that will tower above and over these homes. A good deal of considerations has gone towards protecting the views of new proposed houses and other constructions for Longleaze Farmhouse from the conservation officer because that is a listed building rightly so. However very little consideration has been given to other existing occupiers located along the northern boundary of this development, particularly the density, building heights and the distances of buildings to the neighbouring properties. As much time, effort and consideration should be directed towards other existing occupiers, who already have the Symmetry Park units affording little privacy. These are not attractive buildings, containing rows of windows overlooking the neighbour's once private space and the glare from night time lighting from that site. Houses of up to 3.5 storeys height should not be built in the vicinity of Canal Cottage, as these would still further ruin the neighbour's outlook.</p>
Mr and Mrs Giles	Original (11.04.2018)	It appears that this development is going ahead and that "small people" have no impact against multi-million pound companies, but the impact on the

		<p>neighbour's historic property should be protected.</p> <p>There are many references on the planning application/website referring to Longleaze Farmhouse, including documents referring to the property by the developers and their agents, including comments and assumptions regarding the buildings historic setting, its listing status, best views of the property. The developers/or their agents nor the Council have not sought the neighbour's views or involved the neighbours in anyway, as the application has progressed forward. Previously the Council had assured the neighbours of some "protection" by the Council, but as the proposals have evolved the neighbour has been left without consultation.</p> <p>The property is a historic grade II listed building, which should be a special treasured feature in the landscape, not an inconvenience to the developers. It is hoped that it is not too late to ensure that Longleaze Farm and its surroundings are protected for future generations to enjoy from all directions, as it is viewed from and its views of the Downs, are not destroyed by the development</p>
	Revised (12.04.2018)	<p>The original objection still stands and the main concerns have been further verified by recent statistics that identified the A420 as the most dangerous road in the south-east of England and the 23rd most dangerous road in the UK. This confirms that a development of this capacity with extra traffic to this inadequate, overstretched road from the two to three new access points that are planned is ill thought through to say the least. Having lived alongside this road for the past nine years, there are increasingly frequent road closures due to serious and sometimes quite minor incidents. The number of traffic light controlled junctions planned for a relatively short stretch of narrow highway between Acorn Bridge and the White Hart Roundabout will only serve to cause major gridlock and tailbacks stretching far in both directions on the existing road network. The neighbour further objects to the sheer volume of housing planned on this development that has increased from 1,100 to 1,800 thus reducing the green infrastructure and creating an overcrowded, unattractive and poorly</p>

		<p>planned development.</p> <p>The neighbouring property's drainage system includes a drain out flowing to a former feeder ditch for the canal, located to the rear of the neighbour's property within the application site, but the drainage proposals do not include this drain or ditch within the drainage scheme.</p>
	Revised (26.03.2019)	<p>In response to the revised proposals a further letter of objection accompanied by supporting information to show the flood map for the local area, a sketch showing the water levels in 2016, the location of an existing perimeter boundary fence and photographs to show flooding events in 2014 and 2016 and an extract from the application transport Assessment regarding the new access road to the development was received. The neighbouring occupiers remain extremely concerned with the overall effect the development will have on their property both at the front, adjoining the A420 from the South Marston and Rowborough development and to the rear from this development at Great Stall East.</p> <p>It is confusing whether the proposed new junction west of the A420/Vicarage Lane junction is a temporary or a permanent access to the development. The Council should oppose this continued proposal for an additional junction that will cause further traffic congestion on the A420 and the development should retain the NEV plans to use an eastern entrance and a link to Symmetry Park as previously planned for the western access/exit. An additional western access to the A420 would cause more chaos joining an already congested A420 very close to another busy junction at Vicarage Lane causing lengthy tailbacks.</p> <p>A buffer is shown between the development and Longleaze Farmhouse to the south and west but this is not the same as proposed by the current land-owner for 15.3m (50 feet) buffer between the development and Longleaze Farm. A number of the application plans/drawings show an attractive line of trees/hedges but its location is unclear or which boundary it is to screen. The developers should be required to provide new planting and this should be a condition of the planning permission.</p> <p>The illustrative master plan indicates an area of allotments to the south of</p>

		<p>Longleaze Farmhouse, but the area around the property should be protected to allow an unrestricted view towards the Downs, so the allotments should be moved to the east, to maintain open views for the setting of Longleaze Farmhouse to enhance the rear view of the house, rather than being it in with housing. The proposed strip of allotments to the east of Longleaze Farmhouse are welcome, but the green area shown with trees between the allotments and the A420 is in fact an area of willow trees following the course of the old canal and is not additional planting.</p> <p>There are two historic freshwater wells located at the property that both provide clean drinking water; what effect will the development have on these two wells and their water levels and what impacts will there be from any drainage schemes proposed that may affect the current water levels or contaminate the water?</p> <p>Despite reassurances regarding potential flooding and works previously carried out to alleviate flood risk, flooding events have occurred on land behind Longleaze Farmhouse in 2014 and 2016. It is incorrect that flood maps do not indicate the flood risk and the land can flood very quickly and to a depth of several feet in places as illustrated in the photographs. The line of the former canal that runs through the garden is affected by rainwater settling on the alignment without it draining away.</p> <p>There are concerns as to the long term effects of the development from noise, pollution, dust and other issues over a period of construction of 18 years, including the thatched roof being affected by airborne dust and contaminants. As a listed building there is no double glazing, but with increased noise levels there may be a need to install double glazing particularly as the occupants work night shifts. It is hoped that the Council's Conservation Officer will consider this, particularly as the Officer commented that the proposals should cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Longleaze Farmhouse, to enable the occupiers to continue to enjoy peace and privacy.</p> <p>The application documents are unclear showing an existing perimeter fence which is not the neighbour's current boundary fence but may be a proposed fence to provide a buffer zone to the development..</p>
--	--	---

	Revised (03.04.2019)	<p>The revised proposals include more mention of the impacts on the neighbour's property, Longleaze Farmhouse, prepared by the developers, that the development will not affect the heritage/setting of the building, a lot of it being total rubbish. Part of the parish council's (South Marston Parish Council) response to the planning application refers to Longleaze Farmhouse and raises concerns regarding the effect the development on the property, the closeness of the build to the neighbour's property, the very ineffective proposed screening by some hedging and the potential for some tall buildings to be built close to the boundary, that will completely box-in the neighbour. Longleaze Farmhouse will lose its very character if the plans remain as they are. The Council has previously offered reassurance and their support and protection for the Listed Building, but there is very little evidence of this now, particularly with the increase in house numbers and the locating of roads immediately to the rear of our property.</p> <p>It is a concern that front aspect of the neighbour's property seems to have been ignored in the reports and there are concerns as to where the traffic lights will be sited on the Vicarage Lane/A420 junction and how close stationary cars/lorries will be to the neighbour's house, the effects of extra pollution on the very old and delicate building, particularly the life of the thatch. The updated plans of the junction have been difficult to locate, within the many documents; details are shown for a new proposed junction planned for the Swindon side of Longleaze Farm/Bungalow, but not for the Vicarage Lane junction.</p>
	Revised (17.06.2019)	<p>Objection to the revisions that re-iterates the above points and re-states concerns relating to the specific issues set out above and requesting that answers are provided by the Council and the applicant.</p>
	Revised (09.12.2019)	<p>Although all parties have now taken note of Longleaze Farmhouse and its historic presence and location within the potential development area and the level of development behind Longleaze Farmhouse has been reduced, the following concerns remain.</p> <p>The application does not detail whether the recreation space will be publicly owned and accessible 24/7 or managed by a third party with permitted</p>

		<p>restricted access. The plans do not show if there is any building or changing room, where it would be located, whether flood lighting is proposed for the pitches and where car parking for competitors would be provided. It is surprising that this land is considered suitable for use as sports pitches as it has not flooded in recent times and could be more suitable for house building and the application continues to propose house building to the east of Longleaze Farmhouse. This land to the east has a long history of flooding due to the river Cole and a stream that runs diagonally through the field towards the A40 and it has been underwater on two recent occasions. It would be more sensible to use the drier land to the west of Longleaze Farmhouse for development and to site the sports pitches to the east where potential flood risk would have a reduced impact on future home owners.</p> <p>The neighbour's objections and concerns relating to flood risk have been discussed with the Lead Local Flood Authority/Council's Drainage Engineer, particularly the field to the east of Longleaze Farm and the stream running through it towards the A420 that have been subject of regular flooding, due to surface flood water issues.</p> <p>There is a strong objection to the proposed construction access for heavy vehicles to the A420 to the west of Longleaze Farmhouse/Longleaze bungalow. As previously highlighted an additional junction to the A420 will cause havoc to traffic flows especially with the huge number of lorries that will enter/exit the site on a daily basis. Construction traffic should access the development through Symmetry Park to avoid all traffic congestion with an access directly onto the A420. This would enable a suitable location to be provided to clean excess mud from lorries before they re-join the main road.</p>
	Revised (19.02.2020)	<p>Photographs were previously submitted that show previous flood events in 2014 and 2016 on the filed immediately to the east of Longleaze Farmhouse and a similar event occurred on 17th February 2020; the actual water levels are now higher after a further two days. This flooding continues to be a regular event at this location and supports the fact that this is not a suitable location to building new hosing, particularly in view of current climate changes and national issues</p>

		with flooding.
	Revised (23.05.2020)	<p>It is pleasing that the development finally takes note of comments previously made, in particular to the effect it will have on Longleaze Farmhouse. Further comments relate to, firstly the application does not clarify who will be responsible for the cost of the proposed planting of new trees/hedges along the boundary to the east of Longleaze Farmhouse, between the property and the proposed allotment area,. Will these costs be met by the developer?</p> <p>Secondly, previous comments about the impacts on the neighbour's septic tank and the drainage from it have not been addressed. Thirdly, in relation to the field immediately to the east of Longleaze Farmhouse, where about a quarter of the land is identified as allotments and the rest for housing, this land has been flooded with photographs to show these events where water covered the majority of the field to a depth of nearly 2 feet, across the central two thirds. The proposal continues to propose building on this land, although it is subject to regular large scale flooding. There is no formal response to these concerns apart from a site visit by the Lead Local Flood Authority Drainage Officer who was very concerned about the intention to build on this location. It appears that these and previous comments regarding the flooding appear have been ignored.</p>
Residents (Support)		No comments of support received
Stagecoach Bus Company	Original (19.01.2019)	<p>Stagecoach has grave reservations and concerns about the application in its current form. Stagecoach strongly supports the principle of this site coming forward for residential led development as this proposal represents the single most important element of the NEV allocation within the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>It is the only portion of the NEV that is directly related to an existing high-quality public transport route, the Stagecoach West bus service route 66 (now renamed route S6)</p> <p>Without appropriate assessment of traffic impacts and their mitigation the proposals could significantly and adversely affect the reliable and effective operation of this route which is an important and rapidly developing inter-urban link between Swindon and Oxford having an important sider function to serve</p>

		<p>the whole A420 corrido. This includes its role to mitigate the impact of committed development on a strategic scale within Oxfordshire to the east. The Council's overarching planning policy for this part of the NEV strategic allocation including the adopted supplementary planning documents (SPDs) that the opportunities to create a high-quality public transport spine running through the site to offer a bus rapid transit quality of service parallel to the A420. This would allow the existing service and probable other bus services to effectively serve development in this application and also avoid delays on the main A420 route. This will greatly enhance the relevance and attractiveness of bus services as a more sustainable mode. The rebalancing of travel choices as required by the NPPF, the local plan and the supporting SPDs also requires that a Park and Ride is provided as this is an integral part of the sustainable transport package anticipated and required by the Local Plan to mitigate the impacts of the Core Strategy and the wider NEV as well as this site as part of it. The public transport spine and Park and Ride also directly influence the likely viability and effectiveness of bus services for other parts of the NEV at Rowborough to the north of the Great Western main railway and many parts of the NEV to the south.</p> <p>Great Stall East is relatively unusual within the NEV in that it is not dependent on additional or adjoining development coming forward to be able to come forward in a credible or rational manner. However it is importance in facilitating important highway connections across to its southern boundary to facilitate the wide development being brought forward according to the Council's indicative master plan. Stagecoach consider that the site could come forward independently of other NEV parcels as a stand-alone scheme, provided that it does not prejudice the wider delivery of the allocation and that key elements of the overarching policy and mitigations are secured and delivered.</p> <p>Stagecoach discussed a number of options with consultants for the application at the pre-application stage, to support the efficient and effective operation of service 66 through the site and opportunities to maximise the attractiveness of the both the bus service and the Park and Ride provision, including cross-</p>
--	--	--

		<p>boundary issues along the A420.</p> <p>In a great many respects this advice has been incorporated, for bus services to play the fullest possible role, including the alignment and nature of the spine road to create a bus corridor to enable an efficient route from close to Acorn bridge through to Sainsbury's at Gablecross parallel to the A420. This includes a length of bus-only route and siting key facilities relatively close to the spine road with high density development concentrated close to the spine road. However the site for the Park and Ride is not provided as anticipated by the Council's policy and SPDs. Stagecoach assumed that alternative off-site provision, possibly nearer to Gablecross may be considered. But neither the Transport Assessment or Design and Access Statement refer to an alternative which requires more information.</p> <p>The proposed local centre is located off the main public transport spine, reducing opportunities to conjoin local trips using sustainable modes. The layout includes a second parallel spine road for all vehicles, aligned with key focal points which would marginalise the bus service. A longer term risk is that this route could be used as an effective diversionary route for traffic on the A420, that could potentially seriously undermine the effectiveness of this corridor for bus rapid transit, quality of service, speed and reliability. The crossing point towards Lotmead village to the south is broadly as indicated within the Council's policy but the link continues to a western junction to the A420 that is not anticipated on the indicative NEV master plan, as it introduces an additional junction to the A420. Stagecoach would prefer a route through Symmetry Park, to avoid this junction. Any bus stops proposed west of Vicarage Lane would not be accessible to the development.</p> <p>The transport evidence submitted as part of the application within a Transport Statement not a Transport Assessment, is counter to the Council's adopted policies and the NPPF. The planning and highway authority do not have sufficient evidence to ensure that the residual cumulative unmitigated impacts would not be severe on key portions of the local and wider network and the A420 as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>As Stagecoach operates services three times an hour each way Monday to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Saturday and half hourly on Sunday, it has a unique perspective on the use of the A420 past the site. Existing delays near the site are significant, chronic and lengthening, particularly westbound in the afternoon and evening peak where capacity is reached or exceeded at key junctions, notably the Wiltshire Police headquarters and at Gablecross. Traffic queues regularly extend over the county boundary beyond the Bourton turn west of Shrivenham. There are discrepancies between the evidence presented in the (SATURN) traffic modelling and the traffic counts on the A420 which is a concern. The impacts of development on the A420 including links and junctions east of the Borough boundary are a relevant and material planning consideration that should be properly assessed.</p> <p>No information has submitted for the phasing and delivery of the proposals, or the construction of access junctions and key links in between, necessary to show that initial occupants would have access to a choice of sustainable modes. An adequate bus service is the most credible option available in the initial phases and the application does not refer to how sustainable modes are to serve the site in accordance with the NPPF. There are currently no safe or appropriate bus stops on the A420 that could serve the development and if bus stops were proposed in this location, a very large part of the development would be beyond a reasonable and convenient distance, being located considerably more than 400m away for bus stops.</p> <p>No evidence is presented for the expected level of bus service should the existing service divert to operate into the site. Stagecoach would only seek to operate the service between two access points suitable separated with the bus rapid transit spine completed and subject to no detriment to journey times to the service as a whole.</p> <p>The site is located on the A420, one of the busiest links between Swindon and the strategic road network, the A419, the M4 and links to the A34. The corridor is of more than local or sub-regional significance. Significant further strategic allocations are located off the A420 within the Science Vale in Oxfordshire; the delivery of 4,300 homes is underway and will accelerate as work starts in multiple locations. The existing Stagecoach service serves all the developments</p>
--	--	--

		<p>on the A420 corridor and proportionate contributions, typically £1000 per plot has been agreed by Oxfordshire County Council to help “pump-prime” increases in service frequency. The existing demands on the A420 including increasing use of the current bus service indicates that the development will result in increasing trip demands. The likely additional traffic impacts on the A420 corridor within Oxfordshire should be properly assessed in accordance with the Local Plan and the NPPF.</p> <p>Stagecoach is committed to working constructively with the applicant to address the deficiencies in the application to take full advantage of the opportunities for sustainable transport.</p>
	Revised (30.04.2019)	<p>Stagecoach welcome the revised proposals to deliver the largest single contribution at the NEV to meet the Council’s development requirements; however further attention should be paid to the following matters, in accordance with the NPPF and adopted local policies so that Stagecoach can unreservedly support the proposals. There have been material changes to the inter-urban bus service that passes along the northern site frontage, since the previous consultation response was submitted, reflecting a continued steady growth in use of the service both within the Borough and to the east through Oxfordshire; this includes increasing the frequency of the service to run every 15 minutes towards Oxford with a similar increase in the afternoon peak from Oxford. There is a fleet of new buses to improve air quality and with better facilities for passengers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The rate of delivery of residential development within Oxfordshire has accelerated, particularly in Shrivenham where housing is under construction at four locations and occupiers of new homes are likely to look west for their destinations increasing demands on the A420. Stagecoach is promoting the route for new home-owners and to the Defence Academy of the UK to maximising patronage. Some of the largest increase in patronage has been on the western third of the route towards Swindon. 2. The changes made to the application including a formal Transport Assessment in accordance with the NPPF is noted; this has significantly

		<p>increasing the scope and depth of the previous Transport Statement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Stagecoach recognises the significant pressure on the land budget and welcomes the adjustment of the development quantum to accommodate the park and Ride site, whilst the overall net density of 46 dph is significantly above that achieved on large-scale urban extensions locally and more widely. 4. The development form and mix is more likely to sustain higher levels of public transport use, subject to an efficient bus route and attractive level of service being offered early in the development's trajectory. 5. To achieve these densities it will be necessary to pay attention to the design to ensure that building lines are not located too close to the carriageway that will accommodate double decker buses. 6. The principle of a spine road to act as a key public transport corridor is established in the NE illustrative master plan and the revised proposals more closely align with a single route passing the neighbourhood core and secondary school; measures have been included to present through-traffic using the spine road as an alternative route to by-pass the A420. 7. Although Stagecoach has no objection in principle to the use of shared spaces on bus routes it has little national precedent and present s number of significant detailed design challenges for bus operations, bus passengers and other road users. 8. The indicative bus stop locations shown on the parameter plans are welcomed; the eastern-most pair of bus stops should be re-located to just south-west of the Park and Ride site. 9. The southern route to the Lotmead village is of great importance for bus services to and from the wider NE; another pair of bus stops is required close to the southern gateway into the site. It is essential that bus services can be directed into the site on an efficient and unimpeded route from the earliest opportunity. 10. The western access point is supported in principle as a bus link as it is a deliverable intermediate position pending resolution of connectivity to Symmetry Park (subject to legal challenge by the Council) across the
--	--	---

		<p>western boundary and beyond towards the District Centre. This is essential to facilitate the East-West Core Express Bus route. The optimum public strategy requires the East-West Core Express Bus Route to provide a direct and seamless bus service corridor south of an parallel to the A420 with measures to prevent the route being used by traffic diverting from queuing on the A420. This requires connectivity across the western boundary with Symmetry Park to be resolved in favour of the Council. This matter should not “ransom” the applicant and the proposed western access would provide a suitable, albeit less attractive bus route either on an interim basis or <i>in extremis</i> in the longer term, recognising that this junction is not supported by the Council and it is not proposed in the NEV master plan.</p> <p>11. If car borne traffic could be fully accommodated through the eastern access alone, then the western access could be provided as a bus-only emergency feature offering left-out/right-in functionality controlled by signals activated by an on-bus transponder, greatly limiting the impact on the operation of the A420. This is unlikely to take place more frequently than once every 10 minutes.</p> <p>12. The inclusion of a Park and Ride site of 600 spaces or more on a site identified in the NEV master plan and SPD. Previous advice is re-affirmed that this will be effective in intercepting Swindon-bound traffic. The size of the Park and Ride diverges from the policy requirement of 1000 spaces, but Stagecoach is unconvinced that this scale is warranted or necessary in this location. There is concern that the application refers to the Park and Ride as a first phase of 450 spaces. Further clarification is required as the capacity that is deliverable on the current application site. The application has not clarified how the delivery of the Park and Ride depends on the way other elements of the NEV site are brought forward. Previous comments relating to an alternative location at the proposed District Centre are re-stated.</p> <p>13. The proposed phasing of the development including the internal road infrastructure is noted and the rate of build of 100 dwellings per year is</p>
--	--	--

		<p>conservative; (Great Western Park at Didcot has sustained housing delivery rates that are four times higher.) The spine road should be brought forward earlier to enable completion of the bus route, which the application anticipates after the completion of phase 3, about 8 years into the delivery trajectory, when as many as 800 homes are occupied, nearly half the quantum. Many of these households will be located a great distance from bus stops and it is not clear that pedestrian links will be provided to the bus stops near Symmetry Park access. This arrangement would present delays to the existing bus service which cannot be accommodated on long inter-urban routes where existing delays on the A420 are significant and chronic. There are significant concerns that the link to Lotmead village to the south is likely to be delivered late in the development trajectory that may prejudice the rarely delivery of local bus links through Lotmead via the Southern Connector Road to substantial destinations including the Great Western hospital.</p>
	Revised (14.07.2020)	<p>Support the application subject to conditions, to address remaining concerns, relating to the timing and phasing of delivery of the park and ride site, including agreed arrangements for a bus service, including to serve phase 1 of the development. Secondly for the delivery of the spine road and arrangements to be agreed for bus stops. Thirdly, in relation to the detailed design of the spine road as an express bus route and a condition to ensure connectivity with adjoining portions of the New Eastern Villages, including Symmetry Park to the west and Lotmead to the south.</p> <p>The Covid-19 crisis has disproportionately affected bus use and longer terms impacts are impossible to forecast. Despite the unprecedented short-term collapse of demand for the S6 route and the introduction of emergency timetables, the S6 service is anticipated to remain a very important part of the bus network in the longer term and there is no reason not to assume that a frequent service will be fully established at the point the development achieves first occupation. The proposed very efficient use of land and development densities and mix will support high levels of bus patronage. With respect to the western access point and connectivity across the boundary with Symmetry</p>

		<p>Park, Stagecoach strongly supports all efforts by the Council and the applicant to secure connectivity across the boundary, including to Lotmead, secured by planning conditions, necessary to enable the S6 service to divert through the site. The spine road should be designed to provide a high quality public transport route, representing part of the east-west core express bus route and the proposed master plan reflects a more rational response to accommodating land uses sought by the Council's policy. With respect to phasing, the Design and Access statement refers to phasing together with specific infrastructure, including The Covid-19 crisis has disproportionately affected bus use and longer terms impacts are impossible to forecast. Despite the unprecedented short-term collapse of demand for the S6 route and the introduction of emergency timetables, the S6 service is anticipated to remain a very important part of the bus network in the longer term and there is no reason not to assume that a frequent service will be fully established at the point the development achieves first occupation. The proposed very efficient use of land and development densities and mix will support high levels of bus patronage. With respect to the western access point and connectivity across the boundary with Symmetry Park, Stagecoach strongly supports all efforts by the Council and the applicant to secure connectivity across the boundary, including to Lotmead, secured by planning conditions, necessary to enable the S6 service to divert through the site. The spine road should be designed so that it can provide a high quality public transport route representing part of the east-west core express bus route and the proposed master plan reflects a more rational response to accommodating land uses sought by the Council's policy. With respect to phasing, the Design and Access statement refers to phasing together with specific infrastructure, including the spine road; there is a requirement for the east-west spine road to be completed and made available along its entire length to enable use for regular bus services, early within the development's trajectory.</p>
Go South Coast (Swindon Bus	Original (22.02.18)	Go South Coast operates across the south of England and transport has an important part to play in facilitating sustainable development, so the transport

Company)		system should be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes to offer choice for travel. The submitted Transport Assessment has failed to identify how this will be met.
	Revised (06.05.2020)	Support the western entrance to enable permeability through the site and wish to clarify why the Gable Cross (Sainsbury's) roundabout, which has returned to a signalised crossing before the roundabout on approaches rather than a signalised roundabout. The infrastructure cost plan notes an allocation of £15,000 per bus shelter/stop provision as well as an allowance for service information, but this excludes real-time information which should also be included within the costs at this stage. Concerns remain that the location for the Park and Ride site, as it is clearly designed to access Oxford and not Swindon. Go South Coast/Swindon Bus Company remain of the view that connections to, through and within Swindon should be prioritised rather than flows to Oxford.

End of report