

Appendix 3 - New Eastern Villages - Statement of Consultation

Swindon - New Eastern Villages

Planning Obligations

Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

October 2016

Blank Page

Contents

	Page No.
1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose	1
3. When did consultation take place?	1
4. Who was consulted?	1
5. Summary of the main issues raised	1
6. Post consultation changes	16

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The statement sets out who was consulted on the revised draft of the New Eastern Villages (NEV) Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD comprises of the Masterplan, the NEV Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the Village Proformas. Please note that this statement should be read in conjunction with the Statement of Consultation published in July 2016.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 The SPD sets out Swindon Borough Council's (SBC's) approach to securing the infrastructure required by planning obligations as a consequence of development at the NEV. The approach detailed within the SPD seeks to achieve the effective delivery of infrastructure to enable sustainable growth at the NEV, and to ensure the right infrastructure is delivered in the right place, at the right time.
- 2.2 In accord with the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (Local Plan) and in particular Policy NC3, the SPD requires a comprehensive approach for dealing with delivery of the NEV, including the provision of infrastructure necessary to create a sustainable development as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3. When did consultation take place?

- 3.1 Public consultation on the revised draft SPD took place between Thursday 21st July and Thursday 18th August 2016. A total of 147 responses were received; generating 575 comments.

4. Who was consulted?

- 4.1 In accord with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, all statutory consultees and interested parties were notified of the public consultation.
- 4.2 A formal public notice was made available in the locally distributed newspaper, together with publication on the Swindon Borough Council website, and hard copies of documents were made available at all libraries and Parish / Town Councils within the Borough.

5. Summary of the Main Issues Raised

- 5.1 All comments have been logged on a 'record of interested parties', and have been responded to by relevant Officers. The following paragraphs seek to

summarise the comments made. Due to the high number of responses received, it is not appropriate to detail all of them within this Statement of Consultation. Detailed comments made and Officer Responses can be found at Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of this document.

Stakeholder responses

5.2 Comments were received from stakeholders including:

- Ainscough Strategic Land Ltd
- Alan Drury Architects
- Barberry (Swindon) Ltd
- Capital Land Property Group Ltd and Capital Planning Ltd
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation
- DV4 Properties Swindon Co. Ltd
- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission
- Freehold owners of the Southern Connector Road (SCR)
- GWH Foundation Trust, Swindon CCG, Public Health (SBC)
- Hannick Homes, Hallam Land and Taylor Wimpey (DLA)
- Hannick Homes and Peploe Trust (DLA)
- Haydon Wick Parish Council
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Ministry of Defence (MOD)
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
- South Marston Parish Council
- Stratton Park Ltd

- Swindon Bicycle Users Group
- Thames Water Ltd
- The Ramblers
- The Swindon & Oxfordshire Canal Partnership
- The Inland Waterways Association
- Wanborough Anti Flood Group
- Wanborough Parish Council
- Wilts & Berks Canal Trust (including responses from their members Nationwide)
- Woodlands Trust
- Vicarage Ventures Ltd
- Individuals throughout the Borough, and in adjacent areas.

5.3 A number of key themes and issues are highlighted in the consultation responses, as well as more specific comments related to infrastructure provision:

- Support for the safeguarding and future delivery of the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal within the NEV development area;
- There is support for some of the changes made to the Masterplan;
- There is disappointment that the revised draft SPD does not state a requirement to secure planning obligations to deliver the canal at the NEV;
- A joint response from the GWH Foundation Trust, Swindon CCG and Public Health (SBC) seeks a requirement to secure S106 contributions to support the increased demand in planned care services and emergency care services for the population growth expected from the development;
- Other comments relate to the lack of detail shown on the Masterplan, particularly related to a comprehensive network of public rights of way and cycleways; and
- Detailed comments from Land Owners, Strategic Land Promoters and Developers are addressed separately in paragraph 5.6 of this Statement.

Council's Response

- 5.4 Over half of the responses related to the safeguarding, and delivery, of the Wilts and Berks Canal. Local Plan Policy NC3 requires that the canal alignment within the NEV area is safeguarded, and Policy EN11: Heritage Transport requires that the long term re-establishment of the Wilts and Berks Canal as a navigable waterway is not prejudiced by new development. As with previous comments made to the first draft SPD, a number of the responses specifically requested the Council to secure financial contributions from the NEV developers to fund construction/delivery of the canal. This would not meet the statutory tests for securing s106 planning obligations, in that they must be:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms,
 - Directly related to the development,
 - Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 5.5 With regards to public rights of way, further revisions to the Masterplan have sought to address this. Please refer to paragraph 5.62 for more details.
- 5.6 Unless directly related to development at the NEV there is no policy basis to secure contributions towards the GWH. Such evidence can inform the review of the Local Plan.

Comments from Land Owners, Strategic Land Promoters and Developers

- 5.7 In summary, comments made from **Ainscough Strategic Land Ltd** relate to:
- There is doubt as to whether the framework S106 Agreement can be achieved.
 - Support the broad arrangements of the Masterplan, and latest changes to the Masterplan including the residential development to the west of the existing access from Wanborough Road to Lotmead Village.
 - The education strategy is not supported.
 - The SCR is inconsistent with that presented by Ainscough.
 - Should include the land required for archaeology in situ as open space.
 - There is a lack of reference to the Local Growth Fund (LGF) to deliver schemes.

The Council's response

- 5.8 The Council notes the support for the Masterplan, however considers that the SPD sets out a clear framework for the coordination and timely delivery of infrastructure.
- 5.9 In order to provide for primary education need generated by the proposal, and to accord with the Local Plan and the requirements of the comprehensive NEV allocation, an appropriate solution would be to provide two separate 2FE primary schools with 26 part time place nursery, with one school located at Lotmead and one school located at Lower Lotmead. Therefore two school sites would be required and this would cater for the demographic peak of the development.
- 5.10 With regards to the SCR, it is not necessary to revise as the detailed alignment will be resolved at reserved matters stage.
- 5.11 As stated in the village proformas, land required in order to preserve Scheduled Monuments and other nationally/regionally important undesignated archaeological sites and their settings in situ should not be accounted for as public open space. Public open space should be provided in accordance with the typologies and standards as set out in Policy EN3 of the Local Plan.
- 5.12 With regards to funding provided by external bodies for the provision of infrastructure, this is referenced at Section 3 of the SPD. It states that there will be a provision in the legal agreement between the Council and the landowner/developer providing a mechanism to off-set or pay back the correct proportion of the contribution paid by the landowner/developer towards the same infrastructure, as appropriate. It may not be possible to assess this until all the relevant infrastructure has been delivered and comprehensive final costs of delivery are known.
- 5.13 Where forward funding has taken place in order to ensure the early provision of infrastructure, the Council will secure section 106 contributions retrospectively with the grant of planning permissions post-dating the provision of such infrastructure so as to reimburse the forward funder(s) of the infrastructure.
- 5.14 In summary, comments made from **Barberry Developments Ltd** related to the following:
- Imposition of BREEAM standard on proposed village shop and 2FE School would impact upon viability.
 - Potential capacity to deliver 575 units.
 - No justification for a community hub or contributions towards Adult Social Care.

- Strong objection with regards to contribution towards District Heating Network.
- GP facility should be delivered by the private sector.
- Do not consider that there is a need for traffic calming measures to be taken in villages other than Wanborough.
- No capital project identified for delivery of library provision.
- Local health provision unsure what this refers to if GP facility will be provided.
- Sports facilities to be analysed and costed before contributions agreed.
- No justification for Great Western Community Forest (GWCF) if providing onsite open space and landscaping.
- No evidence for the archaeology / storage solutions.
- No impact to require public art contribution.
- Consider that there are certain items in the IDP that are not necessary and would not meet the CIL tests (203/205 of the framework).
- The SPD does not make it clear that significant elements of the transport infrastructure are to be funded by Central Government.
- Council will fall foul of pooling restrictions.
- May not be appropriate or feasible to achieve a framework S106 agreement.

The Council's response

- 5.15 There is a policy requirement for non-residential development to meet BREEAM Excellent standard.
- 5.16 The Council consider that to ensure fair and equitable distribution of the necessary planning obligations, a framework Section 106 Agreement will ensure the effective delivery and maintenance of the required infrastructure.
- 5.17 All the infrastructure items identified in the SPD are informed by the Local Plan, and are required to facilitate the phased delivery of development at the NEV in a timely and coordinated way. Each infrastructure item and related cost is supported by an evidence base and is clearly referenced in the NEV IDP as shown at Appendix B, part (i) of the SPD.
- 5.18 With regards to funding provided by external bodies for the provision of infrastructure, this is referenced at Section 3 of the SPD. It states that there will be a provision in the legal agreement between the Council and the landowner/developer providing a mechanism to off-set or pay back the correct proportion of the contribution paid by the landowner/developer towards the same infrastructure as appropriate. It may not be possible to assess this until all the relevant infrastructure has been delivered and comprehensive final costs of delivery are known.

- 5.19 Where forward funding has taken place in order to ensure the early provision of infrastructure, the Council will secure section 106 contributions retrospectively with the grant of planning permissions post-dating the provision of such infrastructure so as to reimburse the forward funder(s) of the infrastructure.
- 5.20 The SPD has been prepared in line with the Regulation 122 requirements and contributions that will be sought by means of planning obligation from each development are directly, fairly and reasonably related to the impact caused by the development. These contributions are reasonably required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In addition, under Regulation 123, the Council will take into consideration the impact of the s106 pooling restriction for planning obligations current at the time of the SPD adoption, when negotiating contributions to be secured by planning obligations.
- 5.21 In accord with policy, contributions will be required to deliver traffic calming and management measures within Wanborough and surrounding villages and hamlets to avoid rat-running.
- 5.22 In summary, comments from **Hannick Homes, Hallam Land and Taylor Wimpey** related to the following:
- The SPD needs to be more flexible.
 - There is no change has been made (apart from viability section) to the SPD.
 - Define the 'Framework Agreement' as new policy.
 - Grampian style conditions are not justified.
 - Unjustified contributions towards Public Art, Adult Social Care, Health facilities.
 - District Heating Network is not a matter for policy.
 - Query whether there is an overlap of the leisure facility with the hubs.
 - The provision of an under-bridge to the north of the A420 to Rowborough should be included and should be added to the list.
 - Excessive costs detailed with regards to White Hart Junction, SCR, Nature Reserve, and Major Open Space.
 - Each item should be fully justified.
 - Footpath (FP) 5 should be corrected to an improved link across the railway.
 - Should be made clear that the Village Proformas do not form part of the SPD.
 - Viability is not covered in a clear way.
 - The cost information in Table 1 will need to be appropriately caveated.

- The SPD should make it clear that the list of infrastructure referred in the village proformas does not form part of the SPD and are flexible and subject to review.

The Council's response

- 5.23 The changes made to the SPD at the revised draft stage are clearly set out in the Statement of Consultation (July 2016).
- 5.24 The SPD comprises of the Masterplan, the NEV IDP and Village Proformas, providing a robust framework for securing infrastructure delivery at the NEV.
- 5.25 All the infrastructure items identified in the SPD are informed by the Local Plan, and are required to facilitate the phased delivery of development at the NEV in a timely and coordinated way. Each infrastructure item and related cost is supported by an evidence base and is clearly referenced in the NEV IDP as shown at Appendix B of the SPD.
- 5.26 The leisure facility relates specifically to the delivery of an indoor leisure facility at the NEV whilst the delivery of sports 'hubs' relate to the provision of outdoor sports facilities (requirements in line with Policy EN3), to provide a minimum of 4no. Playing pitches and associated ancillary uses including a pavilion, changing facilities and an appropriate level of car parking provision.
- 5.27 With regards to the railway under-bridge serving Rowborough village, it is considered that this represents direct development access and is therefore not subject to NEV wide contribution as strategic infrastructure. The under-bridge will however be secured against the delivery of development at Rowborough village, subject to an agreed trigger.
- 5.28 With regards to viability and as stated in Section 4 of the SPD, the Council has carried out an independent Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) in respect of the costs of infrastructure required as part of the NEV development. The FVA demonstrates that NEV is broadly deliverable with the required level of contributions to the costs of infrastructure as set out in this SPD, subject to assumptions around site specific costs, such as ground works etc. Therefore, in principle, the Council does not expect developers to challenge the viability of their proposed schemes.
- 5.29 Following consultation, the cost information detailed in Table 1 has now been removed.
- 5.30 In summary, comments from **Hannick Homes and the Peploe Trust** relate to the following:

- The agreement reached between Hannick Homes and Peploe Trust demonstrates a significant opportunity to deliver a larger part of the SCR.
- The proposed amendments to the Masterplan show how this could be achieved holistically.

The Council's Response

5.31 The LPA acknowledges the positive response from Hannick Homes and the Peploe Trust in co-operating to deliver the SCR and associated development at an early stage. Unknown constraints prevent the development of a fixed SCR route at this stage and hence the alignment on the Masterplan is considered indicative only. The Council will engage with landowners as the alignment becomes more fixed and access arrangements to land will be considered at that stage.

5.32 In summary, comments from **Capital Land Property Group Ltd and Capital Planning Ltd**

- SPD fails the legal requirements for planning obligations.
- The evidence is not up to date.
- The mechanisms are too prescriptive.
- Significant delay in the development at the NEV coming forward.
- No viability assessment to support viability.
- Pooling restriction.

Council's response

5.33 In the interests of delivering fair and equitable distribution of the necessary planning obligations, and in the absence of 'alternative mechanism' examples submitted for consideration, the Council consider that a framework Section 106 Agreement will ensure the effective delivery and maintenance of the required infrastructure.

5.34 The SPD has been prepared in line with the Regulation 122 requirements and contributions that will be sought by means of planning obligation from each development are directly, fairly and reasonably related to the impact caused by the development. These contributions are reasonably required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In addition, under Regulation 123, the Council will take into consideration the impact of the s106 pooling restriction for planning obligations current at the time of the SPD adoption, when negotiating contributions to be secured by planning obligations.

5.35 The infrastructure items identified in the SPD are informed by the Local Plan, and are required to facilitate the phased delivery of development at the NEV in a timely and coordinated way. Each infrastructure item is supported by an

evidence base and is clearly referenced in the NEV IDP table as shown at Appendix B of the SPD.

5.36 The Council has carried out an independent Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) in respect of the costs of infrastructure required as part of the NEV development. The FVA demonstrates that NEV is broadly deliverable with the required level of contributions to the costs of infrastructure as set out in this SPD, subject to assumptions around site specific costs, such as ground works etc. Therefore, in principle, the Council does not expect developers to challenge the viability of their proposed schemes.

5.37 In summary, comments from **DV4 Properties Swindon Co. Ltd**

- B2 should be added to the list of uses at the District Centre

The Council's Response

5.38 The Council consider that B2 (general industry) and B8 (storage or distribution) use classes are included in the key as acceptable District Centre uses, subject to being in a location and form that compliments the mixed-use District Centre (as set Policy NC3). The map legend on the Masterplan has been updated to reflect this, please refer to the Masterplan at Appendix A of the SPD.

5.39 In summary, comments from **Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd**

- Support the change to the Masterplan which now clearly includes the existing Sainsbury's store within the designated District Centre.
- The Sainsbury's store and district centre have important roles to play in containing newly generated trips within the NEV.
- Reiterate previous comments that the A420 highway junction improvements would need to be robustly demonstrated and that they would not be detrimental to the operation of the existing Sainsbury's store or the future of the district centre.

Council's response

5.40 The Council acknowledges the support for the Masterplan, and welcomes the ongoing active role from Sainsbury's in the NEV.

5.41 The aim of all junction interventions is to maximise capacity, without negatively implicating upon existing user groups. The operation of Gablecross Roundabout in its revised form will be established through further commissioned modelling and appropriate sense checks which Sainsbury's and other stakeholders will be engaged with.

Parish Councils

5.42 In summary, comments from **Wanborough Parish Council**:

- There is no cycle or footpath shown along Wanborough Road on the Masterplan.
- There is not enough detail shown on Masterplan for the main infrastructure junctions, providing a circle at each junction is not sufficient to understand how for instance the SCR will cross over the Wanborough Road.
- The Masterplan should show how the SCR links in with Pack Hill and Commonhead Roundabout; this has been left off the map. The SCR is a key piece of infrastructure within the NEV therefore the whole route of the road should be shown on the Masterplan.
- The route of the SCR needs to be realigned to allow connection from Redlands village.
- The sum of money to prevent rat running through neighbouring villages needs to be quantified and include the whole of Wanborough village.
- The NEV will result in additional pressures on facilities within Wanborough village, such as the sports facilities, play areas and open spaces. These facilities will be used by residents moving into the NEV especially when their facilities are not yet built; therefore provision should be included within the SPD to help towards the improvement of these facilities.
- Raise concern that there will insufficient funding for the road connections, plus bridges needed between development islands and this could result in areas such as Redlands village being completely disconnected from the rest of the NEV.
- The Redlands village proforma details an average density of 40 dwellings per hectare, this does not agree with the Local Plan which states that density around the outskirts of the NEV will reduce to mitigate the impact on neighbouring villages, views from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and surrounding countryside.
- The reference in the Redlands village proforma details approx. 300 - 400 dwellings. It is considered that this percentage range is extremely high and more exact numbers need to be allocated to this area. The number is considerably higher than that recommended by the Planning Inspector.

- The Redlands village proforma inset map shows an access onto Wanborough Road, this is not detailed in the description under the detail for infrastructure needs.

Council's response

- 5.43 The Council consider that footway provision along Wanborough Road will be required as a consequence of NEV development.
- 5.44 The Masterplan covers the entire NEV strategic land allocation in the Local Plan. The SCR alignment and its detailed design, beyond the strategic land allocation, will be subject to a detailed planning application and public consultation.
- 5.45 The treatment of the 'improved' Wanborough Road and design of the SCR and Redlands village junctions, with Wanborough Road, will be detailed to maximise the attractiveness of the use of the SCR route to Redlands village traffic and, to minimise the likelihood of traffic to rat-run through Wanborough village.
- 5.46 The scale of the Masterplan does not allow for junction proposals to be clearly shown. Junction proposals will be designed according to the Highway Authority/Department of Transport requirements and will be subject to reserved matters and public consultation.
- 5.47 With regards to facilities within Wanborough village and in accord with planning legislation, planning obligations can only be sought when they fulfil the statutory tests as set out in Section 2 of the SPD.
- 5.48 With regards to the dwelling numbers, as stated in the Redlands village proforma this is an approximate number of dwellings that could potentially be delivered at Redlands village. Policy NC3 states that a design led approach to housing density leading to an overall average density of 40 dwellings per hectare should be achieved which responds to landscape and existing site conditions.
- 5.49 The Redlands village proforma has been revised to reflect that access arrangements onto Wanborough Road shall be designed to avoid rat running through Wanborough village.
- 5.50 In summary, comments from **South Marston Parish Council**:
- Welcome more detail about process arrangements governing NEV S106 provision and welcome revisions made to the Masterplan. The Parish are pleased to see inclusion of the road access through Oxleaze Farm land to Thornhill Road.

- Welcome the inclusion of traffic management and calming measures and the expansion of the road network requirements, including new junctions at Carpenters Arms with controlled shuttle movements and contribution to public transport services.
- Welcome the inclusion of Community Forest onsite planting schemes and the inclusion of gas to the required utilities infrastructure services.
- Support with regards to the uncosted elements within the SPD, particularly the road safety and traffic management, early years provision at local and district centres, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) provision management and maintenance and open space management.
- Welcome the A420 footway/cycleway improvements, however, for South Marston, the A420 safe crossing concept seems limited to the former shorter stretch. The Rowborough village proforma covers the longer stretch. The overall PROW network needs to be phased satisfactorily to ensure appropriate safety.
- Pleased to see the inclusion of improvements to Footpath 5, but note that the cost has reduced from £1.5 million in the original draft SPD to £1 million in the revised draft. Object to the reduced cost as this is an essential item of infrastructure to deliver sustainable modes of transport.
- Disappointed that the Masterplan does not specifically refer public rights of way (PROW) types, seek commitment to the preparation of an “additional overlay” to designate route types (for example, cycleways).
- Masterplan conflicts with the draft South Marston Neighbourhood plan in relation to the required PROW network.
- Oppose the PROW along Old Vicarage Lane (OVL) which is shown on Masterplan.
- Require a cycleway from South Marston Farm to link across OVL with Rowborough Lane.
- There is no plan to show how cycleways at Bridleway 4 and Footpath 5 will safely co-exist with proposed road near Oxleaze Wood/SM Farm.
- Note that the Masterplan now includes PROW from Rowborough village through existing tunnels to reach the A420 but no means identified of safe crossing of A420.
- Query the cost of each of the village halls which seem far lower than the Parish’s estimates.

- Further comments were also made to the South Marston village proforma at the Revised Draft stage. Please refer to the table of detailed comments made and Officer Responses.

Council's response

- 5.51 The Council notes the support comments made to the revised draft SPD and Masterplan.
- 5.52 With regards to Public Rights of Way, the Council consider that the level of detail is too difficult to show on a 1:5000 scale Masterplan. Furthermore detailed identification and specification of route types will be undertaken following adoption of the SPD. South Marston Parish Council will be consulted during this process.
- 5.53 Revisions have been made to closely align the Masterplan with the draft South Marston Neighbourhood Plan. With regards to the PROW along Old Vicarage Lane (OVL), this route is shown to provide a safe walking route along OVL for residents walking towards the school and recreation ground. The detailed alignment will be resolved at reserved matters application stage.
- 5.54 With regards to the requirement for a cycleway from South Marston Farm to link across OVL with Rowborough Lane, this route has been added to the Masterplan.
- 5.55 The Council acknowledge that it will be an important requirement to show how cycleways at Bridleway 4 and Footpath 5 will safely co-exist with proposed road near Oxleaze Wood / South Marston Farm. This will be resolved at the detailed planning stage. Similarly with ensuring safe PROW to link the Carpenter's Arm road tunnel and field tunnel to east, the Council acknowledge this as an important road safety issue and will be resolved at detailed design stage.
- 5.56 Footbridge 5 will be constructed to a standard that meets Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) requirements and this will include ramps. Cycleway, rights of way, traffic management and safety are considered within the revised village proforma's.
- 5.57 In summary, comments from **Wilts & Berks Canal Trust (WBCT)**:
- WBCT are disappointed that SBC has failed to modify the SPD as a result of the large response to the first draft SPD regarding the inclusion of a built canal.
 - Swindon Borough Council seems not to have taken the previously stated views of the Wilts & Berks Canal Trust into account. It is our view that similar to development at Wichelstowe, the construction of the

canal must be included as part of the New Eastern Villages infrastructure and should be funded by the developers. The inclusion of the canal will provide opportunities for flood relief and land drainage.

- The canal offers a wonderful opportunity to provide a distinctive character for the New Eastern Villages which will make it an attractive and potentially award winning feature of this development.

Council's response

- 5.58 The Council recognises and welcomes the significant benefits that future delivery of the Wilts & Berks Canal within the NEV would provide for existing and new communities. In accordance with the Local Plan, the Masterplan reflects the safeguarding of the canal alignment at the NEV and planning applications will be required to comply with Policy EN11: Heritage Transport and Policy NC3: New Eastern Villages of the Local Plan to ensure that development does not compromise the delivery of the canal.
- 5.59 However, the Council cannot enforce delivery through the planning process and the cost of the construction and maintenance associated with the delivery of the canal cannot be secured through the planning process; and therefore its inclusion within the NEV IDP is not justified. The Council can only secure contributions for infrastructure that is required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In the short term, the safeguarded route presents a recreational opportunity for walking, cycling and biodiversity gain.
- 5.60 The Council acknowledge that a canal can provide some of the main principles of an overall SuDS scheme to provide drainage and flood risk benefits and this is recognised in the Draft SuDS Vision SPD (July 2016). If the canal is delivered as part of the development, it can form part of the drainage solution, where it is being proposed by the applicant. However, the Council cannot specify which drainage solutions are used to meet the requirements of an overall SuDS scheme.

6. Post revised draft consultation changes made to the NEV Planning Obligations SPD

- 6.1 As a result of comments made to the revised draft SPD, the following changes have been made:
- Improved structure of the SPD;
 - Removal of Table 2 which covered site-specific infrastructure requirements; and
 - Updated section on Viability to provide further clarification and the detailed expected for submitted viability assessments (Section 4 of the SPD).

Post revised draft consultation changes made to the Masterplan

6.2 In addition to the points addressed above, the following changes have been made to the **New Eastern Villages Masterplan**:

- Further amendments to South Marston footpath-cycleway network (cycleway from South Marston Farm to Rowborough Lane added);
- Clarification of the legend on the Masterplan (District Centre uses/Strategic and Amenity Rights of Way);
- Minor revisions to overall footpath-cycleway network; and
- Minor amendment to South Marston housing parcel north of Bridleway No.4.

6.3 Comments from the Ramblers and the Bicycle Uses Group (BUG) highlights the need for further detailing of the proposed NEV pedestrian/cycleway network. A NEV Green Infrastructure (GI) Draft Supplementary Planning Document is currently being drafted and will be available for public consultation in the autumn. It will include more detailed examination and illustration of the proposed network(s) in conjunction with strategic proposals for GI provision.

6.4 There is an acknowledgement that developer proposals for a number of the village “islands” (e.g. Great Stall East, Foxbridge) are less advanced than for others; as detailed work progresses the Development Management process will ensure that emerging proposals are guided by, and are in broad accordance, with the NEV Masterplan. This is consistent with the iterative process which necessarily guides the preparation of the Masterplan for a development as large and complex as the NEV.

Post revised draft consultation changes made to the Village Proformas

6.5 In addition to points addressed above, the following other changes were made to the village proformas:

- The presentation of the village proformas has changed to provide more clarity;
- The inset maps, to reflect the final version of the Masterplan;
- Consistency in the referencing of the infrastructure items in the village proformas and in the infrastructure requirements list (IDP);
- Reference to all relevant policy documents and additional points of clarification.

Post consultation changes made to the NEV IDP

6.6 In addition to points addressed above, the following other changes have been made to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NEV Update):

- Justification and an update on the status of projects (where appropriate)