

Response Number	Respondent	Chapter Number	Paragraph Number	Respondee Comment	SBC Officer Response	Document Amended?
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	All vehicle routes to be of suitable and sufficient capacity for the emergency response of FRS vehicles	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process.	No
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Traffic calming/control measures to not unduly impede emergency response of FRS vehicles.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process.	No
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Emergency access available for the proposed 'green bridge' Great Stall bridge over the A419	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process and subject to application of a Traffic Regulation Order which will consider emergency vehicle access.	No
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Enhanced traffic route south to Common Head roundabout together with improvements to junction to improve traffic flow and reduce peak time congestion	This is not within the remit of the FTP, however the 'enhanced traffic route', known as the Southern Connector Road, is programmed for delivery between October 2019 and March 2021.	No

1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Residential parking arrangements to provide suitable passage for responding emergency FRS vehicles with reduced opportunity for 'kerb mounted' ad hoc parking	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application procedures and will take account of adopted and emerging parking standards, alongside necessary modelled emergency and refuse vehicle tracking of residential and commercial roads.	No
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Cycle users, where possible, to have separated routes from vehicle traffic, reducing the likelihood of collisions and injuries.	This is detailed within paras 5.10 and 5.11.	No
1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	'Traffic light' controlled junctions to have emergency vehicle recognition cameras allowing for improved response times and traffic flow	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process, followed by detailed signal design and eventual highway adoption procedures.	No

1	Dorset and Wilts Fire and Rescue	General Comment	General Comment	Road side vegetation to be low maintenance and not to impede driver vision at junctions	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process, with consideration of future maintenance liability following highway adoption.	No
2	HSE Hazardous Installations	General Comment	General Comment	We have concluded that we have no representation to make at this stage of your local planning process.	Noted.	No
3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chapter 4	Table 4.2	Suggests residents will develop bad habits that have to be improved on rather than putting in measures to prevent bad habits in the first place.	Infrastructure and service provision will be provided as early in the delivery programme as physically and financially feasible. This early delivery will aim to reduce the development of bad habits and will be supplemented by 'soft measures' advising residents of opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport and how to reduce travel demand.	No

3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chapter 3	3.8	Great Stall bridge - Questions use of the words "bus priority" when local plan says "bus only"	Policy NC3 of the Adopted Local Plan considers the Great Stall Bridge as "a green bridge across the A419 near Covingham Drive to provide for walking, cycling and public transport". Through development of the masterplan and through consideration of the planning process, the 'provision' for Public Transport routing across the bridge will be determined.	No
3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chapter 3	3.16	No railway station - demonstrates a lack of vision as we could have a Swindon Parkway.	The potential to secure a further Railway Station was considered through the feasibility study for the development. This however concluded that the proximity of any new station with that of Swindon Station renders it unviable and would cause undue network timetabling difficulties. Furthermore, the implied comparison with Bristol Parkway is unwarranted due to the significant difference in geographical scale and population and the multitude of rail lines accomodated by Bristol.	No

3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chap 3	3.2	Route 45 does not run through East Swindon	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chapter 5	5.5	Incorrect spelling of "Principals"	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
3	John Ratsey (Resident)	Chapter 3	3.6	White Hart junction improvements threaten the east-west cycle / ped links, which are difficult to improve on as they are currently.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. The indicative design of the White Hart Junction facilitates the potential retention of the existing Cycle/Footway Bridge and will further provide for at-grade controlled crossing or each roundabout arm. It may therefore be confirmed that the indicative White Hart Junction proposals improve upon the current east west cycle links and these will be further supported and enhanced by the delivery of Great Stall Bridge across the A419.	No
3	John Ratsey (Resident)	General Comment	General Comment	There's no mention of potential cycle / ped links along Wilt and Berks canal	Although this issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP; additional wording to increase awareness of this opportunity has been included.	Yes

	4	WYG (on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarket's)	General Comment	General Comment	Bulk shopping is a car borne activity and part of trip link chaining and therefore Sainsburys and District Centre should be exempt from mode share targets.	Sainsbury's and the District Centre should not be exempt from mode share targets as they may significantly influence the travel profiles of staff and visitors and may further reduce the impact of car borne bulk shopping through home delivery incentives etc. Furthermore, the site specific Travel Plans for the District Centre and Sainsbury's will be subject to site specific targets which will feed into the Global Targets, but will not necessarily be the same and will reflect the land uses on site.	No
	4	WYG (on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarket's)	Appendix 1	Masterplan	The draft illustrative masterplan should include the Sainsburys store within the District Centre (coloured blue) as per the local plan.	The Adopted Masterplan will be re-configured to accord with Figure 11 of the Adopted Local Plan.	Yes - Prior to adoption
	5	Great Coxwell Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Good detail for some modes of transport but lacks detail around public transport	The FTP reflects current public transport opportunities and is considered to have sufficient detail for a FTP SPD.	No

5	Great Coxwell Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.14	More detailed design guidance needed around routes to schools, or point to other guidance	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application procedures and will take account of adopted standards.	No
5	Great Coxwell Parish Council	Appendix 2	NEV residential TP	There doesn't seem any specified requirement here for defined S106 to fund the planned local bus / rapid transport scheme	This is dealt with in the IDP, which forms the basis for S106 negotiations and infrastructure/service delivery.	No
6	Natural England	General Comment	General Comment	Transport corridors of all types should be designed to be tree lined or otherwise rendered attractive through natural measures. We understand that in addition to the normal green infrastructure benefits, trees lined routes tend to reduce driver speed, driver stress levels, and encourage modal shift towards active travel. Para 5.16 alludes to some of this, but does not support this approach per se	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the masterplanning and planning procedures and will be subject to detailed design to consider species suitability and future maintenance liability.	No

6	Natural England	General Comment	General Comment	Tree planting may also be appropriate to give separation to “on street” parking bays	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the masterplanning and planning procedures and will be subject to detailed design to consider species suitability and future maintenance liability; this approach is readily used in other areas of the highway network.	No
7	Ramblers Association	Chapter 5	5.9	Fully support this paragraph, and the principles must be adopted throughout the development	Agreed	No
7	Ramblers Association	Chapter 5	5.10 and 5.11	We welcome the proposals for segregated footways/cycleways alongside all primary and secondary roads as set out in paras 5.10 and 5.11 but this must not be at the expense of other public rights of way. A network of PRowS running through “green corridors” and green open spaces, as referred to in para 5.15, is equally important.	Agreed	No

7	Ramblers Association	Chapter 5	General Comment	The network of safe walking routes must include safe crossings of the A420 and a safe route across the new White Hart junction. These requirements should be mentioned specifically within the document.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. The revised masterplan will include A420 crossing points to be indicated on the masterplan prior to adoption, whilst the White Hart junction improvements are being developed with the indicative proposals already including at-grade pedestrian crossing points of each roundabout arm.	No
---	----------------------	-----------	-----------------	--	---	----

8		General Comment	General Comment	<p>We are greatly concerned with the current infrastructure on the A419, the A420 and J15 of the M4. We do not believe that the increase in road traffic from the new development has been fully taken into consideration on these areas. From the A420 junction going south on the A419 it doesn't appear that there are any infrastructure changes to cope with the increase in traffic.</p>	<p>This issue is not considered to be within the remit of the FTP. The emerging Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations associated with the New Eastern Villages, incorporates an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which considers all the necessary highway interventions necessary to accommodate this development. These interventions include improvements to the A420 corridor between Greenbridge Roundabout and Acorn Bridge and A419 improvements between White Hart junction and Junction 15 of the M4; further highway works are also considered away from these corridors.</p>	No
---	--	--------------------	--------------------	--	--	----

8	Chiseldon Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	There are a number of roundabouts along and near this route such as Whitehart, Merlin, Commonhead and Coate Water and these will all be affected by the increase in traffic from the development and commuters heading into Oxford, Swindon and down to J15 of the M4. This does not appear to have been addressed in the planning document	This issue is considered to be within the remit of the FTP. The emerging Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations associated with the New Eastern Villages, incorporates an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which considers all the necessary highway interventions necessary to accomodate this development. These interventions include improvements to the A420 corridor between Greenbridge Roaundabout and Acorn Bridge and A419 improvements between White Hart junction and and Junction 15 of the M4; further highway works are also considered away from these corridors.	No
---	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	---	---	----

8	Chiseldon Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	The A419 leading down to the M4 is a current traffic bottle neck. With it only being two lanes wide and not having a hard shoulder, any accident immediately reduces this road to a one lane road causing considerable delays. As traffic tries to find alternative routes, small rural roads face traffic volumes they are unable to cope with. We believe the A419 requires a hard shoulder for emergency use.	This issue is not considered to be within the remit of the FTP. The emerging Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations associated with the New Eastern Villages, incorporates an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which considers all the necessary highway interventions necessary to accomodate this development. These interventions include improvements to the A420 corridor between Greenbridge Roaundabout and Acorn Bridge and A419 improvements between White Hart junction and and Junction 15 of the M4; further highway works are also considered away from these corridors. These works aim to maximiose highway capacity to ensure that these routes are less susceptible to	No
8	Chiseldon Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	The additional use of J15 from the increased number of nearby residents will also increase the already horrendous traffic situation going north to the junction from the A346. As a result we believe that these issues should be addressed before the construction of the Eastern Villages.	There are plans for improvements at J15, but is not within the remit of a FTP.	No

9	Highways England	General Comment	General Comment	Highways England welcome a strategic TPC. Also welcome the mode shift timescales and targets. HE support the measures outlined.m HE support the remedial measures payments and monitoring regime.	Noted.	No
9	Highways England	Chapter 4	table 4.1	NEV Travel Plan Group - Can Highways England be invited to join?	Agreed. Amended to reflect request.	Yes
10	Woodland Trust	Chapter 3	paras 3.6 – 3.10	DCLG has produced revised guidance - would like reference to use of street trees along travel routes as means of providing attractive environmental screening. Also raising many other points regarding the strategic use of trees	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It will be addressed through the detailed masterplanning and planning application process.	No
11	Environment Agency	General Comment	General Comment	Confirm they have no comments	Noted.	No
12	Network Rail	General Comment	General Comment	Stepped footbridge on the site of Marston West crossing - SBC require cycle compatibility but no funding to do this. Developer contributions should be sought for rail infrastructure.	Developer contributions are being sought from appropriate developments for DDA compliant ramps over the railway; this is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the development.	No

12	Network Rail	General Comment	General Comment	Increased patronage from the new development will require upgrades to existing infrastructure, and developer contributions should be sought for this. (List of bullets given)	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. It is however acknowledged that one of the three funding streams for Network Rail arrives from charging for track access levied on the passenger and freight train operators. In this regard, increased patronage represents the potential for increased remuneration and as such the NEV development should not be levied against.	No
12	Network Rail	General Comment	General Comment	Be mindful of impact of planning proposals on level crossings.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. Furthermore, through planned electrification, all level crossings in the locality are in the process of being removed and hence the development will not have an impact upon infrastructure that is planned to be removed.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.1	Document doesn't state how to overcome the problem of the flood plains	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.3	66 does not serve much of the NEV	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes

13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.4	The stated journey time of 11 minutes is not a true reflection of the journey time.	This information based on current timetable information. Any timetable departure is planned to be addressed through improved junction facilities and the implication of Great Stall Bridge and associated Rapid Transit infrastructure.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.6 to 3.10	No mention of Southern Connector Road or upgrade to J15	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.12	There's no evidence that park and rides work in Swindon.	Park and Ride represents a policy consideration for delivery of the NEV and is subject of ongoing analysis to confirm an appropriate design and ticketin to maximise patronage.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.17 - 3.20	Important that cycling and walking provision are includedin plans for the Southern Connector Road	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.3	Lighting on ped and cycle routes could result in urbanising the rural area. Wanborough PC will not support the urbanisation of Wanborough Road.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. The lighting strategy for each individual village island and its connectivity is subject to on-going assessment and urbanisation is a strong consideration that will be mitigated against.	No

13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.6	Masterplan does not tie in with the this section (how will Redlands access the Southern Connector Road?)	The masterplan allows for access from Redlands to the Southern Connector Road via Lotmead. Furthermore, the design and operation of the junction between Wanborough Road and the Southern Connector Road (SCR) has not been determined, although it may be possible to achieve access to the SCR to and from the south, without opening potential rat running routes from the north.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.14	Safe routes to schools very important and should include secondary schools	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.17	Bus routes will be diverted to serve the first communities. Is this possible for Redlands if the planning app comes out of phase?	The phasing of bus service provision will match the funding streams from developers and hence wherever the NEV development commences, funds will be diverted to ensure bus connectivity.	No

13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.22	There should be enough space within the frontage of properties to allow extension to their parking provision if necessary.	This issue is not considered within the remit of the FTP. The existing and emerging parking standards will be applied and through the masterplanning and planning process, this provision will be planned as a mixture of on plot and on-street parking. Sustainable transport infrastructure and service provision will also be made available, to ensure that car parking demand is managed and mitigated.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.24	Distinction between primary route and secondary routes is not clear.	Primary routes are those that link the individual islands and connect with the A420 and Commonhead. Secondary routes are those within the development islands, or those connecting with the existing network, but which are not prioritised for mass transit; i.e. those connecting with Wanborough Road etc. Amended for clarity.	Yes
13	Wanborough Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	No mention of how traffic congestion at the hospital is to be managed.	Not within the remit of this FTP. SBC are working with the Hospital Trust to provide solutions to this existing issue.	No

13	Wanborough Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	TP does not mention horse riders - needs to be incorporated and considered.	The NEV development will encompass a series of interconnecting recreational routes which will form bridleways, providing access to the rural areas and green infrastructure. This will be considered through the masterplanning process.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	How will Covingham traffic access the A419 - without an easy access there could be rat running through Wanborough.	Not within the remit of this FTP. This will be considered through further detailed design of improvements to White Hart junction.	No
13	Wanborough Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Need a strategy to prevent rat running through rural areas	Not within the remit of this FTP. The access to specific development islands, including the secondary routes that pass through them, will be designed to disincentivise drivers from using them, the primary routes will thereafter be made more attractive to drivers and maximise their usage.	No
14	Swindon Bicycle Users Group (BUG)	General Comment	General Comment	Approve of many of the points and urge them to be taken into adopted document	Noted.	No

14	Swindon Bicycle Users Group (BUG)	Chapter 4	4.2	Mode share targets don't align with cycle framework ambition to double cycling by 2026	The targets given within the FTP reflect the first 5 years of occupation for each development parcel, they do not reflect the period to 2026 and hence the discrepancy in values. Notwithstanding this, the principal aims of doubling cycling numbers is fully supported by SBC and the NEV development is included within this aspiration.	No
14	Swindon Bicycle Users Group (BUG)	Chapter 5	5.11	Garsington Drive not the best example. Where cycle paths cross roads, there should be a raised platform giving cyclists priority. If junction designs are used without a raised platform, they should only be used where low capacity cycle routes cross tertiary, lightly-trafficked side roads	The pre-application and planning process will develop appropriate junction designs for each specific site, rather than have a general approach. In this regard, the application of cycle priority across junctions will be considered against a matrix of other user groups and the place/movement hierarchy. Priority to cyclists will therefore be given where the place hierarchy is high and traffic demand moderate to low, to ensure that cyclists as vulnerable highway users are not placed at undue risk. Amended for clarity.	Yes

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	General Comment	General Comment	Welcome the option of the flexibility over how to carry out their travel plans.	Noted.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.17 - 2.25	Further clarity needed on how FTP relates to further additional contributions over and above resi, school and workplace TPs.	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.17 - 2.25	Not clear as to the nature of the FTP that sits above the operational TPs	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.17 - 2.25	Site wide measures - over and above the TPC - if there are any additional contributions over and above this, they must be explicit and consulted on.	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.24	S106 payments payable on commencement of development - Not reasonable and not consistent with CIL regulations. More sense to pay upon occupation.	It is important to ensure that supporting infrastructure and service provisions are made at outset to ensure appropriate base line mode share and to sow the seeds of sustainable modal shift. Payment on occupation would therefore be considered too late, however consideration will be made for appropriate target payment dates. Amended for clarity.	Yes

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.24	Employee contributions should be on occupation and don't agree with a per square metre calculation as not reasonably related to development. Contributions need to be phased and recognised as such in the FTP document.	Agreed. Removed for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 2	2.17 - 2.25	Consultees have provided suggested wording changes in the document	Partly agree. Amended for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 3	General Comment	Infrastructure needs will be set out in the DPD	The wider infrastructure needs are detailed within the NEV Planning Obligations SPD.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.2	Consultees have provided suggested wording changes in the document - based on the emphasis of the land use travel plans	The FTP will provide overarching measures to provide consistency for future residents across the NEV. Amended for clarity.	Yes

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.3 and 4.4	The two paragraphs are inconsistent - one suggests TPs reflect individual circumstances, the other suggests a TP sign up to global objectives.	These paragraphs are not inconsistent. The wider FTP will include targets and measures for the whole NEV. Individual Travel Plans will then have site specific targets and measures that may differ from the FTP due to site specific constraints or opportunities (direct access to Core Express Bus route etc). The individual targets and measures will feed into the global targets and measures.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.5	As above, not appropriate for end users to sign up to global target without some degree of variation. Consultees have provided suggested alteration of wording	Global objectives, targets and measures are specific to the FTP. Individual sites may have objectives targets and measures that differ from global ones, but these will feed into the global picture. For instance, a site with good access to the Core Express Bus Route may have a higher public transport target than other sites, equally, those sites to the periphery of the NEV may have lower aspirational single occupancy driver targets.	No

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chap 4	4.2	Do not agree with using a flat 10% point reduction as this equates to 14% in reality.	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.2	Issues with comparability of ward - suggest targets over longer period than 5 years	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.1	Refers to table 4.3 which is absent	Agreed. Refernece removed.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 4	4.1 and 4.2	Why are there separate targets for walking, cycling and bus. For flexibility, couldn't the table have an overall 'sustainable transport' target?	Agreed for the global picture, but site specfic targets etc may pick up on on-site opportunities and constraints. Additional tables included.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.9	Re contributions upon occupation rather than commencement of development. Contrary to CIL regulations.	CIL Regulations 122 and 123 relate to the appropriateness for infrastructure to mitigate the development. There is no mention of phasing of payment and consideration of scale considers the whole development not the phased aspect of that development.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.10 and 5.11	It is not appropriate for the FTP to prescribe in detail. Matter for detailed design. No evidence base, contrary to NPPF	The masterplanning process for the NEV development will consider in detail the transport route hierarchy of the site, the FTP will further reflect upon this.	No

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.10 and 5.11	Object to 4 metre cycle ways - guidance is 3 metres. Not needed both sides of carriageway. Would result in excessively wide roads contrary to Manual for Streets.	Sustrans guidance for segregated cycle route provision is provided in table H9 of Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design. This guidance recommends an absolute minimum of 3.5m for short lengths and 4.5m to 7m for acceptable and preferred widths. This section may however be addressed to express 'target widths' against design criteria and dual sided routes subject to development frontage and demand.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chap 5	5.10 - 5.12	Retain the opportunity to ride on road in primary and secondary streets - this will narrow roads and slow speeds. (Main motivation is around access to property frontages)	Disagree. Encouragement needs to be given to cyclists. Not providing off-road provision would be an opportunity lost.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.10 - 5.12	Remove these paragraphs, or change them to not prescribe widths etc.	Disagree. These widths are part of relevant guidance.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.22	Object to using blanket car parking and cycle parking standards - want a caveat to reflect local circumstances.	Swindons adopted parking standards are a matter of policy associated with TR2 of the adopted Local Plan. Notwithstanding this, pragmatic consideration will be made against evidence of supply and demand.	No

15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	5.25	There may be times when it is appropriate to bring a bike through a property - suggest amend wording.	Disagree. Bringing a bike through the house is not appropriate and should not be encouraged.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 5	Table 5	Consultee has suggested amendments to wording to make less prescriptive.	Disagree with amendments due to adopted policy.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 6	General Comment	List of measures should be presented as options rather than requirements	Consistency required between those that sign up to the Residential Travel Plan and those that don't.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 6	6.19 and 6.20	Car club costs need to be further evidenced in the context of S106 agreements	Agreed. Footnote added to document.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 6	6.3	Figures set out in para 6.30 will need to be tested in finalisation against S106 agreements... and paid in step with development not ahead of it - suggest wording.	Disagree. Evidence base supports figures.	No
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 6	Bonds	Disagree with remedial measures being taken as a bond - prefer flexibility to require remedial measures as a negotiate S106	Noted. Amended for clarity.	Yes
15	Hallam Land, Hannick Homes and Taylor Wimpey	Chapter 6	7.9	Request an amendment of the wording	Disagree. Remedial measures will be required in the event that that targets are not met.	No
16	Bishopstone Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Enforcement of the FTP will only be possible with road infrastructure (eg J15...)	Not within the remit of this FTP; however amended for clarity.	Yes

16	Bishopstone Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Infrastructure improvements will need to be implemented in line with the travel plan measures (not been reflected in the planning applications that have come in so far).	Not within the remit of this FTP.	No
16	Bishopstone Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Issue of rat running (same as previous comment - last point from consultee 13)	Not within the remit of this FTP. The access to specific development islands, including the secondary routes that pass through them, will be designed to disincentivise drivers from using them, the primary routes will thereafter be made more attractive to drivers and maximise their usage.	No
16	Bishopstone Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Out of phase development should be restricted to allow for travel plan measures to be implemented.	Not within the remit of this FTP.	No
17	Covingham Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	The concern from members was the 'blocking off' of Wanborough Road and therefore stopping Covingham residents of easy access to Sainsburys and the A419. We understand that this has been raised, acknowledged as an issue and will be looked at. We have no other comments to make at this point in time.	Not within the remit of this FTP.	No

18	South Marston Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	We support the concept of a combined travel plan connecting the travel plan requirements of individual developers within the NEV. This is the only way a comprehensive and satisfactory plan can be generated.	Noted.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	We are somewhat concerned at the southern 'bias' of the draft NEV plan – we would remind officers that some 3,000 dwellings will eventually lie in NEV communities north of the A420.	Noted. Consideration has been given to the links and connections between all development islands north and south of the A420, including the proposed district centre.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	Appendix 1	Appendix 1	Before commenting on the individual content of the draft SPD, we wish to register our continuing objections to the draft illustrative masterplan being used within this document (page 29).	The latest adopted masterplan will be used upon adoption.	Yes
18	South Marston Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	The road linking Old Vicarage Lane to Thornhill Road does not sufficiently "contribute towards the creation of an integrated village" and is not "within the limits of the expanded village" as required by Local Plan Policy RA3. The route shown in Policy 5 of the South Marston Neighbourhood Plan should be adopted. Developers HHT have this argument is accepted then we object because the proposed requires a road to cross the bridleway and private right of way between Old Vicarage Lane and Priors Farley.	Not within the remit of the FTP. Currently being considered as part of ongoing planning application negotiations.	No

18	South Marston Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	No safe and credible foot and cycle link is shown from Rowborough to the NEV and in particular the new secondary school at all or at least until the tunnel junction is finalised. Even then, the considerably more direct route from the western parts of South Marston and the eastern parts of Rowborough will lead to pedestrians and cyclists using the Carpenter's Arms tunnel route, the current plan for which is not safe.	Not within the remit of the FTP. Currently being considered as part of ongoing planning application negotiations.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.2	We would like it noted in the draft SPD that the NEV is also severed by the railway and the A420 which create barriers to a comprehensive non-vehicle ROW network. This emphasises the need for an acceptable ROW network that delivers appropriate connectivity to be required <u>prior</u> to giving outline approval for any NEV development application.	Noted. Details to be determined through other mechanisms (eg GI strategy)	No

18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.3	The presumption appears to be that public bus services will concentrate on the current 66 bus route along the A420 or an out-and-return from the town centre. SMPC are seeking the re-routing of some Route 7 buses from Highworth to Swindon centre via Sainsbury's and Greenbridge, which would support historic and economic links as well as providing a destination node in Highworth. The current route 7 via South Marston Industrial Park runs every 12 minutes. We wish this to be noted in the draft SPD.	Noted. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.9	3.9: Provision is assumed to follow the rollout of the build, but this is inconsistent with the priority being given to diversion of the 66 bus south of the NEV and the route of the express bus service. The provisions for a bus service being extended to the northern parts of the NEV at a later stage are not acceptable. Priority provision should be made for services to these areas, which are likely to be developed first.	Agreed, although not within remit of FTP. Demand will assist with which bus services come forward first.	

18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 3	3.13	<p>Agree that the Park and Ride location is likely to be more successful than in other locations in Swindon, but only if it is able to be accessed from Rowborough, South Marston and other NEV villages rather than designed only for A420 traffic from the east. Suggest inclusion of <i>‘provision of the proposed new junction for Rowborough, including the new railway tunnel, will be essential to giving good access from north of the A420 to the P&amp;R facility. This will compensate for what will inevitably be an infrequent normal bus service to serve a population of almost 3,000 dwellings at South Marston and Rowborough and avoids car traffic having to use the A420 itself to reach the P&amp;R facility’</i>.</p>	<p>The proposed eastern access serving Rowborough is illustrated to serve development on both sides of the A420 within the masterplan. This junction form will provide direct access to the Park and Ride from Rowborough for motorised and non motorised traffic and hence provide further public transport opportunities to development north of the A420. With regards to an ‘infrequent bus service’, it is SBC’s intention for frequent services to serve the whole of the New Eastern Villages and this is secured through the emerging Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	No
----	------------------------------	-----------	------	---	---	----

18	South Marston Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	3.19 This will not benefit users from the 3,000 dwellings north of the A420 unless there are adequate and safe cycle routes across the railway between Gablecross and Rowborough. The Carpenters Arms junction on the A420 will not qualify as one of those links and any delay in delivery of the new Rowborough junction will expose the weakness of cycle links from Rowborough to the A420 to reach the Eastern Flyer. To satisfy the guiding principles of the NEV travel plan as noted at 5.8 and 5.9, suggest including ' <i>within the NEV area, more than 3 safe cycleways/pedestrian links across the A420 are essential to connecting north and south NEV settlements and enabling access to the Eastern Flyer</i> '.	Noted - In the interests of the plan, good connectivity is a key objective; however this is too prescriptive for the FTP.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 4	4.1	4.1: The targets to achieve awareness of the travel plan are too low. Awareness amongst residents and employers should be higher, say 85%. The engagement period of 6 months is too long. Travel patterns will be established as residents move in. Amend to 1 month.	Current best practise guidance uses 6 month engagement period.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.1	5.1: Add ' <i>9. Accessibility to key destinations within the NEV, especially the secondary school and district centre</i> '	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes

18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.9	5.9: Amend second bullet point to read 'Routes must be safe, welcoming, well maintained, durable and clearly signposted and, where practical, well-lit and overlooked' We particularly have in mind existing or direct routes which are not overlooked or lit, but will in practice be well-used.	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.11	5.11: Amend to read 'when crossing a <u>secondary or</u> tertiary road'.	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 5	5.3	5.30: Is it possible to require electric points at dwellings?	Not within the remit of the FTP.	No
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 6	6.2	6.2 Travel Plan Management – Suggest that the travel plan group should not just comprise coordinators representing the developers and the schools, but also representatives of the relevant parish councils.	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 6	6.5	6.5: Omit 'new' to ensure that an expansion of South Marston primary school is included.	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes

18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 6	6.25	<p>6.25 Welcome packs are a good initiative to build a sense of community. However, this should not conflict with existing initiatives mounted by local parish councils. South Marston is currently in the process of devising a welcome pack for the expanded South Marston and Rowborough communities which will include travel options, but is far more comprehensive than that noted in this draft SPD.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is intended to serve the brownfield sites likely to come forward in South Marston concurrent with the NEV rollout. Suggest adding <i>'this initiative should dovetail with and co-fund production of local initiatives where PCs are also producing welcome packs that cover a wider range of information'</i>. This is a further reason for including parish councils on the overall Travel Planning Group (see point 6.2).</p>	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
----	------------------------------	-----------	------	---	-------------------------------------	-----

18	South Marston Parish Council	Chapter 6	6.3	6.30: Insert a new 6.30 to read <i>'Existing dwellings to include houses in South Marston village should be included in all aspect of implementing the plan except where this is inappropriate.'</i> We are concerned that, by focusing only on the new settlements, the integration within an expanded South Marston, as supported by the Local Plan policy NC3 and RA3 is being diluted	Agreed. Amended to reflect comment.	Yes
19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	Stagecoach welcomes, and strongly agrees with the assertion at paragraph 2.15 that an integrated approach to travel planning activities (is necessary) for the development that enables economies of scale to be achieved (and therefore removal of unnecessary repetition), and ensures that a coordinated approach is adopted across the site.	Noted	no

19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	However, the focus not on targets, or mechanisms, but a Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC) as a “paid post” is something over which Stagecoach has real concerns. Simply put, an individual cannot be effective in delivering outcomes, where so vast a range of travel demands and travel choices is involved, across so many stakeholders. Stagecoach, in its national experience, has had minimal engagement with TPCs and when it has had any, it is only to request or purchase (free of charge or at a large discount) travel passes for distribution on a development, where the site is already occupied and where there is little or no evidence offered that the recipients are not already using such services as we already provide at their own expense.	FTP is considered to follow best practice guidance.	No
19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	Stagecoach lists key ingredients of successful travel plan.	Officers consider these key ingredients to already be included within the FTP.	No
19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	Of all these tools, “MyPTP”, developed by Liftshare.com, is in the evaluation of Stagecoach, by far the most comprehensive and effective of these tools. It is able to consistently deliver all the ingredients that successfully drive mode shift, and travel behaviour change.	Noted and will review tools used as the NEV evolves.	No

19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	Stagecoach feel that bus operators should be included in the travel plan group	Agreed. Document already reflects this.	No
19	Stagecoach	General Comment	General Comment	Stagecoach believes that the overall NEV site, and thus the SPD could usefully be broken down into three modular elements, with attendant TP strategies that could be separately delivered, without dependency on any other, but at the same time can also seamlessly integrate in due course to deliver a synergistic result.	Officers consider this SPD to be most effective approach for the NEV.	No
20	Haydon Wick Parish Council	General Comment	General Comment	Supports travel plan but warn effects may wear off without physical measures to discourage car use.	Noted. Progress will be monitored closely.	No
21	Karen Brown (Resident)	General Comment	General Comment	Feels that a bus lane would encourage more modal shift.	Noted. These considerations will be considered at the detailed design stage.	No