Quakers Walk Site, Devizes Planning Brief

Statement of Consultation, June 2005

In association with
Foreword

This Quakers Walk Planning Brief has been prepared to accompany an outline planning application to be submitted for the Quakers Walk site in Devizes and, thereafter, guide the preparation of detailed plans for the site. It provides a number of principles to guide future development on the site to ensure the requirements of the Kennet Local Plan 2011 are met.

The planning brief has been prepared by Carter Jonas on behalf of the Society of Merchant Venturers in association with LHC Urban Design and INDIGO Landscape Architects and in consultation with officers at Kennet District Council and Wiltshire County Council.

When preparing the planning brief two stages of local consultation and community engagement took place. The first stage involved an exhibition and workshops to discuss the main issues to be addressed in the planning brief. The second consultation involved circulating a draft brief for comment. This Statement of Consultation sets out details of these events and how responses to the consultation influenced the final planning brief. The content of this document has been prepared by Carter Jonas and Concensus on behalf of Carter Jonas.

On the 26th May 2005, the Planning Policies Executive Committee of Kennet District Council considered the content of the planning brief and resolved to approve the brief as an emerging supplementary planning document for the purposes of development control. One of the key considerations was the range and depth of consultation that had been carried out.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document sets out the activities undertaken by Consensus on behalf of Carter Jonas (Agents to the Society of Merchant Venturers) to consult with near neighbours, local civic groups, environmental bodies and the wider community on emerging proposals for the site known as Quakers Walk, Devizes.

1.2 It is intended that this document should meet the requirements for consultation contained in Kennet District Council’s Statement of Community Involvement and in PPG12 (Development Plans) and should be treated as a Statement of Community Engagement as envisaged in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

1.3 Our instructions were to devise and implement a programme of consultation which would provide participants with an open and inclusive opportunity to communicate their views and observations on the emerging proposals for Quakers Walk.

1.4 It should be noted that it is not Consensus’s role to attempt to directly influence or persuade participants to support or agree to the principles set out in the emerging proposals. Indeed, from the outset, it was clearly communicated to us both by Carter Jonas and by Mr E White of Kennet District Council that we should adopt and maintain an independent and objective approach to the consultation process.

1.5 When carrying out consultation of this sort it is Consensus’s usual practise to pay careful attention to gathering and recording the views of those individuals who live nearest to the proposal site. After all, these are the people whose everyday lives are likely to be most affected by the development. It is appropriate therefore that their concerns, issues and aspirations are particularly prominent.

Mark D Crosby
Senior Partner - Consensus.
2. PROMOTING THE CONSULTATION OPPORTUNITY

2.1 It was agreed with Kennet District Council and Carter Jonas that the consultation programme would consist of a public exhibition, supplemented with two discussion forums (facilitated by Consensus).

2.2 A letter explaining the purpose of the consultation and inviting residents to attend the Public Exhibition was sent to 400 properties in the Quakers Walk area on the 16th December 2004. The public exhibition was scheduled to take place on Saturday 22nd January 2005 from 10.00 am until 4.00 pm.

2.3 The letter also explained that anyone attending the exhibition would also have the opportunity to register to participate in one of the two discussion forums that would take place on the 1st and 2nd February 2005 at the Corn Exchange.

2.4 A news release was issued to the local media which attracted editorial coverage in the Gazette & Herald and the Devizes & Vale of Pewsey News. The exhibition was also the subject of two interviews on BBC Radio Wiltshire.

2.5 A number of local service-providers, specialist groups and other influential third parties were also invited to attend the exhibition. These included:

- Bishops Canning Parish Council
- Devizes Town Council
- Roundway Parish Council
- All district councillors representing Devizes, Roundway and Bishops Cannings
- All county councillors representing Devizes
- Devizes Community Area Partnership
- Community First
- Devizes & Marlborough Friends of the Earth
- Kennet CPRE
- Devizes Chamber of Commerce
- Devizes Development Partnership
- Trust for Devizes
- St Peter’s School (Governors)
- Kennet National Trust Association
- Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
- Sarsen Housing Association
- Devizes Sports Club
- Kennet & North Wilts Primary Care Trust
- Wiltshire association of Local Councils
- The Environment Agency
- Wessex Water
- Diocese of Salisbury
- Roundway Mill Boundary Residents Group
- Roundway Park Group
- The Police Authority (Estates Department)
- Wiltshire County Council (Education. Highways)
3. THE EXHIBITION

3.1 The exhibition was held at Devizes Cadet Centre, Le Marchant Barracks. This particular venue was selected as the priority was to locate the exhibition within reasonable walking distance of the Quakers Walk neighbourhood.

3.2 In excess of 150 people attended the exhibition and 78 registered to participate in one of the two discussion forums.

3.3 In addition to being able to discuss any issues or concerns with the project’s consultants and officers from the District Council, people attending the exhibition were also invited to express their views via the exhibition Feedback Forms.

3.4 The Feedback Forms also asked people to indicate their preference for a number of options addressing key aspects of the emerging proposals including the location of the new primary school, the preferred boundary treatment options for properties abutting the new development in Roundway Park and Parkfields and their preference for landscaping of Quakers Walk itself.

3.5 Consensus received a total of 86 completed feedback forms. A record of all the comments made using the feedback forms is attached as Appendix 1 of the document.

4. THE DISCUSSION FORUMS

4.1 The forums took place during the evening on the 1 and 2nd of February at the Devizes Corn Exchange. The opportunity to participate in the forum(s) was limited to 40 people per evening and selection was made on a ‘first come - first served’ basis at the Exhibition.

4.2 31 people registered to attend the forum on the 1st February. (21 attended).

4.3 32 people registered to attend the forum on the 2nd February. (25 attended).

4.4 The objective of each forum was to provide interested parties with a more open and dynamic environment within which to communicate their views on the emerging proposals and where possible, to explore and expound their concerns, issues and aspirations in greater detail. Consensus was also able to provide participants with an early insight into the emerging preferences relating to the location of the primary school and landscaping / boundary treatments.
5. FEEDBACK & RESPONSES

5.1 Whilst there were a considerable number of comments made about the emerging proposals throughout the consultation – it is fair to say that in qualitative terms they tended to concentrate on a fairly consistent range of core topics.

5.2 The most prominent concern centred on the view that the majority of people have a fundamental objection to the land in question being developed for housing at all.

5.3 However, the question of whether the land should or should not have been allocated for this purpose in the Local Plan was not something we were consulting on. The principle of development was established at the Local Plan Inquiry. Accordingly, during the discussion forums (in particular) it was necessary to regularly remind participants that the purpose of the consultation was to promote, project and enhance the opportunity for people to comment on the principles set out in the emerging proposals – and not to facilitate a debate on the appropriateness of the allocation.

5.4 It is also fair to say that whilst the majority of people took pains to declare their opposition to the principle of development – they also recognised the need to take an inclusive and objective role in the core consultation.

6. BOUNDARY TREATMENT OPTIONS

6.1 This was the quantitative element of the consultation in which we asked people to indicate their preference against a suite of pre-designed options.

6.2 ISSUE 1. LOCATION OF THE NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL.

6.2.1 The majority of respondents (65% plus) wanted the school to be located as indicated in Option 3 of the emerging proposals.

6.2.2 It should be noted that this preference is contrary to the location set out in the Local Plan (Option 1) and also conflicts with the aspirations of St Peter's School and the LEA who have indicated a preference for the school to be located at Option 2.

6.2.3 It appeared from comments made that this preference was particularly popular as the new school playing fields would have created a buffer between the exiting houses and any new development.
6.3 **ISSUE 2. BOUNDARY TREATMENT - ROUNDWAY PARK.**

6.3.1 39% of residents who expressed an opinion preferred Option 3.

6.3.2 34% of residents who expressed an opinion preferred Option 2.

6.3.3 Given the fairly equal division of opinion on this option it would be inappropriate for Consensus to comment on the perceived preferences of the respondents. It *is* our view that (given the result) there is a need at some stage in the planning process to re-engage with affected residents on this issue in order that the reasoning behind given preferences can be further examined and a broader consensus of opinion achieved.

6.4 **ISSUE 3. BOUNDARY TREATMENT- PARKFIELDS.**

6.4.1 65% of residents who expressed an opinion preferred Option 3.

6.4.2 32% of residents who expressed an opinion preferred Option 2.

6.4.3 Given the strength of support for Option 3 it would seem that this as the preferred solution among the majority of residents. The option proposes the establishment of a 6 metre landscaped buffer between the exiting houses and new properties. This appears to meet an underlying aspiration among existing residents to distance themselves from their new neighbours. However, in subsequent discussions, particularly during the forums, this option began to raise additional concerns relating to the maintenance of the buffer; the possible dumping of household rubbish and the potential for access by criminals. It is our view that this Option needs further consultation in order that all of those affected are able to take a more considered view on the implications of the preferred solution.

6.5 **ISSUE 4. BOUNDARY TREATMENT - QUAKERS WALK.**

6.5.1 100% of those people who expressed an opinion preferred Option 1. This would retain Quakers Walk as an essentially rural environment.

A copy of the drawings exhibited at the Exhibition in order to illustrate these options has been prepared as an additional (separate) appendix to this document.
7. CORE ISSUES & CONCERNS

7.1 It should be noted that all responses received during the consultation programme were underpinned by the fact that among the majority of people who attended the exhibition, or who participated in the consultation; there was an ‘in principle’ objection to the development of this land for the purposes set out the emerging proposals. Expressions of support for the principle of developing this site for the proposed use were limited to other key stakeholders such as St Peter’s School and Devizes Sports Club.

7.2 As indicated in the introduction to this document, Consensus’s role was not to engage in, or re-open the debate as to whether this land should or should not have been allocated for residential development. Accordingly, all participants at the discussion forums were asked to set aside their fundamental objections to the principle of development for the purposes of being able to discuss and explore the issues raised by the emerging proposals.

7.3 The following sets out a hierarchy of concerns as presented to us during the Exhibition, the Discussion Forums and the responses recorded in the Feedback Forms. In addition to the issues raised below, Carter Jonas will prepare a 2nd document, based on Consensus’s record of individual comments setting out a response to each of the issues raised.

| 1. Quakers Walk | • Conservation of Quakers Walk for wildlife and the community in its current form.  
                    • Strong resistance to ‘urbanisation’ of current form and character.  
                    • Mixed views on the desirability, purpose and value of lighting along Quakers Walk.  
                    • Proximity of new housing would drive wildlife away.  
                    • Mixed views on the impact that current farming activities have on the surface conditions along Quakers Walk  
                    • Strong desire to retain peaceful, rural feel to the ‘Walk’.  
                    • Protection of vehicular access to allotments. (Deliveries). |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. Traffic.    | • Impact of additional traffic on London Road.  
                    • Roundway Park too narrow for excessive traffic and larger vehicles such as buses.  
                    • Parents dropping off and picking up children in Roundway Park.  
                    • Lack of a suitable junction with London Road.  
                    • Lack of suitable crossing points across London Road for parents and children. |
### 3. The New School.
- Case for a new school in this location not proven.
- Competing views on the preferred location.
- Existing schools in the area have a need for new pupils.
- Concerns over ‘extended’ school hours, particularly among near neighbours.
- Impact of noise, vandalism, mischief in quiet residential area.

### 4. The Helicopter.
- Concerns regarding proximity of helicopter pad to new school
- Greater concern that the new school and new community will (eventually) lobby for helicopter to be relocated elsewhere and that this service will be lost to the local community.

### 5. Housing.
- Height and proximity of new homes should be restricted where close to existing properties.
- Mixed views on the desirability/purpose of proposed boundary treatments.
- Concerns regarding shadowing and overlooking.
- ‘Buffer zone’ should be established between new and existing properties.
- The brief should clearly set out the mix of house types, density and provision/location of affordable units.
- Design must be of the highest quality and not just ‘standard’ house-types.

### 6. Facilities and Infrastructure.
- Impact on existing GP and facilities (Hospital being closed).
- Concerns regarding existing sewage capacity.
- Concerns regarding potential flooding on selected parts of the site.
- Impact on emergency services.
8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 The level of interest and participation in this consultation programme has been particularly high. This is evidenced by the considerable number of feedback responses received by Consensus following the Exhibition and Discussion Forums.

8.2 It was also good to note that some participants did take the trouble to comment on the effectiveness of the exhibition panels in communicating the core principles of the emerging proposals. There was also positive feedback from a number of people who took part in the Discussion Forums.

8.3 It is clear from the comments made throughout the consultation that many people are very concerned at the prospect of this land being developed. We believe the issues set out in the previous part of this document are a true and accurate reflection of those concerns.

8.4 The key question now is to consider how they can be addressed in the preparation of a Development Brief for the site.

8.5 We believe that further work/engagement is going to be required regarding the proposed boundary treatment options. It appears that for the majority of the site’s nearest neighbours the big question is – what’s going to be at the bottom of my garden? The consultation results relating to the proposed boundary treatments show that there are differing views on the solutions preferred by different neighbour groups/individuals.

8.6 It also became apparent during the Discussion Forums that whilst some people appear to favour the imposition of some sort of buffer between existing properties and the new dwellings, there is a need for greater clarity on how such an arrangement would be maintained and indeed, whether this ‘green corridor’ could result in homes becoming more vulnerable to being broken into. The proximity and height of any new building next to existing properties is also of considerable concern. As is often the case, people see bungalows as a possible solution. Clearly, it is for the District Council to determine whether this might be acceptable. If not, then residents do expect to see proposals come forward that will protect their existing amenity.

8.7 There is also some potential for disagreement on the location of the new primary school. A considerable majority of affected residents prefer the school to be located adjacent to Parkfields, in order that the playing fields can provide a buffer between them and the new development. However, this appears to be contrary to the school’s aspirations which favour a location in the south-west corner of the site.

8.8 It is also important to note that there is an almost equal division of opinion surrounding the proposed boundary treatments at Roundway Park.
8.9 Whilst a majority of Parkfields residents appear to favour Option 3 (assuming that their preference for playing fields is not forthcoming) a significant minority prefer Option 2. In our view this underlines the need for some form of design workshop, hosted by the scheme’s architects, aimed at securing a definitive solution.

8.10 The community’s views regarding the future of Quakers Walk itself are clear. It should remain in its current ‘rural’ form. Though the discussion forums did generate some (albeit limited) support for subdued lighting to be incorporated along the Walk, this view did carry a caveat that any lighting should be discreet and in keeping with the immediate environment. There appeared to be little support for resurfacing the Walk but there were a number of comments regarding the impact that agricultural machinery is having on the condition of the current surface.

8.11 As previously indicated, after Quakers Walk, the primary issue of greatest concern is the impact that traffic generated by the development will have on existing roads. We would also draw attention to more localised concerns regarding the potential problems posed by parents dropping off and picking up children attending the new school.

8.12 We would also draw attention to the issues raised by the Sports Club regarding future access to its facilities. We are also grateful for the extensive comments and observations contributed by Marlborough & Devizes Friends of the Earth. (Appendix 1 & 2).

8.13 We hope that those who participated in this consultation programme have been provided with an open and objective opportunity to contribute their views and observations on the key issues that will form and influence the emerging Planning Brief. At this point, we would also raise a need for some caution. In our experience, too much consultation can be as unhelpful as too little. Clearly, Development Briefs play an important role in the planning process as a stepping stone between policy and the preparation of a planning application. However, the vast majority of ordinary people whilst interested in the broad principles that might be used to guide a future development - are actually considerably more interested in what is going to happen at the bottom of their gardens! An extended and overly pedantic period of consultation on the preparation of a Planning Brief is going to result in people disengaging from the consultation process because their need to talk about the detail of an application is not being accommodated.
8.14 To that end, we feel that the comments and observations contributed by those who participated in the consultation are sufficient to provide the basis for an appropriately detailed Planning Brief for the site. Clearly, it is for Kennet District Council to determine what additional scrutiny of the Brief might be required. We would then hope that a speedy adoption would result in an appropriately detailed planning application being submitted which would provide local residents with an opportunity to scrutinise and comment on the issues of greatest and most direct concern to them.

Finally, we commend this Statement of Community Engagement as an accurate and objective account of the (community) consultation carried out to date and that it represents a faithful record of the concerns, issues and aspirations raised by participants.

Mark D Crosby
Consensus.
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APPENDIX 1.  Letter from Marlborough & Devizes Friends of the Earth.

D & M FoE
6 Addington Close
Devizes.
Wilts.
SN10 5BE

4/2/05

Dear Mr Crosby,

Re: Stakeholder Consultation on Development Brief for Quakers Walk, Devizes.

Further to your very well attended and lively public consultation about the future of Quakers Walk, I am writing on behalf of Devizes & Marlborough Friends of the Earth Local Group, with our views for this Development Brief.

BOUNDARY TREATMENT.   We felt this should be more like Option 1.
An informal layout (of sorts) would ensure all else is subservient to Quakers Walk. We felt there would be benefit in reinforcing the tree avenue on Quakers walk, but that there should be NO avenues of trees leading to a ‘cross roads’, as this formality would detract from the existing avenue. Divisions should not be ‘regimented boxes’.

Trees grouped informally in the buffer zone would not compete with the setting. More tree species than those on the ‘informal’ list could be used, and we suggest the addition of rowan, cherry and oak. Oak supports 265 species, so it is good for wildlife. We were uncertain about the advantages of including privet. We welcome under planting with bulbs, and a mix of mown and twice yearly mown grass (for wildlife value) is preferred.

Could the shallow bowl area be planted as a boggy area? We are particularly concerned that this area should NOT become playing fields. Devizes has had problems with transfer of these to wetter grounds, to allow development, and the result has been unusable for long periods.

The tractor access must be kept open from the north, to allow the allotments access for manure. (NO bollard or gate) A system to maintain the condition of the track should be agreed with the farmer concerned.

There should be no obvious bunds, only gentle shaping, fairly low.
LIGHTING. We strongly reject the Highways Authority’s preference for a ‘fully lit’ track. We prefer no lighting on Quakers Walk.

The only option which might be acceptable, would be low level lighting, (as shown on bollards) but preferably closer to the ground. Highlighters are a greater threat to wildlife, and would make the area look more like a London Square, which is totally unacceptable. These should be avoided at all costs.

Could lighting be temporary, removable if development goes on the field between the site and the town? Solar lighting would involve less damage to the walk during construction, be more sustainable, and be more easily removed at a later date.

LANDSCAPE BUFFER. Only if KDC owns it, can the maintenance of the buffer hedge and trees be ensured. If this is a strip behind two lines of rear gardens, there would need to a gated ends to the boundary, for security. We do not feel that it needs to be 6 metres wide. It would be better to put public land elsewhere. It only needs space for small trees and a hedge and strimmer use, not a motor vehicle. Prickly bushes (hawthorn) to deter intruders are a good idea. We feel this is more secure, and looks better, than back gardens adjacent to the road, although we do fear it will become a dumping ground for green waste. Taller trees would overshadow existing gardens, so could be planted to the southern side of the strip, to keep the majority of shading within the buffer.

We support 25m minimum distance between the rear of houses.

SURFACING. Less obtrusive surfacing would be preferred, if used (similar to Drews Pond Wood - greyish/brown or buff.) NOT yellow, or red like the canal.

There must be no loose stone aggregate, as this is bad for cycling on. It would need to be absorbent for rain penetration – but solid.

Secondary aggregate should be used, at least for the base.

SCHOOL. In our opinion, Option 3 is best, BUT with the building further away from the helipad, because of noise. Moving the hard court to the south of the school, nearest the helipad, would make the school building further form the noise source, as well as reducing light pollution to existing houses. In addition, more gardens would benefit from an outlook over the school playing fields, as generally, a school is a good neighbour.

However, we do not feel that floodlighting is required, as it is not necessary for school use. We question whether there would still be unmet demand for such a court, when there is already one at Nursteed School, and there are better facilities at the Leisure Centre. A better option could be to have playing fields, with some form of shelter and toilets, available out of hours, fenced off from school, if that was required.

There should be no playing field, or security fence, intruding into the Quakers Walk Boundary area. Neither should the playing fields intrude into the shallow bowl boundary area, because of drainage problems.
WATER ATTENUATION

Storm water storage should be by water butts to each property.

A more natural-looking pond planted up, as at Wayside Farm, is preferable to a rectangular dry casing for water attenuation facilities, if this is needed in addition to water butts. This could be in the shallow bowl on the boundary, or on the entrance to the site, within the helipad noise exclusion zone.

TRANSPORT

A Transport Impact Assessment for the development is essential, and is needed NOW to inform the Development Brief.

Traffic has increased considerably recently, and with all the new housing elsewhere in the town, and with the additional school, merely updating Wiltshire County Council’s 2002 study may well be wholly inadequate and inaccurate. At the last public inquiry into proposed development at Spitalcroft (also off London Road) the traffic survey done by local residents showed traffic far in excess of the figures presented by WCC, whose choice of days and times to survey appeared badly flawed.

The large number of developments which will exit onto the already congested London Road arouses considerable concern amongst local people. This should be addressed by ensuring that the development is designed to minimise expectation of car ownership, and is well served by low floor buses, as cycling and walking are not options for many elderly and disabled people, the proportion of which will increase substantially in years to come. New residents must be able to live here without a car.

We have found that, even in households with several cars, there are transport needs that are not met. Social exclusion does not necessarily apply only to the households with no car, it also applies to individuals within car owning households. Kennet Passengers have informed us that those who have moved from areas where they are used to using good bus services, expect to be able to travel by bus in Devizes. A large proportion of future purchasers are likely to come from urban areas, where there is a good bus network. On many occasions, once here, newcomers have had to substitute a car for the bus. Kennet Passengers should be asked to report for the development brief.

Bus services will need considerable improvement. 4 year-olds cannot be expected to walk to the new school from the furthest point of St Peter’s catchment (Mayenne Place). At present, the first buses from here into town run at 7.50 and 9.50 am. The last bus from Waiblingem Way leaves at 2.12pm, and there are only 4 buses a day.

With investment, F route has a good chance of becoming as commercial as the Avenues route. Good information is required at bus stops. There should be a target for front door distance to bus stops. Two new wheelchair access buses to comply with the 2005 Act of Parliament will be needed. Many existing service buses will fail to meet the requirements of this Act.

A school bus would be necessary at least initially, and should be funded by the developer for 5 years, until the changing housing policies come fully into effect in this area. (Experience shows developer contributions are insufficient if only for 3 years. e.g. Wayside Farm.) 5 years kick-start money is needed to form good habits early on. Once accustomed to using a bus, children then confidently use them elsewhere, instead of expecting a lift in a car.

A School Travel Plan is needed, and should include a survey of how existing parents intend to get to the new school. Schools have a health and safety responsibility for safe routes to school. Walking buses should be arranged AND PAID SUPERVISION FUNDED IF NECESSARY in order to ensure that those living on both Marina Meadows and in St. Peter’s catchment walk to school, instead of adding to the congestion coming into, and through, the town, in each direction. A Walking Bus might be too dangerous along the canal unless there was paid staff (e.g. ESAs) to accompany it. Reliance on parental
volunteers can be patchy and difficult in the present culture of aiming to get all mothers back to work.

Pelican crossings or ‘Lollipop Ladies’ and zebra crossings on London Road, Windsor Drive and possibly Roundway Park (beyond the bus exit) will be required. A roundabout on London Road would only encourage car use, and does nothing to help pedestrians, whereas a pelican crossing would aid both vehicle egress from the estate, as well as enabling pedestrians to cross. Egress from Roundway Park, turning right, has become noticeably more difficult in recent years.

Garages should be optional, at least on some sites (NOT used to improve sight lines.)

There should be cycle ways through the estate. Sustrans or Cycle Touring Club should be consulted about cycle routes, and we should see the report before it becomes part of the development brief.

ROAD LAYOUT. We preferred Concept 1. We felt Concept 2 looked rather as though the green area under the helipad was simply SLOAP, rather than designed.

We suggest moving the main access road to the south to include the noise exclusion zone by the helipad.

The Sports Club access should be the first route off the access road, to minimise traffic in the new estate.

There should be no further reference to a ‘drop off point’ for cars outside the school. This pre-supposes car use.

The road layout should incorporate loop systems, NOT cul-de-sacs. These are wasteful of land.

We feel pavements separate from the road are preferable on the bus route, but the public transport unit at WCC should be consulted on this.

Rising bollards for the bus egress to Roundway Park would be required.

SUSTAINABILITY. In our experience, this aspect of development tends to be resisted by developers. Devizes receives the majority of Kennet housing allocations because it is perceived to be the most sustainable site in Kennet, NOT because development here IS sustainable. Developers need to accept that housing built on Grade 1 Agricultural land is removing an element of sustainability from this town, and offer something to offset this.

Houses built now will affect future requirements for fossil fuels, and subsequently, Climate Change. Climate Change is currently the biggest threat to our planet. It is therefore ESSENTIAL that all new development seeks to minimise future fuel requirements, IN ANY WAY THAT IT CAN. Small changes now can reap big rewards later on. This should be a good selling point for properties.
Correct solar orientation of roofs and fenestration can contribute the first 10% of heating requirements for a property. The overall layout and direction of houses, roads and terraces should be based upon this, and determine overall design at the plan’s inception. Windows should not merely be placed to the front and back of properties, irrespective of direction. Sunny back gardens and appropriate placing of doors for the later addition of conservatories should be maximised.

Solar panels or photo-voltaics should be on all homes. Failing this, at least on south facing roofs. Super-insulation should be used.

Grey water recycling should be considered, or offered as an option

Recycled and local materials should be used wherever possible.

MARKETING ISSUES. Marketing material must flag up public transport links, such as an improved town service, and the No 49 to Swindon, as an asset to Devizes. It should OMIT ANY REFERENCE TO M4 ACCESS.

We trust you will find our comments useful, and will include them in your consultation report. Although some issues raised might be perceived as unnecessarily detailed at this point, we feel that, too often, decisions made early on in consultations ultimately constrain the best use of the site in question, so we have erred on the side of safety!

Yours sincerely,

C. G. CARVER (Mrs)
Sustainable Development Group
Devizes & Marlborough Friends of the Earth.
APPENDIX 2.  Letter from Devizes Sports Club.

2nd February 2005.

Dear Sirs

Re: Quakers Walk, Devizes.

I am writing in response to the Discussion Forum on 1st February 2005. One of the main requirements of the design Brief is to provide a safer means of access to Devizes Sports Club. The ‘yellow’ route shown on your plan goes part way to solving the problem, but without further provisions the ‘yellow road’ achieves nothing.

We will need to get vehicular traffic to a point close to the club house where, in the fullness of time we can create a new car park. To this end we will need about 8m of land to the west of the new cricket and rugby pitches. The rugby pitch can be moved westwards and a new road can be built along the ‘red’ route on the attached plan.

In short we can only achieve the objective of a safer access if the Sports Club is given this strip of land (or it is allocated for a future road).

With regards to the School site, from a Sports Club perspective Option 2 is our preference. This location would allow for the School and Sports Club to share facilities most readily, without the children, (whether pupils or sports people) having to walk along the public highways.

Yours faithfully

Mr Gaiger
Chairman.
APPENDIX 3. Feedback Forms.

We are pleased to provide a record of all the comments made and issues raised on the Consultation Feedback Forms.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. J. Higgins
Road: Roundway Park
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Our bungalow stands 4.5m east of the proposed secondary access road. The side and rear fences, together 40m long, consist of 4ft posts and 3 strands of wire. The land falls 1m from no52 to 53. Our concern is that the road’s surface will be above the ground level of the bungalow leading to drainage problems, also general security problems and invasion of privacy from traffic, and that the operation of the proposed barrier will create intrusive noise levels in our house.

Additional Feedback Sheet:
Your exhibition photo’s of Quaker’s Walk in Summer fail to address the situation in Winter. Tractors, trailers & other motorised vehicles are using the Walk several times a day, six days a week, accessing in two or three locations both to the east and west. Over the past three months it has become a deeply rutted quagmire for much of its length. When the proposed estate is complete, land on the entire west side of the walk from the lodge gates to Roundway Park will remain to be farmed. Unless a ban is placed on farm traffic using Quakers Walk after it has been refurbished, any notion of pedestrians, prams & cyclists from the estate using it as a route into town can be forgotten. We suggest that pipe rail barriers or bollards will be essentially required. Finally, we did not notice any mention on your display boards of ‘comprehensive landscaping to minimise the external impact of the development on the wider landscape of Roundway Downs’ as called for in Policy HC8 para(d) of the Kennet Local Plan.

P.S. Please avoid locating three storey town houses within the first road adjacent to the rear of the bungalows of Roundway Park.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. J. Barthram
Road: Roundway Gardens
Post Code: SN10 2EF

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Access to farmland to west of Quakers Walk (noted on continuation sheet)
At present the farmer uses Quakers Walk to access these fields. This means that large tractors use the lane, possibly towing heavy ploughs or spray equipment. Dependant on the crop combine harvesters also use this path, associated with trailers and their heavy loads. Even in dry weather soil from the wheels is left on the Walk, but when conditions are wet large amounts of mud are deposited. Also the weight of the vehicles causes damage and pot holes.
Whilst I am very keen for the farmer to continue to cultivate this land, the present access could not continue if Quakers Walk is improved and resurfaced. Any access at the northern end would mean the associated dirt being washed down the hill by the rain.

One other point. It was not specified what would be the use of the land at the town end away from the proposed housing. If this remained agricultural then equipment would have to use the Walk.

Name: Mrs. J. K. Combe  
Road: Bishop’s Cannings  
Post Code: SN10 2LF

Views on emerging planning proposals:
This brief if fundamentally flawed as the site has too many constraints i.e. as helicopter, proximity to Sport’s Club and existing homes – very close to historic Quakers Walk – BAD access inevitable onto London Road – already congested.  
There are other sites in similar areas which would have better access into town and Swindon directions and not under helicopter. Have you looked at land outside “ring road” to NE of Devizes – better access both to A361 (no houses) and Andover Road (new & existing roads) You should not be afraid to change your minds.

Please note the comments about the constraints of the site and the fact that it is not too late to rethink the whole idea.  
St. Peters could be located in already underused local schools where buses would only have to travel an extra mile (i.e. Nusteed and Bishop’s Cannings). If they want bussing to school it will make no difference. One must face the fact that a minimal number of primary children actually walk to school however close they are.  
This number of houses will also need shops, transport (NO ROADS) and not all are willing or capable of walking. FACE FACTS. RE-THINK THE WHOLE THING. And be prepared to admit mistakes.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. R. Sainsbury  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Access from Roundway Park  
Sighting of school and community amenities  
Conservation of Quakers Walk for wildlife and public (No street lights)  
Buffer zone behind bungalows in Roundway Park and Parklands.
Views on emerging planning proposals:
Despite Wilts. C.C. Highways Dept. saying that the London Road is capable of “accommodating” the increased traffic-at what cost would that be to local residents and potential visitors? Perhaps that was why the word “accommodating” was chosen-
As I am sure it could “accommodate” several hundred more vehicles. However no adverb was used and I would maintain that no increase in traffic could be “accommodated comfortably”. I regularly use London Road to travel to work and the volume of traffic at peak times is considerable. I also hear many friends, acquaintances regularly saying – “It’s hopeless trying to get to Devizes you can’t get through!”

I would prefer there to be no housing development off Quakers Walk at all. Devizes has provided many new houses over the last few years on the outskirts of the town. It seems to me that it is becoming a dormitory town, with the residents of the new housing, going out of Devizes to shop and work. Kennet I know were required to build a specified no. of new housing over the past few years. It would be interesting to see a graph showing the nos. of houses in relation to the residential areas of the present Kennet District Councillors! Only 1 lives in Devizes! “not in my back yard”!!

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Quakers Walk – Preservation of it
Congestion on Bridge and around it – especially Victoria Road
Concerns about allotments and plot of land between them and the site
Concerns about adjacent field

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Replacement of existing St. Peters School would be better included in proposed new Rowde Primary School
  1) Concern that the Heli-pad will have to be re-located at public expense once the developers have gone.
  2) Concern that this is not a suitable location for a replacement for the current St Peters School
    a- too far to walk from Bath Road
b- therefore "school run" traffic from Bath Rd via New Park St, Link RD, London Rd adding to existing traffic chaos.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Allfrey  
Road: Rowdefield  
Post Code: SN10 2JD

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Access – extra use of Conscience Lane  
Wildlife – great variety already there – will seriously affect  
Doctors, Dentists and Hospital – not enough now  
Closed Maternity unit and opening a new Primary School  
Light pollution for surrounding area.

Our most urgent concern is the pressure on existing inhabitants.  
Vehicular Access – local roads are full to bursting. This can only increase pressure.  
People Cosseting – try and get a doctor or dentist. You can’t.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Perry  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1ER

Views on emerging planning proposals: Quakers Walk footpath to remain and not be altered.

Name: Mr. M. Gaiger  
Road: Little Cheverell (?)  
Post Code: SN10 4JL

Views on emerging planning proposals: Access to the Sports Club

Name: Mr. G.L. Cooper  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
1. That there is sufficient vehicle access and car parking provided for school to prevent congestion or increase in traffic in Roundway Park.
2. That developments immediately to the rear of property are tasteful & without significant disruption e.g. no properties higher than 2 storey, low density housing of good quality with deep gardens to maintain privacy.
3. That appropriate fencing/trees are planted to mark boundary. Preference for Option 2 i.e. long rear gardens adjacent to property.

Name: Mr. A.D.H. Hibbert-Hingston
Road: Alton Priors, Marlborough
Post Code: SN8 4JZ

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Use of space
Traffic
Harmony with landscape
Affordability of housing

Name: Mrs. S.J. Padwick
Road: London Road
Post Code: SN10 2DS

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Traffic increase and congestion on London road (already at capacity levels). Our Group has organised two traffic surveys, in 2000 & 2004, which prove that traffic is now at capacity. Vehicles produced by 230 new houses PLUS the massive school traffic twice daily would be totally unacceptable and reduce Devizes to gridlock.
2. Adequate Sewage disposal – not mentioned in display.

Bollard Lighting, this is least intrusive & pollution would be minimal. Less lighting would least disturb wildlife, nesting birds and householders & still sufficient for walkers/cyclists.

Traffic disruption and chaos caused by inevitable building works will further affect London Road, which no doubt will once again have to be dug up for months at a time. Uncontrolled access from the site onto London Rd opposite the nursery school could prove hazardous for children, also causing more delays and stoppages on a road already full to capacity.

Environment - Quakers Walk must be kept as an area of peace and quiet for residents of Devizes as a whole. The new school should be kept as unobtrusive to residents of old standing around its area.

Please have this excellent exhibition put up in the front hall of the Corn Exchange for a good month, to allow residents of Devizes a better chance to view it. Also advertise that it is there.
Name: Mr. P. I. Couch  
Road: Parkfields  
Post Code: SN10 2EB

Views on emerging planning proposals: 
In order of priority 
1. Location of school  
2. Boundary treatment Parkfields  
3. Boundary treatment Roundway Park  
4. Boundary treatment Quakers Walk

The location of the school is absolutely crucial to those residents most directly affected in Parkfields and Roundway Park, whose properties face or back onto the new development. We should be protected as a priority because when we purchased our properties there was no prospect of this land ever being developed. The values of our properties will be severely reduced whatever but at least if the school is located at Options 1 or 3 then the devaluation will be minimised and the environment kept as close to what it was when we purchased. In my view greater emphasis should be placed on the views of those in the worst effected areas of Parkfields and Roundway Park rather than the views of those with a lesser or more casual interest. For example those less effected in Parkfields and Roundway Park would have different views on the location of the school, I suspect, because of traffic considerations only.

Name: Mr. A. T. J. Padwick  
Road: London Road  
Post Code: SN10 2DS

Views on emerging planning proposals: 
1. The effects on traffic in London Road. I have organised two traffic surveys in Feb. 2000 and November 2004. While traffic around the north-east corner of Devizes has generally risen by 20-25%, figures at rush hours in London Road were broadly similar, with traffic virtually stationary for minutes at a time. This shows it is already saturated and can take no more without some more imaginative solutions. An uncontrolled junction will be very stressful for both passing traffic on London Road and those who are trying to exit and enter the new development.  
2. The urbanisation of this boundary of the town will reduce the quality of life for surrounding residents. A greater emphasis on recreational space is essential to the town as a whole. Quakers Walk is currently a tranquil haven, much used by recreational walkers and dog owners, without their having to use motor cars. It is important that this should still be available and attractive enough to continue in use.

Thank you for presenting the issues so clearly. Please see if you can mount the exhibition again, in the Town centre (- say the lobby of the Corn Exchange) as I know of people who have missed it. It is too important an issue not to be widely promulgated.
Name: Mr. D. A. Watson  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Siting of school – if at all  
Increased traffic on London Road  
Urbanization of Quakers Walk & environs  
Impact on Devizes amenities (Dr’s, Hosp. Etc)  
Helicopter is an important addition to Devizes.

As house prices in Devizes are expected to fall faster than most parts of the country- additional housing stock will only increase this fall – reducing prices in the whole of the Devizes area.

Name: J.P. & J.I. Brassington  
Road: Roundway Gardens  
Post Code: SN10 2EF

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
1. Breakdown and placement of housing  
2. Impact of additional traffic on London Road  
3. Impact of additional traffic on Roundwell Park  
4. Lighting in Quakers Walk  
5. Why are brown sites not being used first

1. Why is Quakers Walk being forced through when there are plenty of brown field sites.  
2. What about the current infrastructure. It cannot cope now and the loss of the hospital will further aggravate this.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Clapton  
Road: Parkfields  
Post Code: SN10 2EB

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Security of the Helicopter – children and kids don’t mix with machines!! The helicopter was there first it should stay!!  
Traffic along London Road is bad enough now. What will it be like when you have at least 500 new cars and school runs!!
Where are the jobs for these people – they'll work outside of Devizes
Don't like the boundary options
Street lights – this is a nature site, it should be kept that way.

Name: Mrs. M Steel
Road: Roundway Park
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Access, do not want to encourage vehicles into residential area. London Road is too busy now 230 houses x 2 cars per house = 460 min.
School – no need for new school. Bishops Cannings need more pupils. Nursteed has new school.
There is no need for further houses – no work in the town. All will need to commute!

Access/London Road cannot take anymore traffic. There is no pedestrian crossing from one side to other.
Boundary/Landscape – don’t believe developers will put enough time/effort/money into keeping it a rural area. Developers never do – just take a look at recently built estates in the Devizes area.
School – no requirement. Other schools in area wanting more pupils.
Helicopter must stay – is a fantastic emergency resource for the area.

Name: Miss J. Edwards
Road: Victoria Road
Post Code: SN10 1HA

Views on emerging planning proposals:
What is to happen to the actual walk & footpath which is a beautiful and peaceful link between the town and countryside and previously in the 19th century formed part of Lord Roundway’s estate.

The development is obviously going to proceed & as I live in Victoria Road will not directly affect me. I would like to think the actual walk is preserved in its current state, retaining it’s rural walk ‘feel’. I would prefer to see the unobtrusive lighting as column lighting is not within the countryside type environment for the walk area. I’d like to see it retain the current format or as near to as is reasonably possible. Devizes is a ‘special’ place and many people come here because of it’s historical characteristics, the ‘Walk’ being one of them. Thank you.
Name: Mrs. J. M. Chamberlain  
Road: Long Street  
Post Code: SN10 1NT

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Preserving the landscape and environmental setting of the Quakers Walk path and of the Development
2. Traffic in the London Road
3. Creating a real community with on-site facilities rather than dormitory housing.
4. Making sure the Police helicopter stays in Devizes.

Name: Lt. Col. R. C. Chamberlain  
Road: Long Street  
Post Code: SN10 1NT

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Preservation of the rural environment of Quakers Walk
2. Quality of building and landscaping within the site to ensure that it is not too obtrusive
3. Creation of Community with on-site facilities
4. Ensuring that the Air Ambulance/ Police Helicopter is not forced eventually to leave the site
5. Access to London road

Not in any order
1. Please consider oak trees for Quakers Walk
2. I am concerned that the safety zone of the Helicopter goes over the entrance road and the footpath alongside it. The helicopter is an essential service to Devizes
3. The preservation of as much as possible of the RURAL aspect of Quakers Walk should be retained.
4. Landscaping of the site and the preservation of the rural aspects of all the boundaries of the site must take a much higher priority than the number of houses built on the site (there are plenty of other housing development sites in Devizes!)
5. The site must be made a Community not just a dormitory.

Name: Mr. P. J. Dicker  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EP

Views on emerging planning proposals: Vehicle emergency access/buses?
Name: Mr. R. Ormerod  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1ET

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Maintaining rural character of Quakers Walk
2. Mix and choice of housing (inc. affordable housing) to meet needs of Devizes community
3. Quality urban design and form of development

This exhibition says nothing about housing mix, affordability or the urban design of the housing itself, although staff said 70 subsidised and 45 low cost houses were proposed. The brief should set the mix out clearly, and should indicate the spatial arrangement/urban design concept. The character and function of Quakers Walk is still unclear. The aim should be to maintain its rural character – its W side will remain open countryside, and the dominant use will remain recreational, rather than as a purely functional link between the housing and the town centre. Establishing this clear objective for landscape design is more important than the distinction between the ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ concept. Lighting should be low level, and above all should not ‘leak’ into the wider surroundings – it should light the footpaths only.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. J. Booker  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1EU

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Quakers Walk being ruined  
I don’t like the idea of Quakers Walk being lit what about the wild life.  
Quakers Walk is a place of peace and quiet, where you can walk and contemplate – don’t ruin it
Name: Mr. D. Samuel  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1EU

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Concern that Quakers Walk does not become opened for transport and that it retains its rural character as far as possible.

Name: Miss H. Lovelock  
Road: Commercial Road  
Post Code: SN10 1EH

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Instead of looking at budget and profit the Planning Brief should be looking at ways to maintain and preserve the natural oasis that haven’t already been destroyed. It will be too late when it’s done. Too much has already been destroyed.

I think it is disgusting that anyone is even considering building on one of Devizes only natural oasis. Building next to Quakers Walk and re-designing would completely ruin one of the only places left in Devizes that is of natural beauty. Many people walk Quakers Walk and enjoy the countryside. Spoiling it in such a way would be such a waste when there are so many other places that could be built on without causing so much destruction. Have a heart and build on ‘brown’ areas instead, or somewhere such as Hopton which is already being built on. Think of the wildlife – don’t destroy there home.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. W. Wood  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Although we already have a very good hedge at the rear of our property, we would still wish to have a substantial fence erected by the developers at the rear of our property.
Views on emerging planning proposals: The Quakers Walk environment is of particular interest to me. Access to the site is very important.

Views on emerging planning proposals: Make Quakers Walk as per the plans.

Views on emerging planning proposals: The keeping of vehicular access for delivery of manure/supplies to Quakers Walk allotment site. (Currently using Quakers Walk.)

Views on emerging planning proposals: Make Quakers Walk as per the plans.

Views on emerging planning proposals: Consideration of the viability of Quakers Walk allotment site must be taken into consideration. The continued use of Quakers Walk for agricultural vehicles must be kept to allow deliveries of manure to the site. Parking from QW Bridge to gates must be kept/improved and entrance must be kept/improved. No-one has sought to find out the views of the allotment holders (70 families) and their views should be sought to improve/keep this important community facility. On no account must access be left which may result in the possible use of this site for building thus loosing this facility.

Views on emerging planning proposals: Traffic movements, especially in relation to the school, & especially parents choice of where to drop off and wait for pupils. It seems perverse to locate the school at the point furthest from the town i.e. option 1. Option 2 must be more accessible. The access road around Police land
should be designed to cater for parental waiting, not put pressure on Roundway Park road which was not designed for this and is already a cul-de-sac serving 100+ houses.

Name:     Ms. Barber
Road:    Osmund Road
Post Code: SN10 3GD

Views on emerging planning proposals:
The provision of affordable housing within the development – Devizes needs more rented affordable housing.

Name:     Ms. P. Webb
Road:    Victoria Road
Post Code: SN10 1EY

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Congestion of traffic in London Road plus the added congestion of school children being dropped off at school.
2. Helicopter already causes disturbance – how can this be minimised? (as noted on board 1)
3. Would this proposal lose my view of Roundway Down
4. Photos on boards are misleading – look too “pretty”, lighting not in keeping.
5. Would these proposed homes pay council tax to Roundway parish rather than Devizes Town Council
6. Although not mentioned here at this forum I am concerned for the proposal for lighting along the council towpath between London Road Bridge and Park Bridge.
7. The forum was too “cramped” and small for the amount of people attending. It was difficult to read the proposal over the people’s shoulders.

Name:     Mr. & Mrs. A. Norris
Road:    Parkfields
Post Code: SN10 2EB

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Access to site off London Road
2. Boundaries of Parkfields,

Although we prefer the buffer zone between Parkfields/New development and Roundway Park/New development we are concerned with the upkeep of such a buffer zone.
Name: Ms T. Arsley  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Amount of traffic in Roundway Park. Security of properties in Roundway Park/Gardens/Parkfields. Number of people/youths…. In Roundway Park area after dark – security aspect- noise levels. Protection of ‘rural’ and historical area – particularly Quakers Walk – protect from noise levels – traffic/people.  
Concern that vehicular access to the proposed site will not be via Roundway Park/Quakers Walk. Concern that properties adjacent to proposed site have privacy/security buffer.

Name: Ms. S. Dale  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
1. Amount of traffic and noise in Roundway Park – the road is very narrow to take large vehicles like buses on a regular basis and to accommodate large numbers of parent parking for the school run.  
2. It is important to keep the historic Quakers Walk as a footpath albeit with an improved surface and rural landscaping.

Name: Mr & Mrs P J Brown  
Road: Harebell Way  
Post Code: SN10 2TF

Views on emerging planning proposals: Too much traffic on London Rd already although the Sports Centre does need safer access/exit.

Name: Mr. A.R. Taylor  
Road: Parkfield  
Post Code: SN10 2EB

Views on emerging planning proposals: School location  
1. Hope overall design and location will be orientated to look towards the Town thus encouraging integration with the existing urban area and not producing another outlier development.
2. School location in Option 2 will help this respect. School location near the Sports Club and the remnant of farmland will possibly enable expansion and closer cooperation between the sports club and the school.
3. School location nearer new access route will reduce increased car use of Roundway Park.

Name: Mr. J.W. Hawkins
Road: Cunnington Close
Post Code: SN10 3SQ

Views on emerging planning proposals:
School – land flooding – centre of proposed area; also Roundway Park – flooding.

Name: Garton
Road: Roundway House
Post Code: SN10 2ES?

Views on emerging planning proposals:
The treatment & surface of Quakers Walk
The distance of housing from Quakers Walk
NO lighting for Quakers Walk, failing which low level bollard lights.
Surface self binding crushed gravel.

Name: Mrs. M. Cooper
Road: Roundway Park
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. Increase of traffic on Roundway Park – a very narrow road
2. Nearness of new building to the back of the bungalows (a) the bungalow back gardens are very short (b) houses – 2 or 3 storeys overlooking bungalows cannot be good planning.
3. Preservation of Quakers Walk – as a walk.

Name: Ms V. Uttridge
Road: Parkfields
Post Code: SN10 2EB

Views on emerging planning proposals:
The congestion on London Road, it took me ten minutes to cross the road to get here. It would be nice to think people will walk but in todays society people drive everywhere and unless you make it easier for walking nothing will change.

Name: Mr. & Ms. Cowley  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:

1. To be aware that flooding is already a problem in the area where the school may be situated (on Option 1) & needs to be attended to rigorously!!
2. In the event of option 1 being taken, to restrict parking in Roundway Park to collect/deliver children to school.
3. Lighting to be considerate over the playing fields to prevent pollution to gardens.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. J.M. Coslett  
Road: Roundway Gardens  
Post Code: SN10 2EF

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Access to and from London Road. At present it can take a long time to get out of Roundway Park onto London Road. It will not be safe for children (or adults) to cross London Road.

1. Car parking for parents waiting for children coming out of school will be a problem.
2. The farm tractor uses Quakers Walk to access his field. This destroys the surface. Horses use Quakers Walk at times too.

Name: Mrs. V. Messam  
Road: Bailey Close  
Post Code: SN10 2RW

Views on emerging planning proposals: Increased traffic onto London Road. Loss of Quakers Walk countryside appearance.
Name: Mrs. S. Bain  
Road: Parkfields  
Post Code: SN10 2EB  
Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Traffic issues onto London Road. Basically the site should be left as it is! – in an ideal world. Noise of construction. Loss of privacy for a lot of neighbours when for years you have had open space in front and behind.

Name: Mr. L. T. Hayden  
Road: Parkfields  
Post Code: SN10 2EB  
Views on emerging planning proposals: London Road cannot cope with any more traffic.

Name: Mrs. S. Fletcher  
Road: Velley Hill  
Post Code: SN13 9PU  
Views on emerging planning proposals: The location of the new St Peters School.

Name: Ms. J.M. Burton  
Road: Longcroft Road  
Post Code: SN10 3AT  
Views on emerging planning proposals:  
I personally think the whole idea is totally ludicrous and not necessary. Some of the residents will lose their gardens and their privacy. Will these houses be private and expensive, which local residents will be able to afford? Will it have social housing? Will there be houses for first time buyers? Another school? Yes we need the best education for our children. Has this proposition been thought out long term – with the implications for Devizes Town. Houses require people_ a) people have children b) people get old c) people get sick d) people have accidents. What about our local hospital? If you have the money to build more houses around our town, put some of it into the local hospital and not into other coffers. Traffic: has this been deeply investigated? There are only four main roads through Devizes. The congestion is bad now and will only get worse.
Name: Mr. K. Dixon  
Road: Roundway Gardens  
Post Code: SN10 2EF  
Views on emerging planning proposals:  
1. The presentation of Quakers Walk is of paramount importance. The extra planting of trees should be of semi-mature trees and not saplings (easily vandalised)  
2. Access to fields on opposite side of road should be from Roundway village and not off Quakers Walk  
3. Traffic on the Walk should only be pedestrians or cyclists. No petrol driven vehicles.

Name: Mr. P.E. Little  
Road: Bratton Avenue  
Post Code: SN10 5BA  
Views on emerging planning proposals:  
The impact on Quakers Walk as a quiet area in a town with too many houses already. The vandalism and untidiness associated with housing. The loss of wildlife from the Roundway and Quakers Walk area.  
There are too many houses in Devizes already. The access road to London Road will add to the already busy road with longer queues at peak times. The police air ambulance will not (be) tolerated by the 230 residents.

Name: Mrs. M. Bradley  
Road: Avon Road  
Post Code: SN10 1PS  
Views on emerging planning proposals: Location of the proposed new school/relocation of St Peter’s.

Name: Mr. D. Buxton  
Road: Lansdowne Terrace  
Post Code: SN10 1NX  
Views on emerging planning proposals:  
I am most concerned that Quakers Walk should not be spoilt as a rural recreational area. Any development of this sort will change its character but I would not like to see any changes that would tend to “urbanise” the walk itself (lighting, tarmac or similar). A barrier of tree planting in the 35m zone is most desirable to attempt concealment of and act as a green barrier between the walk and housing. As little illumination should be visible as possible of the development from the walk.
Name: Mr. & Mrs. J.T. Lumley  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
Roundway Park must NOT become a “drop off” area, or parking for the school. The narrow road & position of present gateways makes access to home pretty tight now. Could bungalows be built to south of present bungalows; present privacy would be greatly enhanced.

Name: Ms. J. Locke  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals: Road congestion. Position of school. Traffic into Roundway Park.

I am opposed to any development on the Quakers Walk site. The volume of traffic in the London Road at peak times is appalling, making it impossible to get out of Roundway Park. What will happen to the Emergency Services?

Name: Mrs. D. Hague  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
I live on the N.E> side of Roundway Park so the new development will not have a big impact on me. What I am concerned about is the extra traffic on the London Road, there are already huge queues during the rush hours (when people don’t have the chance to rush). A roundabout will not help[ a lot because traffic coming out of Devizes will have priority so “lights” are needed, but the development will still mean more traffic on an overloaded road.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. C.J. Ellison  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1ET

Views on emerging planning proposals:  
My concern is for the type of lighting which you plan to use to illuminate Quakers Walk. Of the four examples shown, in my opinion, there are only two which would be possible & suitable to light such a sensitive area. 1. The bollards.2. The lights sunk into the ground.
Name: Mr. Clayton  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:
The site of the building. Originally stated by K.D.C. that the new development would be built at the south end of the field to allow easy walking access to town and a reduction in car traffic. Development now to be sited at the north end of the town without any explanation for the change. If the development is to take place as stated it is essential for a 35m space between the rear garden fences of Roundway Park and the boundary of the development. Quakers Walk has a 35m barrier to separate the two areas, people in Roundway Park have their lounges in the rear of their bungalows overlooking the field, their permanent view. The land in the field adjoining Roundway Park rises by a good 5 feet for about 40 metres into the field, (it does not slope down as shown quite wrongly in one of your diagrams). Accordingly any building that faces towards Roundway Park should be made up of bungalows only. Your diagram also gives a wider band between the houses in Parkfields and the new development than you are proposing for Roundway Park. Why is this?
I am also completely opposed to school and other buses using the emergency entrance in Roundway Park. Other car traffic will also follow suit. In one of their earlier papers on the general subject, K.D.C. stated “Roundway Park is unsuitable for any further increase in traffic”. Is this a further example of K.D.C. saying one thing at one time and doing the opposite at a slightly later date?

Name: Mr. D.C. Springford  
Road: Victoria Road  
Post Code: SN10 1ET

Views on emerging planning proposals:
Having visited your exhibition on 22 January 2005, I am afraid to say that I am totally against the whole scheme as are very many other people.
1. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty, there is a major risk to wildlife if this development takes place.
2. The London road is gridlocked at the best of times and the thought of creating around 500 extra vehicles + school traffic getting in & out of this new estate is horrendous.
3. When once these schemes are started, they just multiply, just look at all the rabbit warrens that have been created in Nusteed village.
4. With all the new houses being built in Devizes, we seem to end up with less public services, and Devizes is in danger of becoming a dormitory town.

Name: Mr. A. Batt  
Road: Wedhampton  
Post Code: SN10 3QD

Views on emerging planning proposals:
1. With the proposed number of houses plus school and sports club restricted to one exit, traffic will be jammed on trying to exit the site. Traffic lights would help the exit but this will create a complete standstill of London Road traffic throughput.

2. At times traffic on London road can be queuing as far back as Horton road roundabout i.e. today Saturday 1030 hrs. Yesterday Friday 1630 I was jammed on Cannings Hill which is beyond Horton Road roundabout. Traffic jammed on London Road could also create traffic emerging from Police headquarters.

3. Police Helicopter. If Quakers Walk site is developed then the helicopter standing will need moving to a more open site in case of emergency landing.

Name: Isobel Clayton  
Road: Roundway Park  
Post Code: SN10 2EE

Views on emerging planning proposals:

The land in the field behind our bungalows in Quakers Walk rises. In one of the plans on Saturday it said the land dropped. My husband and I and other residents in our road would like all of the buildings to be erected at the South and South West end of the field near the allotments and the canal. It would be more peaceful for us all. We need and would like a barrier of at least 35 metres and then only bungalows to be built the other side of the barrier. The inspector suggested also a barrier of 35 metres on the East side of the trees in Quakers Walk.

We also think it is important to use the emergency entry, only for emergency vehicles and not for buses or cars. Roundway Park has a narrow road and is used already by many cars and other vehicles. We think also it is very important to have a vehicle census along London Road. It is easy to make excuses not to but surely it is possible and very enlightening.

With all these hundreds more houses that developers are hoping to build in Devizes it seems very necessary and logical for Devizes to have its hospital enlarged to cope with the enormous increase in its population. Perhaps the District Council may be willing and capable of assisting the Primary Care Trust to cope with this. Swindon, Bath and other suggested alternative hospitals will be very full helping their own residents; and travelling to those hospitals will be enormously difficult and slow for people in our Devizes town and its villages, especially for parents and elderly married people.

Name: Mr & Mrs Partridge  
Road: Roundway Garden  
Post Code: SN10 2EF

Views on emerging planning proposals: 
Traffic Congestion.
Light pollution – spoiling rural area.
Access Points – please not into Quakers Walk.
Endanger to wild life; (birds and deer).
Bungalows being over shadowed by close houses with short gardens.
Noise.
Quakers Walk being used as a Playground

“NO TO BUILDING ON THE QUAKERS WALK ENVIRONMENT”

With so many plans in hand for building along the London Road, is it necessary to build on this site at all? It appears that some 600 to 700 houses will be built. We shall soon be losing the hospital, we have a shortage of NHS dentists and the Doctors books are full. There will be no extra jobs for these residents so Devizes will become a commuter belt, bringing more cars on the already congested roads and pollution. With numbers falling at both Southbroom school and St Peters, why not amalgamate the two schools? If this school is built where will the children go once they become old enough to attend secondary school, I am sure Southbroom will not be able to accommodate them all.

We certainly do not agree with suggestions to install lighting in our beloved Quakers walk, it will spoil the rural ambience, the lighting from the proposed estate will be quite sufficient.

We are uncertain about the buffer zone, the plans were not clear, it appears to be less than we were originally told, is there to be a road around the perimeter? Or will the gardens come up to the edge of Quakers walk and the edge of the gardens in Parkfield and Roundway Park?

The closeness of this estate to the town, will not get people out of their cars as suggested in your mail of some months ago, it will encourage more cars onto the road. There is a danger that cars will be parked in Roundway Park so parents can meet their children from school. This road is narrow with no pavement for some of the way and will also cause a problem getting out onto the London Road.

Please reconsider the building of this estate, there are so few small market towns left, it would be a tragedy if Devizes were to be gobbled up and made into an urban over populated Town.

Name: Mr and Mrs Whitfield
Road: Roundway Park
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:

1. Whether there is a need for any more development of land for housing in Devizes.
2. Whether the Quakers Walk sit is suitable for development.
3. The siting of the school.
4. Access to the site onto the London Road.

I appreciate that there is pressure from central government to provide more housing but Devizes, as part of Kennet district, seems to have been overloaded with new development in the past few years. Also, the ambience of Quakers Walk will be changed (and not for the better) by this development.

Point 3:
If the proposed school takes the place of St Peters School, this will generate more traffic from the Bath Road end of town as parents take their children to and collect them from school. The school would be best situated as near to town as possible so as to encourage walking to school. The North East corner of the site for the school will generate a lot of traffic in Roundway Park by parents dropping their children off to walk through to the school.

Point 4:
The whole site will generate significantly more traffic on the London Road – which already fails to cope with the volume of traffic at peak times.

PANEL 7:
Regarding improving the surface of Quakers Walk – has any consideration been given to the fact that tractors and other farm vehicles will continue to use it to access the farm land.

Name: J Kennedy  
Road: Roundway Gardens  
Post Code: SN10 2EF

Views on emerging planning proposals:

We are concerned over future use of Quakers Walk after the proposed upgrading has taken place. Plans look good on paper but what will happen to the new surface envisaged in winter conditions.

We should be interested to know what is proposed for the following:-

a) Will agricultural machinery such as Tractors still be allowed to make use of it. If so will conditions be imposed for such users to clear the mud and keep it usable.
b) Will adequate drainage be provided for wet weather conditions, witness the present state of the Walk.
c) Will there be provision for a cycle track and walkway for the increased safety of both pedestrians and cyclists.

Name: Mr. & Mrs. Kantharic
Road: Roundway Park
Post Code: SN10 2ED

Views on emerging planning proposals:
We feel these houses and school should not be built here. London Road is awful as it is without more cars.
The effect it will have on Quakers Walk and Roundway Park will mean it will be changed for ever and not for the best.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Quakers Walk site, Devizes, is allocated in the adopted Kennet Local Plan for housing development (approximately 230 units) and a new primary school. Prior to submission of a planning application, the Council requires public consultation on the emerging proposals, and preparation of a Planning Brief.

1.2 A Public Exhibition was held on Saturday 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 2005, supplemented by two Discussion Forums on 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 2005.

1.3 The Exhibition summarised the main issues associated with development of the Quakers Walk site and presented a number of alternative options concerning boundary treatments, the location of the new school and the approaches to preserving the historic footpath known as Quakers Walk.

1.4 Consensus arranged the consultation process and acted as an independent facilitator for the two Discussion Forums. The results of the consultation process have been summarised in a Statement of Community Engagement, prepared by Consensus.

1.5 The purpose of the following report is to respond to the feedback received from local residents and other interested parties during the consultation period. The next stage in the process will be preparation of a Draft Planning Brief. This will be made available for a comment, prior to consideration of the Brief by Kennet District Council. Subject to the need for any final alterations, the Planning Brief will then be approved as an emerging Supplementary Planning Document.
2.0 FORMAT

2.1 This report is structured to ensure that full consideration is given to the comments received at the Public Exhibition and subsequent Discussion Forums. The majority of responses were received as completed feedback forms.

2.2 The report considers the comments received in two separate sections. The first section deals specifically with the issues raised on the exhibition boards. These were:

- Issue 1 – Location of the new Primary School
- Issue 2 – Boundary Treatment, Roundway Park
- Issue 3 – Boundary Treatment, Parkfields
- Issue 4 – Boundary Treatment, Quakers Walk

2.3 The second section addresses common themes raised by individuals in responding to the exhibition material. Consistent themes included the impact of development on London Road, concerns in relation to the use of Quakers Walk by farm traffic and preservation of the rural character of Quakers Walk.

2.4 A number of other comments were received, often of a very detailed nature. These issues will need to be addressed at the Reserved Matters Planning Application stage. The Statement of Community Engagement serves as a record of the issues raised at this time, and will need to be reviewed by the developer that purchases the site, before submission of the Reserved Matters Application.
3.0 PUBLIC EXHIBITION ISSUES

3.1 The intended response to each of the issues raised at the public exhibition is outlined below.

**Issue 1 – Location of the New Primary School**

3.2 The majority of respondents (over 65%) wanted the school to be located as indicated in Option 3 of the emerging proposals. This would involve the main school buildings being located to the south east of the development area, to the north of the proposed new access off London Road. The playing fields would then run north, adjacent to Parkfields and the eastern end of the boundary with Roundway Park.

3.3 It is intended to pursue this option in the draft Planning Brief.

3.4 Principal benefits of this Option include:

- It is well located in respect of bus access from Roundway Park.
- Existing neighbouring properties to the north and east would back onto playing fields rather than new housing.
- The drop-off area is further away from Roundway Park, deterring parents from parking in this existing residential area.
- School traffic would avoid the new residential areas.
- The school building is located further to the south of the site in a more accessible location (particularly for those pupils that are to be transferred from the existing St Peter’s School).
- The school buildings are further away from the majority of existing residential development, resulting in less noise disturbance from cars and general play activity.

3.5 Option 1 was for the school to be located as per the adopted Local Plan. If the school were to be located in this area, the drop-off point for school children would be closer to Roundway Park, encouraging parents to park in this existing residential area, and then walk their children through the emergency and bus access point.

3.6 Option 2 proposed that the school be located to the south west of the proposed development area. The principal benefit of this location would be that the school is as close as possible to the existing St Peter’s School catchment.

3.7 However, the difference between the school location in Option 2 and Option 3 is marginal, and is unlikely to have any significant impact upon travel mode choice.

3.8 Option 2 also has significant disadvantages. Security fencing would be required around the school site for child safety. It would be difficult to accommodate this fencing whilst maintaining the setting of Quakers Walk. The area most suitable for the playing fields forms part of a natural bowl feature. To accommodate the playing fields it would be necessary to engineer high embankments along
Quakers Walk. This would be detrimental to the setting of this important link between Devizes and the countryside beyond.

**Issue 2 – Boundary Treatment, Roundway Park**

3.9 Three alternative options were put forward for the boundary treatment between new development and Roundway Park. In each case, a minimum of 25 metres was proposed between the existing properties on Roundway Park, and the new properties within the Quakers Walk development area. Whilst no clear preference emerged, little support was given to creation of a single-sided street between new residential development and the existing properties on Roundway Park.

3.10 The principal concern for the majority of residents was the impact of development on their immediate boundary. In particular, people expressed concerns about a loss of privacy, the impact development would have upon their existing views over farmland, and security.

3.11 Based upon the preferred location for the new school, residents along Roundway Park (to the east of the proposed emergency and bus access) will back onto school playing fields. The decision on the preferred boundary treatment along Roundway Park will therefore principally impact upon those residents to the west of the proposed emergency and bus access.

3.12 In view of the detailed and very personal issues associated with alternative boundary treatments, it is proposed that the Planning Brief makes a commitment to further dialogue between the eventual developer and local residents, in advance of submitting the Reserved Matters Planning Application.

3.13 In addition to the commitment to further consultation, the Planning Brief will confirm a minimum separation of 25 metres between existing properties on Roundway Park and the new properties within the Quakers Walk development area. The use of land between the properties, and form of boundary treatment, can then be a matter for discussion at the detailed planning stage.

3.14 Kennet District Council will need to be satisfied that the requirements of Policy HC9 of the Local Plan have been met, in particular the criteria that requires development to respect the amenity of adjacent land uses and residents. Other matters in relation to boundary treatments, for example, the height of new properties, their layout and general design, are addressed in Section 4.0 of this report.

**Issue 3 – Boundary Treatment, Parkfields**

3.15 Respondents indicated a preference for Option 3, which involves creation of a landscape buffer between existing properties along Parkfields and the new properties built on the Quakers Walk site. However, a number of these respondents also indicated their preference for the new school (and associated playing fields) to be located along their boundary with the development area.

3.16 It would appear that there are anomalies between the responses recorded on the feedback forms, and indeed between the feedback forms and views expressed at the public exhibition. Consensus observed that the underlying aspiration among existing residents is to distance themselves from their new neighbours.
3.17 With the preferred location of the new school to the east of the Quakers Walk site, all residents of Parkfields will back onto the school and its associated playing fields. The Planning Brief will refer to the need for appropriate treatment of the school playing fields boundary, to ensure privacy and security. The layout of the new school and its associated facilities will be determined by the Education Authority and Diocesan, in preparing and submitting a detailed planning application. Local residents will have the opportunity to comment on the proposals at this time.

**Issue 4 – Boundary Treatment, Quakers Walk**

3.18 All respondents to this element of the consultation preferred Option 1 (i.e. a rural design approach to the improvement of Quakers Walk and its integration with the adjacent development area).

3.19 This option will be taken forward for inclusion in the Planning Brief.
4.0 OTHER ISSUES

4.1 The more general comments received from attendees at the Public Exhibition and subsequent Discussion Forums are summarised below. The proposed response to each comment is then set out, with input from Kennet District Council and Wiltshire County Council where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quakers Walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation of Quakers Walk for wildlife and the community in its current form.</td>
<td>The Consultation responses showed the considerable importance of Quakers Walk to the residents of Devizes. Policy HC9 of the Local Plan requires that development of the Quakers Walk site retains and respects the quality of Quakers Walk, and imposes the requirement for a landscape buffer (minimum width 35 metres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong resistance to ‘urbanisation’ of current form and character.</td>
<td>The Planning Brief will adopt a rural design approach to Quakers Walk, broadly as outlined at the Public Exhibition. This will help to retain the rural feel to Quakers Walk, and serve to enhance biodiversity, through creation of new habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong desire to retain peaceful, rural feel to the ‘Walk’.</td>
<td>The Planning Brief will respect the requirement for no built development within 35 metres of Quakers Walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed views on the desirability, purpose and value of lighting along Quakers Walk.</td>
<td>Several respondents to the consultation exercise expressed concern over the impact of lighting on Quakers Walk. Wiltshire County Council have previously expressed a preference for the Walk to be lit, providing a safer route for use by local residents in the early morning and evenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Brief will adopt a pragmatic approach to this issue, seeking to reconcile the need for a safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist route, with the need to maintain the rural character of Quakers Walk. The section of Quakers Walk between New Park Road and the southern end of the development area is likely to require lighting. This should be low-level lighting, sensitive to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to the proposed development area, an alternative and lit route will be provided adjacent to new housing, and running broadly parallel to the Walk. This approach will help maintain the character of Quakers Walk whilst providing a safe alternative route for local residents between Roundway Park and the town centre to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity of new housing would drive wildlife away.</td>
<td>The Planning Brief will respect the requirement for no built development within 35 metres of Quakers Walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Brief will adopt a rural design approach to Quakers Walk, broadly as outlined at the Public Exhibition. This will help to retain the rural feel to Quakers Walk, and serve to enhance biodiversity, through creation of new habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed views on the impact that current farming activities have on the surface conditions along Quakers Walk.</td>
<td>Several respondents to the consultation exercise commented upon the impact of farm vehicles on Quakers Walk. Tractors deposit mud and leave a rutted uneven surface to the Walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a requirement of the Devizes Strategic Development Brief that the surface of Quakers Walk is improved, enabling its use by pedestrians, cyclists, mobility impaired and pushchair users. Continued use of the walk by farm vehicles would not be compatible with this upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protection of vehicular access to allotments. (Deliveries).</td>
<td>Farm traffic currently uses Quakers Walk to access agricultural land to the east and west of Quakers Walk. The tenant farmer is able to access land to the west of Quakers Walk by using an alternative access. A significant proportion of the agricultural land to the east of Quakers Walk will from the proposed development area. An access to the remaining area of agricultural land (between the proposed development area and allotments to the south) must be retained. Furthermore, there must be vehicular access to the Quakers Walk allotments, allowing deliveries of manure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is proposed that there will be a crossing of Quakers Walk, allowing farm vehicles to access the remaining agricultural land and provide deliveries of manure to the allotments. The crossing of Quakers Walk (to the south of the development area) will be lined with wooden bollards (or similar) to prevent farm vehicles travelling along Quakers Walk. Likewise, there will be some form of barrier at the Roundway Park end of Quakers Walk, preventing vehicular access (other than for maintenance of the Quakers Walk path).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact of additional traffic on London Road.</td>
<td>The impact of additional traffic on London Road was considered in detail at the Local Plan Public Inquiry. The Highways Authority advised that the new junction with London Road was capable of accommodating the traffic movements associated with approximately 300 new dwellings and primary school. The adopted Kennet Local Plan allocates the Quakers Walk site for 230 dwellings and a new primary school. It also imposes a requirement that the main vehicular access to the Quakers Walk site is from the east, off London Road. The Planning Brief will incorporate the access arrangement agreed in principle with the Highways Authority and designed to protect the mature trees along London Road. Some additional traffic impact analysis may be required to appraise the implications of a new access for the Devizes Sports Club. However, the additional traffic associated with an enlarged new primary school is compensated for by the reduced housing allocation (230 units as opposed to 300 units). The Highways Authority are seeking contributions from the development towards updating a traffic model for Devizes, to assess the traffic situation on a wider basis than the Quakers Walk development. Completion of this work will be determined by the Highways Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of a suitable junction with London Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roundway Park too narrow for excessive traffic and larger vehicles such as buses.</td>
<td>The Kennet Local Plan requires a secondary access to be provided off Roundway Park. The access will be restricted for use by buses and emergency vehicles only. Bus services currently travel up Roundway Park, before looping around the small green and returning to London Road. With a secondary access in place, services will leave London Road using the main new access, travel through the Quakers Walk development area and then (via the secondary access) depart along Roundway Park to London Road. The new routing will result in fewer bus movements along Roundway Park, with each service only travelling in one direction along the road (rather than up and down, as is currently the case).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

**CARTER JONAS RESPONSE**

- **Parents dropping off and picking up children in Roundway Park.**
  - Several respondents were concerned that the parents of children attending the new primary school will use Roundway Park as a picking up and dropping off point. The area allocated for the new school in the adopted Kennet Local Plan could encourage such activity, with the school buildings in close proximity to the secondary access.
  - The preferred location for the new school, to the south east of the Quakers Walk development area, should significantly reduce the anticipated use of Roundway Park by parents on the school run, given the longer walking distances involved.

- **Lack of suitable crossing points across London Road for parents and children.**
  - This is a matter to be addressed by Wiltshire County Council as Highways Authority.
  - The Devizes Strategic Development Brief confirms that a number of new crossings of London Road will be required. These are to include one adjacent to the Le Marchant Barracks site, one in the vicinity of the new main access serving the Quakers Walk development area, and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist links at the canal crossing.

### 3. The New School

- **Case for a new school in this location not proven.**
  - Policy HC38 of the Kennet Local Plan allocates land for a new primary school on the Quakers Walk site. The Devizes Strategic Development Brief confirms that the new primary school is required to meet the educational needs arising from the new population generated by housing proposals in the Local Plan.
  - The Local Education Authority supports proposals for a new primary school on the Quakers Walk site.

- **Existing schools in the area have a need for new pupils.**
  - Taking into account the views expressed at the Public Exhibition and two subsequent Discussion Forums, along with the comments made by the Local Education Authority and St Peters School Governors, the Planning Brief is to identify a site to the south east of the development area for provision of a new primary school. The merits of the preferred location are discussed in more detail in Section 3.0 of this Report.
  - The site to be reserved for development of the school is 1.45ha. This will provide land sufficient for a 10-form primary school.

- **Competing views on the preferred location.**
  - In line with Government policy, the new primary school is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>school hours, particularly among near neighbours.</td>
<td>to be designed to allow dual use of certain facilities, both during and after school hours. It is intended to provide a floodlit multi-use games area within the school, similar to that recently provided at Nursteed School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The dual use facilities at Nursteed School have been a success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The layout and design of the new school and associated facilities will be the responsibility of the Local Education Authority and Diocese of Salisbury. There will be the opportunity for local residents to comment on proposals in due course, both before and after a planning application is submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact of noise, vandalism, mischief in quiet residential area.</td>
<td>Respondents at the Public Exhibition and subsequent Discussion Forums expressed a general preference for the school to be located to the south east of the Quakers Walk development area. Residents of Parkfields and those to the eastern end of Roundway Park were generally keen to share a boundary with the new school (and its associated playing fields) in preference to new residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The design and layout of the proposed new school and wider development area will help to minimise noise disturbance to existing and new residents, as well as ensuring there are sufficient areas for child recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Helicopter</td>
<td>No part of the new school will lie within the 150-metre building exclusion zone associated with the Police Helicopter Pad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns regarding proximity of helicopter pad to new school.</td>
<td>The location and specification of the new school buildings will be a matter for consideration at the detailed planning stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The presence of the Police Helicopter Pad will supersede any new development on the Quakers Walk site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater concern that the new school and new community will (eventually) lobby for helicopter to be relocated elsewhere and that this service will be lost to the local community.</td>
<td>Prospective purchasers of the new houses will be aware of the Police Helicopter Pad and will therefore find it difficult to justify any argument that it should be relocated. Likewise, the Local Education Authority and representatives of St Peter’s School are fully aware of the Police Heli_pad and the noise generated by helicopters using this facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Housing</td>
<td>In addition to the commitment to further consultation, the Planning Brief will confirm a minimum separation of 25-metres between existing properties on Roundway Park and the new properties within the Quakers Walk development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Height and proximity of new homes should be restricted where close to existing properties.</td>
<td>On the immediate boundary with Roundway Park, new dwellings will not exceed two storeys in height. Residents of Parkfields will share a boundary with the new primary school and its associated playfields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The brief should clearly set out the mix of house types, density and provision/location of affordable units.</td>
<td>The Planning Brief will provide a clear Design Statement, specifying the broad mix of house types and density across the development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The adopted Kennet Local Plan and Devizes Strategic Development Brief confirm that the Local Authority will seek to negotiate approximately 70 subsidised units and 45 low-cost units on the Quakers Walk site. The Strategic Development Brief also provides a breakdown of the priority house-types for provision of affordable accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The affordable housing units are to be spread across the Quakers Walk site, in clusters of not more than 10 units (in accordance with Policy HC31 of the Kennet Local Plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design must be of the highest quality and not just ‘standard’ house-types.</td>
<td>The Planning Brief should ensure that a high quality development is achieved on the Quakers Walk site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Brief will include a Statement of Design Principles that will establish the guiding principles for future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Facilities and Infrastructure</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on existing GP surgeries and other facilities (Hospital being closed).</td>
<td>This is a wider issue that cannot be addressed through preparation of the Quakers Walk Planning Brief. New development, wherever located, will place additional pressure on existing GP surgeries and other community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on emergency services</td>
<td>Neither the Kennet Local Plan nor the Devizes Strategic Development Brief require contributions to health facilities. Such issues will need to be addressed by Kennet District Council (working in partnership with the relevant service providers) in reviewing Local Plan policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns regarding existing sewage capacity.</td>
<td>Wessex Water has not identified any insurmountable constraints to development of the Quakers Walk site for housing and a new primary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns regarding potential flooding on selected parts of the site.</td>
<td>The Quakers Walk site does not lie within an area of flood risk. Surface water drainage will be an issue for consideration at the detailed planning stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7. Other Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Other Issues</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impact of development on views to Roundway Hill.</td>
<td>It is a requirement of the Kennet Local Plan that a comprehensive landscaping scheme is prepared for the Quakers Walk development. The Local Plan emphasises the importance of minimising the external impact of development on the wider landscape of Roundway Hill. These matters will need to be addressed in the draft Planning Brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to employment opportunities (Devizes is a dormitory town).</td>
<td>A number of employment opportunities are located in the town centre and to the north of the town, off London Road. The Quakers Walk site is appropriately located to access employment opportunities in both of these areas. In terms of the overall balance between employment opportunities and the resident workforce, this is not a matter that can be addressed through preparation of the Quakers Walk Planning Brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An improved access for Devizes Sports Club.</td>
<td>The adopted Kennet Local Plan suggests that there may be opportunities for development of the Quakers Walk site to enable an improved access to Devizes Sports Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing access on to London Road (close to the canal bridge) is unsafe. Proposals in the draft Planning Brief will ensure that the opportunity for a new access to the Sports Club is retained, allowing vehicles from this facility to use the main access to the Quakers Walk development site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The purpose of this Report is to respond to the feedback received from local residents and other interested parties at the Public Exhibition and subsequent Discussion Forums. The majority of concerns are capable of being addressed in the draft Planning Brief and associated proposals for development of the Quakers Walk site.

5.2 Some of the concerns expressed by local residents were considered and debated at length during the Local Plan Public Inquiry. The views of the Independent Inspector on such matters must be respected. In particular, the Inspector concluded that there was a need for a new primary school to accommodate pupils generated by development proposals to the north of Devizes (including the Quakers Walk site) and that London Road was capable of accommodating the traffic associated with 230 new homes, a primary school and new access to the Sports Club.

5.3 The Highways Authority accepts the principle of a new access onto London Road, although some further work may be required in relation to the impact of Sports Club traffic.

5.4 The next stage in the process is preparation of a draft Planning Brief. This will be made available for consultation, prior to consideration of the Brief by Officers and Members of Kennet District Council.
PART TWO

Preferred Option Consultation Draft
Quakers Walk Planning, April 2005
List of Respondents
## QUAKERS WALK DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF: SCHEDULE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>POSTCODE</th>
<th>RESPONDENT TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devizes Sports Club</td>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>SN10 2DL</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Ellison</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td>SN10 1ET</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devizes Town Council</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>SN10 1BN</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Johns Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt W. &amp; Mrs J. Harrison</td>
<td>Roundway Gardens</td>
<td>SN10 2EF</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Rivers House</td>
<td>DT11 8ST</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunrise Business Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Shaftesbury Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blandford Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blandford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex Water</td>
<td>Claverton Down</td>
<td>BA2 7WW</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs S.E. Payne</td>
<td>Roundway Park</td>
<td>SN10 2EE</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P.L. Dicker</td>
<td>Roundway Park</td>
<td>SN10 2ED</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms A. Boyd</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td>SN10 1ET</td>
<td>Interest Group (Quakers Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest Group (Quakers Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs B &amp; S Rowles</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td>SN10 1ET</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms P. Webb</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td>SN10 1EU</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K. Dixon</td>
<td>Roundway Gardens</td>
<td>SN10 2EF</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs M. Steel</td>
<td>Roundway Park</td>
<td>SN10 2ED</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Cannings C.of.E Primary</td>
<td>The Street</td>
<td>SN10 2LD</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Bishops Cannings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J.C &amp; E.J Higgins</td>
<td>Roundway Park</td>
<td>SN10 2EE</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P. &amp; G. Talbot</td>
<td>Victoria Road</td>
<td>SN10 1GT</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms S. Dale</td>
<td>Roundway Park</td>
<td>SN10 2ED</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T Bolland (The Trust for Devizes)</td>
<td>Southbroom Road</td>
<td>SN10 1LX</td>
<td>Interest Group (The Trust for Devizes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr N. Carter</td>
<td>Western Close</td>
<td>SN10 1AQ</td>
<td>District Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule of Issues and Responses, April 2005
## QUAKERS WALK DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF: SCHEDULE OF ISSUES AND RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
<th>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Quakers Walk site.</td>
<td>When will the Quakers Walk site be developed?</td>
<td>There are a number of stages in the planning process that must be completed before development can proceed. We would not anticipate development commencing before mid 2007. Policy HC9 of the Kennet Local Plan requires that not more than 150 houses should be commenced prior to 2008. This is to encourage the prior use of previously developed sites in Kennet District.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Gate/Lodge at southern end of Quakers Walk also Listed.</td>
<td>Agree. Amend Brief accordingly.</td>
<td>Paragraph 2.5 changed to read: “The site does not lie within or adjacent to a Conservation Area and the only Listed structures in the immediate vicinity of the site are Quakers Lodge and the Lodge Gates, to the south-west. The Lodge Gates denote the entry to the bridge crossing of the Canal”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers Walk</td>
<td>The Quakers Walk pathway has become covered in soil and debris as a consequence of farming activities and lack of maintenance requiring residents to deviate from the main path.</td>
<td>The proposals outlined in the Planning Brief address this issue. See Figure 5.7 and para 5.21.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lighting of Quakers Walk</td>
<td>The Draft Planning Brief adopts a pragmatic approach to this issue, seeking to reconcile the need for a safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist route, with the need to maintain the rural character of Quakers Walk. The section of Quakers Walk between New Park Road and the southern end of the development area is likely to require lighting. This should be low-level lighting, sensitive to its surroundings.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact of cable laying on flora and fauna</td>
<td>Adjacent to the proposed development area, an alternative and lit route will be provided adjacent to new housing, and running broadly parallel to the Walk. This approach will help maintain the character of Quakers Walk whilst providing a safe alternative route for local residents between Roundway Park and the town centre to the south.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on nocturnal wildlife</td>
<td>The detailed concerns highlighted in the responses will need to be addressed at the detailed planning stage, in liaison with key stakeholders, including the police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May encourage anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns over safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vandals may destroy lighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The surface treatment of Quakers Walk should be bound gravel.</td>
<td>See para 5.21 of the Planning Brief.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers Walk will not provide a safe route for school children.</td>
<td>Disagree. Proposed sensitive lighting, increased use of the route and improvements to the surfacing will all help to improve the safety of this important cyclist and pedestrian route.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Access</td>
<td>Congestion in the vicinity of the southern end of Quakers Walk, with parents dropping children off for school.</td>
<td>Improvements to the surface of Quakers Walk are required by the Devizes Strategic Development Brief, to improve access for pushchair users and the mobility impaired.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immediately after the existing paragraph 4.8, a new paragraph 4.9 has been inserted as follows:

“The Devizes Strategic Development Brief requires resident parking restrictions and limited waiting signage on New Park Road, at the southern end of Quakers Walk”.

Also, a further bullet has been added to 5.7, reading: “Parking restrictions are to be imposed on New Park Road, to the south of Quakers Walk, in accordance with the Devizes Strategic Development Brief”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
<th>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic on London Road.</td>
<td>The impact of additional traffic on London Road was considered in detail at the Local Plan Public Inquiry. The Highways Authority advised that the new junction with London Road was capable of accommodating the traffic movements associated with approximately 300 new dwellings and primary school. The adopted Kennet Local Plan allocates the Quakers Walk site for 230 dwellings and a new primary school. It also imposes a requirement that the main vehicular access to the Quakers Walk site is from the east, off London Road. The Draft Planning Brief incorporates the access arrangement agreed in principle with the Highways Authority and designed to protect the mature trees along London Road. Some additional traffic impact analysis has been undertaken to appraise the implications of a new access for the Devizes Sports Club, and the changes in traffic movements associated with the proposed larger primary school, but smaller housing requirement (230 units as opposed to 300 units). The results of this work are that the overall impact of traffic associated with proposed development will be less than assumed at the Local Plan Public Inquiry. The Highways Authority are seeking contributions from the development towards updating a traffic model for Devizes, to assess the traffic situation on a wider basis than the Quakers Walk development. The Quakers Walk scheme will make a financial contribution to this work.</td>
<td>A new section on S.106 contributions has been added to the Planning Brief (paragraph 6.3). This includes a sentence which states: “In addition, contributions will need to be made towards the new SATURN traffic model for Devizes, to be prepared by Wiltshire County Council”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Wiltshire County Council to conduct a detailed traffic survey on London Road.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundway Park is too narrow to sustain any extra traffic, especially a regular bus service.</td>
<td>The Kennet Local Plan requires a secondary access to be provided off Roundway Park. The access will be restricted for use by buses and emergency vehicles only. Bus services currently travel up Roundway Park, before looping around the small green and returning to London Road. With a secondary access in place, services will leave London Road using the main new access, travel through the Quakers Walk development area and then (via the secondary access) depart along Roundway Park to London Road. The new routing will result in fewer bus movements along Roundway Park, with each service only travelling in one direction along the road (rather than up and down, as is currently the case).</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary access should used as an “exit – only” from the Quakers Walk site.</td>
<td>The Kennet Local Plan requires a secondary access to be provided off Roundway Park. This will be restricted for use by buses and emergency vehicles only so as to reduce vehicular impact. Bus services run up and down London Road, and restricting the access as proposed would not provide for practical routing.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School</td>
<td>There is no need for a new primary school on the Quakers Walk site (with related concerns over the future of the Bishops Cannings School). New school should not be on the Quakers Walk site.</td>
<td>Policy HC38 of the Kennet Local Plan allocates land for a new primary school on the Quakers Walk site. The Devizes Strategic Development Brief confirms that the new primary school is required to meet the educational needs arising from the new population generated by housing proposals in the Local Plan. The Local Education Authority has sustained its support for the proposed new school (including the merger with St Peters School).</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact of existing St Peters School pupils crossing town to attend the new Quakers Walk primary school. | It is unlikely that parents of the pupils transferring from St Peters School will choose to drive along the A361 to the school in the peak hour, unless they already had a need to travel along this corridor (i.e. linked trips, probably associated with the daily commute). 

It is expected that parents of the ‘transfer’ children, should they choose to use the car, will drive close to Park Bridge and then walk through the site to reach the school. It is not anticipated that there will be any material increase in traffic along the A361 London Road due to the “transfer” children from St Peters School. 

Parking restrictions are to be imposed on New Park Road, to the south of Quakers Walk, in accordance with the Devizes Strategic Development Brief (see “Traffic” section above). | Immediately after the existing paragraph 4.8, a new paragraph 4.9 has been inserted as follows: “The Devizes Strategic Development Brief requires resident parking restrictions and limited waiting signage on New Park Road, at the southern end of Quakers Walk”. Also, a further bullet has been added to 5.7, reading: “Parking restrictions are to be imposed on New Park Road, to the south of Quakers Walk, in accordance with the Devizes Strategic Development Brief” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
<th>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School may be better positioned behind the allotments for safety purposes.</td>
<td>The location of the new school has been subject to considerable debate. The site needs to be within the area allocated for development in the adopted Kennet Local Plan. Taking all matters into consideration, the proposed site for the new school represents the best compromise between competing views.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>Noise impact from Police Helipad and concerns over safety for school children.</td>
<td>No part of the school will lie within the 150 metre building exclusion zone associated with the Police Helicopter Pad. The Local Education Authority and Salisbury Diocese are satisfied with the proposed new site, although the layout of the new school will be subject to further consideration at the detailed planning stage.</td>
<td>An additional paragraph should be added under paragraph 4.20 (now 4.21). This should read: ‘The Noise Assessment concluded that no mitigation measures were considered necessary. However, as a design guide, residential properties located close to the helipad should be orientated such that, as far as possible, the angle of view to the helipad is minimised. This may include properties with gable-ends towards the helipad or angled obliquely’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>The layout of development should be informed by the scale and form of adjacent bungalows and not the three-storey Police Headquarters.</td>
<td>Agree. See proposed amendments. In addition to the commitment to further consultation, the Draft Planning Brief confirms a minimum separation of 25-metres between existing properties on Roundway Park and the new properties within the Quakers Walk development area. On the immediate boundary with Roundway Park, new dwellings will not exceed two storeys in height. Residents of Parkfields will share a boundary with the new primary school and its associated playing fields.</td>
<td>Amend paragraph 2.9 (first bullet under “Adjacent uses to the south and east of the Quakers Walk Site”) by deleting “…they provide a precedent for larger building blocks in this area”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development proposals will not create a sense of community.</td>
<td>Disagree. See section 5.9 of the Draft Planning Brief. Proposals accord with latest Government advice on Design.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and</td>
<td>The need for additional health care facilities.</td>
<td>This is a wider issue that cannot be addressed through preparation of the Quakers Walk Planning Brief. New development, wherever located, will place additional pressure on existing GP surgeries and other community facilities.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Insufficient community infrastructure to accommodate new population generated by development.</td>
<td>Neither the Kennet Local Plan or the Devizes Strategic Development Brief require contributions to health facilities. Such issues will need to be addressed by Kennet District Council (working in partnership with the relevant service providers) in reviewing Local Plan policies. Policy HC39 of the Kennet Local Plan encourages dual use of the new school facilities, thereby providing a new community resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Club</td>
<td>The Planning Brief proposals do not facilitate an alternative access to Devizes Sports Club.</td>
<td>The proposed development on the Quakers Walk site was agreed after lengthy discussion at an independent Local Plan Public Inquiry. Significant financial contributions will be made by the developer to new infrastructure included within the Devizes Strategic Development Brief.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See paragraphs 4.10 and 4.11 (and Figure 4.4) of the Planning Brief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The retained access fulfils the requirements of the Kennet Local Plan, and provides the opportunity for provision of a new access road in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Biodiversity       | The wildlife section is incomplete. Roe Deer visit the site annually, also Muntjac, hares, foxes and badgers. Pheasants have been present for weeks, Skylarks nest in early summer. | Agree. See proposed amendment to the Planning Brief. | New text inserted as paragraph 2.4, to read:  
"Native wildlife currently frequents the site, including Roe Deer, Hares, Foxes and Badgers. No Badger sets have been identified within or adjacent to the proposed development". |
<p>|                    | Concerns about the impact of proposals on the local badger population. | The Ecology Survey did not identify any active sets within or adjacent to the proposed development area. Areas suitable for badger foraging will remain to the south of the proposed development area, and to the west of Quakers Walk. | None |
| Landscaping        | Recommend the Brief states that any planting should use native species of local provenance. | See existing paragraph 5.23 (first bullet). | None |
|                    | Need for landscape planting to include mature trees/shrubs | Matter to be addressed in the Landscape Strategy, for submission as part of the outline planning application. | None |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
<th>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development will impact on views of Roundway Hill.</td>
<td>It is a requirement of the Kennet Local Plan that a comprehensive landscaping scheme is prepared for the Quakers Walk development. The Local Plan emphasises the importance of minimising the external impact of development on the wider landscape of Roundway Hill. A Landscape Strategy is to be prepared for submission alongside an outline planning application.</td>
<td>New sentence added at the end of Paragraph 4.17: “A Landscape Strategy is to be prepared and submitted with the outline planning application for development of the Quakers Walk site”. The third bullet under Paragraph 5.22, has been amended to read: “A Landscape Strategy is to be prepared and submitted at the outline planning application stage, with the final landscape scheme to be agreed at the detailed planning stage. This is to ensure that landscape issues are attributed appropriate weight and that the proposed landscaping scheme is developed alongside design of the built form”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>Increase in noise and light pollution from floodlit sports area. Concern of affect on amenity of property due to proximity of play areas.</td>
<td>This issue will be addressed at the detailed planning stage.</td>
<td>New paragraph to be inserted in section 5.17, above the existing paragraph on ‘Traffic’. This will read: ‘Residential Amenity: The layout and siting of the new primary school will need to be carefully considered at the detailed planning stage, to ensure that any adverse impact on existing residential properties is minimised. In particular, the location and orientation of the MUGA and other community areas will need to be carefully assessed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Safety</td>
<td>How will farmer access land other than one crossing place?</td>
<td>In consultation with the farmer, it has been agreed that a single access will be sufficient to access remaining farm land to the east of Quakers Walk.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of pedestrians and cyclists from Northern Avenue and La Marchant Barracks, with the need to cross the busy London Road.</td>
<td>The Devizes Strategic Development Brief confirms that a number of new crossings of London Road will be required. These are to include one adjacent to the Le Marchant Barracks site, one in the vicinity of the new main access serving the Quakers Walk development area, and improvements to pedestrian and cyclist links at the canal crossing.</td>
<td>New Bullet inserted under Paragraph 5.7: “Contributions will be made towards a new crossing of London Road, in the vicinity of the new main access serving the Quakers Walk site”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed meeting place for teenagers may encourage vandalism and potential noise disturbance.</td>
<td>The siting of the meeting place will need to be carefully considered at the detailed planning stage. Advice from Kennet District Council Leisure Services and the Police will help to minimise the risk of vandalism and anti-social behaviour.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns over the effectiveness and operation of the barrier to restrict access through the emergency vehicle / buss access point in Roundway Park.</td>
<td>The specification and operation of the bus gate will the responsibility of Wiltshire County Council as Highway Authority. Similar facilities operate without any major problems across the Country.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Will houses/bungalows adjacent to the emergency vehicle access point in Roundway Park be denied on-street parking?</td>
<td>The Devizes Strategic Development Brief was agreed after extensive community and stakeholder consultation. It proposes parking restrictions around the new junction between Roundway Park and the Secondary Access to ensure the bus gate is not blocked. The Highways Authority will be responsible for determining the extent of the parking restrictions.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development proposals for the Quakers Walk site should ensure adequate parking provision.</td>
<td>Parking provision in the new development will have to accord with the standards set by central government and Wiltshire County Council.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding and Drainage</td>
<td>Drainage should be built to adoptable standards to enable sewerage undertakers to adopt sewers within development.</td>
<td>Agree. No requirement to amend the Planning Brief.</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) should require surface water drainage design to be robust in event of failure of SUDS and the Brief should make reference to the long term monitoring and maintenance of ponds and swales etc, where permitted.</td>
<td>Agree. See amendments made to the Planning Brief.</td>
<td>Kennet District Council has requested that a new Section 6.3 be inserted in the Planning Brief, dealing with developer contributions. At the end of this section, a new paragraph has been added as follows: “Wessex Water will require off-site contributions towards the extensive mains reinforcement that is required to serve the cumulative effect all development identified for Devizes within the current Local Plan period. If required, the developer will also need to make appropriate arrangements for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of ponds and swales associated with any surface water drainage scheme”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</td>
<td>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</td>
<td>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</td>
<td>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief should reiterate the need for off site contributions towards extensive mains reinforcements required as part of cumulative effect of development within current Local Plan.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding issues should be expanded to advise on Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</td>
<td>Agree. See changes made to the Planning Brief.</td>
<td>New section under paragraph 4.22, to read: ‘Flood Issues The Quakers Walk site lies within Flood Risk Zone 1 (low risk). Nonetheless, the Environment Agency has confirmed that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for submission alongside the outline planning application. This is principally to address the potential impact on flood risk from the surface water drainage from the development’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                    | The sections on sustainable design and energy efficiency should go further by specifically mentioning water efficiency measures. | Agree. See amendments made to the Planning Brief. | The last bullet under Section 5.17 has been amended to read: “Sustainable drainage and water efficiency measures should be incorporated within the development proposals”.
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT ISSUES</th>
<th>RESPONDENT COMMENTS</th>
<th>CARTER JONAS RESPONSE</th>
<th>AMENDMENTS TO BRIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over existing sewage capacity.</td>
<td>Wessex Water has confirmed that there is adequate capacity in the existing system to accommodate flows arising from the proposed Quakers Walk development (see letter dated 28th April and associated Response Form).</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Include text that encourages the recycling of waste.</td>
<td>Agree.</td>
<td>At the request of Kennet District Council, a new paragraph 3.30 has been inserted, which addresses the requirements of the recently adopted Waste Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule of Responses to KDC Comments, April 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Control Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 2.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police HQ should not be seen as setting a precedent, these are isolated commercial/non-residential buildings therefore no precedent for residential. The approach from London Road is underplayed, it may be commercial/industrial but it has good levels of landscaping softening the approach, something that should be reinforced on the entrance to this site.</td>
<td>Agree. Amend first bullet under ‘Adjacent uses to the south and east of the Quakers Walk site’ by deleting “they provide a precedent for larger building blocks in this area”. Amend second bullet under ‘Adjacent uses to the south and east of the Quakers Walk site’ to read: ‘Existing light industrial and commercial uses provide the approach to this site along London Road. Whilst these are inconsistent with the remaining historic urban fabric, good levels of landscaping soften their impact”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 2.9 and 5.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about the reference to 3 storey dwellings across a wide area of the site, they should be for definition of space. Individual 3 storey buildings should not be used.</td>
<td>Agree. This issue has been addressed by amendments already made to the Brief. In para 2.9, first bullet under ‘Adjacent uses to the south and east of the Quakers Walk site’ has been amended by deleting “they provide a precedent for larger building blocks in this area”. This bullet now reads: ‘Existing three-storey brick buildings associated with the Police Constabulary complex create a varied skyline’. In addition, the two relevant bullets in section 5.12 now read: Development should generally be of 2 storeys adjacent to existing residential streets to the north and east. In areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</td>
<td>Carter Jonas Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| where densities will be higher, buildings could be of 3 storeys.  
• Three-storey (and two-and-a-half-storey) will be used as landmark and gateway features, to provide definition to the development area. | |
| Para 3.31  
Need to make sure its clear that the minimum size means that no one part of the wider provision should be less than 400sqm etc. Often larger areas have worked best on other sites so no need to keep to this minimum. | Agree.  
Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.31 (now 3.33) to read: ‘The Quakers Walk site is required to provide 1,705sqm of equipped play area (with no one part of the wider provision to be less than 400sqm) and 2,255sqm of casual play area (with no one part of the wider provision to be less than 750sqm). These requirements are based upon development of approximately 230 new residential units’. |
| Para 5.8  
The pro rata issue in relation to affordable housing needs to be raised here so that its clear its 30% and 20% of whatever number is proposed. The numbers stated are based on local plan estimate of 230 houses. | Agree.  
The wording of the second bullet was in response to initial comments on a first draft of the Planning Brief. The Brief will be amended as follows: ‘The development should recognise the need for affordable housing in Devizes and provide about 70 subsidised and 45 low cost units. If the total number of houses on the site increases above the allocation of about 230 units (as specified in the Local Plan), a pro-rata increase in the number of affordable houses will be sought’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Para 5.12** | Concerned about the reference to 3 storey dwellings and the diagram which seems to offer carte blanche for 3 storey dwellings across a wide part of the site. It should allow 3 storey (and two and a half storey) as we did at Pewsey to act as landmarks/gateway features and to provide emphasis or definition to an area, they should not be used consistently across the site. | Agree. 
Insert new third bullet to read: ‘Three-storey (and two-and-a-half-storey) will be used as landmark and gateway features, to provide definition to the development area’. |
| **Para 5.17** | A little more needs to be said about the impact of the proposed school on existing residential. At 5.17 it states that it is away from the majority of existing residential development, however there is still plenty of possibility of impact, particularly where there is a MUGA and other community areas integrated with it. At this stage not sure how much the playing fields will be used out of school hours either. | Agree. 
New paragraph to be inserted above the existing paragraph on ‘Traffic’. This will read: ‘Residential Amenity: The layout and siting of the new primary school will need to be carefully considered at the detailed planning stage, to ensure that any adverse impact on existing residential properties is minimised. In particular, the location and orientation of the MUGA and other community areas will need to be carefully assessed.’ |
| **Figure 5.7 and Paragraph 5.11** | Not all dwellings should be back edge of pavement, they should have some defensible space (small front gardens). Proposals should avoid repeating the Brickley Lane development consistently across the site, where there is tarmac wall to wall between properties. | Figure 5.7 of the Planning Brief shows that towards Quakers Walk and Roundway Park, lower density development should be promoted. This will provide the opportunity to create areas of defensible space (front gardens). 
Paragraph 5.11 (dealing with the Design Principles – Place) will be amended, with a new bullet added. The last two bullets will read:  
- Individual dwelling plot sizes will vary across the site as residential densities change. Narrow plots with a depth of about 20 metres will generally suit housing in the higher density areas.  
- Towards Quakers Walk and Roundway Park, individual dwellings should incorporate defensible space (front gardens) and not be back edge of pavement. |
<p>| <strong>Figure 5.31</strong> | The need to have dwellings facing onto the Quakers | This point is articulated in Figure 5.31. It shows houses with front |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk buffer, I don't want to see a row of backs and sides of dwellings.</td>
<td>gardens facing onto Quakers Walk. An new paragraph will be inserted to accompany the Figure, reading:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interaction with Proposed Development Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In keeping with the rural design approach, properties will front the proposed landscape buffer between Quakers Walk and the development area (see Figure 5.31). The design and boundary treatments associated with new housing should compliment the wider landscape strategy for this sensitive area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forward Planning Comments

**Para 3.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to refer to the Wiltshire &amp; Swindon Waste Local Plan which was adopted this year. There is also SPG on key policies that relate to recycling and waste minimisation within housing development. Andy Conn at WCC is the contact.</th>
<th>Agree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Insert new section after paragraph 3.28. This is to read:  
‘Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Local Plan’  
3.30 The Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Local Plan was adopted in March 2005. Policy 10 deals with the requirement for waste audits and Policy 14, the provision of re-cycling facilities in new developments.  
3.31 Supplementary Planning Guidance has been prepared which elaborates upon these two policies, ensuring that new housing developments comply with relevant provisions of the Waste Local Plan.’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 3.23</strong> Need to mention public art as a concept to enhance design and a sense of place at some point within the ‘design issues’ section. (Policy TR22)</td>
<td>Agree. Insert new paragraph under existing paragraph 3.25. This should read: ‘Policy TR22 encourages the use of public art to enhance design and provide a sense of place’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 3.29</strong> There is an addendum to the Strategic Brief that the County prepared concerning contributions to updating the Devizes SATURN traffic model that you need to refer to in this section.</td>
<td>Amend paragraph 3.34 (now 3.36) to read: ‘… secondary education, sustainable transport and updating of the Devizes SATURN Traffic Model’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 3.30</strong> Activities for all school children not just secondary. I know this relates to the Strategic Brief which doesn’t deal with primary schools as these are within individual sites but don’t want this too imply only secondary. Quakers Walk is to provide primary and secondary activities on site; adult activities off site. Solution would be to delete after the comma as more detail is given at para 3.31.</td>
<td>Agree. Amend the sixth bullet under para 3.30 (now 3.32) by deleting ‘with the Quakers Walk site to provide activities for children of secondary school age’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 3.34</strong> As the school is to be dual use contributions to community facilities is included within the cost of the school. There is no separate obligation for contributions towards new community facilities in the Strategic Brief. Design of the school will ensure dual use.</td>
<td>Agree. Amend paragraph 3.34 (now para 3.36) to read: ‘The Devizes Strategic Development Brief also requires significant contributions from the Quakers Walk development towards secondary education, sustainable transport and updating of the Devizes SATURN Traffic Model’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</td>
<td>Carter Jonas Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix 4</strong></td>
<td>I thought we had agreed not to show any spurs off the access road. Figure 4.2 is OK but plan at Appendix 4 isn’t. Agree. Incorrect Plan attached as Appendix 4. Plan to be replaced with the Access Drawing that shows no spurs off onto Police Authority land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 4.20</strong></td>
<td>Did the noise assessment given any info on noise attenuation measure needed within any development near the exclusion zone? If so should we refer to it here? Agree. An additional paragraph should be added under paragraph 4.20 (now 4.21). This should read: ‘The Noise Assessment concluded that no mitigation measures were considered necessary. However, as a design guide, residential properties located close to the helipad should be orientated such that, as far as possible, the angle of view to the helipad is minimised. This may include properties with gable-ends towards the helipad or angled obliquely’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.2 and 5.4</strong></td>
<td>Are the same. Is it necessary? Agree. No. Delete Figure 5.4 (replaced with an alternative image).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Figure 5.8**                         | Figure 5.8 shows amended location of the school site before it has been discussed/justified. Perhaps need to just add reference to the preferred location arising from consultations in para 4.23 with the main discussion in Section 5 still. Agree. A new paragraph to be added under the bullets at paragraph 5.8. This should read: ‘The location of the school indicated in Figure 5.8 has been decided following detailed discussions with key stakeholders and local residents (see paragraphs 1.5 – 1.15). The justification for the preferred location is provided at paragraph 5.17 of this Planning Brief’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential issue – higher densities shown closest to the helipad exclusion zone. Brings back the point about the need to give some idea of the type of attenuation measures needed.</td>
<td>Agree. See amendments proposed to paragraph 4.20 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.11</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our current standard for back to back distances is 21m but ‘about 20m’ would cover this.</td>
<td>Agree. No change to Planning Brief required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure I agree with the idea that brick or stone walls should be used where gardens abut the public realm. Walls often create a ‘dead’ frontage which may be OK for one or two plots but not for a longer length. Walls abutting a casual play area would encourage children to play football against them. A better principle may be to minimise the occasions when gardens abut public spaces but where necessary a boundary treatment that continues to clearly define the area would be OK.</td>
<td>Agree. Amend last sub-bullet under paragraph 5.13 to read: ‘The occasions where gardens abut public spaces will be kept to a minimum. Where boundaries of gardens do abut public areas, they should be enclosed by brick or stonewalls, or walls and railings, to maintain continuity of the building line and ensure suitable spatial definition’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been any discussions with Salisbury Diocese to determine whether their school plans can be accommodated on a site of these dimensions? Need to refer to the role of School Travel Plans under traffic.</td>
<td>The LEA and Salisbury Diocese have confirmed that the site area reserved for provision of a new primary school is acceptable. Agree. The section on Traffic under paragraph 5.17 will be amended through insertion of a second paragraph. This will read: ‘A School Travel Plan will be prepared by the School Governors in consultation with Wiltshire County Council. This will help to reduce the impact of traffic generated by the new primary school’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to the figures in para 5.18 are wrong.</td>
<td>Agree. Correct Figure references – Figures 5.26 and 5.27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 106 Agreement

| Para 6.3 | Other Planning Briefs have included an outline of the issues to be addressed in a Section 106 Agreement. The Le Marchant Barracks PB included this in the body of the text; the Pewsey Hospital PB included this in an Appendix. All the issues are covered in the Brief, and listed in para 6.1, but it would be useful to bring it all together somehow. Headings are – primary and secondary education, affordable housing, sustainable transport, maintenance of on-site equipped and casual play areas (if you want the Council to do this), off-site contributions to adult recreation, long-term maintenance of other open spaces (potentially), affordable housing, traffic model contributions, household recycling (potentially). | Agree.  
A new section should be added under the existing paragraph 6.2 (Proposed Concept Plan). This should read:  

‘Proposed Section 106 Contributions’  

The developer of the Quakers Walk site will need to make financial contributions towards the following new infrastructure, and as appropriate, its long-term maintenance:  

- Primary and Secondary Education  
- Affordable Housing  
- Maintenance of on-site equipped and casual play areas  
- Off-site contributions to adult recreation  
- Long-term maintenance of other open spaces  
- Household recycling facilities  

In addition, contributions will need to be made towards the new SATURN traffic model for Devizes, to be prepared Wiltshire County Council. Wessex Water will require off-site contributions towards the extensive mains reinforcement that is required to serve the cumulative effect all development identified for Devizes within the current Local Plan period. If required, the developer will also need to make appropriate arrangements for the long-term monitoring and maintenance of ponds and swales associated with any surface water drainage scheme.’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape &amp; Countryside Officers Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 4.17 and 5.22</strong></td>
<td>I have now had a look through the amended brief for the Quaker's Walk site, and I find that in general the landscape issues have been addressed although without any substantive detail. I do not find that this is a problem in the brief, but they will have to be addressed at the outline application stage. The visual impact and mitigation of the development along with the protection of TPO trees and the treatment of the boundaries with Quakers Walk and the surrounding residential properties are too important to be left to the detailed stage. Therefore, all reference to landscape issues being discussed at the 'detailed application' stage should be replaced with the 'outline application' stage. Also concerned about the proposed lighting of Quakers Walk at the southern section and the potential effect on trees/character of the walk. Can reference be made to finding a sensitive lighting solution that can be provided without damage to trees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been agreed with Will Harley that a Landscape Strategy will be produced for the Quakers Walk site for submission alongside the outline planning application. This will address matters of principle and not detail. Relevant sections of the Planning Brief will be amended to confirm that a Landscape Strategy will be prepared for submission alongside the outline planning application stage. This will establish matters of principle, with the final landscaping scheme to be agreed at the detailed planning stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph changes advised in the Table of Responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in relation to Quakers Walk are addressed at paragraph 5.21. Reference is made to ‘low-level lighting, sensitive to its surroundings’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure Services Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Figure 5.24** | Access to sports club
Figure 5.24 shows space retained for access to Devizes Sports Club but not sure where this is articulated in Chapter 5. Only other reference is para 4.10. References to enabling/facilitating/considering etc. the route of the improved access road for the Sports Club are therefore unclear. | Agree. |
<p>| | A new bullet has been added to paragraph 5.7. This reads: “The development will facilitate a new access to Devizes Sports Club, retaining an access point along the southern boundary of the development area”. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</th>
<th>Carter Jonas Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.9</strong></td>
<td>Amend the fourth bullet under paragraph 5.9 to read: ‘Development of the Quakers Walk site should provide equipped play areas (totalling 1,705 sq.m. based upon 230 houses), casual play areas (totalling 2,255 sq.m. based upon 230 houses). The multi-use games area should be considered as part of the casual play area provision. Play space should be provided within close proximity to the houses in accordance with guidelines in the Devizes Strategic Development Brief. This might include play provision within Homezone streets’. This amendment will also require a consequential change to paragraph 6.2. This should read (last three bullets):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Brief indicates 1705 sqm for EPA and 2255 sqm for CPAs and 9350 sqm for adult sports. Using my spreadsheet for 230 houses, the development will generate a need for 4.2 EPA’s; 3 CPA’s and 1.5 formal pitches. The reference here suggests 3 EPA, 1 CPA and a MUGA. This reflects the outline concept at section 6. It would perhaps be better to indicate the total sqm expected and not restrict how these are provided. The Brief should indicate that fewer larger play areas are often a better solution. Can say the concept proposes three central areas that would be appropriate for play areas. It needs to be clear that the MUGA referred to here is NOT the hardcourt area shown on the school site. A hard court area is needed for the school in its own right. Support the idea of amalgamating some of the areas, ie village green etc. but we should insist on the m2 for each segment being provided. The Brief assumes that there will be dual use of the school community facilities. Although this is not an issue for the developers, but for the school governors it is right to highlight. Policy HC39 supports this approach. Provision of adult pitches to be resolved through planning application taking into account contribution already made (as agreed in the Strategic Brief).</td>
<td>Equipped play areas (1,705 sq.m.) Casual play areas (2,255 sq.m.) One multi-use games area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</td>
<td>Carter Jonas Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be clear that the list in 5.17 is generated by the school needs based on LEA standards and will be in addition to Kennet District Council SPG requirements.</td>
<td>There is overlap between the LEA Standards and the requirements imposed by the Devizes Strategic Development Brief. For clarity, the Planning Brief will be amended through insertion of the following additional text, at the very end of 5.17: “The two sports pitches and the hardcourt play area are required for the operation of the school and are additional to the requirements of Policy HC34 of the Local Plan and Devizes Strategic Development Brief”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be careful how the ‘neighbourliness’ of the school is presented. Community out of school noise may be greater than general school noise during the day. Obviously this will depend on the amount of use which is unknown at the moment. While the proposals to allow existing houses to back onto playing fields is understood and does improve the visual aesthetics, the noise issues if the pitches really are going to be used for community is a more difficult issue.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfortunate that the preferred location of the school moves pitches away from the sports club – perhaps less opportunity for joint management and use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennet District Council Officer Comments</td>
<td>Carter Jonas Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Para 5.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be careful that Quaker’s Walk does not become a race track for bikes, skateboarders, motorbikes etc. once it is upgraded. An issue that can be dealt with at planning application stage but may need ref. in the Planning Brief.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change required to the Planning Brief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consequential Changes**

**Para 1.13**

Revised paragraph 1.13 to read: “The output from the consultation process and discussions with Kennet District Council and key stakeholders was a Draft Planning Brief”.

Then a new paragraph 1.14 to read: “The Draft Planning Brief was made available to local residents and key stakeholders, and was subject to a three-week period of consultation (ending on 29th April 2005). A total of 20 responses were received, in addition to the detailed comments made by Officers at Kennet District Council”.

**New paragraph 1.15**

“The comments were given careful consideration, and resulted in a number of changes to the Planning Brief”.

**General**

Omit all references to “draft Planning Brief”, and replace with “Planning Brief”.

**Para 4.27**

Amend this paragraph (now 4.30) to read: ‘In addition to the above opportunities, development of the site will deliver a number of important community benefits. This Planning Brief will play an important role in ensuring the delivery of these benefits, through appropriate design, siting and layout of development on the Quakers Walk Site’.