Responses to Question 13 – Malmesbury Community Area - Core Policy 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Malmesbury is known to have a specific problem in relation to its infrastructure. Although its pleasing to see only 287 more houses to be identified prior to 2026 even this will provide infrastructure problems with bousing of children to the surrounding area becoming the norm. This is unacceptable as it defies the definition &quot;sustainable&quot;. Surely we need to provide houses that can be managed from the existing resources in Malmesbury - surely that's the definition of sustainable. Many more reasons exist to ensure that any development is done sensibly and sustainably.</td>
<td>SO9, CP3</td>
<td>Noted concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I believe this assessment of Malmesbury and surrounding area is broadly correct. There are several crucial points that I would make however. 1. You correctly identify that Malmesbury has suffered (I use the word with thought) much housing development recently. However still expect a further 439 houses built in the area, which would do nothing but damage. It has been soul destroying to see the damaging changes to a previously lovely market town since the 80's. With the POSSIBLE exception of a handful of houses ANY further development can only be damaging. The nature of the town is already seriously, and probably irreparably damaged. Further, you comment that some development may be required (later) to alleviate affordability issues - This is erroneous. House prices in Britain are not driven by value, but only by ability to borrow. &quot;affordable housing&quot; is normally a euphemism for simply building rubbish houses on small plots - which are then sold for exactly the same price that better housing stock would have been as the price will be (~) 3 times salary of the people wanting to live here anyway. - Now though, in poor houses with massive profit for the developer. Further the vast majority of housing in Malmesbury recently (eg at Cowbridge and on the former town asset of the old school playing fields) has been of exactly this sort! Small, crammed in flats that has seriously devalued the attractiveness of Malmesbury (but still expensive as that's what people can borrow). If ANY more houses are ever built then they should be of a good quality stock, we already have a surfeit of poor quality rabbit hutch. thank you. 2. You correctly identify that broadening the employment base is a key issue in Malmesbury. I completely agree. Sadly this is largely a result of the council taking the profitable and easy route of allowing more and more small houses and flats on all the former employment sites instead of making the effort to encourage employers back to highly attractive sites with excellent facilities and car parking! For example the Cowbridge site and the old garage opposite the fire station. These mistakes must NOT be repeated with any more building of houses on employment sites and should be reversed wherever possible by encouraging high value employers to the town. 3. You correctly suggest that any retail development should contribute to the enhancement of the town centre.I completely agree again! It has been tragic to watch the completely unnecessary decline of the high street over the past few years. It is ludicrous that this has dramatically increased since the daft introduction of car parking charges in the carparks! The decision seems to have been more due to dogma that &quot;all cars are evil&quot; than any common sense. In fact the result has been more congestion as cars circle the town looking for &quot;a spot&quot; and most people I know now doing their shopping elsewhere where there is a supermarket with a free carpark while our town dies. Thus leading to many more car miles, pollution and congestion (the exact opposite of the claimed goals) - all while the long stay carpark (which is out of the way and it makes sense to encourage parking OUT of the centre) is normally empty (so little revenue anyway I suspect). PLEASE restore free parking (or at least 2 hours free parking) in the long stay carpark and give our town a chance! - and reduce pollution, congestion, road miles and the monopoly of</td>
<td>SO3, CP2, SO1, CP22, SO6, CP37, SO7, CP41</td>
<td>Noted support for overall assessment of Malmesbury but that further housing development is not supported. Information on the distribution of housing must be protected.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supermarkets over local business in the process. 4. You mention a lack of convenience retail in the town centre. - Again, I completely agree. This is largely due to the introduction of parking charges, however there are 2 other aspects: a) We have a choice of a fairly limited co-op or ... an even more limited co-op... Why? When the Co-op bought Somerfield it was stated that they would have to sell off branches anywhere with competition concerns - So WHY have they not been made to sell off the co-op by the fire station in a major market town catering to a significant catchment area that now has no other choice but co-op or co-op?? What Malmesbury does NOT need is ANOTHER new supermarket (eg) on the bypass on top of the 2 existing ones to take trade from the high street shops. What it DOES need is a better quality store to replace the co-op opposite the fire station. b) While this is perhaps a tactical rather than strategic comment: Malmesbury has butchers, bakers but has lost the only real fruit and veg shop it had - (which was not a particularly good one). we would like to use and support the high street - but when you have to go to a neighbouring town’s supermarket to buy your fruit and veg - WHY would anyone not buy meat, bread... at the same time instead of fighting illogical parking charges and congestion to come back to the butcher, baker and Deli as well? Every effort should be made to encourage a good quality fruit and veg shop (not a small, sorry looking stall) into the high street. The trade that would bring to the other shops could well make all the difference in keeping Malmesbury alive.... or not....

| 106 | In general I have no great concerns with Oaksey being designated a 'large village' but there are provisos. There should be sympathetic infill and not a continual expansion along the existing roads. This will require the settlement boundaries will need to be redefined. There should not be any 'estates' but rather individual or small groups of additional housing. The construction materials should be local and sympathetic to the rest of the village. Future development should not use reconstituted stone. |
| 131 | Are the new homes going to be accompanied by: - Schools? School places are already at a premium, yet we are going to add MORE family homes. - Transport Infrastructure improvement? - road widening to M-Way? Improved bus service? Train station? - A hospital that is 24/7? |
| 146 | I broadly support this approach. But with respect to Para 5.9.8 suggest that the proposed "Traffic demand management solution to congestion in the town centre", would benefit from some clarification. What precisely is meant by this statement and how is this to be agreed with the community? What in my estimation is needed is a town bus service which is sufficiently frequent, reliable, and cheap enough to persuade car owners wishing to visit the town centre to leave their car at home. And this needs to be extended over time to the surrounding villages. Also, much improved access to and usage of our only long stay car park needs to be much improved. And because of the non existent or far from adequate bus service in the town and surrounding area early consideration must be given to the provision of cheap car parking for those who are employed in the town. I welcome the recognition in Para 5.9.4 that there is a lack of a convenience retail facility in the town centre and would like to see this addressed. Having the Co op in the high street and also where the Somerfields Supermarket used to be is one of the reasons why shoppers are going elsewhere. There is now no competition and the quality of service and the attractiveness of the products on offer is variable. Not everyone wants "light “ food stuffs or just the Coop brand. The proposed diversification of the employment base is long overdue. Allowing the building of a new and much higher
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I have just returned from Malmesbury Town Hall after reading and discussing some of the Core Strategy. I have the following comments from your Core Strategy, from the Government's Planning Policy 3 (PPS3) Housing and also from my visit: Core Strategy Wiltshire 2026 proposals Malmesbury Community Area This states 1,110 new homes in the Malmesbury area by 2026, yet today I was told 1200! This has increased yet I was told that the Wiltshire figure has decreased from 44,000 to 37,000. Why is Malmesbury being targeted? The Government's Planning Policy 3 (PPS3) Housing, June 2011, Section 38 states:"The need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability." Could you please explain the thought process here? Paperwork handed out to me today This states that 334 houses had been completed between 2006 and 2010 with 139 further permitted sides. That equates to 473 sites out of a total of 760 in the town. That is 62% of the permitted houses in less than 25% of the time. I don't follow this at all? There seems to have been no plan whatsoever. If you carry on at the same rate you will have reached the quota by 2014! After discussion today I was led to believe that this is being looked at - it certainly needs to be! Could you please explain what is being done? The Government's Planning Policy 3 (PPS3) Housing, June 2011, Section 41 states that the national annual target is that at least 60% of new housing should be provided on previously developed land. This includes land and buildings that are vacant or derelict as well as land that is currently in use but which has potential for re-development. Is this being considered? Core Strategy - Developing an appropriate level of housing for Wiltshire and Malmesbury Community Area I do not think that the proposals are, in the document’s words, “robust and evidence based.” The traffic situation in Malmesbury is already very bad and today I heard that nothing is being planned. The Primary School is full and there seems to be no solution for this. I understand that the council is able to draw funds off developers now the school is full - in order to pay for more education. How are you planning to use these funds? Overall, I see a severe lack in planning as Malmesbury can not cope with such sharp increases in population. Also, for many of the reasons above, I strongly object to proposed major development such as the 200 house site at Filands. This needs to be shelved immediately!

The spatial Strategy makes no mention of the style of any new homes. The Filands Development is ugly. It angers me every time I see it. How does the Persimmon Homes building pay homage to our historic town? Why do Tetbury and Avening get stylish Cotswold stone buildings and Malmesbury get a poor relation in imitation stone. Why do we need more development when there are 100 empty homes at Filands and at what expense to the wildlife and the open space? Yes there are infrastructure needs. The school needs to be considered. I went to a school with loads of space and Malmesbury school is now so cramped its unbelievable. Apart from that, the roads. This is an historic town on the edge of the Cotswolds and the AONB. Please don't make it look Chippenham with a confusing array of roads and squashed in houses of no particular style.

Having attended the recent consultation exercise in Malmesbury Town Hall and studied the document in greater detail on line, I can only conclude that the document is “strategic” in title only. There is very little in the document that suggests a coordinated approach to the challenges of the future. I am in complete support of the necessity for Malmesbury to grow in a measured manner which preserves and enhances its core historical centre whilst recognising the need for residential and economic expansion. Unfortunately the strategy lamely recognises these issues but actually offers no solutions for them. It is difficult to accept that the
document's author(s) even accept their own findings as it would appear that to defer much of the further development towards the 2026 deadline is an attempt to buy time to actually try to resolve the very infrastructural and social challenges contained in the strategy. If indeed the scale of development as set out in the document is to be believed (and I saw little supporting evidence to that end) then there has to be a proposed means of resolving the issues such development raises. Fundamentally there are 2 key issues which require addressing: 1). The historic centre of Malmesbury, which also supports what diminishing retail capability the town has, will never be capable of dealing with the infrastructural and traffic demands of today's society let alone that of 2026. So what are the alternatives? Pedestrianisation? Park and ride? Root and branch assessment of the centre's possible development as a tourist attraction rather than a traditional high street? There is no indication in the document that any alternatives to the current situation have been examined. Subsequently the conclusion to be drawn is that either not enough imagination/vision has been applied or Wiltshire Council have no idea what to do with the centre of Malmesbury. 2). The infrastructural, economic and social issues which a residential expansion on the scale suggested would bring to the rest of Malmesbury. Such expansion would almost certainly occur to the north and west of the town and it would certainly have helped if the document had set out more precisely where such expansion would take place. Furthermore there is more than a suspicion that the proposed increase in housing development around Malmesbury is a cynical ploy to reach the quota at which point new educational facilities could be extracted from any would be developer. Whilst this would address those critics concerned about school places etc. it does not address in any satisfactory manner the need for the scale of development proposed. Certainly there is very little to suggest that economic or employment challenges can be met locally. 1 ha of land set aside for business development is in my view woefully short of the scale of economic development required to ensure newcomers to the town will have any hope of local employment. The strategy signally fails to tackle the very issues facing Malmesbury in the future. Rather there is a document which fudges the challenges and offers no solutions - be they the correct or incorrect solutions! We have a strategy based on buying time whilst we grapple with the issues and more of the same in the interim. Currently the strategy will ensure Malmesbury continues to grow as a dormitory town from an economic and employment viewpoint whilst totally failing to deal with the challenges of taking an ancient town centre into the C21. I would have thought the citizens of Malmesbury deserved better.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposals for Wiltshire's future, following the exhibition in Malmesbury on 18 July. I note that Malmesbury will be subject to the second highest growth in housing of all of Wiltshire's market towns (growth 32.4% 2006-26, compared to an average of 23.0% - figures from Malmesbury Town Council). Already the infrastructure is creaking - primary school children are being transported to adjacent village schools, and the 'new' doctors' surgery is at 95% of capacity. The land allocated in the Plan to employment in Malmesbury is less than a third of that allocated to Wootton Bassett, for example, so more traffic will be generated by commuters from Malmesbury as they drive to work elsewhere - hardly consistent with a green agenda, and suggesting that Malmesbury is being regarded as a dormitory by Wilts Council. The conclusion must be that further expansion of this small market town is unsustainable. If more housing must be built, let it be after the necessary infrastructure has been planned, and let it be designed to avoid repeating the Filands mistake. That monstrous estate with its soulless, car-infested, canyon-like streets, lacking communal areas, trees and significant green space, is rapidly becoming an overflow for Swindon. Clearly there was little demand for the large number and type of houses built - eventually several were taken up by a Housing Association. So much for a demonstrated need for additional housing in the town for its own residents. I have copied this to James Gray MP and to Malmesbury Town Council, for information.

Malmsbury & St Paul Without Residents' Association response to Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document June 2011. 26 th July 2011 BACKGROUND Malmesbury is a special place. We have a mostly traditional High Street. We have an Abbey with the finest Norman arch in the country, and in its ancient past a leading learning centre in Europe. We have the 15th Century Market Cross. These and other factors give Malmesbury its strong community, shortly to be evidenced again in our Carnival. Its residents and officials hold Malmesbury in trust for future generations. While there may be a national need for more housing, there is also a national need to preserve our heritage and community. Malmesbury is not a place for developers to make short-term profits, although that seems to be a widespread presumption. We are not against growth. But clearly, our historic centre cannot expand. Recently, the highest growth rate in the town’s 1,000 year history, in the new estates on the margins of the town, has brought conservation, traffic, and parking issues. And any further growth must be at a pace that can be assimilated by our community, or we risk losing our identity and sense of place. SPECIFIC FACTORS THAT CAUSE US CONCERN The credit crunch has resulted in new developments placed on hold by house builders across the country. Major brownfield sites lie derelict across Wiltshire, including derelict factory sites in Trowbridge and Chippenham. We urge that delivery of economy recovery sufficient to develop these brownfield sites, before the further irreplaceable loss of Wiltshire countryside to new housing. Malmesbury Council produced a draft Strategy in 2009. Then, to accommodate changed government guidance, it produced the current 2011 draft. Between the 2009 and 2011 drafts, the new housing total for Wiltshire as a whole decreased from 44,000 to 37,000 (minus 16 per cent). Yet despite our protests the total for Malmesbury has increased from 730 to 760 houses (plus 4 per cent). Why this 20 per cent disparity Community concerns expressed in 500 responses to the Gleeson exhibition focused on the scale of the proposed development, and impacts on services infrastructure and facilities, schools, roads, traffic and parking. We do not see that the concerns of the community have been listened to and addressed. There is no reference to the impact of development on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the boundary of which lies immediately to the west of the town. While there is a local need for social housing, we have not been given evidence that the high levels of social housing at Filands and Cowbridge has been used to meet that local need. Our primary schools are full and over-subscribed for next year.
As a resident of Malmesbury where both my children have been brought up I am concerned that once again the Town is suffering from failed Council planning policy. In both cases new housing development has meant that local schooling provision has become inadequate. The first instance resulted in 8 Portacabins at Malmesbury CE Primary School for a number of years until the new school was built three years ago. Now once again there is insufficient capacity at Malmesbury CE Primary School. This year one parent was told that there were 86 pupils chasing 60 Reception year places. Less than four years after the new school was built this is another failure for Council planning policy. This is likely to get worse as there are already close to 100 empty houses and some with planning permission which have yet to be built. I am pleased therefore that any development will be phased towards the latter part of the period under discussion. I am however less pleased to see the new housing development numbers recalculated. The figure in the document is inaccurate because it has been based upon an extrapolation from an historic figure which has already been proven to have delivered a house building programme that presently cannot be absorbed within the existing infrastructure of the town.

Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Support for phasing noted.

Objection to housing numbers and call for a more up to date evidence base for housing numbers noted. Further information can be found in topic paper 17. Noted that recent development has been poor quality design. CP37 requires high quality design and it is recognised as a particular issue in the town. Support for the neighbourhood planning process noted.
that the evidence base is flawed. Much of the thinking is still based on the much derided 2001 Census. Much has changed in Malmesbury since that time. The Secondary School and Dyson are the main employers in the town but a large percentage of those employed do not live in or close to the Town. What is needed is an up to date survey to provide the real nature of employment in the Town, otherwise the presumptions and projections in the Core Strategy remain flawed. With growth in the economy currently stalled a much better evidence base is required to inform policy making. There is a need by all accounts for more affordable/social housing (not the same thing) however there has been no demonstration of the actual need. Real, demonstrable evidence is needed to determine policy for future development in the Town. There are lots of other things happening in Malmesbury. Despite the building of a new Medical Centre we are told that it has already reached capacity. Parking still remains a major problem in the Town. Malmesbury is losing its local Royal Mail sorting office. There are rumours of an edge of town supermarket and industrial site. Malmesbury also suffers from periodic flooding. Recent investigation concerning a proposed development in Park Road suggests that the Environment Agency has not got really good data with regard to what happens in the Town when it floods. So all in all a complicated picture of a town in crisis. It is not easy to deal with Malmesbury’s problems and the people who live here have had enough of planning policy which has delivered inadequate school provision, and done little to support real infrastructure needs. In addition new housing development particularly at Filands and Cowbridge is considered by many to be of poor quality design and not in keeping with a Town on the edge of an AONB and also the Oldest Borough in England. The Persimmon office building/shed at Filands must also be cast in the same light. Malmesbury is a special place. It deserves to be treated as such. What is needed is a Neighbourhood Plan, not one that preserves the Town in Aspic, but one based on real evidence and in tune with the hopes, needs and aspirations of the people, who live here, the businesses that seek to thrive here and those who visit the town for whatever reason. Malmesbury should not be held hostage by developers who are just here to make a quick buck, get away with a small 106 agreement and disappear into the sunset. A Neighbourhood Plan would have to investigate the real socio-economic zones of influence rather than just stick to Parish boundaries and look at much more detailed phasing so that the most urgent needs are addressed first. This also means engagement with the Town’s main employers, the two nascent Academy Schools and Dyson in order to understand what is likely to happen to employment in the Town over the next 5-10 years. Engage with the NHS, Council and prospective developers to ensure that this the Plan is not just about housing and commercial needs but looks at Malmesbury as a whole much as the Total Place pilots did in 2009/10. Only this ‘whole place’ approach will help deliver a sustainable future for the Town.

Some excellent comments have already been made on this community area strategy - I would agree with much of what has been said, and would like to add the following. In the 28 years that I have been living here, there has been massive development in the town, and whilst there have been some improvements in refurbishing many of the buildings in the town centre and new housing is clearly needed, I feel it has been overdeveloped and is no longer quite the pleasant place to live that it was. There are also appalling traffic/parking problems, a diminishment of green spaces within the town, and a high street with far, far too many empty shops being turned into residences, all of which are changing Malmesbury from something very special to a commuter town. We have lost our hospital to an ugly new development, and moved the surgery from a convenient central location to the edge of town. Doubtless people drive to the surgery now, contributing yet more traffic, and this trend towards out-of-town development is very worrying. Like others, I find some of the comments rather vague, with a lack of concrete proposals to alleviate some of the real problems that Malmesbury faces. ‘...further development...’

Noted that a solution needs to be found to traffic issues in the town centre. A traffic management scheme is proposed, further detail will be provided through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan or another planning mechanism. It is a key objective to enhance the vitality and viability of town centres. There is an opportunity to further address issues such as parking, the vitality of the high street and the pedestrianisation of the high street through the neighbourhood planning process.

Noted that recent development has been poor quality design. CP37 requires high quality design and it is recognised as a particular issue in the town.

Objection to further housing development noted. Further information on the housing requirement can be found in topic paper 17. Flood issues are addressed through core policy 49 – flood risk.
will be phased towards the latter half of the plan period”. What does this mean exactly? "...some new homes" - we have had in excess of twenty separate housing developments in and around the town, in the last few years, with hundreds of new houses being built without the commensurate increase in employment opportunities, infrastructure, transport provision etc etc. On the whole the buildings themselves are ugly and graceless, and do nothing to enhance a unique town. "A more flexible approach to allow economic development".... What does this mean? Where are these employment opportunities (in a shrinking economy) coming from? Is the idea to have shopping malls on the outskirts of town such as those found in West Swindon, thus competing with an already struggling high street? "There is a lack of convenience retail offer". What do you call the Co-op? We have two excellent butchers, and two bakeries, though we could certainly do with a fruit and vegetable shop, in addition to more shops generally. It would be good to have specialist shops that offer different things from the average high street, as a small town cannot compete with the big players. Fresh and Wild is a good example and seems to be thriving. Malmesbury is almost surrounded by rivers - we have suffered very severe flooding in recent years, and there seems to be less and less space available to allow water run-off. How much does this feature in deliberations about town planning? I am dismayed by the sheer volume of housing that is being proposed - I was not impressed by the glib assurances and glossy presentation of Gleeson Developers in their recent exhibition. It is hard to avoid the suspicion that Malmesbury represents an attractive opportunity for indiscriminate development by those who do not necessarily live here, nor have the town's interests at heart. There seems to be a depressing lack of long term strategy, and I also feel quite cynical about whether any protest make a jot of difference. Would pedestrianisation of the high street be an idea as already suggested? At present, Malmesbury is not a "destination shopping town." Perhaps we should replace the Co-op on the outskirts of town with a different supermarket, and concentrate on making Malmesbury a desirable tourist spot, with a wider variety of interesting and different shops. I remember when Swindon centre was open to traffic many years ago - since it has been pedestrianised, it is a much more pleasant area in which to walk and shop, and seems to be reasonably busy. I too, am getting fed-up with the invitation to have a public discussion about the future of Malmesbury, with endless presentations, surveys, committees etc, yet no notice taken of the volume of dissent, reasoned argument and anger expressed by those who live here, which has been consistent over many years. Malmesbury itself, and its inhabitants, deserve much better than this.
I live in and am concerned with Malmesbury, so the questions / comments below all specifically relate to Malmesbury. 1. Please can you explain what the evidence base is for the need for that level of additional housing in the town, and for that level of additional employment space? 2. What is the geographic area that you are counting as Malmesbury? 3. When you designate employment land are you planning (or able) to designate what types of employment? The kind of employment that is right for a large town is not right for a market town. 4. I think it is vitally important that the local people should be able to influence the development that takes place in the town. The housing developments that have been permitted in the town in recent years are not the kind of development that adds value to a market town - they have been designed as 'drive in and drive out' developments, with few linkages and design to encourage people living in them to participate in the town and to use local shops and services. So we should be able to choose where any new houses go and what scale and design requirements they have. 5. Any future housing developments need to be designed with the traditional market town way of living in mind, not the American model of doing everything by car. 6. Future commercial developments in Malmesbury should be sited in the centre of the town - making use of the station yard area for example, or expanding the existing coop store (if it is determined that additional supermarket capacity is required) rather than adding a new supermarket to the main road on the edge of town. I look forward to your response to my questions and comments.

The evidence base for the housing numbers is found in topic paper 17 and for employment in topic paper 8.

Malmesbury Community Area is shown on the map on p81 of the consultation document. This includes the town of Malmesbury - this is the built up area of the town.

Further work is being carried out to identify what type of employment is required in specific areas.

Noted comment on enabling local people to influence where development goes. Small sites will be allocated through either the community led neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism in close consultation with the local community.

Core policy 37 sets out criteria to ensure new development is well designed.

Part of the overarching strategy is to increase the opportunity for people to live and work in the same location reducing the need to travel by private car.

Noted objection to further supermarket development on the edge of the town.

It is impossible to work out how the numbers for Housing Delivery have been calculated but the figures for Malmesbury Town seem very high. The town has grown dramatically since the 1980s and the rate of expansion has increased in the past 10 years. However this past expansion has failed to provide a commensurate growth in prosperity for the local economy, particularly the town centre, nor has it reduced in and out commuting. It has overburdened local infrastructure with for example the main Primary School, built a few years ago and then said to be larger than required, full and oversubscribed for next year. There was planning permission for another 139 houses when the documents were prepared but there are no plans to expand Primary School capacity. The schools in the Community Area are 89% full so even busing pupils out of the town will only provide a temporary respite. No further development should be permitted in the town until this problem has been addressed. If there is to be any growth before 2026 a medium term plan for primary education is required now, so without one no further growth in the plan period should be expected. Access to Malmesbury's historic town centre must be improved. The increase in car parking charges has reduced the number of visitors to the town and steps must be taken to reverse this trend before the retail heart of the town is damaged beyond repair. Instead of acting as a service centre for the large rural community area residents of the villages as well as those living on the outskirts of the town often find it easier to travel to other larger towns.

Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Noted that better access to the town centre must be facilitated.
I wish to comment on the inclusion of Oaksey into the ‘larger’ village category for future development: Policy makers should note the close proximity to the Cotswold Water Park in neighbouring Gloucestershire which has grown considerably over the last 25 years in terms of leisure facilities, thus creating employment opportunities and economic benefits through select housing developments. The transition of the former RAF Kemble on the Wilts/Glos border into a regeneration employment area is worthy of note here. In terms of sustainability the main railway line that borders Oaksey has been identified for re-doubling of the track way between Kemble and Swindon to support further development. Perhaps Wiltshire Planners should campaign for the re-opening of Oaksey Halt or Minety Railway Stations? Oaksey itself has developed over the last 25 years from an agricultural based economy to a wider diversified environment. Most notably the development of Oaksey Golf Course, Clubhouse and Holiday Village, Runway Fitness Club, Enlargement of the Village School, Various Farmyard Barn Conversions, Adoption of the Village Shop into Community Ownership, Continued success of the Public House and the redevelopment of the Village Hall. These items clearly identify Oaksey as a large village capable of sustaining further development in terms of housing and/or employment. Factually the success of these facilities and those in wider environs emphasis the need for future scale developments to support the continued development of these facilities. Wiltshire Council Policymakers should note the business case rationale for upgrading the railway line is derived from economic inflows to the area for which further development is required to deliver this financial return. Coupled with the sustainability of better public transport links needs to be supported by local demand. Any counter arguments would be purely subjective without any factual basis.

One would expect that a medium to long term spatial strategy would: a) take into account the views of those residents most affected by the implementation of such a strategy, and b) the strategy would reflect all aspects relating to the objectives of the review and, comprehensively consider all of the relevant implications. It is not acceptable that residents views are not being taken into account despite considerable and sustained feedback from the residents in public forums, exhibitions, online responses and written comments. This I believe must constitute a failure of Wiltshire County Council in its duty of care to its customers (us). This failure is compounded by the facts that:- 1. the spatial strategy as it affects Malmesbury and other communities appears to be based on a 10 year old census that clearly is so far out of date that it does not, and clearly can not, reflect reality in 2011. 2. The spatial strategy takes no account of the investment required in other fundamental infrastructure that must accompany any substantial proposed increase in housing stock, for example transport/roads, health and schools. All residents in Malmesbury are fully aware that the newly built primary school is full and turning away applications from existing residents never mind from future residents. It cannot be right that in a relatively small town like Malmesbury, that within 4 years of building a new modern primary school the council finds itself already having to bus schoolchildren out of town. 3. The council does not seem to learn from its mistakes. The new development at Filands has on the one hand significantly added to the burden on existing infrastructure with no thought given to expanding the same, and on the other is possibly the worst housing development that the town has ever had to endure. The objective in designing this atrocity seems to be not only to cram as many houses into the smallest possible space which is standard fare for a housing developer but also to ignore the fact that all houses will have a minimum of one car, if not two, to cope with the fact that there is no effective public transport around Malmesbury. When you add this to the narrowest possible street space, one ends up with cars littering the street, no space for children to play and no green spaces either. The town of Malmesbury deserves better than this the residents of Malmesbury deserve better than this and it would be enormously helpful if their articulated views based on actual local experience can be properly considered and

Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Noted comment on the design of the Filands Estate. Core policy 48 promotes the development of the strategic transport network. Core policy 37 sets criteria to ensure new development is of high quality design and it is recognised as a key issue in Malmesbury.

Noted reference should be made of the proximity of Oaksey to Cotswold Water Park and RAF Kemble and the economic opportunities this provides. The business case for reopening the railway stations in Minety and Oaksey should be considered. Core policy 48 promotes the development of the strategic transport network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Surely the proposed high level of housing at Malmesbury is meeting the demands of developers for locations near the M4 rather than local demand? Will long distance out-commuting not be encouraged? The evidence base is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>The challenging target to deliver more housing within the Malmesbury area is simply not balanced against the proposals to improve infrastructure. - The newly built primary school is at almost maximum capacity. My child is not yet old enough to attend, but when he is I want him to attend the school down the road, not be bussed to a different town - Road traffic in rush hour is putting pressure on already laden junctions around the town - There is limited brownfield availability - I certainly don't want to see any more green field sites being developed - There are not enough jobs in the town, and a new supermarket will do no more than provide a few part time jobs for students wanting pocket money - Public transport is almost non-existent. There is no train station, no buses after 6.30pm except when WOMAD is on, and a very limited taxi service. As a result everyone drives. Not exactly sustainable. - The Post Office sorting depot is closing, leaving us with an unclear means of obtaining this much needed and valued service The list goes on. Clearly this needs much further thought in order to combine any sort of growth in Malmesbury with a little common sense. Infrastructure improvements need to be made irrespective of new housing. And perhaps we should wait and see if the 100 unsold houses in the town are actually sold before even thinking about these housing quotas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>The indication that 760 new homes are required is a contradiction of sub-sections 5.9.1 to 5.9.8. Any increase to the 'already provided for' number of 473 would be detrimental to the cohesion and character of Malmesbury. There should be no further development in Malmesbury beyond this figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>1. My first concern is housing. Of course there should be affordable housing for people who have family ties in Malmesbury. It is good for children to have grandparents and other relatives nearby. My feelings are that there has been a great deal of housing development in Malmesbury. Many new houses being empty and some bought by a housing association and subsequently let for social housing to families not necessarily wanting to live in Malmesbury. Our excellent schools are full - parking is difficult. Employment: concerns offering employment should be actively encouraged to set up in one or more of the open spaces outside the town - suitably landscaped. I was told at the exhibition that it has been established that Malmesbury needs a supermarket. By whom? Does the council want to kill off what shops we have left in the High Street - because that is what happens - one stop shopping - free car parking. 2. Our roads are congested. Most residents must leave Malmesbury by car at some time – causing congestion, to travel to work. Some children have to be transported over to neighbouring villages as our primary schools are full, causing further congestion in the mornings. Malmesbury is a unique historic town which is in danger of becoming a dormitory town with people just sleeping and not living in the town who do not venture in the high street to boost trade as parking is difficult and expensive. The only justification for new houses is for local people to rent at affordable rents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic paper 17** sets out the background and evidence behind the housing requirements set for the community areas.

**Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted.** Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.

**Objection to further housing provision noted.** The character of the town has been identified within the community area strategy section; as a consequence it has not been identified for significant growth.

**Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted.** Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Surely the proposed high level of housing at Malmesbury is meeting the demands of developers for locations near the M4 rather than local demand? Will long distance out-commuting not be encouraged? The evidence base is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The challenging target to deliver more housing within the Malmesbury area is simply not balanced against the proposals to improve infrastructure. - The newly built primary school is at almost maximum capacity. My child is not yet old enough to attend, but when he is I want him to attend the school down the road, not be bussed to a different town - Road traffic in rush hour is putting pressure on already laden junctions around the town - There is limited brownfield availability - I certainly don't want to see any more green field sites being developed - There are not enough jobs in the town, and a new supermarket will do no more than provide a few part time jobs for students wanting pocket money - Public transport is almost non-existent. There is no train station, no buses after 6.30pm except when WOMAD is on, and a very limited taxi service. As a result everyone drives. Not exactly sustainable. - The Post Office sorting depot is closing, leaving us with an unclear means of obtaining this much needed and valued service The list goes on. Clearly this needs much further thought in order to combine any sort of growth in Malmesbury with a little common sense. Infrastructure improvements need to be made irrespective of new housing. And perhaps we should wait and see if the 100 unsold houses in the town are actually sold before even thinking about these housing quotas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>The indication that 760 new homes are required is a contradiction of sub-sections 5.9.1 to 5.9.8. Any increase to the 'already provided for' number of 473 would be detrimental to the cohesion and character of Malmesbury. There should be no further development in Malmesbury beyond this figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1. My first concern is housing. Of course there should be affordable housing for people who have family ties in Malmesbury. It is good for children to have grandparents and other relatives nearby. My feelings are that there has been a great deal of housing development in Malmesbury. Many new houses being empty and some bought by a housing association and subsequently let for social housing to families not necessarily wanting to live in Malmesbury. Our excellent schools are full - parking is difficult. Employment: concerns offering employment should be actively encouraged to set up in one or more of the open spaces outside the town - suitably landscaped. I was told at the exhibition that it has been established that Malmesbury needs a supermarket. By whom? Does the council want to kill off what shops we have left in the High Street - because that is what happens - one stop shopping - free car parking. 2. Our roads are congested. Most residents must leave Malmesbury by car at some time – causing congestion, to travel to work. Some children have to be transported over to neighbouring villages as our primary schools are full, causing further congestion in the mornings. Malmesbury is a unique historic town which is in danger of becoming a dormitory town with people just sleeping and not living in the town who do not venture in the high street to boost trade as parking is difficult and expensive. The only justification for new houses is for local people to rent at affordable rents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic paper 17** sets out the background and evidence behind the housing requirements set for the community areas.

**Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted.** Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.

**Objection to further housing provision noted.** The character of the town has been identified within the community area strategy section; as a consequence it has not been identified for significant growth.

**Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted.** Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket.

**Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted.** Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>1) Para 5.9.2. Dyson in Malmesbury is not a manufacturer and the workforce is radically different from that in a manufactory. 2) You refer to any development as being &quot;appropriate&quot;. None of what is proposed is! 3) The primary schools are not &quot;near to capacity&quot; – they are full. Why else would children be bussed to Crudwell? 4) Why should Malmesbury, probably the most sensitive of the market towns and constrained by its hilltop location, be allocated by far the greatest increase in &quot;housing requirement&quot;? You give no reasoning for this and recognise that there are no specified sites for c. 40% of the total. If, as you state, &quot;many residents travel to shop for day to day needs&quot; that is because of the difficulty of parking. How do you consider that will be remedied if a &quot;convenience development&quot; were permitted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Malmesbury's particular geography and social circumstances make it difficult to achieve development in accordance with the Core Strategy. Malmesbury Civic Trust notes that the problems are largely recognised, if not necessarily addressed, in paragraphs 5.9.1 to 5.9.4. 5.9.2 &quot;There is a small employment base that is dominated by a single manufacturer, and the town is a net in-commuter.&quot; The one strongly influences the other and it has been publicly stated that that manufacturer, Dyson, is recruiting young Engineering Graduates who have no wish to live in Malmesbury, preferring the social and entertainment potential of Bath and Bristol. More houses will not influence this, &quot;It is an important local retail centre for the surrounding rural area.&quot; Malmesbury falls short of its potential in this respect because, with the exception of Sherston and Luckington, all the villages lie on or east of the A429. The town's only long-term car park lies to the northwest of the Town and is therefore only accessible from them by threading through the congested town centre or by a long detour around the north and west of the town via Filands Road and Tetbury Hill. 5.9.3 Housing development in Malmesbury has, as this paragraph admits, outstripped its infrastructural needs. Yet the latest allocation has INCREASED the planned number of houses. Why? 5.9.4, Bullets 3 &amp; 4. Following from the above, it should be noted that as well as the Long Term Car Park, the majority of residential areas, the secondary school and the major employer, are all located to the northwest and west of the town, away from the A429. &quot;Proximity to the M4 and the A429&quot; is therefore in practice an illusion, whatever the Ordnance Survey Map might suggest. To access these main arteries, the majority of residents and workers face the same detours and congestion outlined above in respect of potential shoppers. 5.9.8 Traffic: the Town acutely needs two things: A town centre relief road for the western B4040. Long term parking on the A429 side of the town. Both of these needs will be radical and costly to deliver. Who pays? And at what &quot;cost&quot; to the Town?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 488  | SO3, CP2  
SO9, CP3  
SO7, CP41 |
| 489  | Para 5.9.2 does not state that Dyson's operation base within Malmesbury is for manufacturing – it states that Dyson is a manufacturing company. Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket. However, the consultation document states that any proposals for new retail development should contribute towards enhancement of the town centre. Concerns noted regarding dormitory status. |
|      | SO3, CP2  
SO9, CP3 |
|      | Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. |
| 489  | Employment Sites around Malmesbury. Since 2006, several employment sites have been reallocated as housing sites, e.g. Sussex Arms, Custom Transformers, Cowbridge, etc. Moreover, the original work-live units at Cowbridge in the development that replaced the employment site have been quietly dropped. In addition, the employment land on the A429, north of the Whycurch roundabout is no longer in the Plan. How does the Core Strategy turn words into deeds and reverse this trend? |
|      | SO1, CP22, economy |
|      | The consultation document include a draft policy (CP22) to help safeguard and retain existing employment sites. The consultation document also identifies a number of principal employment areas which will be retained for employment purposes to safeguard their contribution to the economy and the role and function of individual towns. |
The total new housing for the county of Wiltshire has decreased between the 2009 & 2011 strategy, but new housing for Malmesbury has increased. Why is this when the town already has properties standing empty, the schools are already full despite new schools having recently been built and our new health centre cannot take many more patients. The plan talks about more employment opportunities in Malmesbury for local residents. How is this to be achieved. Already the major employers in Malmesbury employ the majority of their work force from outside Malmesbury, thus increasing the traffic on our already congested roads. At the recent public consultation talk was about a new supermarket for Malmesbury. We do not want or need this, this would kill our town centre completely. We need to be supporting our local traders and encouraging more diversity in the town centre to ensure that local people can purchase all they need for everyday living within the town and not have to travel to out of town superstores. The plan says that greenfield sites will need to be developed in the latter half of the plan to accommodate the amount of housing for Malmesbury. What impact will these large scale housing developments have on the Area of Outstanding Natural Boundary which lies immediately to the west of the town? We need to retain our greenfield areas. This is what keeps Malmesbury rural. The plan states that due to the rural location and characteristics of the town it is not realistic to plan for significant growth but already vast numbers of houses have been built with no thought to congestion on our narrow roads or to parking for each of these new homes. To travel Malmesbury’s roads with the number of indiscriminately parked cars is dangerous to say the least. How will this be addressed in the future, the plan says that this will need to be addressed but gives no indication on how this will be achieved. Our town bus service times were recently changed and as a result even people working within the town cannot use it to get to work due to the times this bus runs. This causes more traffic within the town, how is this addressing our carbon footprint? 5.07 states that each site will be subject to masterplanning involving community input - No-one appears to be listening to community input at the present time regarding greenfield sites. How will this be addressed.

The principal change needed to the spatial strategy for Malmesbury is to recognise that the town is full. And even then we have 139 houses granted planning permission and 100 empty. I will say it again. We are full. It's not a difficult concept to understand, it has clearly escaped your models, plans, spreadsheets, posters and presentations. So get it in focus. Malmesbury is not expandable, as you seem to believe it is. Geographically it is bounded, with a small centre, traffic problems and a restricted infrastructure. Culturally it has a strong sense of community due to its size. You can’t get any more in, physically or socially. We are full. We can’t take any more. Full up. To the brim. Please don’t ruin our town.

On what basis has it been calculated that we need more housing? I get confused with all the different numbers, what has been added, what left out, etc.? All I know is that there are two large property companies rubbing their hands and hoping to get a piece of the action that Persimmon and Charles Church have already profited from. But who is going to buy in a major credit crunch? I suggest that your research and conclusions concerning the Malmesbury area (which appears to be somewhat undefined) have not been correctly assessed to start with. Not only in terms of house numbers (see previous correspondence) but the stated belief in the document that primary schooling is "close to capacity". This is somewhat inaccurate if not out of date - local parents have been exporting their children to neighbouring villages for primary education for some time and are not too pleased about it either. At least you admit that "it is not realistic to plan for significant growth". Perhaps then, I suggest, it might be realistic to allow Malmesbury to integrate the rapid growth it has experienced over the last 10 years and deal with current problems, before attempting to jumpstart it into becoming a chaotic mishmash of a town where the only people who gain are the developers who don’t have to live here. So what

Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work is required to resolve this issue. The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket. However, the consultation document states that any proposals for new retail development should contribute towards enhancement of the town centre. Concerns noted regarding dormitory status. The consultation document includes objectives to help encourage more sustainable forms of transport (SO8) and safeguard and enhance the natural environment (SO5).
do we need to address now? We need to encourage more employment (rather than instituting a dormitory town population that will be obliged to commute elsewhere - if there are any jobs in the area beyond the town). We need our education needs fulfilled. Infrastructure needs to be looked at: a) Parking - a perennial problem in Malmesbury; b) Water - the Sherston Avon seems to be running dry this summer and water is going to be our number one priority in the coming decades; c) Encouraging local shops and a vibrant town centre. We need to get rid of one of our Co-ops! d) Healthcare and provision for the older generation - again another major future issue that these plans are not considering; d) Conserving our green spaces. I repeat, these are all issues that need tackling now. Thus we are certainly not in position to support development! We cannot procrastinate and hope that with the carrot of development money all our dreams will come true - because they won't - more likely they will turn into nightmares. I am against any further development as per current discussions with Gleesons et al which are orientated to large buildingprogrammes on green field sites. If anything was to go ahead I would like to see a more local input into design and development which should be on a very small scale in keeping with an ancient and historic borough. Perhaps we could have some original thinking - how about the institution of a Malmesbury Housing Trust that could ensure that local people rent properties with the option after X years to buy at a reasonable price? We have to change our thinking and create what we want from the inside out - not have to continually fight against external profiteering and abstract numbers imposed from without. This may not be answering your question but I think in this case the cart needs to get behind the horse.

622

Support Oaksey being identified as a "Large Village" within the Community Area. Oaksey has no infrastructure impediments for some modest growth and some development will assist in sustaining the community facilities. The village also has suitable infrastructure to take a small housing development adjacent to the current settlement boundary on the east of the village - behind the village pond.

CP1

Support noted.

Spatial strategy

643

1. I mistrust the housing numbers calculated by Wiltshire Council and would like to see these re-calculated based on a current assessment of housing needs. We have already had a large increase in some very unattractive housing which is over stressing the sustainability of local resources, particularly as far as water provision, sewage and education are concerned. Many poor decisions were made about the new, unnecessary build of Malmesbury Primary School a few years ago which resulted in an unpleasant housing development around the school site and failed to recognise the numbers of children requiring places. The opportunity of a realistic, existing school extension offer was dismissed. 2. The Core Strategy Document seems to take little account of Malmesbury's special position in terms of the historic nature of the town, its history, buildings, layout and community. 3. Our river flows are very low. The habitat of the endangered and protected water vole, prevalent here a few years ago, has vanished along with a healthy stream/ river environment which encouraged trout, swans, ducks and many species of local wildlife. I urge you to reconsider and respect this environment.

Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.

The Malmesbury community area strategy makes specific reference to its valued historic and landscape assets. Officers will consider strengthening these elements where necessary. The consultation document contains policies to protect and enhance the natural environment and encourage water efficiency and conservation (SO9).
On what basis has it been calculated that we need more housing? I get confused with all the different numbers, what has been added, what left out, etc.? All I know is that there are two large property companies rubbing their hands and hoping to get a piece of the action that Persimmon and Charles Church have already profiled from. But who is going to buy in a major credit crunch? I suggest that your research and conclusions concerning the Malmesbury area (which appears to be somewhat undefined) have not been correctly assessed to start with. Not only in terms of house numbers (see previous correspondence) but the stated belief in the document that primary schooling is “close to capacity”. This is somewhat inaccurate if not out of date - local parents have been exporting their children to neighbouring villages for primary education for some time and are not too pleased about it either. At least you admit that “it is not realistic to plan for significant growth”. Perhaps then, I suggest, it might be realistic to allow Malmesbury to integrate the rapid growth it has experienced over the last 10 years and deal with current problems, before attempting to jumpstart it into becoming a chaotic mishmash of a town where the only people who gain are the developers who don’t have to live here. So what do we need to address now? We need to encourage more employment (rather than instituting a dormitory town population that will be obliged to commute elsewhere (if there are any jobs in the area beyond the town). We need our education needs fulfilled. Infrastructure needs to be looked at: a) Parking - a perennial problem in Malmesbury; b) Water - the Sherston Avon seems to be running dry this summer and water is going to be our number one priority in the coming decades; c) Encouraging local shops adn a vibrant town centre. We need to get rid of one of our Co-ops!; d) Healthcare and provision for the older generation - again another major future issue that these plans are not considering; d) Conserving our green spaces. I repeat, these are all issues that need tackling now. Thus we are certainly not in position to support development! We cannot procrastinate and hope that with the carrot of development money all our dreams will come true - because they won’t - more likely they will turn into nightmares. I am against any further development as per current discussions with Gleesons et al which are orientated to large building programmes on green field sites. If anything was to go ahead I would like to see a more local input into design and development which should be on a very small scale in keeping with an ancient and historic borough. Perhaps we could have some original thinking - how about the institution of a Malmesbury Housing Trust that could ensure that local people rent properties with the option after X years to buy at a reasonable price? We have to change the way we look at development and create what we want from the inside out - not have to continually fight against external profiteering and abstract numbers imposed from without. This may not be answering your question but I think in this case the cart needs to get behind the horse.

Oaksey is a very privileged village in terms of its facilities. The methodology used to classify a village is defined in “Wiltshire 2026 Spatial Strategy Background Paper”. When this robust methodology is applied to Oaksey it is clear that it is a ‘Larger Village’. This classification is further detailed and supported in Core Policy 1 and Topic Paper 3. A ‘Larger Village’ is defined as having at least 3 basic facilities and medium to good scores in other indicators. Oaksey comfortably surpasses these basic thresholds. It possesses: a recently enlarged primary school; a place of worship; a modern village hall for various entertainment options; a food shop; a Post Office; a public house with restaurant; a gym; a golf course with restaurant; and a sizable recreation field (cricket and football clubs). Even despite its proportionally smaller population, Oaksey has an equal or greater number of basic facilities to other villages in the ‘Larger Village’ category e.g. Crudwell does not have a food shop anymore. Due to its location, Oaksey acts as a wider local service centre for surrounding settlements (including: Upper Minety; Poole Keynes (Glos); Somerford Keynes (Glos); Eastcourt; and Chelworth). These ‘smaller’ villages have lost several of their basic facilities in the two last decades. Therefore
the sustainability of Oaksey is even more important than ever before. Oaksey has the option through its infrastructure, facilities and possible development sites to respond to employment at nearby Kemble Business Park and the Cotswold Water Park. Tourism activities in and around the adjoining Water Parks has grown significantly in the last decade. In addition, the confirmed redoubling of the railway line from Kemble to Swindon, expected to be complete by spring 2014, presents another new and sustainable opportunity for the village given its close proximity.[1] Without the ‘Larger Village’ classification it will be nearly impossible for Oaksey to respond to these opportunities and the economic benefits will go, most likely, to Gloucestershire. There hasn’t been any development in Oaksey for 5 years. Modest development in the next 15 years would aid self-containment and ensure the existing service facilities are sustainable in the long-term. Supporting growth through modest development is therefore necessary for the vitality and sustainability of the village. Controlled and incrementally growth, in the village, has to be preferable to larger over-corrections that may be required in the future, for example, to sustain the village school. In addition, some modest development in Oaksey would also help redistribute development pressures on other ‘Larger Villages’. The definition of ‘Larger Village’ is based on factual indicators and a consistently applied methodology. Oaksey’s categorisation, therefore, should not change during the current stage of consultation. To change its categorisation would undermine the Council’s methodology used for its settlement strategy. There are no higher order infrastructure constraints preventing modest development; this has recently been confirmed with both Wessex Water and Southern Electric. [1] Wikipedia, On 23 March 2011, the Chancellor George Osborne gave the go-ahead to plans to redouble the line between Kemble and Swindon in his budget statement “5.9.5 Development within the Malmesbury Community Area will have reflected and respected its high quality built and natural environment.” appears in the core development strategy for Malmesbury. The recent development, as commented on by others, has diminished rather than reflected and respected the built and natural environment. The Filants estate in particular has not reflected or respected the heritage of the town nor the local environment. Looking forward there are few little brown field sites available, and new development will be on green land, as recent development proposals have shown. If there is to be respect for Malmesbury’s high quality built environment, any building must reflect the traditional vernacular, and not take its precedent from developments of recent decades. Undoubtedly this will increase the costs of building, which is why the developers have avoided the use of traditional materials and opted for a pastiche of reconstituted stone blocks. Similarly if the high quality natural environment is to be respected, green field sites around Malmesbury must be preserved. Reading through the core strategies for the other areas there is no mention of development reflecting and respecting the high quality built and natural environment; yet Malmesbury has been allocated a proportionally higher number of houses: this is not consistent. Why Malmesbury has been singled out for above average levels of development has not been explained, particularly when it is recognised that there are serious deficits in the infrastructure. We know that the local infrastructure is strained: the local schools are full and the primary care centre is close to capacity: and this is without the completion of housing for which planning consent has been given and the arrival of the 100 or so families to occupy the empty housing stock. It is frankly ridiculous to consider any further development without fully understanding the impact that completion of the current phase of developments will have. It is recognised that Malmesbury is a ‘net in-commuter’ town. The core strategy does not address this discrepancy. Building new housing will clearly not address this, as there is empty housing already. If the in-commuters wanted to live in Malmesbury they would already do so. The likelihood is that new housing will be taken up by commuters who live elsewhere and will therefore place additional pressure on the local roads. The nature of Malmesbury is such with its river valleys, that any further

The statement ‘5.9.5 Development within the Malmesbury Community Area will have reflected and respected its high quality built and natural environment.’ appears in the core development strategy for Malmesbury. The recent development, as commented on by others, has diminished rather than reflected and respected the built and natural environment. The Filants estate in particular has not reflected or respected the heritage of the town nor the local environment. Looking forward there are few little brown field sites available, and new development will be on green land, as recent development proposals have shown. If there is to be respect for Malmesbury’s high quality built environment, any building must reflect the traditional vernacular, and not take its precedent from developments of recent decades. Undoubtedly this will increase the costs of building, which is why the developers have avoided the use of traditional materials and opted for a pastiche of reconstituted stone blocks. Similarly if the high quality natural environment is to be respected, green field sites around Malmesbury must be preserved. Reading through the core strategies for the other areas there is no mention of development reflecting and respecting the high quality built and natural environment; yet Malmesbury has been allocated a proportionally higher number of houses: this is not consistent. Why Malmesbury has been singled out for above average levels of development has not been explained, particularly when it is recognised that there are serious deficits in the infrastructure. We know that the local infrastructure is strained: the local schools are full and the primary care centre is close to capacity: and this is without the completion of housing for which planning consent has been given and the arrival of the 100 or so families to occupy the empty housing stock. It is frankly ridiculous to consider any further development without fully understanding the impact that completion of the current phase of developments will have. It is recognised that Malmesbury is a ‘net in-commuter’ town. The core strategy does not address this discrepancy. Building new housing will clearly not address this, as there is empty housing already. If the in-commuters wanted to live in Malmesbury they would already do so. The likelihood is that new housing will be taken up by commuters who live elsewhere and will therefore place additional pressure on the local roads. The nature of Malmesbury is such with its river valleys, that any further

Call for high quality design in the town noted. Core policy 37 sets criteria to ensure new development is of high quality design and it is recognised as a key issue in Malmesbury. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury was noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Where appropriate amendments will be made to the map included within the community area strategy.
development will be in outlying areas. These areas have poor pedestrian and cycle access to the town, as the pavements are narrow and the roads busy. There is an obvious temptation to use motor transport in order to visit the town centre, which already has restricted parking and severe congestion. Malmesbury is therefore not suitable for any further development and the limits have been reached. There is a need to improve the local transport, educational and healthcare infrastructure now, just to cope with the current level of development. Additionally the Malmesbury Community map does not fully represent the area, as outlaying residential areas are not shown, e.g. Burton Hill, Cowbridge, Common Road & Foxley Road. The extent of development in the immediate vicinity of Malmesbury is therefore not apparent.

| Additional housing will bring additional vehicles into the Town. Parking facilities are restricted and more vehicles will gridlock the streets making it inconvenient for people to drive into the Town to shop etc. Some will recall that parking at Cross Hayes was a problem when the Doctors' surgery was in the town. The surgery having now moved to the PCC, spaces have become available. This benefit, however, will be eroded if more vehicles are piled into the Town thus making parking difficult with the concomitant loss to local businesses. Rumours of another supermarket in the outskirts of the town will impact negatively on our butchers and bakeries. The effect could even extend to the other shops because supermarkets these days not only sell food items but clothes and other products. When houses don't sell, the properties are invariably purchased by Housing Associations. This is clearly evident at Filands where Association occupancy is drawn from Swindon's overflow. The social problems that this has given rise to is reflected in the Police presence which is certainly noticeable in those areas. As there are no jobs available locally, increasingly these tenants tend to be those who draw off benefits with the probable result that new housing in Malmesbury could lend itself to becoming another 'Council' estate. We need a moratorium on housing for the moment. Concentrate on economic development. |
| SO8 Concerns surrounding traffic flow and congestion noted. The consultation document includes objectives and policies which seek to promote and enhance more sustainable forms of transport (SO8). The proposed strategy aims to balance housing and economic growth. |
| Wiltshire Council produced a draft Strategy in 2009. Then, to accommodate changed government guidance, it produced the current 2011 draft. Between the 2009 and 2011 drafts, the new housing total for Wiltshire as a whole decreased from 44,000 to 37,000 (minus 16 per cent). Yet despite our protests the total for Malmesbury has increased from 730 to 760 houses (plus 4 per cent). Why this 20 per cent disparity? |
| SO3, CP2 Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. |
| Community concerns expressed in 500 responses to the Gleeson exhibition focused on the scale of the proposed development, and impacts on services infrastructure and facilities, schools, roads, traffic and parking. We do not see that the concerns of the community been listened to and addressed. While there is a local need for social housing, we have not been given evidence that the high levels of social housing at Filands and Cowbridge has been used to meet that local need. Our primary schools are full and over-subscribed for next year. There are over 100 new houses empty in the town, 139 houses have been granted planning permission and the town is being asked to accept 287 more houses. According to Wiltshire Council this will generate over 150 additional primary school places. This means we will need a large, new primary school. |
| SO3, CP2 SO9, CP3 Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. |
The Core Strategy fails to define ‘Malmesbury’, this is critical given Neighbourhood Plans will be based on parishes, the Strategy hence fails to accommodate even the principles of Localism. This prevents the local community having a full understanding of the implications of the Core Strategy. The Spatial Strategy must define ‘Malmesbury’. The policy states that it is not realistic to plan for significant growth. Yet based on Wiltshire Council’s own figures, Malmesbury will be subjected to a growth of 36% over the period of the Core Strategy. This is a significant rate of growth. The Spatial Strategy must significantly reduce the rate of growth. It is a simple fact that the historic core of Malmesbury cannot be expanded, yet the proposal is for the highest rate of growth in the 1,000 year history of the town. To accommodate the rate of growth proposed, a separate community will develop, dependent around yet another out of town shopping centre. This may be acceptable in some areas but should not be accepted given the nature of Malmesbury. Wiltshire Council do seem to recognise similar cultural sensitivities for example in the proposals for very limited development in Pewsey, recognising the aspirations of the community of Pewsey. The Spatial Strategy must recognise the cultural, archaeological, historical, landscape and capacities of Malmesbury. Recent new developments in Malmesbury are not in keeping with the character of the town, reflected by the high number of empty properties. Wiltshire Council has both made and admitted serious planning errors in Malmesbury and the Council now needs to listen to the community. A Residents Association poll at the Gleeson ‘Public Exhibition’ met with 94% opposition from 500 local respondents, largely based on the negative impact of such development on the town, yet where has this community response been recognised in the Core Strategy? Both original and interpreted responses to this poll are held by the Residents Association and have been presented to Town Council. The Spatial Strategy must recognise the aspirations of the local community. The Strategy comments on development of brownfield sites. Wiltshire has one of the lowest % of new housing on brownfield sites in England. Yet major brownfield sites currently lie derelict in Trowbridge, Chippenham and even villages such as Sutton Benger. The need for new housing is quoted as increasing population, yet the ability to feed this increased population is removed by building on agricultural land. This makes such proposals wholly unsustainable. Existing brownfield sites must be used to avoid challenges over sustainability. The Spatial Strategy must prioritise development on brownfield site prior to the unsustainable loss of agricultural land. The strategy also comments on affordable housing, yet the town has over 100 empty properties on ‘affordable’ sites. A very high proportion of recent developments have been taken up for social housing, yet no figures are presented to confirm that this has accommodated local housing need, or confirmed the success of dealing with the affordability of housing in Malmesbury. The Spatial Strategy must quantify the current success of policies on affordable housing.

Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. The specific issues defined within the Malmesbury community area strategy identify the importance of protecting the town’s important built, natural and historic assets. The consultation document seeks to secure at least 35% of new development on previously developed land. By providing for an appropriate level of housing within all our communities it is hoped that local need will be accommodated.
| Comments noted - Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. | SO3, CP2SO9, CP3

Malmesbury does not have the infrastructure to cope with houses on the scale put forward by WC. According to the document the remainder of housing is only 439, why then did Gleeson identify 800 houses would be built on the Whychurch farm fields by 2026, in fact why do we need houses on this scale at all? Malmesbury has special historical buildings and it is important that the heritage of the town be preserved for the whole country, not be sidelined for the supposed need to satisfy requirements of WC. People who would buy these houses wouldn't shop in Malmesbury, wouldn't work in Malmesbury so how would this benefit Malmesbury? I understand that like everywhere else we have to keep pace with the growing population, but surely there must come a time when saturation point is reached and someone with common sense stands up and says NO MORE!! As survey work was carried out last week on the 7 fields above Whychurch farm, it certainly appears that it is already a done deal and all this CONSULTATION AND LOCAL OPINION is just gloss and will not make a jot of difference to the end result which has already been decided!!!! I do not see an open and honest discussion here, nor the wishes of Malmesbury being really considered, or the beauty of the town being retained - isn't one of our largest income streams from tourism? Once the town is swallowed up by mammoth housing developments around it like Swindon, and already well on the way to becoming so, we may well find tourists don't come anymore, but by then it'll be too late and what makes Malmesbury special will be lost forever!! There are already several shops vacant in the High Street, so the argument that more housing would bring people into the town to shop hasn't borne fruit with the current developments, so how would this change with yet more houses on the outskirts? The beauty of Malmesbury is slowing being eroded in the name of progress and to satisfy the statistics of faceless bureaucrats and is deplorable! Common sense obviously flew out of the window a long time ago with regards to this development, replaced by £ signs! |

SO3, CP2SO9, CP3

Housing Infrastructure
Yes, in a word. I chose to move to Malmesbury 12 years ago with my family to take advantage of the benefits of a small, vibrant and well managed village community with the benefits of excellent schools, good local amenities and a rural setting. The development of the village since then has comprised of resisting most efforts to increase employment in the area and to increase the number of residents. There are now many empty business premises, many empty houses, new schools already over capacity and an escalating traffic and parking problem. In addition it seems the number of visitors and tourists being attracted to the village is falling. I cannot comprehend that the solution to this situation is to construct a large quantity of new residential property. Having read much of the "Core Strategy" concerning the Malmesbury area I see very little reference to improving the area’s infrastructure and amenities or to create employment (except if you are in the building trade). The suggestion of a new supermarket to compete with the existing one and drive out the last remaining traders from the village high street is an anathema. Perhaps it would be more productive to improve existing small industrial sites and perhaps build new ones and give incentives to attract more small businesses to the area.

The community area strategy identifies the specific infrastructure requirements for the town (5.9.8) the consultation document also makes provision to secure appropriate infrastructure from future development (CP3). The consultation document does not identify the need to develop a new supermarket. However, the consultation document states that any proposals for new retail development should contribute towards enhancement of the town centre. With regards to employment land provision the strategy seeks to protect a number of principal employment sites within the community area. Further detail on employment levels will be developed for the submission draft of the core strategy.

Comments noted - Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work is required to resolve this issue. Core policy 29 seeks to ensure the appropriate type and mix of homes is delivered within Wiltshire’s communities.

There is no mention in the Core Policy of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Any development must have due regard to the AONB, including an assessment of the likely impact of proposed development on the AONB.

I have very serious concerns about the projected number of properties to be built in Malmesbury. The percentage increase is significantly higher than in other local towns yet the number of jobs in Malmesbury is hardly increasing-so are we to become a dormitory town? Social services are already housing people from other towns-in particular Wootton Bassett-in the Filands development, some of whom are making life unpleasant for these residents who have purchased their houses there-why are you not proposing higher levels of building in Wootton Bassett? These levels of buildings will change the nature of this beautiful, ancient historic town and ruin it. It appears to be developer-led rather than planning-led and this is highly suspicious.
| 1053 | The basis for saying that Malmesbury’s need for 287 additional houses which not only is an increase on previous figures but is also an unsubstantiated figure, is based upon a flawed analysis. I understand the need for this additional housing is based upon a mathematical extrapolation of the population growth and deaths. The population growth figure has been overstated by the very fact that Malmesbury has taken an unsustainably higher growth of population in the past 6-7 years (+32%) than any other market town in Wiltshire. The overgrowth has not been absorbed and therefore any calculation based upon past population growth must be flawed. Do you agree and if not, why not? | SO3, CP2 | Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. | Housing |

| 1054 | Do not understand why number of homes required to be built in Wiltshire has decreased and yet numbers in Malmesbury has increased. There are at least 100 empty/new houses in Malmesbury. With these houses empty, why do we need new houses? | SO2, CP2 | Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. | Housing |

| 1055 | I feel that Malmesbury is being unfairly targeted for expansion. Due to its nature (small market town with little room for expansion anyway) adding the proposed number of houses will spoil the ambience - as has already happened in the entrance to the town of the Filands site. Your officer today could not advise us as to where the proposed 760 houses would be built which makes it difficult to comment fully. Even now parking is well-nigh impossible in the town centre, the primary school is completely full and has no room for expansion, shopping facilities are unsatisfactory. I do think that the design of this is "unfriendly" - ie, there are 90 chapters in the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document, nor is there an item for "question2. The official I asked could not say why the form was so designed-but I feel it is to make it off-putting so that people who will be affected do not feel confident to complete it. This is very unfriendly and unprofessional approach to something that affects the ordinary people of the town (like me). CAN YOU TELL ME WHY MALMESBURY HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AS A TOWNSUITEABLE FOR A 32.4% INCREASED GROWTH? IT IS TOTALLY OUT OF KEEPING WITH THE TYPE OF TOWN WE ARE AND THE COMMUNITY. | SO2, CP2 | Noted objection to housing requirement. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Comments regarding the consultation material have been noted and will be considered for future engagement exercises. | Housing |

| 1056 | I think we should have more housing, low cost affordable, only for local people built by housing association NOT developers. Local lettings agreement are needed. | SO2, CP2 | Noted support for more affordable housing but only for local people. Further work will be carried out through an Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. | Housing |

| 1057 | I think Malmesbury should grow and have more housing particularly built by the Housing Associations. However, I do think a % of any new affordable housing should be let to local people on a local lettings agreement. | SO2, CP2 | Noted support for more affordable housing but only for local people. Further work will be carried out through an Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. | Housing |

<p>| 1060 | 1. How can Malmesbury town cope with more houses? 2. Why is Malmesbury having and unfairly-large increase in houses? 3. Put new houses(if they are really need which I doubt) in the wider community area, not the town. | SO3, CP2 TP14 | Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. No strategic sites have been identified for the community area therefore future development sites could potentially be identified through a subsequent neighbourhood plan. | Housing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>I would like to comment on the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document of June 12th. Firstly, Malmesbury is not only a tourist attraction. It is also a place for living. In the indications that the majority of inhabitants do not want more change or development such as that threatening the worthies, its cricket fields and other greenfield sites. Secondly, the infrastructure is inadequate for the suggested growth in population and the town centre is unsuitable for expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>With regard to any future housebuilding or development in Malmesbury: I would like the council to be much more demanding of prospective developers. For example, they should be redeveloping brownfield sites first before they are allowed to touch greenfields. Any development should be for the benefit of local people not increase easy profits for developers. I want the council to be a custodian of the environment and to work towards passing a well cared for town to future generations. Why has the number of proposed houses in Malmesbury despite the total number of houses required in Wiltshire decreasing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>Why have you increased the proposed number of new houses of Malmesbury to 760? It is difficult to believe that, when originally consulted, residents said they did not mind this, particularly as so many of the existing houses are still unsold. Was the question clear or misunderstood? At the consultation meeting on July 18th, we were promised an answer as to whether the proposals for Burnham House counted as new property or 55% this promise was not fulfilled. The problems concerning parking, health services and educational facilities have been aired ad nauseam but we feel that these problems should be addressed before and not after further development takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>With reference to the Wiltshire core development strategy June 2011 I should like to point out that the proposed addition of several hundred houses before 2026 would quite possibly wreck the existing town. The infrastructure is already feeling the strain of existing expansion and our surgery and care home are not big enough for the existing population let alone the primary school. Our retail outlets are satisfactory as they are; I very seldom shop outside the town; the traffic in these medieval roads already threatens the houses that line them and more expansion would mean more traffic. Could you not consider some brownfield sites elsewhere in the county for this necessary housing quota? It seems criminal to build on the green fields which surround this very special ancient borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Following the recalculation of housing need in Wiltshire, requirement has reduced by 17%. Why, then, has Malmesbury’s proposed growth increased by 4%? We were told that this was in response to demand from residents. We have yet to meet anyone who want additional housing. The infrastructure can not cope with anymore housing and there are unsold and empty new houses already, which indicates a lack of need. Malmesbury is a medieval town which can not cope adequately with existing traffic. WOMAD weekend is a perfect demonstration of what happens when the local population increases. Malmesbury was gridlocked within the 20mph zone. How many people sat in the traffic, getting nowhere and unable to park? Emergency vehicles would have taken at least half an hour to get through, as I did. The roads are too narrow to pull over to allow emergency transport to pass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1170 Suggest use of brownfield sites before using Greenfield ones such as suggested for Malmesbury. New housing total has decreased so Malmesbury increase cannot be justified. Residents of Malmesbury have, time and again, demonstrated that these proposed large developments are not welcome e.g. Gleesons for park. Where are the 1400 additional cars going to be parked? Malmesbury has only Dyson as a major employer—where are the 2000 plus people going to work? Perhaps a high % will be on state benefits!

SO3, CP2 Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. The proposed strategy also seeks to deliver a proportionate amount of job provision within the county. Further work regarding the level of provision needed within the Malmesbury community area will be incorporated within the submission draft of the core strategy.

1289 We are most concerned that two important development areas within our parish of St Paul etc. have not even been mentioned, and themselves rate equally with Milbourne etc. Namely south of the river Avon, Burton Hill on Priory roundabout (A429), where the old Burton Hill Priory once stood; and contains the area nursery, police station, telephone exchange, and more. Secondly Cowbridge very near the new Swindon Road bridge which already has over 300 residents, and likely to grow to 400. These two areas on the map should never have been left off the Malmesbury Area Map, page 24

CP1 Officers will investigate incorporating these areas into maps as appropriate.

1291 I wish to question the concept of Malmesbury as a town in this context. Do you remember the village of Souham (pop 5000) where the child murders took place? Malmesbury's population is about 4,500. I realise it MUST retain it's status of town as the seat of the country's most ancient mayorality, but in reality it is just a big village, and perhaps should be treated as such in this strategy. Reality needs to come to the desire to maintain the conservation high street banks, businesses and boutiques. There is little the boutiques can do except develop niche markets; for there is absolutely nothing that can be done about the lack of parking, save unrealistically thinking about underground or multi-storey parking. For this reason as well as those already expressed, I feel further Malmesbury housing should be very limited; and that to enable the bypass to be completed to the Sherston Road, to save traffic going through the very narrow Bristol Street to our Area Secondary School, and our Activity Zone. This new road would be funded by housing development, which is of greater importance to the town and the greater Malmesbury area.

SO3, CP2 Comments noted - Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation.

1293 Buckley Barracks is in our parish. There is no question of it closing at present but this can suddenly change; and we would like to suggest keeping the runway open for use like Kemble and using the conservation hangers as appropriate storage use etc. The listed officers mess should be considered as a hotel development project. The non-conserved hangers and outbuildings for industrial use while the MoD homes could be largely equity-shared to make this a centre of affordable housing.

MoD Comments noted.

1298 The proposals seem to imply the maximum building allowed in the Malmesbury area, but our parish may wish to discreetly develop much more to improve our community facilities, and all behind thick screening so as to retain its rural character. We would like to revive the Corston by pass, with industry near the airfield, and close the M4 and railway. We would like to explore the possibility of a good sized supermarket at Filands/Tetbury Hill. And behind this to explore a housing development behind the supermarket with a new primary school (St Joseph's is looking for new premises) and a surgery outpost, in the part called 'Marsh'. Environmentally this housing might have a central heating well, to supply area heating. Consideration might be give to establishing a 'Prince of Wales' housing village at Quobwell farm, to the north. Under Q2 it says that none strategic sites may be brought forward, and if this answers the above then fine. But otherwise the plans now appear to be inflexible. And again to QU 3 the plans seem rather restrictive for our thoughts.

SO3, CP2 SO9, CP3 SO8 Comments noted - No strategic sites have been identified for the community area therefore future development sites could potentially be identified through a subsequent neighbourhood plan.
I am writing to ask you to preserve the wonderful town of Malmesbury as it now is. The building of more houses than planned at present, will be more than the infrastructure can stand.

I question the number of houses specified for development in Malmesbury and surrounds and also for development by 2016. I am pleased to see that no strategic sites have been allocated, however, infrastructure of our town will not support the 287 extra homes, plus the extra 139 outside. Our primary schools, medical facilities and parking facilities are almost at capacity. Until our town infrastructure has been resolved, then large developments should not be built and should not be the constraint of a date of 2016 or even later, but rather when the town has capacity to support these extra homes. Dysons do not employ many local people, they drive into Malmesbury. There is very little employment in our town for young people as well as older people. In consequence many people commute out of town for their employment. The area allocated for new employment opportunities is not specific enough and does not estimate numbers. Further housing development will also add to this scenario with more commuters and a greater carbon footprint. I believe these issues should be considered by local people through the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plans.

This Council is generally supportive of the spatial strategy set out for the Malmesbury Community Area as set out in Core Policy 13. The Parish Council would expect to see the majority of the 1200 new homes required to be provided in the MCA actually being provided in and around Malmesbury. We do not consider that the figure of 760 units mentioned in the text accompanying this policy should be modified so as to result in any additional units being required to be provided elsewhere in the MCA. We consider that the balance is about right. We were slightly surprised by the lack of guidance given in this section of the Core Strategy to development outside of the settlement of Malmesbury itself. Indeed, other than the figure given for housing outside of Malmesbury (152 dwellings) no mention is made of the future development needs or aspirations in relation to any other settlement. We have no problem with this, provided that such guidance is in due course incorporated into a Neighbourhood Plan. However, should no such plan be prepared, we would want to be assured that the aspirations and future development needs of Sherston are noted and that a number of specific planning issues are addressed. In which case there ought at least to be some mention made of some or all of these at this stage in the plan process. The following issues have already been identified as being of relevance in this regard: 1. The need to identify a site for a new doctor’s surgery. 2. The need to expand the existing primary school. 3. The need for some form of elderly persons accommodation in the village. 4. The need for new allotments. 5. The need to provide improved sports facilities for the village. 6. The need to provide for future employment opportunities - at the Old School and elsewhere in and around the village. 7. The need to identify a site for a new vicarage and an expanded cemetery.

The strategy for delivering jobs and infrastructure alongside future housing does not take into account the circumstances of communities adjacent to county boundaries. Oaksey is equidistant from Cirencester (Glos) and Malmesbury (Wilts). There is a difference between ‘out-commuting’ to Bristol or London, and ‘out-commuting’ 6 miles into an adjacent county. The balance of the community is therefore influenced more by employment and services which are not within this Strategy. Our recent survey of the Oaksey residents revealed that 87% saw Cirencester as their main centre for local services and shopping. Strategies for this Malmesbury area may therefore be incorrectly skewed if this is not taken in to account.
Malmesbury Community Area Detailed analysis of the evidence base and topic papers is essential prior to making comprehensive representations regarding the Malmesbury community area. A realistic approach must be adopted to development outside of the principal community area settlement. Successive local plans have denuded the ability for 'infilling' to contribute meaningfully to the provision of dwellings in the rural area, a policy context that places development in the 'most sustainable locations' without reliance on an artificially defined boundary to a given settlement is the most appropriate method to deliver essential residential and commercial development, at an appropriate scale in the rural context.

CP1 proposes to takes a more flexible approach to development in rural areas.

Spatial strategy

Oaksey Parish Council re Malmesbury Area Strategy In the Core Strategy settlement categorisation for Malmesbury area, Oaksey is proposed to be included as a Large Village. This seems to be based on the relatively well developed facilities in the Parish, although in terms of size of population Oaksey clearly is an exception - not just smaller but substantially smaller than all others in the Large Village category, and smaller than many in the Small Village category. Large Villages are proposed as Ashton Keynes (1420), Crudwell (1100), Great Somerford (740), Sherston (1420) and Oaksey (490) - population figures from the 2001 census. Included in the Small Village category are Brinkworth (1230) and Minety (1400). In the light of this Core Strategy consultation, Oaksey Parish Council carried out a complete survey of each household in the Parish between 29 July and 5 August. All households had a survey form delivered by hand. Three collection or response options were provided, including a collection point in the village shop. The topics questioned are in the attached survey form - see Appendix. 86 responses were received and analysed, including some extensive free-form comments. The key messages from the survey results on which the Parish Council's response is therefore based are as follows Only 8% wanted more than 10 new houses in the first 5 years from 2011. Half the remainder wanted none, the other half no more than 10 houses. The majority envisage therefore minimal development in the village Between 59% (years 0-5) and 75% (years 10-15) saw no need for new employment based in the village over any of the next three five year periods to 2026. In response to a question as to how much employment the village needed outside Oaksey, 90% said Some or None, only 10% Plenty. 25% of households already have someone working from home. 46% expect that someone will be working from home in that household in 10 years. 15 households envisaged the need for an affordable housing unit within their family in the next five years. 83% supported the provision of affordable housing for residents of the village. 70% were not in favour of the village providing affordable housing for the wider area. 61% saw tourism as of no or negligible importance to the village. 91% did not see Malmesbury as their main centre for local services and shopping. 79% were against the proposal that Oaksey should be seen as a 'Large Village'. As a Parish Council we therefore feel we have a firm and detailed mandate from our residents as to their wishes for the community over the next 15 years. The circumstances that the Planning Strategy group record in Oaksey that the quality of facilities in the village is of a good standard are, in the view of the community, the achievement, over quite a few years, of a number of determined and organised individuals, some fortunate private funding and considerable community support. They are not the result of a linear relationship with the size of the population. In the words of one resident - "we are being punished for having the temerity to organise ourselves". However the possibility that defined as a 'Large Village' in the 2026 Core Strategy, Oaksey would be unable to resist development which would take the community to the size of other communities in the category - an increase between 50% (Great Somerford) and 290% (Ashton Keynes) - is overwhelmingly opposed by the residents. With the vast majority of those surveyed opposed to more than 10 new houses in any of the 5 year periods to 2026, as a Parish Council we are mandated to engage with the Core Strategy process to clarify what the definitions of

CP1 Noted concern that Oakesy is designated as a Large Village rather than a Small Village and a request for further clarification of what this means - further work is being carried out on the definitions of Large and Small Villages and officers will assess which category Oaksey should fall in.

Spatial strategy
Large and Small Village actually mean in practice. These definitions are likely not only to indicate planning policy for small development, but more significantly will provide precedent for opportunistic larger development which is not community driven. They are therefore of fundamental importance to the future of the community for which we hold some responsibility. We will be looking for a face to face meeting with the Core Strategy team to clarify how their perception of the practical consequences of the settlement categories can reflect the views of the community as indicated in our mandate. This will include The processes for varying the settlement boundary as a Large Village The processes for protecting the settlement boundary as a Large Village The controls to prevent a ‘small Large Village’ being seen as a potential ‘large Large Village’ over time The clear definition of ‘infill’ expected in the Small Village category The forms of protection available to replace the settlement boundary if they are removed for Small Villages What process of community consultation will be authoritative to ensure that the community’s wishes in relation to settlement boundaries and scale of development will be respected A detailed survey of affordable housing need in the village The planning impact of Kemble Airfield industrial park on the local balance of employment and housing - not mentioned in the Malmsbury Area Strategy The planning impact of the doubling of the railway line from Kemble station The findings of the Community Area Plan and how they are reflected in the Core Strategy Clarifying perceptions of and evidence for how tourism impacts the local economy or bypasses it How the recent history of new housing in the village affects the plans for further development In what way the stock of affordable housing already available in the village impacts how the need for new affordable housing is distributed in the area. How the village can limit the growth in through traffic caused by development in adjacent areas - Kemble industrial park, Cotswold Water Park, Ashton Keynes housing etc. How the last 10-20 years of development has affected traffic volumes emerges, time and time again, as the principal concern of our residents, in terms of its effect on amenity and community cohesion. While the survey response to the choice of Small or Large Village was conclusive in Oaksey, we suspect that much of the response may have been to the two alternative titles rather than with an appreciation of how the two categories in your Core Strategy would impact the community’s control of their village in practice. This is still unclear.

We will support the categorisation which is most likely to deliver what our community value for the future of Oaksey. We will vehemently resist a category which puts the community at risk over time including in circumstances not foreseen by the Core Strategy.

Althought the wording of this strategy purports to be sensitive to local issues, it does little to address issues that we residents live with on a daily basis NOW while advocating increased development that can only make those issues worse. I would like to see the current issues resolved satisfactorily BEFORE I would have any confidence in pledges that increased development will not cause further difficulties.

Parking: We have been raising this issue repeatedly for several years now, and all that has happened is that parking places for Town Centre residents have been reduced (by around 80 I think). Parking on double yellow lines is endemic in the town – not because people want to park disrespectfully but because there is nowhere else to park. On my way home following your own Consultation Evening I passed 3 cars parked on double yellow lines within 100m of the Town Hall. Had I had time then, I would have walked back to the Town Hall and taken your representatives outside so they could see it for themselves. When I moved to the town 3 years ago I could park just outside my house 3-4 evenings a week (note point 5.9.3 that there have been 528 more homes since 2006). Now I am lucky to be able to do it once a month and I commonly have to visit 3-6 different places to find somewhere. Under these circumstances, how can it possibly make sense to plan the construction of 287 + 139 more homes? Infrastructure: Having lived in US where out-of-town centre developments have decimated the centres of previously

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SO7, CP41</th>
<th>SO5</th>
<th>SO3</th>
<th>SO1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking is an issue that is likely to be dealt with via the Neighbourhood Plan. Noted comment that the town centre must be improved. CP41 ensures that any out of town developments provide an impact assessment to fully understand any impact on the town centre. The policies under strategic objective SOS aim to protect and enhance the natural environment. Further work will be carried out on empty homes in the town. Noted comment that mechanisms need to be put in place to encourage high quality employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The housing numbers proposed for Malmesbury should be recalculated in accordance with the comments and document put forward by the residents association. The housing figure in the council document is inaccurate because it has been based upon an extrapolation from an historic figure which has already been proven to have delivered a house building programme that presently cannot be absorbed within the existing infrastructure of the town. The calculations are therefore flawed. A precise definition of the area referred to as "Malmesbury" should be made clear. For example does this include the areas of Burton Hill, Swindon Road, Milbourne, Common Road, etc.? In order to more accurately match housing demand to delivery, we suggest that the planning period be divided into three phases, namely 2006 - 2016, 2017 - 2021 and 2022 - 2026. This would remove ambiguity from the vague language used in the present draft which promises only that "development would be phased towards the latter half of the plan period." There appears to be no clear plan to provide school places for any additional housing proposal - this is unsustainable.

The strategy for Malmesbury is to support its role as a tourist location in Wiltshire and local retail centre offering a range of shops and services for the wider community. There has been a high level of development in Malmesbury in recent years. Therefore, further development will be phased towards the latter half of the plan period to address local educational issues associated with capacity at existing schools. Given Malmesbury's rural location and the characteristics of the town, it is not realistic to plan for significant growth: 287 extra houses is significant growth on top of the last 15 years, but some new homes will contribute towards meeting local housing need and supporting the employment, who is expanding in Malmesbury? Service where is this? and retail role. This is not correct unless you add substantially to the existing retail stock. The primary schools in the town are close to capacity. Already out of date as one is full with a waiting list for next year and the other using the library. Development should be phased towards the latter half of the plan period.

Noted comment that the housing numbers need to be reconsidered. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. The proposed strategy also seeks to deliver a proportionate amount of job provision within the county. Further work regarding the level of provision needed within the Malmesbury community area will be incorporated within the submission draft of the core strategy. Noted comment that the document should be clear of the definition of the limit if the town – the town will be shown on the proposals map. Consideration will be given to phasing development over three time periods – further information can be found in topic paper 17.
to enable a solution to be reached and should only come forward once sufficient primary school places can be provided. This development, phased or not, only opens the door for more housing to justify the school being built and hence should not be in the plans until after 2026, if it can be justified then. Other solutions need to be found to provide places around Malmesbury. • Diversification of the employment base will strengthen the local economy and reduce outcommuting. A flexible approach to allow economic development on the edge of the town will be considered. There haven’t been any new industrial developments in last 10 years, only a LOSS of places to outside of Malmesbury. Build this first and then look to build housing if and only if required. There isn’t a location within Malmesbury for this so an edge of Town development is the only real option. The type of industrial units also needs to be appropriate. • The town’s proximity to the M4 and the A429 should provide the impetus required for attracting increased employment growth. Future growth must be balanced, with economic development alongside housing and at a scale appropriate to maintaining the self sufficiency of the town. The site for development does NOT support this level of GROWTH as 400+ houses would need far more employment opportunity. This level of employment should support the existing requirement WITHOUT the need for more housing. This also assumes that the road links are needed for road traffic so the site would be used for Warehousing and with it would come significant large scale traffic. Look at the traffic caused by Dyson’s warehousing operation, finished when Manufacturing was moved to Malaysia in 2003, where most of the traffic was to the North of Malmesbury on to the A429. See issue with Filands Road onto A429 junction. • There is a lack of convenience retail offer in the town centre. There may be scope for convenience development of an appropriate scale but impact on the town centre would need to be assessed. This is not correct. There are sufficient shops but there is a lack competition as only one major supplier runs both stores and the convenience store closes earlier in the evening than the previous owner. Make it easier to use the Internet for people to order online, at the Library say, or encourage a new company to takeover one of the stores. 4 • Future development will be carefully managed to ensure the high quality built environment is protected. It should be of high quality design and well integrated with the existing built form. What needs to be built is more first time houses, that are NOT sold for Rental, and for elderly accommodation, as expected by 2026, which might also free up existing houses stock. • Malmesbury has few opportunities to bring forward development on previously developed land. A greenfield site may need to be identified towards the latter half of the plan period. This is because ALL the space, including allotments, has already been developed as jobs have moved away from Malmesbury. With the levels of development over the last 15 years there should not be any further major developments until after all the existing housing has been completed and the movement and readjustment of the employment area completed. Any development should be AFTER 2026 if it can then be justified. Housing Over the plan period (2006-2016) 1 hectare of new employment land and 1200 new homes are proposed in the community area. 760 should occur at Malmesbury. There will be no strategic site allocation in Malmesbury. Non strategic sites can be identified through either a neighbourhood plan or a site allocations development plan document. If new edge of town greenfield development is required is should be phased and only commence once sufficient primary school places have been delivered. There should be no further Major developments in the Malmesbury area until all the village schools have been filled and supported with the appropriate level of housing. The level of housing supported by a Greenfield site, given these housing figures, does not support further Primary School places. Any new school would put further pressure to build more housing with ALL the existing infrastructure problems unresolved. A Super Primary school has also been shown to reduce attainment and not improve it. So I would expect ALL teaching staff, parents and Governors to reject this idea. Restate what is happening with Burnham House. This is effectively as a protected employment site. Noted comment that the problem is not lack of convenience retail but that both supermarkets are run by co-op thus reducing competition - the scope of the Core Strategy does not cover existing uses. Parking and the provision of a skate park may be issues that can be addressed via the Neighbourhood Plan.
50+ units which if used by Malmesbury residents would encourage a turnover in housing stock. This development is welcome. Employment Land north of Tetbury Hill, retained local plan allocation 1ha. This amount of land would not support sufficient jobs for the Town if the current levels of development were to take place. The following existing principal employment areas will be supported: Malmesbury Business Park (Full), Dyson site (Opportunity for growth of existing company), Land north of Tetbury Hill This is a small low skilled area which needs to have proper small work units to thrive, which has been over 10 years in coming and still not at a planning level. 5 What about the old Lucent Site? This is missing from your map and what about the other sites close to Malmesbury along the Sherston Road or Charlton Park? There aren't 21% of jobs in Manufacturing in Malmesbury. The main activities at Dyson are Call Centre and R'N'D. The only manufacturing near Malmesbury is on the Sherston Road. Retail Proposals for retail should contribute towards the enhancement of the town centre. There are plenty of vacant opportunities in Malmesbury already. The high cost of rental and business rates is causing these to remain empty. As a tourist area there are sufficient food and restaurant places to cope with the trade. If this was to grow then there would be an opportunity to take up some of the currently vacant premises. There are plenty of Supermarkets all around Malmesbury. Having another here would not increase competition sufficiently to reduce prices but would encourage those that currently use the town to stay outside. This was ably reported in the Newspapers yet again last week. Where one large chain was pushing for an edge of town development and correspondents from a town that lost in a similar situation reported that the high street had died very quickly after the store opened. Infrastructure requirements identified so far to support development at Malmesbury: • Traffic demand management solution to congestion of the road network in the town centre. Easy! Make Station Road Car Park free, as it was before the disastrous hikes in charges, to encourage able bodied people to park there! Ensure that large vehicles do not enter the Town except via approved routes. There isn't anything in this document that addresses the Filands to A429 junction to improve the flow of traffic away from Malmesbury and to ensure Dyson's traffic uses the by-pass and not to go through the town. There are a high proportion of HomeWorkers so the roll out of High Speed Internet is essential to support the development of both small businesses and home workers. Look again at the Eilmer bridge to encourage people to park responsibly overnight in Station Road car park and reduce potential issues for emergency services. • Increased primary school capacity in the town. Only required due to the over development of Housing as planned by Wiltshire Council. If the forecasting of school places from existing developments is this bad then why should the people of North Wiltshire, or Wiltshire as a whole, support the figures you currently suggest? Capacity in the villages should be used first at the cost of the WC for letting this happen. You do not say anything about the problems of Electricity supply or Flooding which are known issues in Malmesbury. 6 What about the Skate Park for which money has been available for several years? Are we waiting for an election before we get this sorted?
MALMESBURY COMMUNITY AREA STRATEGY. Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document. There is a fundamental fallacy in strategic thinking that unless there is development for a particular place that place will sooner or later die. The crucial point is to be constantly alert to the possibility that development may be required and to review regularly the needs of a town such as Malmesbury, weighing those needs against the town’s fundamental and qualitative characteristics. If development is going to harm those characteristics to a serious degree or simply cannot be accommodated sympathetically matters should rest there. In these circumstances planners should not regard their mission as a failure. On the contrary they have fulfilled their obligations to the community if they have asked the pertinent questions, regardless of whether that means some of the apparent needs of the community cannot be satisfied. Those whose needs cannot be satisfied must look elsewhere, otherwise England is doomed to a legacy of a characterless concrete jungle; of ribbon development around the perimeter of every old town and village with a historical heart, to the irreversible detriment of the locality and its inhabitants and the abiding disappointment of the many visitors who specifically wish to see our unique country and countryside uncluttered by so called modernisation. The essential facts about Malmesbury. Its historical importance. Its very particular geographical and topographical features. Its extraordinary juxtaposition of residential and commercial buildings in the old part of the town. As the Core Strategy Consultation Document (“CSCD”) acknowledges there has been a high level of development in Malmesbury in recent years. This is an understatement. Malmesbury has more than fulfilled any actual or notional obligation to the local and wider community in terms of providing housing, many of the long term residents would justifiably say to their considerable disadvantage, viz traffic, health services, schooling, parking, public services; points largely rehearsed in the CSCD. A walk round the town indicates very clearly that every possible space available has been built on, in a number of instances without proper thought being given to the affect of that development on the town as a whole or that development itself. Where is the corner shop, or a proper garden rather than a tiny yard with barely room for the compulsory wooden shed, or a side entrance to accommodate the pushchair or bicycle?Residents were told several years ago that the land at Filands on which the old secondary school stood would have to be sold for residential development (rather than being used for much needed leisure facilities for the younger generations who did not wish to participate in sporting activities at what was then the embryonic Activity Centre) in order to fund the new Malmesbury secondary school. Messrs Persimmon 1 Charles Church have doubtless ultimately done very well out of that development, despite the midway blip in completing what we all thought and hoped was the end of building at Filands. Surely it cannot be seriously in any sane planning contemplation that in the next decade or beyond Malmesbury might see development the whole way along the B4014 eastwards from the current building limit up to the B4014 A429 junction? Of course if such development was by some extraordinary quirk approved and carried out one could see why calls for another primary school and an out-of-town supermarket might be justified. But this would simply represent circumstances being artificially created to satisfy criteria for further development; and then one would have to ask the basic questions as to who was in charge of planning for Malmesbury: was it a certain well known supermarket chain or certain developers with offices very close to the development site? One wonders. There is a very low demand for housing in Malmesbury according to the CSCD. There is however a considerable need to support Malmesbury’s hard pressed retail outlets. If money is to be spent that is the direction in which it should go, because in essence Malmesbury is perfectly well served by its current retail outlets, including food shopping. Let there be some assistance to our current shopkeepers through ameliorated business rates and other charges they face to encourage trade in the heart of our town. If local people wish to go to larger stores than the riverside Co-op they can easily go to Tetbury.

Noted objection to any housing growth. Information on the distribution of housing is found in topic paper 17. Noted comments on potential improvements to the traffic flow in the town - this could be an issue dealt with through the Neighbourhood Plan. Noted comments on parking - this could be an issue dealt with through the Neighbourhood Plan.
Chippenham or Cirencester. Transport is not an insuperable problem in this context. It is clear as the CSCD states that the town suffers from at least three basic problems which need addressing, viz: 1. Primary schools capacity. After much wrangling a new primary school was built at Tetbury Hill in 2008. Why was this school not built with growth in mind? Only three years later we are told it has reached capacity. Planning?? Alternatively why was land not set aside for a second new primary school on the old Filands site before all the land was sold for development? Planning ?? 2. Parking Not an easy problem to solve given Malmesbury’s topography if additional parking is going to benefit the town from both commercial as well as a residential standpoints. However a few additional parking spaces could be made available in the Cross Hayes by ending whatever arrangement Hyams Autos have to take up eight (8) spaces as an “outside” showroom for their used car sales. More fundamentally the town should acquire, if necessary by exercising compulsory purchase powers, the field at the bottom of the High Street to the left of the entrance to the playing field on the town side of the river, reconfiguring the playing field entrance, where both parking and public convenience facilities could be provided. 3. Town centre traffic congestion Why not reverse the flow of traffic through the town? This would be achieved as follows: a. Traffic coming up Bristol Street from the Sherston direction which is not stopping in Malmesbury would be positively signed away from the town at the war memorial junction of Bristol Street and Abbey Row (e.g. “For Tetbury, Cirencester, Chippenham follow ......” taking that traffic up Gloucester Street to the Park Road roundabout and then on up Tetbury Hill etc.). At the Dyson T junction the current road arrangements would be altered by constructing a roundabout and at the junction of the B4014 and the A429 a mini roundabout would be installed. This would not only assist the flow of traffic from Filands onto the major road at busy times of the day but also slow down traffic moving south along the A429, minimising the number of accidents and “near-misses” at that dangerous junction, predominantly caused by the speed of the traffic coming south from the Crudwell direction. b. Traffic coming west from the Sherston direction needing to come into the town centre would turn right into the High Street at the Market Cross and proceed south. There would be NO ENTRY into Oxford Street at this junction but a filter system as in c. below. c. At the High Street junction with St Denis Road traffic would either turn left into the Cross Hayes or continue down the High Street. At this junction there would be an alternative vehicle filter system, a flow arrangement very successfully employed in Guernsey where there is heavy traffic and a lot of narrow roads. d. Traffic turning left at St Denis Road into the Cross Hayes, if not parking in the Cross Hayes, would continue round in the opposite direction to the current flow and either proceed to Holloway or turn left into Oxford Street. At this junction there would be a mini roundabout but there would be NO ENTRY into the Cross Hayes for traffic coming south from Holloway i.e. all traffic from this direction would have to turn right. e. Deliveries in the High Street by vehicles over a certain weight would be prohibited between 8am and 6pm, effectively allowing only light vans to park / deliver between these hours. Double parking in the High Street would be strictly prohibited and a much higher profile would be required from the Council's parking/ traffic services staff than is presently evident to ensure traffic flow and parking arrangements were working smoothly. CCTV cameras which currently serve little useful purpose could be better used in this context among others. In conclusion, the great majority of long term residents of Malmesbury do not wish to become residents of a mini New Town and see no overriding reason for yet further housing development in the next decade. Let planning be directed towards keeping the town as it is, vibrant at its heart and attractive to its citizens and visitors alike.

We agree with the proposed allocation of Oaksey as a 'large village' which is capable of accommodating further development in the future in order to facilitate the delivery of new housing, improved services and facilities in the area.

Noted support for designation of Oaksey as a Large Village.
The Housing Requirement for Malmesbury Town is deeply flawed. Although the County’s requirement for housing has been reduced by 16.6% since 2009 (37,010 instead of 44,400) the total for Malmesbury Town has been increased by 5.5% (760 instead of 720). No reason has been given for this increase. Both of these figures seem to constitute “significant growth” which contradicts the statement in paragraph 5.9.3. There seems to be no relationship between the number of extra houses required in the town (32.4%) and the projected population growth in the Community Area (12.9% - 18,390 estimated in 2006 to 20,760 projected for 2026). The statements regarding Malmesbury Community Area in Appendix 4 of Topic Paper 17 may apply to the villages but do not apply to the town. The town’s Primary Schools are full and it is not sustainable to make village schools viable by sending pupils from the town to them. However this is the only way for education to be provided for any new housing, including those being built or with outstanding planning permission. It has been suggested that a meeting of the Area Board on 22 March 2011 provided evidence of agreement in the community for some growth. At that meeting the four growth options outlined in Topic Paper 17 (Natural change, Population led, Economic led & Job alignment led) were presented suggesting between 1,000 and 1,700 new houses are needed here. These options were not properly put in the context of the whole County nor was it explained how the figures for Malmesbury had been calculated. With the more detailed information now available the basis for the calculations is still unclear. The proposed one third increase in the number of dwellings in the period follows a dramatic increase in the size of the town since 1980. Even this proposed excessive scale of development will not deliver the Primary School capacity which that previous expansion now requires. As there are no plans to deliver this essential infrastructure in accordance with the proposed Core Policy 2 there should be no additional housing delivered in the town during the policy period. There were outstanding permissions for 139 dwellings when the documents were prepared for which there is no local Primary School capacity. Expansion since 2001 has merely exacerbated the problems of in and out commuting. Dyson, employing over 1,300 and still recruiting, attracts young people many of whom do not wish to live in the town. Most people moving into the town work elsewhere. It is easier for those living to the north of the town to travel to work and shop elsewhere. This is due to the town centre being on a hill top nearly surrounded by river valleys. Expansion on the outskirts has put pressure on education provision and other infrastructure without commensurate benefit to local retailers and recreation providers. Although Wessex Water has carried out extensive works to improve the sewer connection between the town and the sewage farm this has not completely solved the problem. Overflows of raw sewage still occur in the Tetbury Avon valley particularly during periods of heavy rain. Any development to the west or north of the town will worsen this. It is important to maintain the vitality of the town centre and to conserve its historic buildings which are essential to continuing prosperity.

Noted comment that the housing numbers need to be reconsidered. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.
| 1831 | I am very concerned about the way new housing development has been allowed to run riot in Malmesbury over recent years. We simply do not have the infrastructure to support the very high numbers of new houses that have already been built - already the recently built junior and secondary schools are under pressure with Malmesbury children having to be bussed out to village schools. It is thoughtless, greedy and irresponsible to put profit before duty to this very small town. Indeed, many of the recent newly built houses at the old Filands site remain unsold, so why must we have more? Who wants them? I would say only those who stand to make financial gain. I would ask for a halt to all further major development for a minimum of ten years so that the impact of recent mushroom developments can be properly evaluated. | SO3, CP2 SO9, CP3 | Noted comment that the housing numbers need to be reconsidered. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. |
| 1859 | Malmesbury Community Area Detailed analysis of the evidence base and topic papers is essential prior to making comprehensive representations regarding the Malmesbury community area. A realistic approach must be adopted to development outside of the principal community area settlement. Successive local plans have denuded the ability for 'infilling' to contribute meaningfully to the provision of dwellings in the rural area, a policy context that places development in the 'most sustainable locations' without reliance on an artificially defined boundary to a given settlement is the most appropriate method to deliver essential residential and commercial development, at an appropriate scale in the rural context. | CP1 | Comments noted. CP1 states that most development will be small sites within existing development boundaries in Large and Small Villages. |
| 1881 | This Council is generally supportive of the spatial strategy set out for the Malmesbury Community Area as set out in Core Policy 13. The Parish Council would expect to see the majority of the 1200 new homes required to be provided in the MCA actually being provided in and around Malmesbury. We do not consider that the figure of 760 units mentioned in the text accompanying this policy should be modified so as to result in any additional units being required to be provided elsewhere in the MCA. We consider that the balance is about right. We were slightly surprised by the lack of guidance given in this section of the Core Strategy to development outside of the settlement of Malmesbury (152 dwellings) no mention is made of the future development needs or aspirations in relation to any other settlement. We have no problem with this, provided that such guidance is in due course incorporated into a Neighbourhood Plan. However, should no such plan be prepared, we would want to be assured that the aspirations and future development needs of Sherston are noted and that a number of specific planning issues are addressed. In which case there ought at least to be some mention made of some or all of these at this stage in the plan process. The following issues have already been identified as being of relevance in this regard: 1. The need to identify a site for a new doctors surgery. 2. The need to expand the existing primary school. 3. The need for some form elderly persons accommodation in the village. 4. The need for new allotments. 5. The need to provide improved sports facilities for the village. 6. The need to provide for future employment opportunities - at the Old School and elsewhere in and around the village. 7. The need to identify a site for a new vicarage and an expanded cemetery. | CP1 | Noted comment that there is a lack of guidance on development outside of the town. Further work is being carried out on delivering the spatial strategy. Detailed issues and development in Sherston will be addressed though a Neighbourhood Plan. |
1963

5.9.1 The assumption here is that Malmesbury is and always has been the focal point of the villages for employment/education etc historically this is not true the villages had a life of their own and were very much a community of school/church/shop etc. More housing and school places in the villages could reinvigorate these villages. 5.9.3 There are contradictions here if ... "there has been a high level of development in recent years" and "it is not realistic to plan for significant growth" why is there a proposal that Malmesbury should get a disproportionate number of houses compared to other Wiltshire towns? Is this based on Dysons? Surely the employment offered by Dysons has significantly decreased in recent years. 5.9.2 says "there is small employment here"! 5.9.6 Is the implication here that the extra school Primary School places need to be be funded by house developers or "others" rather than Councils? Is that (a) viable? (b) desirable? Won't the reality be a scramble for places and unsavoury competition until the places emerge. 5.9.7 Although the word "community" is used there is no attempt in the document to interpret/define the word or recognise where community exists already or will have to be created etc. A sociological look at the historical development of Malmesbury might help planning of "new" housing and development. Historic Malmesbury is not just "the town centre - Corn Gastos, Milbourne, Filands are all historic communities Table 5.16 When does a Primary school just become too big? My general concern, as can be gauged from my replies, is that not enough attention is paid as yet to local knowledge including historical understanding when deciding development, which has resulted in allowing economics to overwhelmingly control planning. ie too many houses planned for a small town, too little account of community feeling.

SO3, CP2

Noted comment that the housing numbers need to be reconsidered. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation.

1973

The Consultation Doc is wide ranging, attempts to say and do everything right and is - inevitably - thin on key details. It will not be possible, especially given the current financial climate, to achieve all its aims. In the process therefore of prioritising aims can I suggest the following: 1. Malmesbury needs steady economic growth. A priority, before housing is considered, is to ensure support for such growth that will establish businesses in the area that can provide a range of jobs for local people and incomers. This will need land, premises and financial support. 2. The pressure for increased housing in Malmesbury seems to stem more from Central Government demands as from local needs. As many others have pointed out, the town has expanded greatly in the last 15 years. There are empty houses and current planning in hand. There may be need for more housing in 15 years but it is not a general current priority. Where there is a need is for housing stock that will allow first time buyers a toehold and help fuel the economic prosperity of the town. This seems to be unlikely from developer led housing and requires County leadership. 3. Again, as others have pointed out, the local infrastructure cannot currently cope with expansion. Inability to plan for population growth has bedevilled school plans over the last 20 years (as when Reeds Farm was developed) and we are there again. Primary and secondary places need to be planned and financed soon; what house buyer will be tempted to a new home in Malmesbury where there are no school places for their children? And where can such new building take place in a way that maintains the town’s balance? Health care faces the same problems. 4. Financial pressure pushes planners to accept the terms offered by developers who have their own financial interests, unsurprisingly, closer to their hearts than the needs of the community. Reeds Farm development has not brought substantial community advances to the town and any future development must be on Malmesbury’s term’s not the developers’. Malmesbury will fight its own battles here in the future but we expect Wiltshire to support us to ensure the high quality of planning and construction to meet the community’s needs that you promise in the Consultation. 5. Malmesbury faces particular geographical constraints. It cannot expand from its centre; traffic is already heavy; town centre retail services are under extreme pressure. It needs a sympathetic approach to maintain and confirm its life, history and heritage. These are easy things to promise - as your Consultation does not detail...
Overview: The schools are full, healthcare facilities full or thereabouts, the town centre suffers significant congestion at busy times of the day and there are effectively false levels of employment figures due to the mass influx of Dyson employees on a daily basis. Dyson aside, Malmesbury is most definitely a dormitory town, forcing residents into their cars to commute elsewhere. This will increase exponentially if Malmesbury is subjected to the level of development proposed for the town, particularly when taking into account the number of houses currently lying empty and sites with planning permission where works have yet to be completed. Schools it is unclear as to exactly who will be addressing the education issues. If development is to be community led and not by financially driven developers, a plan should be drawn up by the local educational authority in advance of developer involvement. If Malmesbury Primary School cannot be extended, then perhaps housing development should be directed towards villages that have the capacity. Villages may also benefit in other ways, such as introduced feasibility of a village shop. Malmesbury Secondary School would be under the same pressure on its capacity either way so I would want to see a guarantee that 106 payments (or equivalent) would be allocated to providing these school places. Employment: Employment figures in Malmesbury are skewed by the fact that the majority of staff employed by Dyson do not, nor wish to live in Malmesbury. Therefore, Malmesbury should be treated as currently being a ‘dormitory’ town. Employment opportunities most definitely need to be addressed prior to residential development, if we are to rectify the current shortfall of employment opportunities in Malmesbury and yet only 1ha of land has been proposed for commercial development, which does not equate to providing anywhere near the employment required for the inhabitants of the proposed number of new dwellings. We believe it is important to note that the current exodus of residents commuting elsewhere quite straightforwardly means that there is NO more housing required to support local employment. The Core Strategy states: ‘The town's proximity to the M4 and the A429 should provide the impetus required for attracting increased employment growth’. The proximity of Malmesbury to these two highways has not changed so unless Wiltshire Council is aware of any progress demands? Can Wiltshire ensure that “progress” is not housing led?

Housing Infrastructure Economy Retail

Concern regarding housing development and appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Noted comment that the housing requirement should be more evenly distributed to Malmesbury and the villages. Further work will be carried out on the distribution of housing. Noted comment that employment must come forward prior to housing development and that 1ha of employment land is not sufficient. Noted comment that ‘economic diversification’ must be defined. Further work will be carried out on employment provision. Noted comment that impact on the town centre must be avoided. Core policy 13 states that any proposals for new retail development must contribute towards the enhancement of the town centre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Core Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Core Policy 13 identifies the larger villages to include Sherston, but with the smaller villages of Luckington, Alderton and Sopworth either identified as smaller villages or as a settlement not suitable for development. In the case of the noted villages other than Sherston, including Luckington, it is a fact that these villages often share community facilities and with opportunities for additional employment or housing sites that would assist in sustaining or regenerating these individual or groups of rural communities. Not to allow for appropriate new development or redevelopment will therefore lead to stagnation and/or decline and reinforce the likelihood of private car transport being used for people to access jobs in the local larger settlements. Policies should therefore allow for suitable new development or redevelopment opportunities that will support both the rural economy and community interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>Noted comment that consideration should be given to how groups of villages such as Sherston, Luckington, Alderton and Sopworth, function together and that there should be greater flexibility for development in rural areas. Further work will be carried out through the spatial strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2163</td>
<td>Question 13 - Malmesbury Community Area (Core Policy 13) New developments will need to consider the impact on the River Avon floodplain with regard to biodiversity issues.</td>
<td>SO5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have no objection to the identification of Community Areas within the Core Strategy or to the identification of specific growth requirements for each of the areas, including individual settlements. These representations relate in particular to the Malmesbury Community Area and specifically to future growth of Malmesbury Town. Whilst we have raised objection to the reduced housing target for Wiltshire as a whole, we have no specific objection to the identified housing requirement for the Malmesbury Community Area and Malmesbury Town set out within Table 5.15 and Core Strategy Policy CP13. We concur that there are few opportunities for housing development within the settlement boundary and that greenfield land on the edge of the settlement will be required to meet the identified housing need within Malmesbury (WCSCD – Para 5.9.7). This has been evidenced within the the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (March 2008) which identified very limited previously developed land suitable for housing within the town. The Wiltshire 2026 consultation document also identified that greenfield land will be required to meet local housing requirements. However, Core Policy 13 proposes that there will be no strategic housing sites allocated in Malmesbury and that future housing sites will be identified through a Neighborhood Plan or site allocations DPD. This is backward step from the Wiltshire 2026 document which indicated that the Council was looking to identify housing sites to meet need and sought representations to this effect. The rationale for not now making housing allocations within Malmesbury is set out within Technical Paper 14 – Site Selection Process. This seeks to establish that the scale of housing development required for Malmesbury is not of such strategic significance to warrant allocation within the Core Strategy. We object to this approach because: · The outstanding requirement of 287 dwellings may be a small proportion of the overall housing target for Wiltshire, but it is highly significant for the continued growth of Malmesbury. · There is an immediate need, of which the Council is already aware, for affordable housing within the town and it recognises that development on greenfield land on the edge of the settlement is required to meet it. · There are, as the Council is already aware, limited opportunities on the edge of the town which will provide deliverable/developable housing sites. · The Council has been provided with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that land off Park Road is one such site where housing development can take place without any significant adverse impacts[2] - ie the exercise of allocation is feasible now. Therefore, the Council is holding back inappropriately the allocation of housing land at Malmesbury Town and this only serves to exasperate local housing issues which are central to the Core Strategy. It has sufficient evidence at its disposal to allocate greenfield sites on the edge of the Town without holding up progress of the Core Strategy. The proposal to defer site allocations is therefore contrary to PPS12 (Para 4.6) concerning strategic allocations and PPS3 (Paras S2-57) which requires a flexible and deliverable supply of housing sites. It is also not reflective of current advice from DCLG which encourages development and the timely delivery of strategic objectives [Ministerial Statement “Planning for Growth” dated 23 March 2011 and draft NPPF Paras 13 & 26]. Furthermore, Core Policy 13 also proposes a phasing restriction to ensure that development of greenfield sites can only commence when sufficient provision of primary school places has been forthcoming. We have no objection to the principle of developer contributions towards necessary infrastructure improvements required as a result of proposals (see above). However, the phasing policy as currently drafted would be self-defeating as contributions from housing development are a major source of funding for education improvement projects. Any policy that would limit the ability of the Council to grant planning permission for major housing development will also restrict the ability to move forward with plans to improve educational facilities. It is necessary to have a mechanism in place whereby the Council can build up a pot of resources for infrastructure projects. The allocation of housing sites within the Core Strategy would provide greater certainty as to where such resources would come from. The capacity of primary schools should therefore not be presented as a
reason to delay site allocations on the edge of Malmesbury town. [2] Planning Application 11/01382/OUT for 77 houses at Park Lane Malmesbury where all matters concerning flooding, drainage, highways, transport (subject to a S106 contribution of £10k) ecology, education (subject to the S106 contribution of c.£560k), housing (subject to the affordable housing provision), water services, archaeology, noise and contamination have been resolved.

We support the Council's acknowledgement that there is a lack of convenience retail offer in Malmesbury town centre and that many residents currently have to travel outside the community area to shop for their day-to-day needs. As such, there is scope for some convenience retail development of an appropriate scale during the plan period. We also support the proposed diversification of the employment base within Malmesbury which aims to help strengthen the local economy and reduce out-commuting.

The Agency agrees that it is not realistic for Malmesbury to accommodate significant growth because of its rural setting and location, however, local housing may be appropriate in some instances to contribute towards alleviating affordability issues in the area. We are concerned that the M4 and A429 are identified as providing the impetus for attracting increased employment growth in the town. As and when sites come forward the Agency will be able to provide more detailed commentary. The Agency acknowledges the intention to provide 1ha of employment land, the supporting of Principal Employment Areas and 1,200 dwellings in the community over the plan period (2006-2026).

Core Policy 13 - largely supported but considered to be inappropriately worded in some areas. Hannick Homes and Developments Ltd supports the conclusions that there is not an appropriate level of previously developed sites to support the growth required for Malmesbury and that non-strategic green field sites will be required. The increase in housing requirement for the Community Area is also supported; however the proportion of this development to be provided in other smaller settlements is not tested by the Sustainability Assessment and should not therefore be supported. In particular, the addition of Crudwell, Oaksey and Sherston as large villages and six further small villages of Luckington, Lea, Corston, Milbourne, Charlton, Brinkworth, Upper Minety and Minety as suitable locations for development is not supported. Hannick Homes and Development Ltd notes that the Malmesbury and the Villages Community Plan has been published and that this covers the period 2009-2013. It is understood that this will be revised and updated to become a Neighbourhood Plan under the Government's Neighbourhood Planning Front Runner scheme and a funding bid has been put to Wiltshire Council. The geographic extent of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan will include the parishes of Malmesbury, St Paul Malmesbury without and Brokenborough with the timetable for the adoption as November 2012. It is noted that Policy 13 identifies a Neighbourhood Plan as a vehicle for identifying non strategic sites. Hannick Homes and Development Ltd also notes that the primary school is reported to be operating close to its capacity and additional capacity will be required. However, the relevant clause in Policy 13 states that 'if new edge of town green field development is required, this should be phased and only commence when sufficient provision of primary school places has been forthcoming'. (My emphasis) It is clear that new edge of town green field development is required and the identification of such sites through the Neighbourhood Plan or site allocations DPD applies suitable phasing. However, if the school is at capacity any new site which impacts on that capacity whether green field or not will need to address that capacity issue. Therefore the clause should be amended as follows: 'New development will only be able to commence once sufficient primary school capacity has been identified.'
2. OVERVIEW We support much of the detail contained in Chapter 5.9 of the Community area Strategy for Malmesbury particularly: The requirement to retain historical assets and the environment. The requirement to support and enhance employment in and around Malmesbury The requirement to support and enhance retailing in and around Malmesbury. We strongly feel that our tenants would support the provision of better retail facilities in and around Malmesbury. The requirement for suitable housing particularly for local people. We feel that your Core Strategy 13 may have been appropriate in the past but believe in the present economic climate we need to look at things differently and to allow development to support our community. We see the development of a balanced and structured Neighbourhood Plan as fundamental to Malmesbury’s future. This should involve the local villages if they do not develop their own plan. Given its location with such good communications to the M4 and beyond Malmesbury should look to consolidate its position as an important market town. We see the importance of the promotion of tourism and particularly hotel space in Malmesbury as the gateway to the Cotswolds. There is a requirement for more to do in Malmesbury. As with many County strategic development plans the proposed plan is too restrictive on the development of Malmesbury’s surrounding villages and the rural communities. These villages need to evolve and to develop within their existing framework and not just remain as they are in some sort of 'time warp'.

3. WHAT CAN THE CHARLTON PARK ESTATE OFFER

On the basis of the comments above Charlton Park Estate puts forward the following detailed proposals for inclusion in the Core Strategy: A. Employment Opportunities Employment opportunities and employment land. This should include the development of land for employment following on from the development of retail sites. For example the land numbered 1 on the attached plan. Equally this area of land could be identified for a hotel or leisure use. The estate has numerous redundant buildings and farmsteads - it is much better to develop sites than allow them to fall into disrepair and to provide employment or living accommodation to allow the rural areas to thrive and evolve. We would refer particularly to: Brokenborough Farm, Brokenborough, Brook Farm, Hankerton, Buildings within Charlton Park. B. Schooling and Residential Development We note the requirement for at least one further school site. We put forward the land numbered 2 on the attached plan but there are other sites that could equally be put forward on estate land, if a Greenfield site is favoured. We would welcome the opportunity to look at residential development on such sites to include affordable housing. C. Village opportunities Given that villages such as Charlton should be allowed to evolve any future development should be identified as part of a Neighbourhood Plan but we would in particular identify the following infill sites in Charlton as shown on plan attached: Vicarage Farm Buildings, Vicarage Lane (numbered 3) Land adjoining the Horse and Groom (numbered 4) There may be other sites that come forward but equally there other larger sites within the village which might form the basis of a mixture of affordable housing and high quality residential housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP1, spatial strategy</th>
<th>SO3, housing</th>
<th>SO1, economy Site selection process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted support for the overall strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted recommendation that tourism and hotel space should be encouraged in the area - paragraph 5.9.2 recognises the role Malmesbury has as a tourist location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted comment that development is too restrictive in rural areas. The settlement strategy in core policy 1 intends to offer a more flexible framework for rural development in the right locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted sites put forward for a number of uses namely Charlton Park Estate, Brokenborough Farm and Brook Farm, Hankerton for employment or leisure use, and sites on the Charlton Farm Estate that may be suitable for a primary school and residential use. These can be considered through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spatial strategy Housing Economy Site selection process
| 2608 | Core Policy 13 - We object to the wording of Policy CP13 as currently drafted and strongly recommend that a strategic site allocation is identified at Malmesbury. A number of potential housing sites within Malmesbury have already been assessed as part of the Strategic Sites Background Paper (2009) and preferred locations for development identified as two sites: one site to the west of Tetbury Hill on land at Sunhaven and one site to the north west of Feeds Farm Estate. The sites were described as being well related to the employment land and the existing built form of Malmesbury. No major constraints were identified. As the policy is currently drafted (i.e. without a strategic allocation) it fails to accord with national policy and is contrary to the advice set out in PPS12. Paragraph 4.5 explains that "It is essential that the Core Strategy makes clear spatial choices about where development should go in broad terms" Simply following the existing settlement hierarchy does not give a strong enough vision or clear spatial direction for how areas and places will develop over the plan period. We are concerned that the lack of clear spatial direction will result in development not being delivered in the areas that have been identified and acute need for housing. Furthermore we are concerned that the lack of strategic site allocation will lead to piecemeal development, which will lack sufficient strategic infrastructure for the town and existing residents. A strategic allocation which allows for a comprehensive approach to housing delivery can deliver the appropriate level of infrastructure in order to bring forward significant community benefits for the town. We object to the wording in Core Policy 13 which currently drafted states that, "if new edge of town green field development is required, this shsould be phased and only commence when sufficient provision of primary school places has been forthcoming" |
| 2635 | OBJECT Due to the high level of development in recent years the community area total should be phased with the greater portion of development taking place towards the end of the Plan period. Only non-strategic sites within the community area will be identified through a Neighbourhood Plan which will inform the DPD. Greenfield development should only be considered if there is sufficient employment available at the time and there are primary school places available in order to balance housing growth. |
| 2715 | OBJECT Due to the high level of development in recent years the community area total should be phased with the greater portion of development taking place towards the end of the Plan period. Only non-strategic sites within the community area will be identified through a Neighbourhood Plan which will inform the OPO. Greenfield development should only be considered if there is sufficient employment available at the time and there are primary school places available in order to balance housing growth. |
| 2779 | With respect to Malmesbury - Any out of town businesses should have a minimum effect on the High Street. The 267 houses designated for the Malmesbury area are not enough to generate a new primary school so given the current taxing of children to village schools, any new development should occur in the villages, where shops, pubs etc. are closing, and where there is usually capacity in the Primary school. |
| 2790 | Re 5.9.3 Whist I welcome the acknowledgement of the high level of development since 2006 and the recommendation that further development will be phased towards the latter half of the plan period, and that it is not realistic to plan for significant growth, I have attached a paper which I wrote for the Malmesbury + District Conservation Area Group entitled "The Impact of Development on the Conservation Area". I believe this is critical to the core strategy. |
The definition of Minety, particularly as it is closely associated with the nearby settlement of Upper Minety, as a small village denies the availability of employment and community facilities including public houses, together with a Post Office/shop. By comparison Minety together with Upper Minety as a whole should be properly described as a ‘Large Village’ and is undoubtedly comparable with those villages in this community area so defined.

Persimmon Homes support the identification of Malmesbury as a Market Town in Core Policy 13. However, objection is raised to the level of development proposed in the Malmesbury Community Area, including at Malmesbury. It is noted that non-strategic sites will be identified through a Neighbourhood Plan or Site Allocations DPD. Persimmon Homes consider that land at Reeds Farm, Malmesbury should be allocated for development. [further details provided in hard copy report]

I write to put forward the views and concerns of Malmesbury & District Chamber of Commerce, regarding the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document. The greatest concerns of the Chamber of Commerce are that new jobs have not yet been provided to support the sustainability of large scale residential developments built in the early part of the plan period and that infrastructure issues exacerbated by such developments have put pressure particularly on existing town centre businesses. It appears that 1ha of land has been allocated for commercial development in Malmesbury, which we do not believe will equate to an adequate level of employment provision based on even the minimum assumed increase in population during the plan period. Furthermore, the Chamber is concerned that if there is no requirement for such commercial development to actually take place, any such applications may potentially never get further than achieving permission. The Chamber would like to see strong levels of support to retain town centre businesses with additional opportunities for small businesses to be located in the area. Commercial premises must be retained at an affordable cost for commercial enterprise to prosper. In a recent survey undertaken by the Chamber, the potential loss of town centre shops was raised as an issue presenting a challenge to other businesses in the area. Commercial premises must be retained at an affordable cost for commercial enterprise to prosper. In a recent survey undertaken by the Chamber, the potential loss of town centre shops was raised as an issue presenting a challenge to other businesses in the area. The Chamber is concerned that any additional convenience retail to be considered must be subjected to a full impact assessment specifically to ensure that it does not detract from town centre trade. The Chamber would strongly prefer to see any development of this nature to be town centre or edge of centre located and restricted to food only. The Chamber would also want to see provisions in place to promote town centre shops and businesses in the event that any additional convenience retail is approved. Infrastructure issues including internet connectivity, roads, traffic and parking must also be addressed prior to any further development as without this, businesses in the town centre will suffer. Additionally, if infrastructure issues cannot be resolved, the Chamber is concerned that additional residential developments may eventually result in a new town bolted on to the old town, taking trade away from the town centre. The Chamber would strongly question how this would benefit the town and therefore whether any such developments should be allowed to proceed at all in these circumstances. The Chamber supports the statement within the Core Strategy; “future growth must be balanced, with economic development alongside housing and at a scale that is appropriate to maintaining the self sufficiency of the town.” Finally, to confirm, I write this letter as a committee member with the full backing of Chairman, Paul Baker.

Noted comment that Minety and Upper Minety should be considered together as a Large Village. Further work will be carried out through the spatial strategy.

Noted comment that Reeds Farm should be allocated for development. A strategic site has not been proposed in Malmesbury - further information on the justification can be found in topic paper 14. Non-strategic sites will be taken forward through a neighbourhood plan or site allocations dpd.

Noted concern that not enough new jobs are provided to balance the housing growth proposed for the town. Further work will be carried out on the level of employment land required in the town and will be included in the submission document. The requirement set will not be a limit. Any retail proposals will need to provide an impact assessment to show that there are no significant impacts on the town centre. Further initiatives to improve the viability and vitality of the town centre can be addressed through the neighbourhood planning process. Small sites for development will be identified with the local community through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism.
528 houses built and 221 proposed houses is a sufficient expansion that already causes problems with parking and movement around this historic and beautiful town. Please do not turn this characterful and community-based small town into part of a commuter belt. There are existing brown sites in Trowbridge and Chippenham that should be built on first where infrastructures can accommodate the expanding population. In addition a substantial proportion of the 528 houses already built remain empty – so why does Malmesbury require more. The only way to protect the high quality tourist attractions such as Malmesbury Abbey and the town's historic uniqueness is not to build more houses but make the most of what we have. There is not sufficient parking in the town centre for residents, the primary schools have reached full capacity and the infrastructure is old and fragile. The proposed developments will only destroy Malmesbury as a community and tourist attraction and reduce the quality of life for the present residents and visitors. Please do not build any more houses in and around Malmesbury.

Noted objection to housing growth. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation. Concern regarding appropriate infrastructure provision in Malmesbury noted. Infrastructure needs to be delivered in line with development (CP3). It is recognised that there are infrastructure issues in Malmesbury, specifically primary school capacity issues. Further work will be carried out to resolve this issue through the neighbourhood planning process or another planning mechanism. Further work will be carried out on empty homes in the town. Parking issues can be addressed through the neighbourhood planning process.
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