Responses to Question 8 –
Trowbridge Low-Carbon,
Renewable Energy Network -
Core Policy 8
Please note that this document should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Statement January 2012 Report and the User Guide for the Record of Comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Representations on Core Policy 8 - Trowbridge Low Carbon Renewable Energy Network I note from the consultation document that it is proposed that the site in Court Street, Trowbridge owned by Prospect Land Ltd (and labelled &quot;Prospect Land&quot; on Map 5.7) is to be included in the renewable energy network and as such, it is proposed to be designated as a site where consideration must be given to the use of a proposed low carbon district energy heat network when redevelopment occurs. The site is small (approximately 0.5 acres) and is heavily constrained with its proximity to the River Biss, adjacent listed buildings and a main sewer running through the site. To place any further obligations on the site will only hinder its development. Prospect Land Ltd therefore does not wish to have the Court Street site included in the district low-carbon energy Proposals.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Any proposals for development will need to comply with national policy which includes changes to Building Regulations and so connecting to an energy network may improve the viability of development on this site. The proposed policy suggests that options will be considered through the preparation of a Sustainable Energy Strategy which would take account of site specific issues.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Question 8. Trowbridge Town Council agrees with the proposed energy network. Map 5.7 The Shires Gateway should read 'The Gateway'</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>We are concerned that this policy, although with laudable intentions, might deter developers. Trowbridge may not therefore be the right place for this.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>The policy includes consideration for viability and offers potential to enable development could make development sites more attractive.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>We support the proposed Trowbridge low carbon/renewable energy network as outlined. We hope it will be made to sound so attractive that potential developers see it as an incentive rather than a disincentive to investing in Trowbridge Community Area.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>In principle, I support the development of renewable energy networks, but Core Policy 8 - Trowbridge Low-Carbon, Renewable Energy Network does not give much detail on what exactly it would entail. Furthermore, it is not clear why such a strategy is being proposed at Trowbridge only. If a larger population is required than say market towns can offer, then why isn’t it being supported for Salisbury and Chippenham? If market towns are sufficiently large, then why are there no proposals for at least a trial in one of them? Bradford-on-Avon has already indicated its enthusiasm to be carbon neutral by 2050 so would a potential market town site.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>CP 8 has been developed as there are particular opportunities relating to planned and potential development opportunities. Other such schemes in other towns would be supported through CP 26.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>Agree There does, however need to be an approach that ensures developers are not put off by excessive demands.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Noted. It is clear within the requirements of the Sustainable Energy Strategy that viability should be assessed on a site by site basis.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991</td>
<td>Yes, but would question commitment and deliverability, especially as works to County Hall are already underway.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>The County Hall modifications are compatible with any future energy network.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>By and large yes, but I would hope that any measures taken will not be allowed to spoil the environment in any way, and that the public would be consulted.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Any proposals would be assessed on a case by case basis and be subject to the normal planning application process.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>We support the proposal for a low-carbon renewable district energy/heat network in Trowbridge and we would encourage similar developments in other community areas (given the appropriate environmental protection and enhancement), particularly Chippenham and Salisbury.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Support welcome.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>Cheaper bus travel and train travel will take cars off the roads. More individual shops. Not supermarket giants. Produce local products. IE grow more. 1. Consult with everyone it effects 2. Vote on it. 3. Get on with it/build it/act on it 4. Don't waste public money IE revamp Town halls civil centres.</td>
<td>SO2/ SO8</td>
<td>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the WCS.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>The following points were again discussed at last nights Parish Council Meeting. 1 No adequate improvements to the A35 around Yambrook. The round about suggestion will not remove the long peak time queues. 2 No new school planned in the Hilperton Gap area. 3 More reasonably priced car parking will be needed in Trowbridge. 4 Inadequate use of town centre brown field sites. 5 Many long term vacant commercial properties in the area, particularly the failing White Horse Business Park. 6 The new housing will increase the flooding in the river Biss. 7 The railway service needs to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>I support the proposed low carbon energy network provided that detailed studies show it to be economically viable. It must be clear at implementation who is going to pay if the network is uneconomic.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>This matter is covered by response to ID 296 above.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Policy 8 Trowbridge Low Carbon Renewable Energy Network I realise that this is a vitally important matter but I object to the stipulation that applications for development “must demonstrate how these matters have been considered in preparing the proposal” because I think it might frighten developers off coming to Trowbridge and it would be preferable to ask potential developers what contribution to energy saving they feel they could realistically make.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>This matter is covered by response to ID 296 above.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>The energy &amp; heat exchange network must be proved in economic terms. Where is the detailed analysis?</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>This matter is covered by response to ID 296 above. A detailed feasibility study has been undertaken which is available as part of the evidence supporting the WCS.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2158</td>
<td>Core Policy 8 - We support the principle of renewable energy networks.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Support welcome.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2372</td>
<td>Core Policy 8  Map 5.7 “Trowbridge energy network area of potential” at page 61 of the Core Strategy Consultation Document identifies a number of sites (and a red line) that Core Policy 8 infers provide an “area of potential” for the development of a low-carbon renewable district energy / heat network. Although it is not explained by the Core Strategy, we understand the area of potential is taken from the “Energy Opportunity map for Trowbridge” which is part of the Wiltshire Sustainable Energy Study. Whilst we recognise that Core Policy 8 does not put explicit demands on major development (it requires that major developments “give consideration” for future routing, network expansion and the development of energy hubs) it is important that the Core Strategy should also have regard to economic considerations in its promotion of the regeneration of sites within Trowbridge. Accordingly, Core Policy 8 should include recognition that feasibility and viability will be key considerations in assessing a scheme’s ability to contribute to a Trowbridge Energy Network</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>This matter is covered by response to ID 296 above. The map is derived from a specific feasibility study examining the opportunity for district energy in Trowbridge centre. This will be made clearer in the text.</td>
<td>Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2625</td>
<td>AGREE to item 1 With regard to item 2 the network should relate to reduced areas for development.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2707</td>
<td>AGREE to item 1 With regard to item 2 the network should relate to reduced areas for development.</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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