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Community area infrastructure profiles
(Based on information gathered during the Wiltshire 2026 consultation)

The following information has been obtained through discussions and further correspondence with infrastructure service providers during the Wiltshire 2026 public consultation. It is intended to give a picture of the likely infrastructure issues and needs for community areas. Comments relate to the draft strategic site options, which are included at the end of Appendix 2.

Further comment will be sought from infrastructure service providers during the preparation of a draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which will be published alongside the submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy towards the end of 2011.

South Wiltshire Community Areas

Information on infrastructure requirements for community areas in south Wiltshire has been gathered as part of the preparation for the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, which has been the subject of an Examination in Public. That document, and the associated Topic Paper 17 on Infrastructure, should be referred to, to see what the infrastructure requirements are for those community areas, and can be viewed at:

www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategysubmissiondraft

The evidence base for the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, including the associated Topic Paper 17 on Infrastructure, can be viewed at:

www.wiltshire.gov.uk/southwiltshirecorestrategyevidencebase
### Major Settlements

1. Chippenham
2. Trowbridge

### Market Towns

3. Bradford on Avon
4. Calne
5. Corsham
6. Devizes
7. Malmesbury
8. Marlborough
9. Melksham
10. Tidworth
11. Warminster
12. Westbury
13. Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

### Draft strategic site options

Draft strategic site options
1 Chippenham

Town context

1.1 Chippenham is designated a Strategically Significant Town and is therefore identified for significant housing and employment growth. There are a number of regeneration opportunities in the town centre and the ‘Chippenham Vision’ group consists of a number of private and public partners who are developing a strategy to deliver the regeneration of Chippenham town centre. It is well connected by the M4 and intercity rail links. In recent years there has been a lack of available housing land in Chippenham and work is being advanced to ensure land is available for development. A strategic site will ensure that development in Chippenham is self-contained and delivered in a holistic manner.

Overall level of growth

1.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver a further 4,000 additional houses in Chippenham for the plan period 2006 – 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

1.3 The following table shows the proposed housing allocation for Chippenham, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 1.1 Proposed housing allocation for Chippenham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 identified a surplus of potential employment land in Chippenham, of which it recommended that 42.86ha will provide an adequate supply for the plan period.

Draft strategic site options

Preferred option - Land to the north and east of Chippenham

1.5 The preferred option would deliver 800 houses to the north of Chippenham, 2,850 houses to the east of Chippenham, and 350 houses in central Chippenham over the plan period.

1.6 The preferred option comprises the following potential housing sites:

(Northern area)

- land north east of Chippenham, between Malmesbury Road and Maud Heath Cause
- land north of Chippenham

(Eastern area)

- land east of Chippenham
• land north of London Road and west of Stanley Lane
• land south west of Abbeyfield School

1.7 The preferred option also includes the following potential/ or intensification of existing employment sites, which would need to deliver 42.86 ha of employment land over the plan period:

• land at Showell Farm
• land at Hunter’s Moon
• land at Hill Corner
• land at Langley Park
• land at east Chippenham

Option 2 - Land east of Chippenham

1.8 Option 2 would deliver 3,650 houses to the east of Chippenham, and 350 houses in central Chippenham over the plan period.

1.9 Option 2 comprises the following potential housing sites:

• land east of Chippenham
• land north of London Road and west of Stanley Lane
• land south west of Abbeyfield School

Option 3 - Land south of Chippenham

1.10 Option 3 would deliver 3,650 houses to the south of Chippenham and 350 houses in central Chippenham over the plan period.

1.11 This option comprises the following potential housing sites:

• land south of Pewsham
• land south of Pewsham Way
• land at Forest Farm

1.12 Option 3 also includes the following potential/ or intensification of existing employment sites, which would need to deliver 42.86 ha of employment land over the plan period:

• land at Showell Farm
• land at Hunter’s Moon
• land at Hill Corner
• land at Langley Park

Option 4 - Land to the north and south of Chippenham

1.13 Option 4 would deliver 800 houses to the north of Chippenham, 2,850 houses to the south of Chippenham, and 350 houses in central Chippenham over the plan period.

1.14 This option comprises the following potential housing sites:

(Northern area)

• land north east of Chippenham between Malmesbury Road and Maud Heath Cause
• land north of Chippenham
(Southern area)

- land south of Pewsham
- land south of Pewsham Way
- land at Forest Farm

1.15 Option 4 also includes the following potential/ or intensification of existing employment sites, which would need to deliver 42.86 ha of employment land over the plan period:

- land at Showell Farm
- land at Hunter’s Moon
- land at Hill Corner
- land at Langley Park

1.16 All of the options for Chippenham include the strategic regeneration site. This incorporates the development of two previously developed sites in Chippenham town centre:

- land at Middlefield Training Centre
- land at Westinghouse Sports Ground.

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

1.17 The Highways Agency raised concerns about the eastern site, which is included in both the Preferred Option and Option 2, because of the problem of out-commuting to Junction 16 of the M4. Out-commuting is likely to increase via the M4 for any development around Chippenham, however development on the proposed northern and eastern urban extensions would most contribute to this effect. The proximity of the M4 would make these sites popular with commuters travelling to Swindon and the east of Bristol and the west. An increase in car traffic would therefore be likely.

1.18 However, Chippenham is located on the main Bristol / London railway line. The Preferred Option and Option 2 are more related to the railway station and opportunities to increase rail use may exist.

1.19 The southern site, which is included in options 3 and 4, is detached from the town; development in this location is likely to consider heavily on use of the private car and thus is not supported by the Agency. There may also be issues with sustainable and public transport to the centre.

1.20 In general, phasing of employment, schools, shopping and health facilities would also be important to help ensure self containment. Evidence would be needed to show that sustainable transport has been considered and measures and funding have been put in place to deal with them.

1.21 Before making more detailed comments, the Highways Agency would need to see the existing traffic modelling work that has been carried out for Chippenham. It would also be useful for them to have further information on the employment allocations, when this is available, as well as any recently updated population forecasts.
Local road network

1.22 The Local Highways Authority informs us that the transport assessment for Chippenham tested various areas of search in and around the town for accessibility, bus connectivity, highway capacity, journey to work, access to a railway station and rail connectivity. The periphery of Chippenham scored relatively low. This largely reflects the very low bus connectivity scores. It is likely that a development of this size would facilitate new bus connections. Further information on the scoring and specific locations of the areas of search can be found in the Wiltshire Strategic Transport Assessment, which is available from the council’s website.

1.23 A traffic model has been developed for Chippenham and scenario testing has been carried out using this model. This indicated that an increase in the number of journeys in Chippenham would be likely to lead to the A350 road to the west of Chippenham becoming increasingly congested. In turn, this is likely to lead to an increase in the number of journeys on less suitable roads. Improvements to the A350 would be required.

1.24 Resolution of significant congestion and safety problems along the Chippenham Western Bypass (A350) is an essential infrastructure requirement for Chippenham. The Chippenham Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Growth Package includes improvements to the A350 in the medium/longer term Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) programme.

1.25 A very high level of relative growth will require other transport interventions in the locale, with the expectation that solutions will be RTS compliant (i.e. broadly based on demand management). Given the demography, and the high degree of out commuting, the extent to which demand management is supported and implemented in Bristol & Bath will play a significant role in supporting/facilitating growth in Chippenham.

1.26 Access to an urban extension north east and east of Chippenham is reliant upon a new eastern distributor road, including a new railway bridge, ideally connecting the A350 Malmesbury Road with the A4 Calne Road. This would ensure that the urban extension is effectively connected into the existing road network. Further work will be carried out on the need for an eastern distributor road and the provision of a new railway bridge.

1.27 The proposed eastern urban extension could only function if a new distributor road were constructed, ideally connecting the A350 Malmesbury Road with the A4 Calne Road, which would also require a new crossing of the London/South West railway line. Without such a road, access to the site would be inadequate and through town traffic and congestion would increase. The road would ensure that the urban extension is effectively connected into the existing road network. Further work will be carried out on the need for an eastern distributor road and the provision of a new railway bridge.

1.28 The proposed southern urban extension is more remote from the town centre than alternatives. A new distributor road would also be required to facilitate access to this site and reduce through town traffic and congestion.

Bus network

1.29 The Passenger Transport Unit agrees with the Preferred Option for Chippenham, especially as the Abbeyfield Secondary School would be in close proximity to development to the east of the town.
The suggested area of development to the east of Monkton Park would be large enough to justify its own bus service (half-hourly local minibus service). It would be important to take the opportunity to link in with Monkton Park. In terms of bus services beyond Chippenham, the bus service currently serving Calne and Swindon could potentially go through the new estate. This would be in addition to the local minibus service.

The suggested area of development to the north of Chippenham would also need its own bus service, and the same would probably be true for infill development to the south west of the town centre. The need to provide three new bus services would lead to a total cost of around £600,000 pa.

With regard to Option 2, the comments made regarding the preferred option also apply except that, since there is no development to the north of Chippenham, this option would only require two additional bus services.

The total cost of Option 3 would be around £400,000 p.a. A link to Lackham College may be possible through the suggested development to the south of Pewsham. Option 4 would need three new bus services and cost around £600,000 p.a.

**Rail network**

Network Rail advise that the rail corridor between Bristol - Bath - Chippenham and Swindon has little spare capacity and what there is used for freight service diversions. However, this is sufficient to cater for the proposed introduction of the new IEP 'Super Express' from 2016 onwards and any future electrification of the Paddington to Bristol route.

The mainline from London Paddington to Bristol Temple Meads runs through Chippenham. This route has been identified for electrification in the Network RUS - Electrification; currently waiting for government approval for the electrification scheme.

This route is a core route and would be one of the first to be electrified; if work were to start today then it could possibly be complete by 2016/17. Network Rail is optimistic about the funding for this project.

The 125mph high speed trains need replacing by 2020 to meet technical and DDA requirements; so the Government has a programme to buy new trains (the Intercity Express Programme (IEP)).

If the electrification doesn’t go ahead for this part of the route then the replacement trains would need to be diesel or bi-powered; seating capacity would be impacted on as the need for a diesel traction unit would occupy potential seating accommodation.

Electrification will drive change at Chippenham; journey times are reduced and capacity increased, but the impact is unknown. DfT have some models of the impact; it may be worth contacting them for more information.

There is no difference between the options; the issues are mainly the same. It will be important to consider how people will get to the train station e.g. bus services, and what facilities there are at the station. Section 106 money may be useful for enhancing the station.

Infrastructure capacity issues will be published in the Great Western RUS Draft for consultation in September 2009. However, one emerging issue is the capacity required to operate Wiltshire Council's proposed hourly Salisbury/Westbury - Melksham - Chippenham service. This may require the re-instatement of a former platform at Chippenham station.
Water supply and sewerage

1.42 Wessex Water inform us that some modelling has already been carried out for Chippenham at the beginning of 2009 in response to a number of developer enquiries. Reference should also be made to Wessex Water's response to a previous consultation by North Wiltshire District Council, in 2008, regarding development cells in Chippenham.

1.43 The railway in Chippenham must be considered as it will need to be crossed. Public foul sewers serving Chippenham drain southwards to the Sewage Treatment Works. Surface water systems normally outfall to local land drainage systems.

1.44 **Preferred Option and Option 2** - works to bring sewers to sites in the East and North of Chippenham would be very expensive, as the sewage treatment works are to the South of Chippenham. The East area would cost around £1.6 million and the North around £900,000.

1.45 **350 dwellings Central Chippenham** - local minor improvements will generally satisfy windfall sites of less than 50 dwellings.

1.46 **800 dwellings North Chippenham** - The following information is based upon 1000 dwellings and 2.1ha of employment land.

1.47 Due to the location of the northern site at the head of an urban catchment, accommodating flows from this site has the potential to be disruptive for existing residents and traffic routes. The indicative solution proposed has sought to minimise the number of working locations. It consists of:

- Upsizing 107m of 225mm diameter sewer to 300mm diameter within the highway (Green Way Lane)
- Upsizing 135m of 300mm diameter sewer to 375 diameter within the highway (Green Way Lane)
- Upsizing 480m of 375mm diameter sewer to 450 diameter within the highway (Green Way Lane and the Hamlet)
- Replacing 143m of 450mm diameter sewer with 1200 diameter laid to new levels and installing a flow control device within the highway (Langley Road)
- In addition, a local connection is proposed to Hardenhuish SPS but costs associated with this are assumed to be nominal as the development area abuts the pumping station.

1.48 Subject to detailed appraisal off site reinforcement costs are likely to be in the region of £0.9 million. These costs are indicative and will be confirmed through engineering appraisal. It is assumed that all on site sewers will be provided for by the developer. It may be possible to construct the proposed sewer improvements in stages as the development proceeds, depending on phasing arrangements.

1.49 **2,850 dwellings East Chippenham** - The information below is based upon 3,584 dwellings and 21.13 ha employment land, 2.3ha local centre/retail and 4 schools.

1.50 **A new dedicated sewer route to the Sewage Treatment Works** would be needed and requires:

- 1030m of 375mm diameter sewer within the highway
- 870m of 375mm diameter sewer within fields
- 370m of 450mm diameter sewer within fields
- 1 Siphon under Sewage Treatment Works to the inlet works, dual 375mm diameter
1.51 Subject to detailed appraisal off site reinforcement costs are likely to be in the region of £1.65 million. These costs are indicative and will be confirmed through engineering appraisal. It is assumed that all on site sewers will be provided for by the developer. It may be possible to construct the proposed sewer improvements in stages as the development proceeds, depending on phasing arrangements.

1.52 **Option 3** - This is the cheapest option for sewerage, however the reservoirs for Chippenham are to the north of the town and there would be some expense in connecting water to the site.

1.53 Also the sewage treatment works are within the South site and a 15m radius would need to be left clear around the works and some extra space may be needed to allow room for expansion.

1.54 The following information is based upon 4,750 dwellings, 43.10ha commercial, 7.82ha school 6 schools. The areas commented on are slightly different, with the draft strategic sites extending within the employment area further to the West and bisected by the railway.

- Connections direct to the Sewage Treatment Works via two pumping stations – east and west - would be a considered solution. It is assumed that all on-site sewers and pumping stations would be provided by the developer, thus off site costs associated with the development would form a smaller part of infrastructure costs.
- The sewage treatment works in this area. A development restraint zone would need to be left clear around the works. To prevent any complaints regarding odour and fly nuisance. Furthermore extra space may be needed to allow room for expansion.

**Gas**

1.55 Wales and West Utilities advise that, in general, there are no major issues. However, to connect the north-east site to the gas mains, a relatively long, and thus more expensive, connection would be needed. This would have to snake around the built-up area at the bottom. This would affect the Preferred option and Option 2.

**Electricity**

1.56 There are two primary sub-stations in Chippenham. Scottish and Southern Electricity (SSE) would firstly look to try and supply all developments from these, secondly look at reinforcing these sub stations and only as a final solution look at installing a new primary substation within the development site. The latter option would need a 20m x 30m area.

1.57 There is no real difference between the Chippenham options, both main housing sites have a 132 Tower Line running through them. This should be regarded as a permanent feature (masterplanning can ensure that this is avoided). SSE may find that the capacity that is currently spare is used if the industrial areas are developed first and this may change which sites are easy to supply for housing.

**Economic facilities**

1.58 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership suggest that there is an opportunity to review existing developed zones and to subsequently relate any expansion of development to those areas thereby coordinating and consolidating infrastructure and services. Consequently the various plans should clearly show all existing industrial/commercial/residential zones and how the proposed expansion areas relate.

1.59 Consideration should be given to the desirability of identifying future employment sites to the North of Chippenham which provides easy access to the M4.
1.60 A key challenge is to ensure a focus on the provision of appropriate housing provision - especially affordable provision - to dovetail with - and support the long term sustainability of the development of sites for employment.

**Telecommunications**

1.61 BT Openreach confirm that all options are within existing exchange boundaries and advise that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

**Historic legacy**

1.62 The County Archaeology Service made the following comments:

- **Preferred Option** - there are no scheduled monuments. However, on the north east and south east portions, there are three previously unknown small Roman sites at New Leaze and Rawlins Farm (an archaeological survey is already being undertaken). They are Roman rural farmsteads. However, they are not of national significance and it is a case of mitigation, rather than their presence being a showstopper.

- **Options, 2, 3 and 4** - No scheduled monuments. Options 3 and 4 are preferred overall by the County Archaeology Service.

- **Employment option** - there are no scheduled monuments here, although there is some non-designated archaeology around Showells Farm.

1.63 The council's Conservation Team made the following comments:

- The allocation is centred upon the historic town centre, including large part of the Conservation Area. This clearly is not desirable. Significant development within the historic core and the sensitive river valley is clearly inappropriate.

- Preferred employment option to the east of the railway line includes a listed farmyard group, Rawlings Farm. This is clearly harmful to its setting.

- Residential option to the east of the town centre contains Hardens Farm, which is listed and the allocated area is highly visible in views into and out of the river valley and Monkton Park.

- The residential allocation needs to be contained within the road network and not encroaching further south east of Stanley Lane.

- Employment site south east of the railway between West Cepen Way and the A350 (Showell Farm - listed building) represents a further encroachment into the open countryside.

**Mineral extraction**

1.64 The council's Minerals and Waste Policy Team advise that the site in Option 3 is covered by a mineral resource zone; this would need bore hole testing to establish the quality of the deposits. If there are high quality deposits these may need to be extracted before development goes ahead. However as the area covered by the mineral resource zone is also in the flood plain it is unlikely to be built on so this may not be an issue.

**Social infrastructure requirements**

**Early years and childcare**

1.65 The council's Early Years and Childcare Team advise that, in general, childcare provision in Chippenham is currently close to full capacity. A big children's centre is currently being developed in Pewsham. Wiltshire College have recently closed their nursery and this has led to an increased
problem in Chippenham with regards to childcare provision. Monkton Park has a pre-school and a primary school. The Preferred Option would be preferred from a childcare perspective (as opposed to Option 3).

**Primary and secondary education**

1.66 The Local Education Authority describe the situation with secondary schools in Chippenham as complicated; there are two to the north of Chippenham which are oversubscribed and these also take students from South Gloucestershire. Abbeyfield Secondary School, which is within the eastern site but further to the south, has spare capacity and, in the short term, could accommodate some additional school places. There is not spare capacity at the Hardenhuish and Sheldon Secondary Schools.

1.67 For 3000 new houses, there would be a real debate about the need for a new secondary school. Modelling will need to be carried out to assess the need for a new secondary school. The reserve position is to require a site for a new secondary school. The council’s Strategic Property Service should be made aware of the need to keep some space around Abbeyfield as space for expansion.

1.68 For primary schools, three new two forms of entry (2FE) primary schools would be required in the main housing area and one new one form of entry (1FE) primary school in the northern area, with financial contributions for the infill development.

1.69 The Preferred Option is preferred by the Local Education Authority.

**Further education**

1.70 Wiltshire College suggest expanding the housing development area within the town boundary to include Cocklebury Road. They have no immediate infrastructure needs other than to plan for the replacement of buildings that are coming to the end of their useful life. By 2026, the College needs to have greatly improved its links to public transport systems (road, rail, and sustainable transport). At present this is envisaged by the following:

- **Chippenham** - implementation of a green travel plan. Strengthening links to bus a rail transport facilities which are already adjacent to the site.
- **Lackham** - the College has formed a partnership with Crest for the development of employment and housing land in the vicinity of the Lackham Campus.
- The College is reviewing its need for existing residential property with a view to some disposals in order to help fund some capital development for the Campus

**Primary health care**

1.71 NHS Wiltshire advise that there are four general practice surgeries in Chippenham and three of these are already at capacity.

1.72 There is a focus on delivering services locally; this means that there is more work for general practitioners (GPs). Usually, there are about 1700 people per GP and about 3000 people per dentist.

1.73 The large housing area would probably need a new GP practice, however it is difficult to establish one with sites being developed in phases; there might be potential for a shared site with the fire service or police. Land would need to be allocated within the site as a minimum. Greater priority given to health facilities during Section 106 negotiations, on a par with education, would be welcomed.
1.74 The hospital in Chippenham is crucial to Wiltshire. Increases in population will have a knock-on effect, especially on the community teams.

1.75 The above points apply to all of the options; there is no preference between options.

1.76 **Preferred Option and option 3** - with regard to the east site, there is a surgery with capacity to the south west of the town. This is the nearest GP Surgery but it is next to capacity itself. The development site is possibly big enough for a branch surgery but it would be difficult to build on the nearest surgery. Another option would be to develop a new, bigger building in the development and either close the existing nearby surgery or treat it as a branch surgery.

1.77 Allington Surgery is in close proximity to the north site and could potentially take the growth from there.

**Libraries**

1.78 The council's library service are that the library in Chippenham needs replacing. Regeneration sites, like the one in Chippenham town centre, will be one answer and a vision for Chippenham is in development.

**Police**

1.79 Wiltshire Police made no specific comments on Chippenham. However, their *Estates Strategy* (2008) identifies the Chippenham Police Station for redevelopment/ replacement within the next two to five years (2010 to 2013). The Strategy cites poor working conditions, electrical problems and the issues of housing non-sector staff. There is an option to rebuild on the current site.

1.80 Wiltshire Police advise that extra housing is likely to particularly affect two areas of police work; the Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) and responses to, for example, 999 emergency calls.

1.81 The Police Authority is keen to look at options for shared sites, which could be a parking space in a visible public area or office space within a community building. They are interested in further information from the council's strategic property service to see if there are opportunities cost reductions where they are leasing sites, e.g. the Road Safety Partnership base in Chippenham.

1.82 There are no ‘showstoppers’ or preferences relating to the options.

**Fire and Rescue**

1.83 Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that the developments in Chippenham equate to growth of about 25%. Extra infrastructure will be needed to cope with this growth.

1.84 Where a large new development is being planned a shared drop in centre with other services might be the best option. It may be necessary to have separate day and night centre with the day centre in or near the employment area and the night centre closer to the housing area.

1.85 The southern option is the worst as the site is furthest from the existing infrastructure.
Ambulance

1.86 Great Western Ambulance Service (GWAS) advise that the main ambulance station is to the north of the town, close to the northern part of the preferred option. It has reached the end of its useful life and the ambulance service is looking to redevelop the site (it is 7 acres including a disused training area). They are reviewing what options there are for the site and are interested in tying this site into the development if possible.

1.87 There is also a standby station located at the community hospital.

1.88 The GWAS would be looking to have enough fixed bases for breaks, these would probably need to include a standby point (20m squared with toilet facilities, tea/coffee facilities, a rest area and space to do paperwork) within the large area of housing – same for all of the options. This could be linked to a GP surgery or a community centre.

1.89 All these points apply to all options; there is no preference between them.

Cemeteries and crematoria

1.90 The council's Amenity and Countryside Service advise that the cemetery in Chippenham is owned and run by the Town Council. It has probably less than ten years of remaining capacity. The easiest solution would be for development to make available land that is suitable. The Environment Agency (EA) has tightened up on environmental pollution and therefore the extension of existing cemeteries would probably not be acceptable. The existing cemetery on the A4 is bounded by walls so there is little scope to extend there anyway. The need to reduce CO2 emissions from cremations may lead to additional pressure on burial sites.

1.91 There may be a need for future cemetery provision in Chippenham, but this would need to be confirmed by further discussions with the Town Council.

1.92 Preferred Option - land within the eastern part of the option may be needed for cemetery provision.

Leisure Facilities

1.93 The Leisure Facilities Team advise that car parking is an issue in Chippenham town centre and a cycle route linking to the leisure facilities would be necessary. Developer contributions would be wanted to help fund a teaching pool for Chippenham.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

1.94 The Environment Agency made the following comments in relation to flooding issues:

- For all of the options for Chippenham, the River Avon, a designated “main river” (MR), runs through or is adjacent to sites. Its associated floodplain (including functional) will limit land available for development.
- There are opportunities here to improve and/or set back flood defences, set back redevelopment from the riverside or floodplain, improve riverside access and reinstate the floodplain through set back and/or “water compatible” use of land in the floodplain, e.g. as public open space.
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 2 modelling is recommended for all of the options.
The flood zones referred to below are those given in the Environment Agency flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding, and must be used in conjunction with the SFRA flood mapping, which includes other forms of flooding and the impact of climate change. Currently, parts of the options for Chippenham are in Flood Zones 2 and 3. A SFRA Level 2 Assessment is required if the development cannot be all be fitted in Flood Zone 1. Otherwise, if all development is in Flood Zone 1, a surface water management plan and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required from the developer. Parts of the options are also within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 2 and, to ensure that the type of development to be considered is appropriate, reference should be made to the Environment Agency’s Groundwater Protection Policy.

1.95 Natural England made the following comments in relation to flooding issues:

- The area of the north east and east sites within the flood plain could be used for green infrastructure. This could be linked with improvements to the riverside within the town centre strategic site.

Biodiversity

1.96 The Environment Agency made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:

- There are no preferred options for Chippenham in terms of having a minimal impact on biodiversity. All options include substantial stretches of river corridor, including the main River Avon. In this part of Wiltshire, the River Avon and its tributaries serve an important function, which is to facilitate the passage of wildlife through a major urban area. The River Avon is also home to some UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species (otter, water vole) which are recovering in terms of numbers in this part of the country.
- Birds Marsh Wood is nearby, which is ecologically sensitive but careful design and masterplanning would minimise impact on this site.
- The preferred option consists of three main areas. To the north, there are minor watercourses. In the centre of the town, there are the River Avon and its tributaries, Hardenhuish and Ladyfield brook (known to support a population of native crayfish). To the east, there is the main River Avon and River Marden.
- All of these areas should be subject to detailed survey and the watercourses are important links that allow wildlife a route through the urban area. Riparian species such as otter and water vole are known on the larger rivers and may also use the smaller ones. Development should allow for this and incorporate a buffer along any watercourse, the width of which is largely determined by the size of the river.
- Option 2 includes those sites in the preferred option, excluding the northern site, so most of the above comments also apply to this option.
- Option 3 does not include the areas to the north or east but includes an area to the south which incorporates the main River Avon, Cocklemoor Brook and other small tributaries. There is a substantial length of the River Avon within this option and the river must have plenty of room to continue its natural course across the floodplain. Extensive ecological survey would be necessary to determine the existing value of the area.
- Comments applying to the north and south areas of the Preferred Option and options 2 and 3 also apply to Option 4.

1.97 Natural England made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:
Natural England would like to see 30 to 40% of the larger sites left free from development. They pointed out that these options are close to woodland and the nature site at Lackham College.

Play Areas and Open Space

The council's Play and Open Spaces Team made the following comments in relation to provision in Chippenham:

- The leader of the council is pushing for more play provision in the central area of Chippenham. Substantial provision is needed in the form of playgrounds/open space but bigger than a LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play). A destination play facility would be appropriate, rather than a LEAP.
- In terms of play areas and playing pitches, the general push now is to try and link these with safe cycleways and walkways. A joint workshop with the council's rights of way service and other green infrastructure service providers would be welcomed.
- The Council Leader is very keen to promote allotments and urban orchards. Chippenham currently has plenty of allotments.
- **Preferred Option** - this option may be fine in terms of sports pitch provision, providing it is possible to get access to Hardenhuish and Sheldon playing pitches and access to Stanley Park. There is no need for additional pitches, at least for the central and northern sites, and there is plenty of provision for rugby and tennis.

Rights of Way and Cycle Networks

The council's Rights of Way Team made the following comments in relation to Chippenham:

- Sustrans route 4 runs through or close to all the options, it provides access to the town centre and should be safeguarded.
- Safe pedestrian access should be provided along and across busy routes to allow access to the town centre and to recreation facilities.
- The character of the Rights of Way should be preserved, not subsumed into new estates.
- Further discussions with the council's canal officer would be useful to clarify proposals for the Wilts and Berks Canal around Chippenham.

The following rights of way infrastructure requirements apply to the selected option (see Table 7.2).

Table 1.2 Rights of way requirements for strategic sites in Chippenham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Way Infrastructure Requirements</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access must be carefully managed in regards to Mauds Heath Causeway and Birds Marsh Farm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe pedestrian access across A350 (Malmesbury Rd) at roundabout to connect to PRoW network on W. side of A350</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a riverside walk along R Marden linking to the R Avon and LBUR 1 from BREM 44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links from BREM 44 to OldCanal (recreational provision) at StudleyBridge</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe pedestrian crossing of London Rd near to Gate Farm/Jays Farm</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe pedestrian route along London Rd to BREM 47/Old Canal from Jays Farm/Gate Farm pedestrian crossing</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of pedestrian bridge/underpass as spur from CHIPP 1 crossing A4 to Sports Ground</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adoption and safeguard of Sustrans route 4 as it goes through the development and into Chippenham Centre</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe pedestrian crossing of London Rd near to Jays Farm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe pedestrian route along London Rd to CALW 60 via BREM 47/Old Canal from Jays Farm pedestrian crossing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adoption and safeguard of Sustrans route 4 spur as it goes through the development and from Chippenham Centre to Lacock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention of woodland plot</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of a riverside pedestrian/cycle route along river Avon from OldCanal to Lower Lodge Farm and Sustrans route 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian bridge crossing to LACO 39 from riverside pedestrian/cycle route near Lower Bridge Farm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landscape**

1.101 The council's Strategic Landscape Team advised that the grading of soil in agricultural areas will need to be considered. However, development in the northern site and central Chippenham should be fine.

**Other Environmental Considerations**

1.102 The Environment Agency advised that, with regard to options 3 and 4, parts are adjacent to an historic landfill. Therefore, assessment and remediation may be required.
2 Trowbridge

Town context

2.1 Trowbridge is designated a Strategically Significant Town and is therefore identified for significant housing and employment growth. It is an important employment, administrative and service centre in west Wiltshire. There are a number of regeneration opportunities in the town that could improve the self-containment of Trowbridge. The town has good transport links. The development of strategic sites will support and enhance the employment, service and regeneration opportunities in the town and improve the self-containment of Trowbridge.

Overall level of growth

2.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver a further 3,000 to 4,000 additional houses in Trowbridge over the plan period 2006 to 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

2.3 The following table shows proposed housing allocations for Trowbridge, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3,000 to 4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 identifies that a balance between town centre and out of town provision is important. It recommends that 38.1ha of employment land is supplied over the plan period.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - land east and south east of Trowbridge

2.5 Option 1 for Trowbridge would deliver 3,000 houses to the east and south east of Trowbridge over the plan period.

2.6 Option 1 comprises the following potential housing sites:

(Eastern area)
- Land south of Green Lane
- Land north of West Ashton Road
- Land north of Green Lane

(Southern area)
- Land north of Drynham Lane
- Land south of West Ashton Road
2.7 Option 1 also includes the following potential or intensification of existing employment sites, which are to deliver 37ha of employment land over the plan period:

- Land at West Ashton Road (already allocated)
- Land north of Yarnbrook (mixed use)

**Option 2 - land east, south east and south of Trowbridge**

2.8 Option 2 for Trowbridge would deliver 3,000 houses to the east, south east and south of Trowbridge.

2.9 Option 2 includes the following potential housing sites:

(Eastern area)

- Land south of Green Lane
- Land north of West Ashton Road
- Land north of Green Lane

(South eastern area)

- Land north of Drynham Lane
- Land south of West Ashton Road
- Land at Drynham Farm

(Southern area)

- Land at Drynham Road
- Land off the A363
- Land at the district offices
- Land adjacent Church Lane
- Land at Woodmarsh
- Land at the Limes

2.10 Option 2 also includes the following potential or intensification of existing employment sites, which are to deliver 37ha of employment land over the plan period:

- Land at West Ashton Road (already allocated)
- Land west of White Horse Business Park

**Option 3 - land to the east, south east and south of Trowbridge**

2.11 Option 3 for Trowbridge would deliver 4,000 houses and is a combination of option 1 and 2. This option was proposed in order to accommodate higher housing numbers if required.

2.12 Option 3 also includes the following potential or intensification of existing employment sites, which are to deliver 37ha of employment land over the plan period:
• Land at West Ashton Road (already allocated)
• Land north of Yarnbrook (mixed use)

Option 4 - land east and north of Trowbridge, including the Hilperton Gap

2.13 Option 4 for Trowbridge would deliver 3,000 houses to the east and north of Trowbridge.

2.14 Option 4 includes the following potential housing sites:

(Eastern area)
• Land south of Green Lane
• Land north of West Ashton Road
• Land north of Green Lane

(Northern area)
• Land at the former nursery
• Land off street, Hilperton
• Land east of Hilperton
• Land at Marsh Farm, Hilperton
• Land at the Grange
• Land off Devizes Road
• Land at Blue Hills
• Land at Enniswood House
• Land rear of 116-118 Trowbridge Road
• Land rear of the Lion and Fiddle
• Land rear of Church Street
• Land at Church Farm

(Hilperton Gap)
• Land at the Hilperton Gap
• Land east of Wyke Road

2.15 Option 4 also includes the following potential or intensification of existing employment sites, which are to deliver 37ha of employment land over the plan period:
• Land at West Ashton Road (already allocated)
• Land west of White Horse Business Park

Option 5 - land to the east and south east of Trowbridge, including land at the Hilperton Gap

2.16 Option 5 for Trowbridge would deliver 4,000 houses to the east and south east of Trowbridge and comprises option 1 and land at Hilperton Gap. It was proposed to accommodate higher numbers if required (4,000 houses).

2.17 Option 5 also includes the following potential or intensification of existing employment sites, which are to deliver 37ha of employment land over the plan period:
• Land at West Ashton Road (already allocated)
• Land north of Yarnbrook (mixed use)
Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

2.18 The Highways Agency's primary concern in Trowbridge is the impact on the A36 trunk road. Self-containment is important and thus employment opportunities will need to come forward alongside housing growth. Growth to the north of the town is of concern to the Highways Agency. The corridors between towns will need to be considered, and improvements made to public and sustainable transport. Links to schools need to be well thought out and be as sustainable and public transport based as possible.

2.19 Option 4 - this option does not fit as well with the town as the other options; it seems less deliverable.

Local road network

2.20 The Local Highways Authority advise that the model for Trowbridge has used broadly the same proxy indicators as the Chippenham model. Trowbridge is more complicated due to issues on the A350 such as Yarnbrook. This is a very expensive issue, which would cost in the region of £17 million to sort out.

2.21 Accessibility for Trowbridge still needs to be done.

2.22 The resolution of significant congestion and safety problems at Yarnbrook and West Ashton (A350) is an essential infrastructure requirement, irrespective of development taking place. However, locating development to the south east of Trowbridge would help facilitate these improvements. The Highways Authority has indicated that they favour the Option 1 in comparison to the alternatives.

2.23 A high level of relative growth will require transport interventions in the locale with the expectation that solutions will be RTS compliant (ie broadly based on demand management). Given the demography, and the high degree of out commuting, the extent to which demand management is supported and implemented in Bristol & Bath will play a significant role in supporting and facilitating growth in Trowbridge.

2.24 The council's Development Management Team has a preference for Option 5, along with the very similar Option 2 because, if the Hilperton relief road is going ahead, development to the south of this road is logical.

Bus network

2.25 The council's Passenger Transport Unit advise that none of the options will be cheap ones.

2.26 Option 2 - a link across the railway line would probably be needed for bus services. There is no scope for diverting existing services, and therefore any development to the south of Trowbridge would need £200,000 per year earmarked for transport. Everything would be new – nothing existing. Some distance from school – therefore would need relocation of the school to make this option stack up.

2.27 Option 4 - this option appears logical. An extra bus would be needed to serve it (costing £200,000 pa). The potential development is on the limit of the acceptable distance to existing schools, so it would need to provide free transport. This option gets quite expensive, but anything in Trowbridge would be quite expensive.
Rail network

2.28 Network Rail point out that the Cardiff to Portsmouth line runs through Trowbridge. The Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS), out for consultation in September 2009, is looking at how to meet the forecast demand on this route. Currently there is a lot of pressure on the Bristol/ Bath area and improvements to the service are needed. Network Rail is considering an express service calling at the major stations, and a local service to provide more capacity on the line. Funding for this proposal will be needed; S.106 money could go towards this.

2.29 There is no difference between the sites; connectivity with the station and services is the only issue and is the same for all sites. Improvements to Trowbridge Train Station, including facilities and service information such as digital displays at the station should also be considered. S.106 money could be used to improve these; an example where S.106 money has been used towards the redevelopment of a station is Reading Station, where S.106 money contributed towards the £900 million redevelopment.

Water supply and sewerage

2.30 Wessex Water advise that the “ring” main sewer that surrounds Trowbridge was laid in the 1970s and it was not intended that there would be any expansion beyond the sewer. This causes some capacity issues in Trowbridge, there were improvements planned but these were linked to the Waterside development and are currently on hold.

2.31 The sewage treatment works are based to the north west of Trowbridge. All the options for Trowbridge have their own constraints.

2.32 There is currently a scheme to deal with flooding in the sewage treatment work area; this would need to be completed before other developments. Otherwise temporary measures will have to put in place until the scheme is completed.

2.33 Most options will involve new routes to the Sewage Treatment Works to the West of the town via gravity and pumped mains.

2.34 Options 1, 2, 3 and 5 - to link to the sewage treatment works from this site new infrastructure would either have to go through the town or all the way round the edge.

2.35 The following specific comments relate to the proposed 3,000 to 4,000 houses east of Trowbridge, with associated employment land:

• Pumped and gravity connection to the west and outside of the Trowbridge centre
• Discharge through the town centre to the sewage treatment works will cause major disruption for development within the central area
• The small block of development on the east, known locally as the “White Area”, dependent upon timing may have capacity via the new East of Trowbridge Scheme.

2.36 Option 4 - the following specific comments relate to the proposed 3,000 dwellings north east of Trowbridge:

• Gravity and pumped connections required to the Sewage Treatment Works. Proposed area closer to the Sewage Treatment Works. Improvement works also required to the inlet.
Gas

2.37 Wales and West Utilities advise that there are no major issues. However, they make the following points:
- **Options 1, 2, 3 and 5** - the site to the south east of Trowbridge is a longer distance away from the gas mains.
- **Option 4** - the connection to the gas mains would have to come some distance through the adjoining built-up area.

Electricity

2.38 Scottish and Southern Energy advise that the two primary sub stations in Trowbridge currently have some spare capacity but will probably need reinforcement to meet the needs of the developments.

2.39 There are no tower lines on any of the sites.

2.40 The options identified for development at Trowbridge are crossed by National Grid’s 400kv overhead electricity transmission line between Bramley substation and Melksham substation.

2.41 **Option 1** - this is the lower cost option; it is close to one of the sub stations and only has 11kv lines across the site.

2.42 **Option 4** - this is the more expensive option, it might need to split the load between both substations (more infrastructure work needed to do this) and higher voltage lines cross the site (more expensive to move).

Economic facilities

2.43 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership do not support the additional provision indicated at North Bradley. However, concern exists that the land identified at Yarnbrook/ West Ashton Road might not be capable of being brought forward for development within the timescale or at an affordable cost to many businesses. Some additional alternative provision would be needed unless the higher allocation at Westbury is retained.

Telecommunications

2.44 BT Openreach advise that all options are within existing exchange boundaries. Any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

The County Archaeology Service make the following comments about Trowbridge:
- **Option 1** - there are no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology on this site, although there is the risk of previously unrecorded archaeology in the area proposed for employment.
- **Option 2** - there are no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology on this site, including the area proposed for employment.
- **Option 3 and 5** - there are no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology on this site, although there is a limited amount of known, non-designated archaeology on the area proposed for employment.
- **Option 4** - there are no showstoppers on this site, no scheduled monuments, although there is a risk of as yet unknown archaeology. There is a moderate amount of known archaeology, so this is the least preferred option by the County Archaeology Service.

- There are no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology on the area proposed for employment.

**Mineral extraction**

2.45 The council’s Minerals and Waste Policy Team advise that the Option 4 site is covered by a mineral resource zone; but the quality is likely to be low, which could be checked by bore hole testing. There is normally a 90-100m buffer zone between housing and mineral extraction.

**Social infrastructure requirements**

**Early years and childcare**

2.46 The council’s Early Years and Childcare Team make the following comments with regard to Trowbridge:

- **Option 1** - there is not much childcare provision in the West Ashton area at present, as this has always been a more rural area. Therefore it would be necessary to look at childcare provision if this option is taken forward.

- **Option 2** - this option is more spread out. Small sites which are tagged on to an option may create a need, but not sufficient need for additional facilities to be provided. Therefore more concentrated development is preferred from the perspective of childcare provision.

**Primary and secondary education**

2.47 The Local Education Authority advise that a minimum of two 2 forms of entry (2FE) primary schools would be needed, together with a financial contribution towards the existing primary schools.

2.48 There already two secondary schools and a smaller catholic secondary school in Trowbridge. There would be debate as to whether a new secondary school is needed or if one of the existing secondary schools should move to the new development.

2.49 Detailed modelling would be needed to see if a new secondary school is necessary. However, the education service would want to reserve a site for a new secondary school.

2.50 **Option 1** - the local education authority is happy with this option.

2.51 The Development Management Team considers that a new secondary school as part of the eastern site would be very sensible and needed. Lack of school provision is a common reason for opposition to similar schemes.

**Further education**

2.52 Wiltshire College’s stated policy to move to a more central location within the town is still very relevant. Although the proposed funding route for this is now not open to them, alternative options for acquisition of the Stallard Street site either through a partnership or Lab-V or other vehicle are being considered.

2.53 Relocation to a town centre site remains a top priority for the College and this may be included in regeneration of the town centre.
By 2026, the College needs to have greatly improved its links to public transport systems (road, rail, and sustainable transport). At present, this is envisaged by relocating Trowbridge College to a town centre site.

Primary health care

NHS Wiltshire advises that all four GP surgeries in Trowbridge are at capacity.

A new primary care centre and an extension to one of the GP surgeries is planned but this would not be enough to take this extra growth, only that of the existing population.

A new surgery and dental provision would be necessary. Chippenham has similar issues but, here, there is less capacity.

The existing facilities could possibly expand but there is only capacity for expansion. There is also a possible need for another GP Surgery in the town centre.

Trowbridge hospital is going to close and there will be a real pressure on Trowbridge in the future.

There is not much difference between the options – no preference. Options 1, 2, 3 and 5 are very similar and Option 4 merely shifts the emphasis as to where you provide the healthcare.

Libraries

The council's library service considers that the proposed Waterside regeneration scheme, now on hold, would have solved the lack of space in the current library building in Trowbridge.

Development proposed is not enough to warrant a branch library. There are good public transport links from the town centre to nearby libraries in Melksham, for example, and this reduces the need for a satellite branch.

However, there are implications for the mobile service; perhaps the need for more stops.

Police

Wiltshire Police made no specific comments relating to Trowbridge. However, their Estates Strategy (2008) does not foresee the police station requiring redevelopment or relocation within the next 10 years (2008 to 2018).

There are no showstoppers or preferences relating to the options. However, the police service is interested in options for shared sites with similar agencies, such as the health service, fire and rescue and ambulance service.

Extra housing is likely to affect the Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) and responses times to calls.

Fire and rescue

Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service consider that the growth is comparable to Chippenham and has similar problems, if not worse as the station is further away from the proposed developments.

It may be best to look at Trowbridge in conjunction with Westbury and look at combining stations to one station based at Yarnbrook.

Option 4 - this option is closer to Melksham, which would be the second pump.
Ambulance

2.70  Great Western Ambulance Service (GWAS) advise that the ambulance station for Trowbridge is on the Hilperton Road. An additional standby point would need to be provided whichever option went forward.

2.71  There is not much difference between the options – GWAS has no preference.

Cemeteries and crematoria

2.72  The council's Amenity and Countryside Team advise that the cemetery in Trowbridge is run by Wiltshire Council, and is surrounded by housing so there is no possibility of expansion. Therefore, it would be ideal for the developers to provide something within the development area. It is not just an issue of capacity, for which figures are available, but also the number of burials allowed each year. A second site may be needed to spread the load.

Leisure facilities

2.73  The council's Leisure Facilities Team advise that, when looking at development in Trowbridge, it is important to look at the relationship with Melksham and Westbury and the facilities that are available there.

2.74  Access to the town centre will be an issue. The provision of sports halls at any new schools will need to be considered alongside the provision of leisure facilities.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

2.75  The Environment Agency made the following comments in relation to flooding issues:

- The options include areas that are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The existing West Wiltshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 1 study could possibly be used to assess the suitability of the site. If not, then a Level 2 SFRA may be required and is recommended for all the options.
- A green infrastructure corridor is required around the watercourses and the lake. Where possible, development should only occur in Flood Zone 1.
- **Option 1, 2, 3 and 5** - the River Biss (MR) runs through the site, with adjacent tributaries (plus Lambrok Stream (MR) for Options 2 and 3). Their associated floodplain (including functional) covers a significant area within the site; limiting the land available for most types of development. However there are opportunities to include an upstream attenuation basin(s) to reduce risk to Trowbridge.
- **Option 4** - there are still some floodplains from the River Biss tributaries, but significantly less. This option borders the River Avon floodplain to the north and maybe floodplain associated with Hilperton Brook (MR).

Biodiversity

2.76  The Environment Agency made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:

- Of these options there is no clear favourite option - all have the potential to disrupt the movement of key riparian mammals throughout the system but, with careful consideration,
effects can be minimised if development is sited away from watercourses and allows for an appropriate buffer.

- **Option 1** - this option covers parts of the River Biss catchment area and a tributary. The Biss is important in this area as a link to the main River Avon and is used extensively by otters and water voles and is important for the continued success and spread of these recovering UK BAP species.

- **Option 2** - this option covers the same areas as Option 1 and also includes a section of the Lam Brook which is known to support water voles in the Southwick Country Park area.

- **Option 3** - this option covers the same areas as above but includes more of the upper River Biss catchment area. By developing high up in catchments potential problems downstream from accumulated runoff, etc. should be a consideration.

- **Option 4** - this option does not include the Lam brook or the upper Biss but is located to the north of Trowbridge. The Kennet and Avon canal is a consideration as it supports water voles. The area around Hilperton is crossed by small ditches which when previously surveyed were found to support water voles albeit in small fragmented populations. Otters use the canal and ditch networks to move around the area.

- **Option 5** - this option includes a small part of Hilperton Marsh and the upper River Biss and a tributary. All these areas have potential for water voles and otters.

**2.77 Natural England** made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:

- Areas of floodplain are more likely to be used constructively if they are co-located with housing; if they are with industrial areas they tend to become areas of waste land rather than being used for green infrastructure.

- **Option 1** - there is a potential impact on woodland from this option and, also, for options 2 and 3. The floodplain should be used for green infrastructure.

- **Option 4** - the Hilperton Gap area looks as though it would benefit from being managed as a country park. Building in this area would mean a loss of green space for existing residents and this goes against the health agenda. This point also applies to Option 5.

**2.78** The council's Strategic Landscape Team made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:

- The South West Nature Map identifies areas where habitats such as woodland or grassland etc should be targeted.

- There is a Strategic Nature Area to the south east of Trowbridge; all the options are affected by this. There is some guidance available on this. Since the Strategic Nature Area is likely to be part of the proposed site we need to consider how to help deliver the woodland habitat that is being targeted.

- The existing woodland sites are very important. They include Picket and Clanger Wood SSSI, Green Lane Wood and Meadow CWS, Woodside Wood CWS and Biss Wood CWS. All are ancient woodland sites and are also of interest for bats. Picket and Clanger Wood also have an important invertebrate assemblage; ideally they would be connected up by new planting.

- The woodlands would need protection from the effects of increased recreational pressure; there is already a precedent where planning permission has been given for a 550 housing site adjacent to Green Lane wood, a 100m buffer zone was provided. This would be necessary for future developments. But in addition, new high quality ecological recreational land would need to be provided to ensure that there was no increase in recreational pressure on the existing protected sites.

- A wide range of protected species surveys would be necessary to support applications in the area e.g. badger, reptiles, bats, water voles.
A corner of a land parcel that is in every option is part of a proposed country park (identified in the local plan).

There would need to be corridors provided along both sides of any rivers. The clay vales are noted for good great crested newt populations. Surveys would be required at a later stage and land may need to be allocated for mitigation.

See Figure 8.4.1 Trowbridge map for strategic landscape comments.

Advise survey at early stage AFTER option has been selected in order to identify key risks and land which needs to be set aside for mitigation.

Trowbridge has the capacity to absorb development; as long as hedgerows and trees are kept and do not disappear with developments.

Option 2 - this option is second best.

Option 4 - this option may hold greatest risks for newts. This option is preferred as it has the least impact on the protected woodlands strategic nature area.

The council's Development Management Team made the following comments in relation to biodiversity issues:

- Option 1 - there is an issue with woodland/ bats habitat in proximity. The existing East of Trowbridge application resulted in sports pitches being realigned to avoid issue with bats. There is the potential for a linear park along river side/ sustainable/ walking route into Trowbridge. Similar Park on Paxcroft Mead development is very well used and popular.

Play areas and open space

The council’s Play and Open Spaces Team made the following comments in relation to Trowbridge:

- There is a dearth of allotments in Trowbridge.
- In terms of playing pitches, the development management service at the West Hub have already identified a playing field (this is subject to a review). However, there is potentially a need for another pitch on top of that already identified by development management service, because of the extra houses.
- Option 1 - a Destination Play Area (DPA) would need to be provided within the development as the nearest DPA is some distance from Option 1.

Rights of Way and cycle networks

The council’s Rights of Way Team advise that the options provide a good opportunity to link West Ashton to Trowbridge with a safe pedestrian and cycle route. Access through Biss Park would need to be managed; the underpass is currently an issue.

The following rights of way infrastructure requirements apply to the selected option (see Table 2.2). sites in Trowbridge

Table 2.2 Rights of way requirements for proposed strategic sites in Trowbridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Way Requirements</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure combined cyclist/ pedestrian access to Trowbridge Park, via Biss Meadows Country Park from both the West Ashton Road Employment Areas and</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rights of Way Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>through the housing along West Ashton Road, either by connecting to the bridge over the A361 or improving the underpass beneath the A361.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a safe cycle/pedestrian route linking West Ashton with the town centre.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBRA 43 &amp; NBRA 31 not to be used as part of development and safeguard use BOAT and footpath</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access must be carefully managed in regards to Green Lane Wood and Biss Wood. Also Picket Wood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe pedestrian access across A350 at Ashton Hill Farm and upgrading of quality of footpaths WASH 6 and WASH 19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the Kennet &amp; Avon canal towpath to be created for both pedestrian and cycle use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILP 19 and HILP 21 not to be used as part of development and safeguard use as Bridleway/Restricted Byway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure combined cyclist/pedestrian access to the town centre via Hilperton Marsh farm and Hilperton Marsh (HILP 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical upgrade of STAV 1, HILP 19, HILP 48, SEMI 38, HILP 31, HILP 17 and STAV 3 to allow for increased usage and as a circular route and to connect the development to Semington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Bradford on Avon

Town context

3.1 Bradford on Avon is designated a policy B settlement. The town is highly constrained and has a dormitory role with out commuting to Bristol and Bath. It is also the least affordable town in Wiltshire. However it does have good public transport and services. A mixed use strategic site in Bradford on Avon would help increase the self-containment of the town and would alleviate affordability issues in the town.

Overall level of growth

3.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver up to 200 additional houses in Bradford on Avon for the plan period 2006 to 2026. This figure was reached using a number of sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

3.3 Table 3.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Bradford on Avon, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 3.1 Proposed housing allocation for Bradford on Avon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc S106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative Additional Dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford on Avon</td>
<td>(6,300 between Melksham, Warminster, Westbury and Bradford on Avon)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Bradford on Avon is not designated as a strategic employment centre in the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land at the Moulton Estate

3.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 200 houses to the east of Bradford on Avon and comprises:

- Land at Moulton Estate

Option 2 - Land at the Golf Course

3.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 200 houses to the east of Bradford on Avon and comprises:

- Land at the Golf Course
Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

3.7 Bradford on Avon is not located close to the strategic road network. Growth in this location is therefore not considered strategic by the Highways Agency.

Local road network

3.8 From the perspective of the Local Highways Authority, there should be a general presumption against any specific planned housing growth in Bradford on Avon. Network and environmental traffic capacity is generally accepted to be below any reasonable minimum standard. Unless there is a compelling economic or social reason to the contrary, growth should be limited to no more than windfall sites.

3.9 With regard to Option 1, the council's Development Management Team point out that there would be access to Melksham, Trowbridge and Bath without the need to travel through the town centre. Therefore, the development should not increase congestion in the town. The stone wall along the roadside is an important feature of the site in Option 1 and would be good to protect. However, it is realised that improvement to the road would be necessary. There is a need to consider how the road improvements can be accommodated within this development.

Bus network

3.10 Option 1 could be developed without needing much in the way of a bus service. However, the Passenger Transport Unit advise that accessibility will be the biggest problem with Option 2. If access is only to be provided from Bridge Street, then it would not be possible to send a bus service through the new development. But it may be possible to use footpaths to access existing services.

Rail network

3.11 Network Rail have no problems with the options. The only issues with the station are the physical constraints. The proposal to upgrade the Trowbridge route may improve connectivity at Bradford on Avon.

3.12 With regard to Option 2, the Development Management Team advise that there would be no access available through Bridge Street development, unless Network Rail change their view.

Water supply and sewerage

3.13 Wessex Water advise that there are pressure problems in Bradford-on-Avon. Both options would require up-sizing of the sewers through the town. They have not anticipated growth on this scale in Bradford on Avon.

3.14 Whichever option is taken forward, there will be a requirement for the following improvements to the sewer infrastructure network:

- Dedicated pumping stations
- Upsizing of downstream sewers
- Rail and river crossings to the sewage treatment works, which is to the west of both sites

3.15 The scope and extent of network improvements will need to be confirmed by engineering appraisal.
3.16 In terms of water supply, subject to detailed modelling, Wessex Water do not anticipate off site works will be required for up to 200 units at either site. Modelling is currently underway to consider the impact of the Kingston Mills Development and either of these two sites on the supply network.

3.17 However, Option 2 presents the following challenges:

- The rising main crossing the site would be expensive to move.
- A 6m easement of the rising main skirting the southern boundary of this option should be observed. However, a diversion can be completed at the developer’s cost.
- A 3m easement is required for the 6" water main skirting the southern boundary of this option.

Gas

3.18 Wales and West Utilities advise that either option would require reinforcement of the low pressure mains.

Electricity

3.19 Both options are a long way from the primary substation. Scottish and Southern Energy advise that there should be enough capacity available unless the housing has electric heating, in which case it might be necessary to run cabling all the way through Bradford on Avon.

Telecommunications

3.20 All options are within existing exchange boundaries. Any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

3.21 To the east, Option 1 includes the registered historic park and garden of Hall Garden. Although inclusion of an historic park or garden on the Register in itself brings no additional statutory controls, registration is a material consideration in planning terms (see Planning Policy Guidance Note 15, 2.24, September 1994). Following an application for development which would affect a registered park or garden, local planning authorities must, when determining whether or not to grant permission, take into account the historic interest of the site. The County Archaeology Team recommend that this area of the option is excluded. There is limited, known, non designated archaeology.

3.22 Option 2 is preferred by the County Archaeologists. There are no scheduled monuments and no known, non designated archaeology.

3.23 The Development Management Team point out that it is important to consider the setting with regard to the Grade 1 Listed Building (including park land, trees, screening railway line and the river). The impact on setting of the conservation area should also be considered, although this is not thought to be a significant issue.

Mineral extraction

3.24 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team highlight an issue with the quarry within Option 1, which currently has dormant consent. This may cause problems with getting planning permission.
Social and community infrastructure

Education – early years and childcare

3.25 The council’s Early Years and Childcare Team advise that an extra 200 dwellings may not be enough to warrant additional childcare provision. Option 1 is likely to be the better option in terms of accessing childcare provision.

Education – primary and secondary

3.26 The Local Education Authority comment that both options are on the correct side of town for the Fitzmaurice Primary School. They advise that financial contributions would be necessary to expand the primary school and put infrastructure into the secondary school.

Primary care

3.27 There are two GP surgeries in the town. NHS Wiltshire advise that the larger practice is at capacity and has been looking to develop for the last ten years, whilst the smaller practice does not have enough capacity to cope with the extra growth. It is unlikely that the number of houses would be sufficient to warrant a new GP surgery but there are real capacity problems in Bradford on Avon.

Libraries

3.28 The council's Library Service advise that the likely requirement of an extra 15 sqm of library floorspace required by the development is not an issue. The existing library would be sufficient. Table 3.2 shows the library infrastructure requirements for Bradford on Avon.

Table 3.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Bradford on Avon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford on Avon</td>
<td>0 - 200</td>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>0 - 15</td>
<td>0 - 42,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire and rescue

3.29 The Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that there are already traffic issues in Bradford on Avon. The developments are not a problem in their own right but the cumulative effect will need to be considered.

Ambulance service

3.30 Great Western Ambulance Service has no facilities in Bradford on Avon and they believe that the impact from the proposed development would be negligible.
Cemeteries and crematoria

3.31 The council's Amenity and Countryside Team advise that the cemetery is virtually full, and an extension is actively being sought. A contribution would be sought from the housing. A footpath link would be nice, to link the cemetery and the town. It is likely that there would be a footpath inside the development, as opposed to along the road as at present. This may offer the opportunity for a link with the cemetery.

3.32 The current cemetery occupies a triangle of land to the east of Option 1. There are current negotiations about a possible extension on land directly to the east of this option.

3.33 The Development Management Team comment that the development is also well related to the cemetery. Essentially there is a gap between the existing housing and the cemetery; the cemetery is part of the town.

Leisure facilities

3.34 The council's Leisure Facilities Team advise that Bradford on Avon has the most intensely used swimming pool in Wiltshire. The amount of housing proposed will not affect the facility.

3.35 The Development Management Team say that Sport England objected to an application on the site in Option 1 (which was refused) for loss of the public golf course, which is much used.

3.36 The council's Strategic Landscape Team is not in favour of losing the golf course and the facilities it provides.

Green infrastructure

Flooding

3.37 The Environment Agency advise that, as both options lie within Flood Zone 1 (FZ1), there are no significant flood risk issues.

3.38 However, the Development Management Team point out that the Greenland Mills site had to be raised for the 1 in 100 flood plain. However, the site in Option 2 often floods when the river is in high flow. There would be a flooding issue on the Golf Course site.

Biodiversity

General

3.39 The Strategic Landscape Team advise that surveys would need to be done because the river is a County Wildlife Site (CWS).

3.40 Natural England suggest that both developments may have landscape impacts on the AONB. There are bat related SSSI's nearby of European importance and development could cause the loss of foraging ground. The sites would need habitat regulations assessments. Both options are close to the edge of town and development could cause the loss of green infrastructure for existing residents. The options are also several km from Winsley Mines SSSI/ SAC and therefore the sites will not be directly affected by development in these areas.
Several species of bats are known to use the River Avon corridor for commuting. Option 2 is located adjacent to the river and is more likely to have a detrimental effect on bats using this corridor than Option 1, where the proposed land is set back from the river. As above, Natural England advise that both options need to be considered with respect to bat-supporting habitat in order to be able to arrive at a more objective view as to which option is preferred.

**Option 1**

3.41 The west end of Option 1 is densely wooded, the Strategic Landscape Team would object to this part being developed. But the rest of the site is fine. Option 1 is preferable; it seems a better option.

3.42 The Development Management Team advise that it would be important to consider the setting of the Grade 1 Listed Building (including park land, trees, screening railway line and the river).

3.43 Combe Mine County Wildlife Site is next to the site but it is further from the river corridor so this would be the preferred option for the Environment Agency.

**Option 2**

3.44 The Strategic Landscape Team is not in favour of losing the golf course and the facilities it provides. The river would need a wide buffer zone. Wintering waterfowl may be affected, as may reptiles and otters.

3.45 Access to Option 2 would be an issue, according to the Development Management Team. They believe that it would have to go through the existing estate, which would not be ideal, or on the lane to the side of the existing estate. This would have an impact on the countryside and greenbelt.

3.46 This option, the site of an existing golf course, is next to the River Avon County Wildlife Site. There is also a pond on site and the Environment Agency advise that the river should be surveyed for the presence of water voles, otters and Japanese knotweed.

**Play areas and open space**

3.47 The Amenity and Countryside Team advise that there are only 8 allotments for the whole of Bradford-on-Avon. Therefore, allotment provision would be needed. The allotments are currently located to the south of the town, close to the canal.

3.48 Play facilities would also be needed.

3.49 The Development Management Team point out that the map of the draft strategic site options shows the inclusion of an allotment in Option 2. If this is part of the option, then this may lead to the loss of a facility that would need to be replaced.

**Rights of Way and cycle networks**

3.50 The options for Bradford on Avon would require the improvements and maintenance of the right of way and cycle networks, shown in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Way Requirements</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure safe cycling/pedestrian route avoiding B3107</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rights of Way Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRAD 72/BRAD 18 to K&amp;ACanal maintained to a high standard. Safeguard against cycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Greenland Mills along BRAD 35 and 72 – maintain to high standard, ensuring step free route along BRAD 35 into town</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan and maintenance of woodland at Greenland Mills NB slippage risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route to town on minor roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other environmental considerations

**3.52** The Development Management Team advise that Option 2 is heavily contaminated; it is a former tip. This is thought to present a significant issue.
4 Calne

Town context

4.1 Calne is identified as a policy B settlement and plays an important role in North Wiltshire. It however experiences high levels of out commuting and performs less well economically. The delivery of a strategic housing and mixed use site will help increase the self-containment of Calne.

Overall level of growth

4.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver further 400 – 1,200 houses in Calne for the plan period 2006 – 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

4.3 The following table shows the proposed housing allocation for the Calne, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 4.1 Proposed housing allocation for Calne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calne</td>
<td>5,200 (for the former North Wiltshire area, excluding Chippenham and West of Swindon)</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>400-1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 recommended that 8.31ha of employment land is provided in Calne.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land north east of Calne

4.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 1,200 dwellings to the north-east of Calne and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Oxford Road
- Land at Penn Hill Farm
- Land at East Woodhill Rise
- Land East of Calne

Option 2 - Land south east of Calne

4.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 1,200 dwellings to the south-east of Calne and comprises the following potential housing site:
Land at Quemerford

Option 3 - Land to the west of Calne

4.7 Option 3 would deliver up to 1,200 houses to the west of Calne and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Berhills Farm
- Land to the south of Castle Walk
- Land at 29 Castle Street

Option 4 - Land to the south of Calne

4.8 Option 4 would deliver up to 1,000 houses to the south of Calne and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Marden Hill Farm
- Land at Silver Street
- Land at Stockley Lane

Employment option

4.9 The employment option would deliver 8.31ha of employment land to the north of Calne and comprises the following potential/ intensification of existing employment sites:

- Portemarsh Industrial Estate (existing employment site, with potential for intensification of use)
- Land to the north and west of Beversbrook Farm (potential employment site)

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

4.10 The Highways Agency advise that Calne has a similar problem to Chippenham with out-commuting to Junction 16 of the M4. This is an existing issue which will be exacerbated by any future growth in the town. There is no railway station in Calne so all out-commuting will be by car. It is therefore a difficult location to implement demand management measures through a travel plan. Consequently, Calne is a less preferable location for development than other towns.

4.11 The Highways Agency would be keen to see further information about the methodology for selecting these growth options, the housing/ employment mix and whether the Chippenham transport model could be extended to cover Calne.

Local road network

4.12 The Local Highways Authority comment that, historically, the town has supported development to the east, largely due to what is seen as the accompanying potential transport benefits. Options for growth to the east have been previously explored in some depth, and it would be possible to accommodate scenarios at the lower and higher end of the suggested quantum.

4.13 If the transport benefits are to be realised to their maximum, the higher level of growth (1200+) would achieve the greatest return.
4.14 Earlier work has considered the possibility of a new road linking Sandpit Road to the north and the A4 to the South – the challenge has been to achieve what would be essential links back into the town along the route. Low Lane is an option that has been pursued, however there may well be some difficult issues regarding land ownership.

4.15 From a transport perspective, a more dispersed option for growth would be resisted given that there would be far less potential for gain.

**Bus network**

4.16 The Passenger Transport Unit advise that all four options would have about the same cost (£200,000 pa) as they would all need a new minibus service. They do not have a preferred option.

4.17 The northern section of Option 1 would be fine for development as bus services already run past the industrial estate. The southern section of this site (near Abberd Way/ Prince Charles Drive) would need a new minibus.

4.18 Options 3 and 4 would need a new minibus service, particularly Option 4, an extension to the existing Stockley Lane estate, which would need new transport costing around £200,000 p.a.

**Water supply and sewerage**

**Sewer system**

4.19 The sewage treatment works are to the west of the town. For substantial development at Calne, Wessex Water advise that works will be required to improve sewers upstream of the treatment works to provide off line pumped return storage with a new 50m long, 300mm diameter sewer.

4.20 A restricted level of development for Options 1, 2 and 3 may be able to proceed prior to reinforcement of the sewerage system.

**Option 1**

4.21 A developer has already requested information on the site but no modelling has been done. Works would need to go through the centre of town, sewers might need to be upsized and a pumping station might also be required. An initial desktop appraisal, on behalf of a developer, indicates improvements required through the centre of Calne to allow drainage to the treatment works at the far west of the town. This will be required to avoid the risk of sewer flooding to downstream property and deteriorating water quality from existing overflows.

4.22 Specific requirements for upgrading the sewer system to serve this option include:

- 300m long 450mm diameter sewer
- New twin 2.5km long rising mains
- New pumping station

**Option 2**

4.23 Further to comments for Option 1, this option would also require extended lengths of sewers and additional pumping.

**Option 3**
This option is closer to the sewage treatment works but quite a lot of infrastructure crosses the site. Works will be required to improve sewers upstream of the treatment works to provide off line pumped return storage with a new 50m long 300mm diameter sewer (12E).

Option 4

4.24 The development option for land (south) west of Calne (Option 4) is considered to provide a more sustainable option for the provision of sewerage services (preferred option).

4.25 In general, some upsizing of the sewers would be needed. More specifically, the following improvements to the sewer system in Calne would be required for this option:

- Foul discharge from this site will be taken north through the town and then west to the treatment works
- Upsize existing length of 340m sewer to 300mm
- New 350mm length of 450 sewer
- New sewage pumping station
- New 250m length of 300mm Rising Main
- Further reinforcements required for the sewers draining through the western section of town – part of Scheme 12B

Water supply

4.26 With regard to water supply, the location of potential development is not critical as Calne has a ring main system. Initial assessment identified that it would be prudent to allow £1 million for unspecified trunk main improvements to be confirmed by detailed modelling once a preferred site is selected. The requirements to supply the proposed new and upgraded employment areas are included in the estimate of £1 million, subject to no water intensive industry locating here.

Option 1

4.27 Further to the above general comments, there would need to be diversion and upsizing of the 10” trunk main passing through site. This is a strategic trunk main and unfettered access is required to maintain this asset. Enhanced on site mains and connections required for security of supply.

Option 2

4.28 There are a number of water mains crossing the site. These would usually need an exclusion zone of 3-6m but it may be up to 12m.

Option 3

4.29 General comments about water supply in Calne apply to this option.

Option 4

4.30 Further to the above general comments, the following improvements to the water supply infrastructure in Calne would be required for this option:

- Western parcel – diversion and upsizing/ potential replacement of 250mm trunk main passing through the site – this is a strategic trunk main and unfettered access is required to maintain the asset
• Eastern parcel – there is an existing 4” supply main crossing the site which, depending on layout, may need diverting. There should be no building within 3m either site of this water main.

• Preliminary options to serve this site include extending the existing mains network from the North West and connecting to this 4” water main. There is a 10” diameter trunk main to the south/west of the site and subject to appraisal a connection from this main may be possible.

Gas

4.31 Wales and West Utilities have no issues with the options for Calne. However, GPSS pipelines (government supply pipelines, supplying aviation fuel and petrol to MOD sites) run through Option 3, in particular, and, to a lesser extent, through Option 4. This means that much of the land may need to be given over to exclusion zones. These pipelines are managed by Fischer-German but the MOD can be secretive over exact location of pipes. Fisher-German need to be contacted for further details.

4.32 A longer connection will be needed to run gas mains through open fields outside the option but not within the built-up area.

Electricity

4.33 Option 1 would be the cheapest option, being nearer the primary substation in Calne, but Scottish and Southern Energy advise that the substation would still need some reinforcement. Option 3 would be the most difficult and expensive option.

Telecommunications

4.34 BT Openreach advise that all options are within existing exchange boundaries. Any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

4.35 Option 1 is the preferred option by the County Archaeology Service, as it contains no Scheduled Monuments.

4.36 With regard to Option 2, there are extensive, well-preserved medieval earthworks in Quemerford, on the north side of the A4, part of which are a Scheduled Monument.

4.37 There are very well-preserved medieval earthworks within Option 3 too. It is also possible there are some Roman sites. The County Archaeology Service would prefer that they be preserved. The remains are probably of scheduled quality. There are no Scheduled Monuments within Option 3 but extensive well preserved earthworks survive around Berhills Farm.

4.38 Some well-preserved medieval earthworks can be found near Option 4. A protective buffer is needed because it is often the case that the extent of the remains is more than what is visible, even beyond the scheduled area. There is also possible archaeological interest to the north part of the site. There are no Scheduled Monuments within Option 4.

4.39 A Scheduled Monument at Beversbrook (medieval earthworks) is adjacent to the North West side of the employment option and the setting of the Schedule Monument may be an issue.
Mineral extraction

4.40 The council's Minerals and Waste Policy Team highlight issues to the east of Calne. There are landfill and extraction sites. Sands Farm takes industrial waste and there is the Hills site at Compton Bassett. These sites would need a large buffer zone (about 250m) which would rule out large parts of some of the proposed options. On the whole, development to the west of Calne would be easier.

4.41 The northern part of Option 1 should be fine but the southern area will be affected by the waste sites.

4.42 A substantial amount of Option 2 is affected by the waste sites. It really is a showstopper for the majority of the site.

Social and community infrastructure requirements

Early years and childcare

4.43 The council's Early Years and Childcare Team advise that there is some existing provision near Option 1. They believe that it may be possible to link in with this existing provision.

Primary and secondary schooling

4.44 In terms of providing primary and secondary school places, there is a lot of difference between 400 and 1200 houses. Assuming there are 1200, the Local Education Authority advise that a new 2 FE primary school and financial contributions to expand the secondary school would be required.

4.45 Option 2 is closer to the existing secondary school. Option 3 would have the potential to link to the Chippenham secondary schools. However, there is the risk here of joining Chippenham and Calne together. There is also the potential for conflict with the existing primary schools.

Primary health care

4.46 There are 3 GP surgeries in Calne. While the newest has capacity for 4-5 years, NHS Wiltshire advise that they would not be able to cope with the development. This surgery is Council-leased and a listed building. One of the other surgeries is on a new housing estate. It would be necessary to develop existing facilities to cope with the extra pressure. At the lower end of the housing range, there will probably not be any issues, however, at the higher end, there will definitely be issues.

Libraries

4.47 There is a relatively new library in Calne. The council's library service advise that future development may require additional mobile stops and, thus, additional funding. However, there is no need to add to the central facility. Table 4.2 shows the level of financial contributions required for the proposed development in Calne.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calne</td>
<td>400 - 1,200</td>
<td>1000 - 3000</td>
<td>30 - 90</td>
<td>85,000 - 255,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Calne
Fire and rescue

4.48 The proposed housing figures suggest an increase in population of approximately 20%. Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that additional infrastructure will be required to cope with the proposed development. There is a potential need for a new fire station/drop in points.

4.49 The socio-economic background is a problem in Calne with fires being deliberately started and other antisocial behaviour.

4.50 The location of the proposed additional/intensification of existing employment sites is good.

Ambulance

4.51 Great Western Ambulance Service advise that they are searching for standby points in Calne at the moment; whichever option when ahead they would want to have a centrally located standby point.

Police

4.52 The Wiltshire Police Authority’s Estates Strategy, published in December 2008, identifies Calne Police Station for redevelopment/replacement in the next 2 years (2008/2010). It sites poor working conditions, an under-utilised site that does not impact upon the rest of the force. There is the option to rebuild on the current site.

4.53 No specific comments on Calne were received from the Wiltshire Police Authority.

Leisure facilities

4.54 The council’s Leisure Facilities Service advise that the situation in Calne is different to the other towns as the building is owned by Wiltshire Council but it is leased to a local community trust. The existing facilities should be able to absorb the development but the trust will need to be consulted directly.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

4.55 Parts of options 1, 2 and 3 are in Flood Zone 2 and 3 and the Environment Agency advise that development should avoid these areas. The floodplain (including some functional) will restrict the amount of land available to develop. The Environment Agency’s own flood mapping is rather high level and they suggest SFRA Level 2 flood mapping for greater detail.

4.56 Watercourses run through options 1, 2 and 3; Abberd Brook (MR) runs through Option 1, River Marden (MR) and River’s Brook run through Option 2, and River Marden (MR) also runs through Option 3.

4.57 Option 4 is in Flood Zone 1 and, providing surface water drainage issues are addressed, there would be no objection from the Environment Agency relating to flood risk issues at this stage. The same applies to the employment option. Option 4 would be their preferred option because it is outside the designated floodplain, although there are adjacent and on-site watercourses, which must be considered in a flood risk assessment.
Biodiversity

4.58 Natural England advise that flood plains and archaeology should be used to provide green infrastructure, and care should be taken to preserve green infrastructure for existing residents.

Option 1

4.59 Abberd Brook bisects part of the site. The brook supports a healthy population of water voles. There are also ponds within the site area. The Environment Agency would recommend a protected species survey as part of a general ecological assessment.

4.60 The council's Strategic Landscape Team would want a buffer along the water course and hedgerows linking out to the countryside to be preserved. This is their preferred option.

Option 2

4.61 Rivers Brook runs through the site. Water voles are known to have been present on this watercourse in the past. The Environment Agency would therefore recommend a survey.

4.62 The Strategic Landscape Team would want to see a buffer zone along the watercourse and mature trees retained. There are a lot of water vole records in this area so the buffer zone is particularly important; alternative recreational areas would be needed to divert pressure from public use.

Option 3

4.63 River Marden and a section of the Wilts & Berks Canal run through the site. This is the least preferred option by the Strategic Landscape Team. The River Marden, which runs through centre, has numerous water vole records so a buffer zone would be necessary; alternative recreational areas needed to divert pressure from public use.

Option 4

4.64 Apart from some small drainage ditches there are no main rivers within Option 4. The Environment Agency would expect a general ecological survey would be expected but this option is probably less sensitive than the others in terms of species interest.

Play areas and open space

4.65 The council's Amenity and Countryside Team advise that there is updated sports field provision in Calne, which is probably over and above what is required so there may be spare capacity for additional dwellings.

Rights of Way network

4.66 There are a number of Byways Open to All Traffic (BOATS), Rights of Way that have vehicular access as well as pedestrians and horses, these should not be used as roads within the developments, their character should be preserved.

4.67 In general, circular routes should be upgraded to a high standard. Footpaths running through the sites should be upgraded to cycleways. Table 4.3 shows rights of way and cycle network infrastructure requirements for the development options for Calne.
### Table 4.3 Rights of way requirements for strategic sites in Calne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of way requirements</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALW 61, CALW 22 and CLAN 58 managed as cycleway/pedestrian use through development and into town centre but safeguard against cycle use NE of development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN 40 and CALW 16 managed as cycleway/pedestrian use through development and into town centre but safeguard against cycle use NE of development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN 63 &amp; CALW 56 (bridleway over track), not to be used as part of development and safeguard pedestrian/horse/cycle use</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular route, comprising CALW 61, CALW 22, CBAS 4, CBAS 23, CHER 29, CHER 30, CHER 22, CALW 56, CLAN 63 and CLAN 4 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To include Southern spur comprising CLAN 40, CALW 16, CALW 63, CHER 34 and connecting to CHER 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN 4 and CALW 63 not to be used as part of development and safeguard pedestrian use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also the circular route, comprising CALW 61, CALW 22, CBAS 4, CBAS 23, CHER 29, CHER 30, CHER 22, CALW 56, CLAN 63 and CLAN 4 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN 32, CLAN 27 and CALW 35 to be managed as cycleway/pedestrian use through development and into town centre but safeguard against cycle outside of development to the SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of pedestrian access to services on A4 (current footpath CLAN 21) and Compton Bassett road to E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe route (along A4 on verge ?) to primary school at C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route of Old Canal? Plus extend across Chilvester Hill at Studleybrook Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If above not considered then link CALW 5 and CALW 13 at Studleybrook Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALW 12 &amp; CALW 11 managed as cycleway/pedestrian use through development and into town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALW 5 not to be used as part of development and safeguard pedestrian use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of way requirements</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of pedestrian link from junction of CALW 5 and CALW 11 to Wenhill Lane (CALW 10) NE of Penhills Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage to high grade circular route around Penhills Farm; CALW 51A, CALW 18, CALW 3 and CALW 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALW 75 – access across stream to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALW 24 and CALW 75 managed as cycleway/pedestrian use to CLAN 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN 10 and CALW 51 be developed to a high grade to enable route to withstand increased use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALW 74 not to be used as part of development and safeguard pedestrian use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape

4.68 Natural England advise that there are potential landscape impacts on the AONB, however they would not be a showstopper. Option 3 would have the least impact on the AONB. The Strategic Landscape Team also advise that the impact on the AONB, including views of the developments, would need to be considered.

Other environmental concerns

4.69 The Environment Agency point out that part of Option 1 is an historic landfill, which would need assessment and remediation, if appropriate. The northern most part is situated upon a former landfill which may have potential contaminated land issues. Part of Option 2 is within or near the edge of licensed landfill. The potential impact of this would need to be assessed as part of the sustainability appraisal.
5 Corsham

Town context

5.1 Corsham is identified as a policy B settlement. There is a continuing military presence in the town which increases the employment offer in the town. However there are less facilities than might be expected and there are high levels of out commuting. There has been a high level of housing completions in recent years therefore the housing allocation is relatively low however a strategic site is necessary to increase the self-containment of the town and encourage better services and facilities.

Overall level of growth

5.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver an additional 200-400 dwellings in Corsham over the plan period 2006 to 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

5.3 The following table shows the proposed housing allocation for Corsham, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corsham</td>
<td>5,200 (between Development Policy B and Policy C settlements in the area covered by the former North Wiltshire District Council)</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200 to 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 In the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009, Corsham is not designated as a strategic employment centre. However, the study does refer to the current redevelopment of the Basil Hill Barracks and the potential for this to attract future ‘spin off’ employment growth to the west of Corsham.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land to the south of Corsham

5.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 400 houses to the south-east of Corsham over the plan period and comprises the following potential housing site:

- Land to the east of Leafield Trading Estate
Option 2 - Land at Gorse Farm and land at Rudloe Manor

5.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 400 houses to the south-west of Corsham over the plan period and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Gorse Farm
- Land at Rudloe Manor

Option 3 - Land to the north west of Corsham

5.7 Option 3 would deliver up to 400 dwellings to the north-west of Corsham and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Rudloe
- Land adjacent to Box School
- Land adjacent to the A4 at Rudloe
- Land at Hartham Quarry

Option 4 - Land at Hartham Quarry and Land at Rudloe Manor

5.8 Option 4 would deliver up to 400 dwellings to the south-west of Corsham and comprises the following potential housing sites:

- land at Hartham Quarry
- land at Rudloe Manor

5.9 All options include a proposed broad area of search for employment. However, specific employment sites have not been identified.

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

5.10 Corsham is less of a concern to the Highways Agency because of the distance from the strategic road network but self-containment will still be important.

5.11 While there is uncertainty over if and when the MoD sites will be delivered, they are of concern in terms of meeting sustainable transport objectives. If these sites are to come forward, the Highways Agency would wish to see their deliverability demonstrated through a phasing plan.

Local road network

5.12 The Local Highways Authority foresee no difficulties for the local road network with regard to the amount of development. However, Option 1 is unsuitable because of the extremely poor access with little likelihood of improvement.

Bus network

5.13 The Passenger Transport Unit advise that an existing bus service already serves the Rudloe estate. Option 3 is the best option, in their view, because it is surrounded by existing bus services, while Option 1 is their second favourite option.
5.14 However, Option 2 is not preferred because it would be difficult to provide a bus service. There is a similar situation with Option 4, which is nowhere near an existing bus service. Likewise, the proposed area of search for employment to the south of Corsham is not served by buses at present and is unlikely to be served in the future and there is no nearby housing.

Water supply and sewerage

General

5.15 Wessex Water advise that any site south of the railway line is preferable.

Water Supply

5.16 There are sufficient water resources and service reservoir storage to accommodate the level of development proposed in Corsham. Subject to detailed modelling, Wessex Water do not anticipate any significant off-site works will be required for any of the four sites identified for domestic development of up to 400 units, or for foreseeable employment development in the areas identified.

Sewerage

Option 1

5.17 This is the best option as far as foul sewage is concerned and requires the following infrastructure:

- New 3m deep bifurcation chamber
- 100m of 450mm diameter sewer
- New 150kw SPS
- New 2km twin 300mm diameter rising main in fields
- New 0.9km 600m diameter off site trunk sewer

Option 2

5.18 This option would need more work than Option 1 and requires the following infrastructure, in addition to that required for Option 1:

- New 2km 450mm diameter trunk sewer in fields with various road and stream crossings

Option 3 and 4

5.19 These options would entail flows gravitating through the town to the sewage treatment works on the other side of the railway. The capacity of downstream sewers would also need to be assessed. The following infrastructure would be required for Options 3 or 4:

- New 250m 300mm diameter sewer in road
- New 250m 900mm diameter surface water sewer in road to form additional storage to SUDs

Gas

5.20 Wales and West have no major issues with the options for Corsham. However, they advise that a National Grid line runs through Option 3 and the more central employment area. See Appendix 2 for a map showing the gas pipelines in Corsham.
Electricity

5.21 Scottish and Southern Energy advise that there are two primary sub-stations in Corsham. One is near to Option 1 but this would need reinforcing to meet the demand. There are also 33kv lines crossing Option 1. The primary sub-station near to Options 2 and 3 has more spare capacity so it would be cheaper to use these sites. There are also 33kv lines crossing Options 2 and 3.

5.22 National Grid advise that Option 3 is crossed by a National Grid 400kv overhead electricity transmission line.

Economic facilities

5.23 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership expressed concern that Corsham was ignored in terms of the market town employment/commercial expansion needs given the current MOD development programme. If sustainability/carbon footprint policies are to be embraced then additional employment opportunities must be located in close proximity to the MOD. Brownfield sites exist in these areas where it is preferable to develop such areas in preference to green field sites.

5.24 The current major employment sites are not marked on the draft strategic site options map for Corsham.

5.25 The allocated employment site at Potley, as defined by the North Wiltshire Local Plan (category BD1), is now included within one of the housing options. The Chamber of Commerce would oppose a non-employment use of this site.

5.26 Two of the other housing options are on land between the A4 and Bradford Road and also between the Bradford Road and Park Lane. These sites are defined as Local Rural Buffers (category NE3) in the North Wiltshire Local Plan in order to prevent Rudloe becoming an extension of Corsham. There is likely to be strong opposition from the Parish Councils, with the additional aspect of increased traffic congestion following the completion of the MOD Basil Hill site in 2011.

5.27 The two areas marked to be researched for employment land are too vague to comment on except that the area around the Eastern portal of Box Tunnel includes an extensive SSSI and a Local Buffer. The other area to the North of the A4 is highly speculative and there are ownership constraints.

5.28 The Copenacre site to the North of the A4 will be marketed by the MOD from 2011 onwards. The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership consider that it is subject to Planning Policy NE20 of the North Wiltshire Local Plan and therefore employment use is favoured over residential. The Chamber of Commerce would oppose a non-employment use of this site.

5.29 There is an opportunity to review existing developed zones and to subsequently relate any expansion of development to those areas thereby coordinating and consolidating infrastructure and services. Consequently, the various plans should clearly show all existing industrial/commercial/residential zones and how the proposed expansion areas relate.

Historic legacy

5.30 The County Archaeology Service suggest that an Extensive Urban Survey (EUS) would be helpful here. An evaluation has already been undertaken for the MOD development in Basil Hill Barracks. They advise that there are no scheduled monuments that would affect the options.
5.31 The council's Conservation Team advise that the proposed area of search for employment sites to the north of Corsham would completely obliterate the Guyers House site and should not be supported as it encroaches into open countryside, bounded by no apparent landscape features.

5.32 However, the proposed area of search for employment sites to the south of Corsham, the MOD site, would be more appropriate.

5.33 Option 1 encroaches on open countryside to a greater extent than Option 3. Options 2 and 4 do not extend beyond the existing MOD site and Option 4 would be preferable to Option 2. Option 3 represents a continuous band of development resulting in the coalescence of Corsham and Rudloe. Does this matter?! The area north of A4 might be better as business use.

Telecommunications

5.34 BT Openreach advise that all options are within existing exchange boundaries. Any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Minerals and Waste

5.35 The council's Minerals and Waste Policy Team advise that there are significant historic and current mines in Corsham. Hansen Bath and Portland Stone own and operate all the mines in Corsham and they may open up currently closed mines if there is demand.

5.36 Option 1 seems sensible. Moor Park mine covers Option 2, it is currently dormant. Hartham Park is a current site that covers part of Option 3, and may undermine it. This can be a noisy activity.

Social and community infrastructure

Early years childcare

5.37 Option 1 is not preferred by the council's Early Years and Childcare Team because there are more services to the west of the town. Childrens centre services have just been developed in Rudloe. Option 3 is fairly close to Rudloe so there may be the opportunity to link in with this development.

Primary and secondary schooling

5.38 The Local Education Authority advise that financial contributions would be necessary to expand the primary school. Option 1 is close to Neston but it is difficult to expand the primary school as it is a listed building. Options 2 and 3 are good for the existing primary schools.

5.39 The secondary school is currently taking out of area students so there should be enough spaces, and there should be no need for a contribution at the moment.

5.40 No sites would be needed in Corsham.

Primary Healthcare

5.41 NHS Wiltshire advise that the GP surgery in Corsham is struggling for capacity and looking to expand. There is room to expand on-site but funding would be the only issue. The £30,000 received from previous development has not been enough.
Libraries

5.42 The council's library service advise that, while the existing library is busy, there is no need for a major new building in Corsham. However, there would be difficulties in expanding the building, which is next to a listed mansion building.

5.43 Table 5.2 shows the financial contributions required to fund the extra library service provision to cope with new development.

Table 5.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Corsham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corsham</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
<td>15 - 30</td>
<td>42,500 - 85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire and Rescue

5.44 Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that additional infrastructure will be necessary in Corsham, which is complicated by the MoD sites.

Ambulance

5.45 Great Western Ambulance Service does not have any permanent standby points in Corsham. They would want a 24/7 standpoint centrally located in Corsham (e.g. in the south search area) to cope with any of the proposed options.

Police

5.46 The Wiltshire Police Authority's *Estates Strategy*, published in December 2008, identified Corsham Police Station for redevelopment/replacement in the next 5 to 10 years (2013/2018). It sites the current facility being a big site, that is under-utilised. There may be housing options for the site and the opportunity to use space in the redevelopment of the Chippenham Police Station.

5.47 No specific comments on Corsham were received from the Wiltshire Police Authority.

Cemeteries and Crematoria

5.48 The council's Amenity and Countryside Team advise that the cemetery in Corsham is nearly full, and is located to the north of Option 1. Money would therefore be sought to expand the cemetery. The land is already secured, and an expansion is almost ready to go - it is just a case of waiting for funding.

Leisure Facilities

5.49 The council's Leisure Facilities Team advise that there has been a lot of investment in the leisure centre at Corsham. However, the sports pitch does need upgrading to all weather and flood light. There are also opportunities to improve the Sauna areas for health and fitness purposes etc, and developer contributions would be sought towards providing these facilities.
Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

5.50 Option 1 has two watercourses on site, some floodplain designated – further modelling recommended by the Environment Agency. Part of this option is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Development should avoid these areas. Option 1 is also in Special Protection Zone (SPZ) 2. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

5.51 Option 2 is adjacent to Box Mine SSSI, which would need to be protected. Options 2, 3 and 4, for that matter, have no flood risk constraints but, as with Option 1, are also within SPZ 2. With Option 4, there is a small drain to the east but otherwise no issues. The proposed area of search for employment is also within SPZ 2 but includes a watercourse and lake, which must be considered in a flood risk assessment.

Biodiversity

General

5.52 Natural England advise that there are bat related SSSIs of European importance, these will need looking into. None of the options contain significant proportions of BAP habitat (lowland grassland, deciduous woodland etc.), though any one option may still contain habitats and features of significance to bats. Each option should be ground-truthed in order to determine the likely significance of the broad habitats, and site connectivity, in order to inform the preferred option process more thoroughly.

5.53 The council's Strategic Landscape Team point out that the SAC is an important hibernation site for bats; it is an N2K site of European importance. There would need to be a judgement of likely significant impact for any development, and assessment would need to be carried out for all of the proposed sites. The HRA should pick this up. All suitable habitats surrounding the SAC that is used by foraging/commuting bats will need to be retained, protected and enhanced, and lighting restricted. Not able to rank sites until results of HRA.

Option 1

5.54 Option 1 is further away from the SSSI/ SAC but largely comprises, and connects with, open countryside. If this site were to be favoured, Natural England advise that a considerable buffer may be needed to prevent light spill into the area of farmed land beyond. Existing networks of hedgerows would need to be retained and enhanced so they could continue to function as effective wildlife corridors.

5.55 The Strategic Landscape Team advise that the belt of trees through Option 1 would need to be retained with a buffer and restricted lighting. Habitat corridors linking to railway embankment and wider countryside retained and enhanced.

5.56 The Environment Agency point out that there are small watercourses and ponds on the site and Corsham railway cutting County Wildlife Site and SSSI is to the north.

Option 2
5.57 Option 2 is particularly close to Box Mine SSSI/SAC, advise Natural England, with possible linkages via the mine system underground. Potential effects of development on the bat SAC will be greater with this option if there is below-ground connectivity. Above-ground habitat and connectivity are also likely to be more significant with this option, as the movement and feeding opportunities for bats are more limited closer to the SAC site. The western half of this site is open countryside which may be of significance to bats.

5.58 Option 2 is also set amongst a large area of development which already has planning permission to be developed or where development is underway (Spring Park site, Ark Continuity, Basil Hill Barracks, Rudloe Manor firing range, and Royal Arthur Park is close by). Horseshoe bats are known to use a band of woodland to the south of the Spring Park for commuting, and significant lesser horseshoe bat roosts have been found at Basil Hill Barracks and Rudloe Manor. Development of this option would infill another block of land where disturbance to bats is already occurring.

5.59 The Strategic Landscape Team have major concerns with Option 2 as it contains woodland and habitat known to be used by species of bat that are a primary reason for the selection of the SAC. There are records of great crested newts within the site, likely to require mitigation measures that could influence site layout and no. houses. Not a good option.

5.60 There are no watercourses of concern to the Environment Agency but Box Mine SSSI/SAC is adjacent and there are Great crested newts recorded nearby.

Option 3

5.61 Natural England point out that Option 3 is again farmed land in open countryside, with more open country beyond its boundary. Their comments for Option 1 also apply to Option 3.

5.62 The hedgerows and mature trees in Option 3 would need to be retained for foraging/commuting bats advise the Strategic Landscape Team; buffered and lighting restricted.

5.63 There is no watery interest on the site for the Environment Agency. It is close to Box Mine SSSI/SAC.

Option 4

5.64 The blue part of Option 4 looks superficially more suitable to Natural England than Option 2 because the larger proportion of open countryside is excluded and it is not directly abutting Box Mine. However, the concerns about development pressure in this area and its proximity to the SSSI/SAC remain, notwithstanding any inherent bat-supporting habitat this option may contain.

5.65 There is an SSSI along the railway in Option 4 and there could be some show stopper associated with this. The greyed area marked as "for employment" contains Corsham Railway Cutting SSSI, a site notified for its geological interest. Any development must avoid incursion into the SSSI. The railway line provides a wildlife corridor through Corsham, and may be an important commuting route for bats. Development proposed in this area must take account of effects on the wildlife using this corridor particularly with respect to bats.

5.66 The Strategic Landscape Team do not believe Option 4 is a good option.

Employment area of search

5.67 Corsham Railway Cutting SSSI is within part of the employment option. The Environment Agency advise that this should be protected.
Rights of Way and Cycle Networks

5.68 It would be useful to create links out to the surrounding rural communities. There is a central route that provides good links all the way through Corsham, this should be upgraded. Table 5.3 show the rights of way and cycle pathway infrastructure requirements resulting from the planned development.

Table 5.3 Rights of way and cycle pathway requirements in Corsham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Way requirements</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Employment options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>south</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>south</td>
<td>north</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From A4 to Bradford Rd (CORS12) to Park Lane (CORS 96) to Sheffield Lane (CORS67) to Pockeridge Drive (CORS 99). Upgrade and widen to allow for a safe pedestrian route connecting the communities to the west of the town. Also create footpath to west of CORS 99 to recent seating/ recreation area adjacent to Pockeridge Drive.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe pedestrian/cycle access across railway line at CORM 95 and Valley Rd.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a safe pedestrian /cycle access to town centre from the development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe pedestrian access across the A4 at Copenacre site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape

5.69 Natural England and the Strategic Landscape Team advise that there are potential landscape impacts on the AONB, including views of the developments, with all of the proposed sites.
6 Devizes

Town context

6.1 Devizes is designated a policy B settlement and has traditionally been a focus for development within the east Wiltshire area. It has a good employment base and is identified as a location for strategic employment growth. It has a strong town centre and land available for development. It is however constrained by transport issues and congestion. A strategic site is needed to maintain employment and service provision in the town within these transport restrictions.

Overall level of growth

6.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver a further 700 to 1,100 additional houses in Devizes for the plan period 2006 – 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

6.3 The following table shows the proposed housing allocation for Devizes, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 6.1 Proposed housing allocations for Devizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative Additional Dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>6,000 (Policy B and C settlements in the area covered by the former Kennet District Council)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>700 -1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy (2009) found that there was more employment land available than was required in Devizes. It recommended that 13.25ha is supplied over the plan period. This comprises:

- the intensification of use at Folly Road
- land between the A361 and Horton Road

6.5 The strategy also makes reference to a current appeal for employment use on land at Bureau West. This is currently the subject of an appeal. If the appeal is dismissed further consideration should be given to progressing the site through the Wiltshire Local Development Framework.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land north-west of Devizes

6.6 Option 1 would deliver up to 1,100 homes to the north-west of Devizes over the plan period and includes the following housing sites:

- Land to the south of Roundway Hill Farm
- Land to the north-east of Roundway Park
- Land south of Parkfield

**Option 2 - Land to the east of Devizes**

6.7 Option 2 would deliver up to 1,100 homes to the north-east of Devizes over the plan period and includes the following housing sites:

- Land at Bureau West
- Land adjacent to Lay Wood

**Option 3 - Land east of Devizes**

Option 3 would deliver up to 1,100 homes to the east of Devizes over the plan period and includes the following housing sites:

- Land at Coate Bridge
- Land to the east of Windsor Drive

**Option 4 - Land south of Devizes**

6.8 Option 4 would deliver up to 1,100 homes to the south of Devizes over the plan period and includes the following housing sites:

- Land off the A342 (behind the Fox and Hounds)
- Land off the A342 and Sleigh Road
- Land south east of Devizes

**Physical infrastructure requirements**

**Strategic road network**

6.9 The Highways Agency advised that the impacts on the strategic road network will be minimal. Developments closer to the town would be preferred in order to reduce unnecessary trips by private car.

**Local road network**

6.10 The Local Highways Authority say that Devizes has been modelled but there were issues with the process. The model went up to 2021 not 2026 and indicated that, at a point, the capacity of the road network could not cope with additional growth. This is a concern if extra housing has been allocated up to 2026 and will need further attention. The problem for Devizes is that there is not the range of alternatives to make people change their behaviours, such as buses or trains. The constraints on the road network could be a showstopper post-2021.

6.11 There had been a belief within the Local Highways Authority that options for growth had been considered, compared and largely settled. A great deal of work has been undertaken to come to the above conclusion by Highways and the former Kennet District Council and the findings have been shared at some length with the local community. Some two years ago, the former County Council built a town-wide transport model that was used to help determine both the quantum and pattern of growth. Highways are still engaged in discussion with the Town Council (and Wiltshire Councillors) about the scope and quality of that evidence.
6.12 There will be a significant financial implication to running (different) model scenarios again. However, there is one useful and compelling conclusion that will remain constant. The original Devizes modelling exercise considered a number of increasing growth scenarios and, although it was based on some specific sites that may or may not carry through to a revised arrangement, the basic conclusion was that Devizes reached a critical threshold at a relatively early stage. Beyond that, it became very evident that the transport network failed, and therefore we should only be considering scenarios at the lower end (i.e. circa 700). By the way, Option 2 may already be in the system.

Bus network

6.13 The Passenger Transport Unit advised that Devizes Road is now at capacity during peak periods. Option 1 would require a new bus service. However, Option 2 would have the least cost in terms of public transport. This option looks good as there is already a decent bus service in this area. However there may be an issue with capacity of Devizes Road and the implications of this on bus service provision. Option 3 would require a new bus service. Option 4 would also require a new bus service and there would probably be an issue with distance to schools.

Water supply and sewerage

6.14 Wessex Water advises that sites south of the canal are preferable. The sewage treatment works are to the west of the town.

Water supply

6.15 While sufficient water resources are available, network reinforcement will be required to convey water into the local Devizes service reservoir. These works are estimated at £1million to upgrade the feed into Devizes reservoir. The service reservoir storage itself should be adequate to accommodate the planned development.

Option 1

6.16 Network modelling needed to confirm impact on upstream trunk main network back to Shepherds Shore reservoir. Assume off site costs at circa £0.5million at this stage to upgrade connections to trunk mains in London Road.

Option 2

6.17 Subject to detailed assessment, off site works likely to be less than £0.25million for this site as close to trunk mains in London Road.

Option 3

6.18 This is high ground that will may require a booster to maintain adequate pressures. This needs detailed modelling, but off site costs likely to be circa £1million.

Option 4

6.19 Development land lies upstream of the existing water supply systems and includes high ground at Potterne Field. Therefore, there is a high possibility of significant off site works up to circa £2million.

Waste
6.20 All of the options require a scheme to reinforce the second stage of network from East Devizes to Potterne Sewage Treatment Works as follows:

- New pumped return storage tank
- New 50m rising main – 150mm diameter
- New 100m 300mm diameter sewer
- New 3km 450mm diameter sewer laid parallel to existing sewer mostly in fields
- Four river crossings

6.21 Option 1, 2 and 3 would require a scheme to reinforce the first stage of network from site to East Devizes as follows:

- New 700m 450mm diameter sewer in road
- New 800m 300mm diameter sewer in road
- New SPS and bifurcation chamber
- New 2km rising main – 150mm diameter to duplicate existing. Includes canal crossing

6.22 Option 4 could connect to the sewage treatment works at Potterne but the capacity would need to be checked first.

Water quality

6.23 The Environment Agency advise that Devizes sewage treatment works (STW) is known to impact on water quality and the current consent needs to be tightened. Modelling has confirmed this together with the results of REC/ WFD compliance. The STW was proposed for PR09 but is not on the final draft list.

6.24 There is insufficient dilution as the flow in the receiving watercourses is not very large, especially during the summer months. Any increase in discharge volume would exacerbate the situation and therefore the consent would need to be tightened to ensure maintenance of load. This could result in a consent that would be very difficult or very costly for Wessex Water to comply with.

6.25 Both STWs have existing tight ammonia conditions of 5mg/l 95 percentile and 20 mg/l max – standards below this are considered very stringent. Most likely action by Wessex Water would be to relocate the discharge points. Both STWs have complied with their consent limits over the past 3 years.

6.26 In general, for options 1 - 4 and the employment option, the current consent to discharge conditions for STW may need to be tightened, and along with the low dilution, the potential capacity available for growth.

6.27 Devizes would need to be carefully assessed as part of the SA. Water supply infrastructure capacity also needs to be assessed as part of SA.

Gas

6.28 Wales and West Utilities have no issues in Devizes. However, the length of pipe needed to connect Option 4 to the gas mains will be relatively long (thus, more expensive) and will need to go through a large part of the built-up area in the town centre.
Electricity

6.29 Scottish and Southern Energy advise that, while the primary sub station is fairly central, all the options are on the wrong side of town for the sub station. There is not much difference between the options. Option 2 probably requires the most expensive infrastructure, whereas Option 4 probably requires the least expensive infrastructure.

Economic facilities

6.30 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership expressed concern that the allocation at Devizes is inadequate, particularly in terms of businesses looking to expand/relocate to sites away from residential neighbours.

Telecommunications

6.31 BT Openreach advised that all options are within existing exchange boundaries, any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

6.32 The County Archaeology Service advised that, with respect to all of the options, there are no Scheduled Monuments and limited, known, non designated archaeology.

6.33 The council's Conservation Service made the following comments on the individual options:

Option 1

6.34 At the north-eastern edge of Option 1, the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed Roundway Mill Farmhouse is a significant consideration.

Options 2 and 3

6.35 With regard to options 2 and 3, the Kennet and Avon Canal has national significance as a heritage asset and the desirability of preserving its setting is a significant consideration. On the southern edge of Option 2, the current setting of the canal is rural and secluded. This is very different from those stretches which run through the town and this distinction between the settings of urban and rural reaches should be maintained. Ladywood bridge and the adjacent blockhouse are listed structures and there is a statutory requirement to consider their setting in the planning process.

Option 4

6.36 There is the potential with Option 4 for direct impact upon the setting of a number of listed buildings. Of particular concern are Nursteed House and Nursteed Place in Nursteed village. Also, the Fox and Hounds Public House, Nursteed; Roudway Hospital; and Nafford House and Sandfield House, Potterne. This option also appears the most likely to have a general impact on the setting of the town as a whole.
Social and community infrastructure requirements

Early years and childcare

6.37 The council's Early Years and Childcare Team advise that there is a possible issue with Bath Road. A childcare provider operating on Bath Road (providing around 90 places) has been given 18 months notice that the site is up for redevelopment (St Peter's School). The options for development are all located away from Bath Road, and therefore it may be that a new site could be found for the nursery away from Bath Road.

6.38 A pre-school has been moved out of the town centre and put into Nursteed.

Primary and secondary schooling

6.39 The Local Education Authority advise that, for 1,100 houses, a new 2 FE primary school would be necessary.

6.40 Devizes is a single secondary school town and they do not want to set up a second school. Expansion of the school should be fine; a financial contribution would be necessary for this.

6.41 The Devizes Development Plan included building a new 1FE primary school very close to Option 1. Other than the potential conflict with this new school, Option 1 is a good option. Option 2 is close to Bishops Cannings and might put the village school at risk; there is potential for conflict. There are no problems with Option 3. Option 4 is very spread out; there might be issues with travelling to school.

Primary health care

6.42 NHS Wiltshire advise that there are currently 3 GP surgeries in Devizes. However, there is a scheme to merge all of them together on a site at Green Lane, to the south of the town. Extra capacity is being built into the building. It would be able to cope with the extra development but this would still require funding for the extra doctors and dentists. This new health centre is close to Option 4 but a long way from the other options. The hospital in Devizes and the community point will be closing.

Libraries

6.43 The council's Library Service advised that to cope with the extra development, there may be a need for more public space in the existing building and more mobile library provision.

Table 6.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Devizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>700 - 1,100</td>
<td>1,750 - 2,750</td>
<td>52.5 - 82.5</td>
<td>148,750 - 233,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fire and Rescue

6.44 The Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advised that additional infrastructure will be necessary in Devizes. The current retained fire station is already at capacity. Reorganisation to a day crew might be necessary.

Ambulance

6.45 Great Western Ambulance Service advised that the ambulance station near the centre of town needs replacement. They are looking at potential options. A standby point might be needed in the development.

Police

6.46 Wiltshire Police Authority made no specific comments on Devizes. However, their Estates Strategy (2008) identifies the police station in Devizes Borough for replacement or redevelopment within the next 5 to 10 years (2013-2018). The reason for this is sited as the existing station being on a "large site, sector part small, option to use better when HQ resolved".

Cemeteries and crematoria

6.47 The council's Amenity and Countryside Team advised that the Town Council has doubled the size of the cemetery but, as each new section of field is opened up, there are associated costs. Contributions would therefore be sought.

Leisure Facilities

6.48 The Leisure Facilities Team advised that the leisure centre at Devizes is under pressure. There are car parking issues and the sports hall, pool and fitness gym are (or are reaching) full capacity. The town benefits from a vibrant hockey club who are looking to expand.

6.49 Developer contributions would be useful to help with the provision of a teaching pool, an expansion of the gym, expanded sports hall and more hockey facilities. Cycle routes linking to the leisure centre would be needed as access is a problem in Devizes. The facilities are shared with the school.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

6.50 The Environment Agency advised that all of the options are in Flood Zone 1 and, therefore, have no flood risk constraints.

Biodiversity

Option 1

6.51 The Environment Agency have no issues with Option 1. However, the council's Strategic Landscape Team point out that the site is close to Roundway Down SSSI and they would need to assess the possible impact on conservation features of SSSI (chalk grassland) e.g. dog walkers.

Option 2
This option is adjacent to the Kennet & Avon Canal County Wildlife Site, which supports water voles. There are a woodland copse and important hedgerow within the site. Bats and roosting barn owls recorded within site. The Strategic Landscape Team advise the retaining of the woodland and hedgerow. They also say that the canal would need buffer zones, and the land connecting these habitats would need to be retained and enhanced.

Option 3

The Kennet and Avon Canal is to the north of the site, so water voles are a consideration. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that the hedgerows would need to be retained; maintaining the links to the wider countryside. The canal on the northern boundary would need to be buffered.

Option 4

Drew's Pond Wood County Wildlife Site is to the north of this option and there are also ponds on the site. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that there would have to be a buffer and recreational areas provided to direct public usage elsewhere. Additional habitat should be retained and enhanced as mitigation for the impact to Drew's Pond Wood. There are also records of bats in the area. This is the least preferred option.

Rights of Way and cycle routes

The Rights of Way Team advise contacting British Waterways to discuss the impact of extra use on the tow path and see if any upgrades are necessary.

In general, circular routes need to be upgraded to cope with increased use. With Option 3, there are a number of Byways Open to All Traffic across and around this site and, therefore, there would be issues associated with managing any extra vehicular use on the network.

For Option 4, it would be necessary to provide links to Potterne for the school; it might be worth talking to the Safe Routes to School people about this. Existing paths around the site should be retained, upgraded to bridleway and their character protected. The former railway should have pedestrian access provided.

In addition, the following rights of way and cycle network infrastructure requirements, as shown in Table 6.3, apply:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of Way Infrastructure Requirements</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROUN 4 and ROUN 2 (incl. Quakers Walk) from Roundway Hill Farm to be managed as pedestrian/cycle access to a high standard. NB maintain corridor development free to retain some of the existing character</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundway Hill &amp; Oliver’s Castle – maintain, from development to high standard PRoW to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of safe pedestrian link along Consciences Lane between ROUN 2 and ROUN 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAN 7 not to be used as part of development and managed as pedestrian/cycle access through the development and over the canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to pub at marina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes, comprising BCAN 32, BCAN 7, BCAN 8, BCAN 6, BCAN 4, BCAN 9, BCAN 10, BCAN 16 and BCAN 34 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUN 10 (Gypsy Path) ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to towpath (BCAN 34) for cyclists/pedestrians opposite marina (pedestrian bridge across canal at this point?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUN 14 not to be used as part of development and maintained to high quality to Coate (BCAN 28) to withstand all users including vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAN 30 (Wessex Ridgeway) maintained to high quality to Coate (BCAN 28) to withstand all users including vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAN 19/ROUN 13/DEVI 5 and ROUN 11 managed as cycleway/pedestrian use through development and into town centre from BCAN 30 (Wessex Ridgeway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes, comprising BCAN 19, ROUN 13, DEVI 5, BCAN 28, ROUN 14, ROUN 10, ROUN 14 to withstand increased recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Way Infrastructure Requirements</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, ETCH 6 and BCAN 30 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTT 46, POTT 47 and ROUN 18 not to be used as part of development and managed as minimum pedestrian/horse/cycle access along edge of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismantled Railway, from development to STER 10 opened as pedestrian access and managed to high quality grassland – protected from misuse by vehicles and cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes, comprising STER 10, STER 6, POTT 127, POTT 51, POTT 50, POTT 45, POTT 34, POTT 35, POTT 47 and POTT 46 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTT 121, POTT 34, POTT 45 and POTT 47 to be linked as a pedestrian/cycle access route between Potterne, the development and Devizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drews Pond access to be carefully managed to reduce impact of neighbouring development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Play areas and open space**

6.59 The council's Play and Open Space Team advise that the sports club cannot develop due to access issues. The football club wants to move but cannot find anywhere to move to, due to planning concerns. There are general issues with access/transport in Devizes.

6.60 The Kennet and Avon Canal has been used by developers in the past to provide drainage solutions – this leads to flood risk elsewhere. All the northern options in Devizes will need to be considered in terms of drainage.

6.61 The land around Option 2 is very wet. Springs may be located on the land. Therefore, there would be practical difficulties with development. There may also be an existing planning application on the Bureau West site.

6.62 Play provision would be no problem with Option 3, as there is a major play site to the west of the site. However, there are no play facilities in and around Option 4.

**Landscape**

6.63 The Strategic Landscape Team advise that the AONB is to the north and west of Devizes and the impact, including views of the developments, will need to be considered. The Kennet Landscape Assessment may be useful when considering sites in Devizes.
Option 1 would have a large impact on the AONB, whereas while Option 2 could be a natural extension to the town, it would still need to be assessed. The southern part of Option 3 is not as good as the northern part and agricultural land to the south of this option has recently had funding to be improved. Option 4 is disassociated from the town, which it also overlooks and is visually sensitive. This option is not preferred. The employment option is visible on the approach to Devizes.

Natural England also advise of potentially important impacts on the AONB. They comment that Option 4 would have the least impact on the AONB but there is a wildlife site and there could be cat predation issues.

Other environmental considerations

Landfill

The Environment Agency point out that Option 2 is situated on a former landfill site and this may have potential contaminated land issues should it be developed upon. Assessment and remediation, as appropriate, would be required.
7 Malmesbury

Town context

7.1 Malmesbury is identified as a policy B settlement. It has a strong economic base and a good level of services and facilities but is less affordable than the other market towns in the former North Wiltshire area. It is environmentally constrained but a small strategic allocation will address affordability issues and support services and employment in the town.

Overall level of growth

7.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver an additional 200 to 400 houses in Malmesbury over the plan period 2006 to 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

7.3 Table 7.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Malmesbury, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>5,200 (between Policy B and C settlements in the area covered by the former North Wiltshire District Council)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 does not designate Malmesbury as a strategic employment centre. However, it does make reference to the Dyson site as a key employer in Malmesbury.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land north-west of Malmesbury

7.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 400 dwellings to the north-west of Malmesbury and includes the following potential housing sites (not all this land would be required to fulfil the housing allocation):

- Land at 177 Backbridge Farm
- Land west of Malmesbury
- Land at Park Road
Option 2 - Land north and east of Malmesbury

7.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 400 dwellings to the north and east of Malmesbury and includes the following potential housing sites (*not all this land would be required to fulfil the housing allocation*):

- Land at Whychurch Farm
- Land north west of Reeds Farm Estate
- Land to the rear of Sunhaven

Option 3 - Land south of Malmesbury

7.7 Option 3 would deliver up to 220 dwellings to the south of Malmesbury and includes the following potential housing sites (*land at Burton Hill was added later to this option and was not shown on the map given to infrastructure providers*):

- Land at Malmesbury Static Caravan and Camp Site
- Land at Burton Hill House School site

Option 4 - Focus on previously developed land

7.8 *Option 4 would deliver up to 125 dwellings to the south and west of Malmesbury and includes the following potential housing sites (*land at Burton Hill was added later to this option and was not shown on the map given to infrastructure providers*):

- Land at Burton Hill House School Site
- Land at the rear of Bloomfield House

7.9 The proposed employment site to the north of Malmesbury is currently in use but may offer the opportunity for expansion or reuse in the future and is included with each option.

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

7.10 The Highways Agency advise that the proposed volume of housing growth is manageable. However, there are currently high levels of out-commuting which needs to be addressed.

Local road network

7.11 The Local Highways Authority have a preference for rounding off of Option 2.

Bus network

7.12 The Passenger Transport Unit advise that, for Options 1 and 2, new bus services would be needed, at a cost of £200,000 per annum. However, there would be no cost in terms of public transport for Options 3 and 4 because no extra buses are needed. Therefore, they can be considered transport neutral.

Rail network

7.13 Network Rail had no comments to make regarding Malmesbury.
Water supply and sewerage

7.14 Wessex Water advise that there is not much spare capacity in Malmesbury.

Water supply

7.15 There are sufficient water resources and service reservoir storage to be able to accommodate this level of development in Malmesbury.

Waste

7.16 Each site is likely to require a combination of gravity and pumped connections to the Sewage Treatment Works to the east of the town.

7.17 Option 1 would need a big scheme with a new pumping station required. This site is the furthest from Whychurch Water Tower, which supplies the town, and, therefore, this option would have the greatest off-site costs, possibly up to £0.25 million.

7.18 Option 2 is preferable to Option 1, but it would still be a big scheme requiring a new pumping station. This site is still close to Whychurch Tower and off-site costs would be limited to less than £0.1 million.

7.19 Option 3 could be accommodated by the existing infrastructure. This site is smaller but would require a suitable point of connection and may need up to £0.25 million in off-site works.

7.20 Option 4 is a smaller site and the demand would be nominal. Subject to detailed modelling, this option is unlikely to require significant off-site works.

Gas

7.21 Wales and West Utilities currently have no issues with the supply of gas to either existing or future development in Malmesbury.

Electricity

7.22 Scottish and Southern Energy advise that there is capacity on the primary sub-station for the number of houses proposed. Option 1 would be closest to the sub-station.

Economic facilities

7.23 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership had no comments to make regarding Malmesbury.

Telecommunications

7.24 BT Openreach advise that all options are within existing exchange boundaries and any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics. There are no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

7.25 The County Archaeology Service advise that Malmesbury is a place of historical significance and there are likely to be significant finds. Investigations are likely as a result. For example, a Saxon Palace was found just outside Malmesbury.

7.26 There are no Scheduled Monuments on any of the options, including the employment option.
7.27 The council’s Conservation Service advise that the Malmesbury Conservation Area Appraisal (and its associated Management Plan) provides information on important views into and out of the conservation area which should be protected.

7.28 They advise that Option 1 is probably least harmful. However, Option 2 would seriously impact on views of Malmesbury Abbey and harm views into the town across the valley. There is a mediaeval farm complex adjacent to the Cricklade roundabout - the area to the north of this is less sensitive.

7.29 Options 3 and 4 impact on the river valley setting and a number of listed buildings. Consolidating development at this point would be harmful. The parkland associated with the (listed) Burton Hill school is important.

Minerals extraction

7.30 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team point out that there is a flood plain within Option 1.

Development management

7.31 The council’s Development Management made no comments on Malmesbury.

Social and community infrastructure

Early years and childcare

7.32 The Early Years and Childcare Team advise that childcare provision in Malmesbury is difficult and always has been. There is currently a big development planned for extended services and childcare adjacent to the Secondary School.

7.33 Option 1 would be the preferred option in terms of childcare provision.

Primary and secondary schooling

7.34 The Local Education Authority advise that primary school provision is tight in Malmesbury, with a small catholic school with no space to expand and a full 2FE primary school. If there were 550 houses planned then they would want a new 1FE primary school. If it is 200-400 houses then they would struggle; it is possible that the catholic school might move and expand, they will need to discuss this in October. They might need a site for the school to move to.

7.35 They might want a financial contribution for the secondary school. It is a PFI school and expansion would be expensive.

7.36 Options 1 and 2 would be better options in terms of education provision.

Further education

7.37 Wiltshire College made no comments regarding Malmesbury.

Primary health care

7.38 NHS Wiltshire advise that there is a new Primary Care Centre on the old Malmesbury Hospital site. Spare capacity has been built in but funding would be needed to bring this extra space into use. The centre should be able to cope with growth for the next five to ten years (an extra 200 to 400 houses) but not beyond this time.
Libraries

7.39 The council's library service advise that the existing library building is well-located. There is the opportunity to reconfigure existing space within this building. There is no service funding available for major refurbishment requirements need in Malmesbury, Warminster and Amesbury.

7.40 Table 7.2 shows the infrastructure requirements and likely cost of extra library provision to serve the development proposed in the Core Strategy.

Table 7.2  Library service provision for planned growth in Malmesbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
<td>15 - 30</td>
<td>42, 500 - 85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police

7.41 Wiltshire Police Authority made no specific comments on Malmesbury. However, their Estates Strategy (2008) identified Malmesbury Police Station for redevelopment/ replacement within the next two to five years (2010 to 2013). The Strategy cites it being a big site with costly maintenance plans and rather tired looking. However, there are commercial options available.

Fire and Rescue Service

7.42 Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that the existing fire station should be able to cope with the increase in housing in isolation, but the cumulative impact and the impact of the employment area may mean that new infrastructure is necessary.

Ambulance

7.43 Great Western Ambulance Service advise that, since the ambulance station is centrally located, either of the proposed options would be fine. Modelling would need to be done to see if additional crews or extended shifts would be necessary.

Cemeteries

7.44 The council's Amenity and Countryside Service made no specific comments on Malmesbury.

Leisure facilities

7.45 The council Leisure Services Team advise that there is no need to develop the leisure centre in Malmesbury.
Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

7.46 The Environment Agency advise that all of the flood zones given below are those given in the EA flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that your SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.

Option 1

7.47 Part of Option 1 is in Flood Zones (FZs) 2 and 3. If these areas could be avoided for development, the Environment Agency would have no objection at this stage. However, a SFRA Level 2 may be required, particularly due to the potential road realignment. Surface water drainage issues would need to be considered.

7.48 Part of Option 1 also falls within Groundwater Special Protection Zone (SPZ) 2 and 3. The Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

7.49 The River Avon (Tetbury Branch, MR) runs through Option 1 and its floodplain (including functional) constrains the southern part of the site.

Option 2

7.50 Option 2 is within FZ 1 and part of the site also falls within groundwater SPZ 3. The Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should again be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

7.51 There are no constraints, with regard to flood risk, on Option 2.

Option 3

7.52 Part of Option 3 is in FZ 2 and 3. If these areas could be avoided for development, the Environment Agency would have no objection at this stage. However, a SFRA Level 2 may be required, particularly due to the potential road realignment. Surface water drainage issues would need to be considered.

7.53 Part of Option 3 also falls within Groundwater SPZ 2 and 3. The Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

7.54 Option 3 is adjacent to but outside the floodplain. A flood risk assessment would be needed to check this in detail.

Option 4

7.55 Flooding issues are a showstopper to part of Option 4. This option is virtually all within FZ 3, which is probably Functional Floodplain (FZ3b). Therefore only water compatible development as given in Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) would be appropriate at this location. The Environment Agency would object to housing or commercial development in this location. However, their objection only relates to the western site of Option 4. This site is also in SPZ 2.

Employment option
7.56 The employment option for Malmesbury is in FZ 1.

**Biodiversity**

*Option 1*

7.57 The council's Strategic Landscape advise that there could be issues with Option 1. It's adjacent to a Strategic Nature Area (SNA) for neutral grassland. The Bristol River Avon (running through centre of site) is a county wildlife site; records of water voles and great crested newts within site. The river would need a significant buffer zone. This is the least preferable option.

7.58 Natural England suggest that the flood plain should be used to provide green infrastructure.

7.59 The Environment Agency point out that Option 1 borders the Tetbury Avon County Wildlife Site, which is important for water voles, otters and native crayfish. There are also ponds on the site which may contain protected species.

*Option 2*

7.60 Strategic Landscape advise that there are areas of rough grassland on Option 2 and so this habitat would need to be retained as would the hedgerows to provide green corridors.

7.61 The Environment Agency advise that, since there is just a small ditch on this site, Option 2 is preferable to the other options.

*Options 3 and 4*

7.62 Strategic Landscape advise that Options 3 and 4 are fairly close to the Bristol River Avon CWS, so water voles would need to be considered and a buffer zone retained but nothing major.

7.63 The Environment Agency advise that Option 3 is close to the River Avon and a tributary of the Avon, both of which may be important for water voles, otters and crayfish. Surveys will be required.

**Play areas and open space**

7.64 The Play and Open Space Team point out that, with regard to Option 1, there is no physical link between the Kingsway and the town centre. Thus, there is no link with play provision in the town.

**Rights of way and cycle networks**

7.65 The council’s Rights of Way Team advise that Option 1 would require the following:

- A footbridge across the River Avon within the development to connect the 2 parts of the development other than by road.
- To continue BROK 16 from BackBridge to MALM 24/Park Rd junction as a cycle/pedestrian route connecting to the town centre
- Create a safe pedestrian access along the A 4014 to BROK 14
- Maintain BROK 14 to a high standard to enable increased use

7.66 There is the opportunity with Option 3 to connect development to MALW 29 and maintain MALW 29 and MALW 30 to a high standard to enable increased use.
**Landscape**

7.67 Natural England advise that there would be potential landscape impacts on the AONB. Equally, Strategic Landscape highlight the impact on the AONB, including views of the developments, advising that all this would need to be considered. The proposed development has the potential to change the nature of Malmesbury, it is a sensitive site.

**Other environmental considerations**

7.68 No other environment considerations were mentioned.
8 Marlborough

Town context

8.1 Marlborough is designated a policy B settlement but is one of the smaller market towns in Wiltshire. The town is heavily constrained by environmental factors and its rural setting. It is one of the least affordable market towns but does have an employment base that is relatively large for its size. A strategic housing allocation should help support employment, enhance services and address affordability issues.

Overall level of growth

8.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver 200 to 600 additional dwellings in Marlborough for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

8.3 Table 8.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Marlborough, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>6,000 (for the east Wiltshire area)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200 - 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 Marlborough is not designated as a strategic employment centre in the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land south of Marlborough

8.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 320 dwellings and comprises:

- Land east of Salisbury Road
- Land west of Salisbury Road

Option 2

8.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 320 dwellings and comprises:

- Land adjacent to Chopping Knife Lane
Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

8.7 The Highways Agency have advised that the number of houses planned for Marlborough does not present a strategic issue.

Local road network

8.8 The Highways Authority have indicated a preference for Option 1. Option 2 would present significant access constraints.

Bus network

8.9 If both options were taken forward then the Passenger Transport Unit estimate the cost to be around £200,000 for provision of a new bus service. Option 1 is very close to the schools and existing buses could serve this development. The cost would be around £100,000. Option 2 would also cost around £100,000 on its own.

Rail network

8.10 No specific comments on Marlborough received from Network Rail.

Water supply and sewerage

8.11 No specific comments on Marlborough received from Thames Water

8.12 The Environment Agency advises that the two sites at Marlborough would both require a sewer network to be built prior or in line with the developments construction. Also the receiving Sewage Treatment Works and the current sewer network within the town may require upgrading. The cost implications would need to be considered for the three points noted above.

Gas

8.13 Wales and West Utilities advise that there are currently some supply issues to the proposed sites. However, there are projects planned in the next year that will resolve these issues.

8.14 A GPSS pipeline crosses Option 1.

Electricity

8.15 Scottish and Southern Energy advises that there is capacity on the primary substation for the number of houses proposed. Option 1 is right next to the substation, however there is a GPSS pipeline through this site.

Economic facilities

8.16 No specific comments on Marlborough received from North and Mid-Wiltshire economic partnership.

Telecommunications

8.17 All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.
**Historic legacy**

8.18 The County Archaeology Service advise that Option 1 has no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology.

8.19 Option 2 has no scheduled monuments and no known, non-designated archaeology. However, the impact on the setting of the Scheduled hill fort on the opposite side of Chopping Knife Lane will need to be considered. English Heritage should be approached at the earliest opportunity to discuss whether this may be considered a ‘showstopper’.

8.20 The council’s Conservation Team advise that the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed Elcot Mill House, at the northern edge of Option 2, is a significant consideration.

**Mineral extraction**

8.21 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team point out that a Household Recycling Centre (HRC) near to Option 1 could cause problems. Option 2 is preferred.

**Development management**

8.22 No comments were received by the Development Management Team.

**Social and community infrastructure**

**Early years and childcare provision**

8.23 The Early Years and Childcare Team point out that the amalgamation of St Marys and St Peters schools is currently taking place. If Option 1 is the old school site, then another pre-school facility would be desirable.

**Primary and secondary education**

8.24 There is currently an infant and a junior school in Marlborough. The Local Education Authority advise that they are looking to rebuild these as a primary school but this will be full in a few years. Currently children go to Preshute as well. If both options go ahead then they would want a new 1FE primary school on one of the sites. It would be more difficult if only one option goes ahead.

8.25 The secondary school is taking out of area students so should have space.

**Primary care provision**

8.26 The existing GP surgery in Marlborough is at capacity and experiencing severe pressure. It is an old building, with little room for expansion. There are currently no plans for extension. The Primary Care Trust would encourage the development of a new property, with new facilities (i.e. purpose built). However, there is no desire, as yet, from the doctors for this but they were, at one stage, looking at a branch operating out of Savernake Hospital, which is not ideal (located on outskirts of the town). There may be some services operating out of the Hospital at the moment. Savernake Hospital will be staying open. Expansion of the existing facility/ a new facility would be necessary to cope with the planned development.
Libraries

8.27 The council’s library service advise that they are not able to do much with the existing building. It is more or less at capacity. If development occurs at the top end of the range, needing an extra 45sqm floor space, they may have to look at relocating elsewhere in town. Existing building is well-located, with a car park behind.

8.28 There will probably also need to be an increase in mobile service provision.

Table 8.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Marlborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>200 - 600</td>
<td>500 - 1500</td>
<td>15 - 45</td>
<td>42,500 - 127,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police

No specific comments on Marlborough were received from Wiltshire Police Authority.

There are plans to develop or replace the Response Hub in Marlborough over the next ten years, according to Wiltshire Police Authority's Estates Strategy 2008.

Fire and Rescue

8.29 Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service advise that the existing fire station should be able to cope with the increase in housing in isolation, but the cumulative impact and the impact of the employment area may mean that new infrastructure is necessary.

Ambulance

8.30 The Ambulance Service advise that the ambulance station in Marlborough needs replacing; neither option would be a problem.

Cemeteries and crematoria

8.31 No specific comments on Marlborough were received from the council's Leisure and Amenity Team.

Leisure Facilities

8.32 The Leisure Facilities Team say that co-location of community facilities has been proposed in Marlborough, linking sports facilities with the library. Price sensitivity is not an issue in Marlborough.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

8.33 All of the flood zones below are those given in the Environment Agency flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that the SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.
**Option 1**

8.34 This option is within Flood Zone 1 (FZ1). The eastern site is adjacent to an authorised landfill (Marlborough Railway Cutting). The potential impact from any contaminated land should be considered in the sustainability appraisal. Part of the western site is within a Source Protection Zone 3. The Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure an appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

**Option 2**

8.35 This option is also within FZ1. The site is adjacent to the River Kennet and is a SSSI. Protection of this water interest would be required. The potential impact of surface water drainage from the site, and potential on groundwater (quality and quantity) of the development should be assessed.

**Biodiversity**

8.36 Neither site in Marlborough is good, according to the council’s Strategic Landscape Team, since both sites are adjacent to SSSIs and a Strategic Nature Area for woodland. Natural England advise that a great deal of consideration is necessary as the whole of Marlborough is within the AONB. With regards to both sites in Malborough, the Environment Agency emphasise the need for consideration of the Water Framework Directive and ensuring that the new developments do not have a significant impact upon the ecology or the River Kennet SSSI.

**Option 1**

8.37 This site is next to Savernake Forest SSSI. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that this option would need an assessment of the impact on conservation features before it could go ahead. The site is also close to Marlborough railway tunnel, which is an important site for numerous species of hibernating bats. The impact of development on this site would also need to be assessed. All tree-lines and hedgerows would need to be retained and enhanced and buffered, with lighting restricted. Natural England comment that connectivity to the town could be an issue, as the tunnel limits access. Option 1 is preferred by the Environment Agency, with regard to biodiversity interests, because it is located further away from sensitive receptors, such as the River Kennet. Sites should be screened for existing ecological interests (including bats in existing buildings and trees).

**Option 2**

8.38 Option 2 is adjacent to the River Kennet SSSI, with sensitive wildlife and fishery, to the north and adjacent to Chopping Knife Lane County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Postern Hill CWS (both chalk grassland habitats) to the south. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that increased public pressure would impact upon all sites. Therefore, significant buffer zones and a contribution towards management and mitigation for the CWS would be required. Natural England comment that this option provides good access to the countryside, as a result of its close proximity to the River Kennet and the CWS, but point out that there may be site specific issues. The Environment Agency advise that runoff from the site would need particular attention and the use of SuDs recommended.

**Play areas and open space**

8.39 Playing pitch provision would need to be considered as there is not a great deal at present in Marlborough. A destination park is planned to the north of Option 1, so play provision would fine with this site. Access would be a problem for Option 2.
Rights of way and cycle networks

8.40 Safe pedestrian links should be provided to Savernake Forest. Circular routes should be upgraded to cope with increased demand (See Appendix ?? for a map of the rights of way and cycle network in Marlborough).

8.41 Rights of Way requirements for Option 1:

- Create pedestrian link to MARL 24 (into SavernakeForest)
- MARL 30 not to be used as part of development
- Safe road crossing over A346 to SAVE 14 (into SavernakeForest)
- The circular routes, comprising MARL30, SAVE 6, SAVE 3, MARL 36 and MARL 34 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.

8.42 Rights of Way requirements for Option 2:

- MILD 19 and MARL 20 to be linked as a pedestrian/cycle access route between Cock-A-Hoop Lane, the development and Marlborough
- The circular routes, comprising MILD 19, MARL 20, MILD 37, MILD 20, MILD 18 and MARL 22 to be developed to a high grade to enable potential recreational route to withstand increased use.
- Safe pedestrian link along A4 from hospital to Grand Parade (into SavernakeForest)

Landscape

8.43 Option 1 is well contained and has fewer issues, whereas Option 2 would be urbanisation of the edge of town and would need a lot of evidence to support it and a full study.

Other environmental considerations

8.44 There are no apparent show stoppers which would preclude development at the two sites in Marlborough with regards to water quality issues.
9 Melksham

Town context

9.1 Melksham is designated a policy B settlement and is one of the larger market towns in Melksham. The town is identified as a strategic employment centre and further housing development will complement this. Retail offer in the town is poor and regeneration should be a priority. It is important that new development in the town provides a good balance of housing and employment growth potentially increasing the self-containment of the town.

Overall level of growth

9.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver up to 600 to 1,100 additional dwellings in Melksham for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

9.3 Table 9.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Melksham, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melksham</td>
<td>6,300 (for the west Wiltshire area, excluding Trowbridge)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600 - 1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 recommends that 12.6ha of employment land is provided in Melksham. This comprises:

- Redevelopment of the Railway Cluster Area
- Land south of the A365
- Land at Hampton Park (already allocated in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 2011)
- Part of land at Berryfield

Draft strategic site options

9.5 The draft strategic site options could deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated, only part of the site would be developed.

Option 1 - Land to the north east of Melksham

9.6 Option 1 would deliver up to 1,100 dwellings and comprises:

- Land at the rear of Woodrow
- Land at Woodrow House Farm
- Land at the rear of Savernake Avenue
Option 2 - Land to the east of Melksham and between Melksham and Bowerhill

9.7 Option 2 would deliver up to 1,100 dwellings and comprises:

- Land north and east of the Spa
- Land south of the Spa
- Land south of the A365
- Land south of Western Way

Option 3 - Land to the south west of Melksham and Berryfields

9.8 Option 3 would deliver up to 1,100 houses and comprises:

- Land at Townsend Farm
- Land east of Semington Road
- Land south of Melksham and east of Berryfields
- Land at the rear of Semington Road
- Land at the rear of 592 Semington Road
- Land west of Semington Road

Employment option

The employment option for Melksham would deliver 4ha of employment land on an existing employment site with the potential to expand. This comprises:

- Land at Hampton Park (already allocated in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 2011)

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

9.9 None of the sites are preferable to the Highways Agency, who say that demand management and containment will need to be demonstrated.

Local road network

9.10 The Highways Authority have not identified any major showstoppers for the proposed development sites. However, they are concerned that some of the land under consideration may have already received planning permission. However, they would be opposed to Option 1 coming forward because access to the site would have to be as an extension of Forest Road, which would be very poor in transport terms. With regard to Option 2, the Highways Authority is concerned that parts of the site has already been allocated for housing and do not believe that this has been taken into consideration.

Bus network

9.11 For Option 1, an existing local bus service could be diverted to serve this option depending on the road layout. The cost would probably be around £100,000.

9.12 The eastern part of Option 2 would be good in terms of proximity to the school and fit in well with everything else. The western part is not so good and, therefore, is not preferred. The cost would be around £100,000.
9.13 Option 3 would be the easiest to serve. The existing Berryfield Lane could be extended into the development. This option is preferred. The cost would be around £100,000.

**Rail network**

9.14 There is a Wiltshire Council proposal to upgrade service levels on the route through Melksham to an hourly service. This is dependant on the Route Utilisation Strategy and would involve work at Chippenham station to reinstate a disused platform. Funding for this project is needed; potentially Section 106 money could help. Timetabling for this is complicated by the fact that it is also a freight route with up to 5 trains a day, so it may end up with an hourly peak time service and less frequent outside of peak times.

**Water supply and sewerage**

**Waste**

9.15 Wessex Water advise that the sewage treatment works at Melksham is at capacity, all new flows are directed to the sewage treatment works “Bowerhill”, in the south of the town. Option 1 may be able to drain to the Melksham sewage treatment works in the north of the town if some existing connections to the sewage treatment works were redistributed.

9.16 Option 1 would be the most difficult and expensive. Option 2 is fairly close to the sewage treatment works but further capacity improvements will be required to accommodate a development of this scale. Option 3 is the closest to the sewage treatment works and would be the cheapest option. However a buffer zone round the sewage treatment works would be necessary to prevent any complaints regarding odour and fly nuisance. Extra space may also be needed to allow room for expansion.

**Water supply**

9.17 There are sufficient water resources in the area, however there are transmission constraints in getting this water into the local Sandridge service reservoir. Therefore, a sum of £1million should be set aside for a booster and improvements to the mains feeding Sandridge Reservoir. The service reservoir storage itself should be adequate to accommodate the planned development. The £1million cost is applicable to all sites.

9.18 Option 1 is likely to require a new circa 1.5km long link main from the Sandridge reservoir, which will cost around £0.6m. Option 2 is likely to require a new circa 1km long link main from the Sandridge reservoir southern outlet main, which will cost around £0.4m. For both developments, at this scale enhanced on-site mains will be required, as well as a number of interconnections with the existing system for security of supply. Option 3 will require detailed modelling, assume £0.5m for off site works to upgrade the upstream network and provide interconnections with the existing system for security of supply.

**Gas**

9.19 Wales and West Utilities have no major issues with the growth options for Melksham, however reinforcement of the LP mains is needed for Option 1.

**Electricity**

9.20 The primary substation is fairly central in Melksham and all options are some distance away. The substation will need reinforcement and there will be significant infrastructure costs.
Economic facilities

9.21 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership support the extension of the site identified between the A350 Semington Bypass and the western side of the Bowerhill Industrial Estate, currently associated with the Christie Miller Sports Centre, to include the remainder of the land along that side of the estate. This would help facilitate the much needed regeneration of the whole of that side of Bowerhill for employment uses.

Telecommunications

9.22 All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

9.23 The County Archaeology Service advise that there are no Scheduled Monuments on any of the Options. However, there is a known medieval settlement site in the north east corner of Option 1, essentially earthworks extant in pasture. Although it is non-designated, it should be considered as potentially of national importance and excluded from the proposed development area. There is no other known, non-designated archaeology within this Option, nor within Option 2 or the employment site for that matter. There is limited known, non-designated archaeology within Option 3.

Mineral extraction

9.24 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team point out that there is a flood zone across the site. Option 2 is preferable. There is a mineral resource zone that covers part of Option 3 and bore hole testing would be necessary to check the quality.

Development management

9.25 For Option 1, the Development Management service believe that the eastern component of the site is a logical choice. There is the potential for a road around the site, or the continuation from the new road that is part of the East of Melksham development. In the long term, there is the potential for this to link up with the A350. They highlight possible floodplain issues with Clackers Brook and are unsure of the merit of the western component of this development.

9.26 Considerable local opposition may be expected for Option 2 (Bowerhill). The residents regard this as a separate rural settlement/village. The Spa House and Woodmore are Grade 2 listed buildings and there is a need to preserve the setting of the buildings and the landscape. The nearby trading estate has a combination of B1 and B2 uses and there is a possible bad neighbour impact. Overall, this site is logical and well-related to the town, new school and leisure centre and has excellent road connectivity.

9.27 There would be coalescence issues between Melksham and Semington if Option 3 were taken forward. It is the least preferred option in the eyes of the Development Management Service. They wonder whether the route of the old canal is an issue. The eastern part of the site may be acceptable. However, the western part of the site raises the above concerns, principally the linkages between Melksham and Semington.
**Social and community infrastructure**

**Early years education and childcare**

9.28 The Early Years and Childcare Service believe Option 2 would be good in terms of childcare provision. There are various facilities nearby, including the Queensway children’s centre/nursery, after-school facilities, and Kings Park Nursery. These nurseries are not full at present.

**Primary and secondary education**

9.29 For 1,100 houses, a new 2FE primary school would be needed and maybe a financial contribution towards the secondary school, depending on timing. Option 1 is on the correct side of town for the new secondary school and Option 2 is well-placed for the new secondary school. The Local Education Authority would like to confirm whether the George Ward School site is included in the figures for Melksham.

**Primary care provision**

9.30 The PCT advise that Melksham hospital is staying open for the medium term. There are two relatively new GP surgeries near the hospital. However, capacity is an issue. Both sites have capacity for five years but not beyond. One site is only five years old but is already getting close to capacity. The smaller practice is keen to relocate to the north of the town. There is a lack of surgeries on the west of the town. In summary, there will be capacity issues in the long term and it is likely to be a case of expanding the existing practices.

**Libraries**

9.31 An increase in mobile service stop points likely to cope with the planned development and the Library Service suggest that relocating the library is a possibility if growth is at the top end of the range.

Table 9.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Melksham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melksham</td>
<td>600 - 1,100</td>
<td>1500 - 2750</td>
<td>45 - 82.5</td>
<td>127,500 - 233,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Police**

9.32 Extra housing is likely to particularly affect two areas of police work:

- Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs)
- Responses (to, for example, 999 emergency calls)

9.33 The Police Authority is keen to look at options for shared sites, which could be a parking space in a visible public area or office space within a community building. They are interested in further information from the council’s strategic property service to see if there are opportunities cost reductions where they are leasing sites, e.g. the Road Safety Partnership base in Chippenham. There are no ‘showstoppers’ or preferences relating to the options.
9.34 There is a District Headquarters and a smaller Police Station in Melksham. These properties are unlikely to be redeveloped or replaced in the next 10 years, according to the Wiltshire Police Authority’s Estates Strategy, 2008.

Fire and Rescue

9.35 The Fire and Rescue Service advise that extra infrastructure would be necessary to cope with the planned development but the situation would need to be looked at in the context of nearby towns. The fire station is busy especially as there used to be two stations, now there is one.

Ambulance

9.36 Currently, there is only a part-time standby point at Melksham hospital. The Ambulance Service is examining the need for a 24/7 standby point.

Cemeteries and crematoria

9.37 The Leisure and Amenities Service advise that Melksham cemetery is full and a new cemetery would therefore be required. There are three perspective sites for a new cemetery in Melksham. One potential cemetery site is owned by Sainsbury’s but is unlikely to be suitable. The new school site would probably be a good place for a new cemetery. While 400 dwellings would not fund a new cemetery, contributions would be sought.

Leisure facilities

9.38 Sports hall accommodation is an issue in Melksham, according to the Leisure Service. This is currently at Christie Miller but when the facilities are relocated to the new school site the new school does not want the extra sports hall. It would be useful to have land allocated as part of a development for sports hall provision. The new facilities are going to be located to the south of Melksham so it would be sensible to develop closer to there. Option 2 is the best.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

All of the flood zones given below are those given in the Environment Agency flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.

Option 1

9.39 Part of Option 1 is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the Environment Agency advise that an SFRA Level 2 may be required, particularly if considering development near or within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Assessment must include surface water drainage issues. A watercourse runs adjacent to the site and the associated floodplain, including functional, will restrict the amount of land available to develop.

Option 2

9.40 Option 2 is within Flood Zone 1 and, provided that surface water drainage issues are addressed, the Environment Agency have no objection at this stage relating to flood risk issues.

Option 3
9.41 A small part of Option 3 falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Provided that development can be located only in Flood Zone 1, then an SFRA Level 2 is probably not required. However, surface water drainage issues should be considered. Protection of Berryfield Brook is required, including a suitable buffer to be included between any potential development and this watercourse. While both Option 2 and 3 are outside of designated floodplains, watercourses that cross or are adjacent to the sites still need to be considered in the SFRA.

Employment Option

9.42 The Environment Agency have no objection at this stage to the employment option, which lies within Flood Zone 1.

Biodiversity

9.43 Natural England advise that access to green space needs to be considered. None of the proposed allocations are likely to affect protected sites, according to the council's Strategic Landscape, who also advise surveying for Great Crested Newts, in April to June 2010, on selected housing and employment sites to identify the extent to which they are an issue.

9.44 None of the proposed allocations are likely to adversely affect protected sites, according to the council's Strategic Landscape Team. They advise a biodiversity survey of the housing and employment sites to assess the extent to which Great Crested Newts would be an issues, preferably to take place in April to June (See Appendix 4 for a maps showing the draft strategic site options and associated biodiversity issues).

Option 1

9.45 The Environment Agency advise that there are minor watercourses on-site, which will require surveying to determine what species are present and what mitigation will be required. A Great Crested Newt survey may not be necessary, according to Strategic Landscape, since there are no ponds within the site or in the vicinity. This is possibly the option with the least implications for Great Crested Newts. However, they advise that protected species surveys are still needed for badgers, water voles, bats and reptiles. A buffer zone on the north-east side of this site would also be needed (See Appendix 4 for a maps showing the draft strategic site options and associated biodiversity issues). The Strategic Landscape team point out that the land affected is intensively agricultural. This option is their preferred choice.

Option 2

9.46 There is a watercourse to the west of this site, so comments from the Environment Agency regarding Option 1 also apply to this option. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that there are Great Crested Newts in the area and surveys would be necessary. This is a significant issue, which requires surveying and probable/ possible translocation and new habitat provision. There may be long lead-in times and particular problems if the site is split up into parcels. A strategic approach is needed towards mitigation. Mitigation measures may reduce the land available for development. Other protected species surveys are also required, such as badgers, reptiles, bats and water voles (See Appendix 4 for a maps showing the draft strategic site options and associated biodiversity issues).

Option 3
9.47 Since Berryfield Brook runs through the site, the Environment Agency advise that it will be necessary to maintain a buffer along the brooks corridor. Again, the Strategic Landscape Team advise that there are Great Crested Newts in the area and surveys would be necessary. This is a significant issue, which requires surveying and probable/possible translocation and new habitat provision. There may be long lead-in times and particular problems if the site is split up into parcels. A strategic approach is needed towards mitigation. Mitigation measures may reduce the land available for development. Other protected species surveys are also required, such as badgers, reptiles, bats and water voles (See Appendix 4 for a maps showing the draft strategic site options and associated biodiversity issues).

Employment option

9.48 The Strategic Landscape Team advise that the employment option has similar issues to Option 1. In addition, Great Crested Newts surveys are required due to suitable water bodies within the site allocation area. Mitigation measures may reduce the area available for development. Other protected species surveys also required.

Play areas and open space

9.49 The situation with regard to play facilities is similar to that for cemetery provision (see above). Contributions would be sought.

Rights of way and cycle networks

Option 1

- MELW 60 to be managed as a cycle/pedestrian route

Option 2

- Safe pedestrian/cycle access to the school must be provided
- MELW 18 and MELW 19 to be managed as pedestrian/cycle access to link developments to the N and S of Melksham in a traffic-free environment. The bridge over Clackers Brook would need improvement.
- MELK 42 should not be incorporated into the development and its use as a pedestrian only path should be safeguarded.
- MELW 34 should be safeguarded against cycle access
- The circular route formed by MELK 42, MELW 24, MELW 20, MELW 36, MELW 35 and MELW 34 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a commuting/recreational route
- MELW 42 should be managed as a pedestrian/cycle route between the A365 and the Sports Centre, the remainder of the route safeguarded against cycle use

Option 3

- Safe pedestrian access across the A350
- MELW 8 as it passes through the development should be managed as a cycle/pedestrian route – to connect to Sustrans route 4 on the Semington Rd but safeguarded against cycle use outside of the development
- MELW 9 and MELW 17 should not be incorporated into the development and safeguarded against cycle use
• A footpath link to MELW 10, where it meets MELW 11 (and from there the towpath of the Kennet and Avon Canal) should be developed from the development and both the new link and MELW 10 developed to a high standard to withstand increased use
• NB Old Canal route?

Landscape

9.50 Melksham can absorb development without much impact on the landscape, according to Strategic Landscape.

9.51 A Special Landscape Area looks down on Option 1 and the impact upon this would need to be considered.

9.52 There are some listed buildings close to Option 2. The small hedgerow patterns within the site should be preserved. The eastern part of this option is a logical place to develop.
10 Tidworth

Town context

10.1 Tidworth and Ludgershall are designated jointly as a policy B settlement. This reflects the unique and complementary role between the two places which are being planned for as one. There are a number of employment opportunities available in the towns. The number of MOD personnel is set to increase in Tidworth and other housing development is needed to balance this.

Overall level of growth

10.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver between 1,200 and 1,850 additional dwellings in Tidworth and Ludgershall for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

10.3 Table 10.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Tidworth and Ludgershall, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</td>
<td>6,000 (for the east Wiltshire area)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,200 - 1,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 Tidworth and Ludgershall are not designated as strategic employment centres in the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land north west of Ludgershall

10.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 920 dwellings and comprises:
   - Ludgershall MOD sites 1 and 14
   - Land at the former MSA depot (north and south sites)

Option 2 - Land west of Ludgershall

10.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 1,850 dwellings and comprises:
   - Ludgershall MOD sites 2,3,4,12 and 13

Option 3 - Land south east of Ludgershall

10.7 Option 3 would deliver up to 660 dwellings and comprises:
   - Land at Empress Way
Option 4 - Land south of Ludgershall

10.8 Option 4 would deliver up to 260 dwellings and comprises:
   • Ludgershall MOD site 7

Option 5 - Land south west of Ludgershall

10.9 Option 5 would deliver up to 450 dwellings and comprises:
   • Ludgershall MOD sites 6, 8 and 9

Option 6 - Land north of Tidworth

10.10 Option 6 would deliver up to 920 dwellings and comprises:
   • Tidworth MOD site 13

Option 7 - Land in the centre of Tidworth

10.11 Option 7 would deliver up to 190 dwellings and comprises:
   • Tidworth MOD site 1

Option 8 - Land south west of Tidworth

10.12 Option 8 would deliver up to 520 dwellings and comprises:
   • Tidworth MOD sites 7, 8 and 9

Option 9 - Land south of Tidworth

10.13 Option 9 would deliver up to 1,850 dwellings and comprises:
   • Tidworth MOD sites 10, 11 and 12

Proposed Employment Site

10.14 The draft strategic site options for Marlborough also include a potential employment site north west of Ludgershall.

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

10.15 The Highways Agency is concerned about how the sites fit with the proposed developments on MoD sites. The nearest junctions with the A303 are already busy, and the A303 runs at close to, or over, capacity, particularly in the summer months. Innovative containment and sustainable transport solutions will be needed for the sites. Phasing will be important here, particularly in relation to the MoD sites. The larger sites may give better opportunities for developing sustainable transport solutions. It will be important to limit the impact on the A303.
Local road network

10.16 The Highways Authority urge general caution regarding the higher end of growth scenario and question whether this is a sustainable community capable and appropriate to accommodate such a high relative level of growth. They point out that Option 3 has no obvious access.

Bus network

10.17 The Passenger Transport Unit point out that Tidworth does not have its own local bus service. If options 4, 5 and 6 were combined, the total cost would be around £200,000. Option 1 is the least preferred option because it would be difficult to serve and difficult to justify an extra bus service. Option 2 is almost as bad an option because it would require a new bus service at a cost of around £200,000. Option 3 is a good option, provided there are links across to the main road, because it is close to the bus route. Option 4 is in a location where there is hardly any service at present but the development would probably not be enough to justify a new service. It is a less favoured option along with Option 5, for the same reasons. Option 6 is not preferred either because, while it is fairly close to the town centre, it would need some extra provision and cost around £200,000. Options 7 and 8 are quite good options as there are no associated costs. This is similar to Option 9, for which there is an hourly bus service.

Rail network

10.18 No specific comments on Tidworth and Ludgershall were received from Network Rail, other than to say that the only rail link in Ludgershall is an MoD only link and is protected as such.

Water supply and sewerage

10.19 Wessex Water do not supply the water in Tidworth and Ludgershall here but do have some infrastructure, there are some quite complicated arrangements in place.

10.20 No specific comments on Tidworth and Ludgershall were received from Veolia Water, who took over responsibility from Thames Water.

10.21 The Environment Agency have concerns regarding development at Tidworth and Ludgershall. The foul drainage and water supply requirements should be assessed in a water cycle study covering all of the options.

10.22 Both the Tidworth and Ludgershall Sewage Treatment Works (STWs) discharge to soakaway. Therefore any further growth would need to be assessed to establish if there would be an impact on groundwater quality, and whether there is sufficient capacity within the sewerage network.

10.23 A water cycle study for the area is recommended, which should cover both water quality and water resources/supply issues.

Gas

10.24 In the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Scotia Gas Networks only cover the towns of Tidworth and Ludgershall. In these two towns, there are no capacity issues.

10.25 If a new source is required for any particular development, land would be required to build this. This is not particularly difficult but it is costly to purchase land – this takes time to purchase and build.
If reinforcement or a new source is required, the site would be referred to our connections process to determine if the cost would be carried by the developer or absorbed by Scotia Gas Networks. Each project is analysed on an individual basis and are dependent on scale and location.

Scotia Gas made the following specific comments on the individual options:

- **Option 1** - okay, with significant reinforcement of the network.
- **Option 2** - okay, with significant reinforcement of the network and a new source required.
- **Option 3** - okay, with reinforcement of the network.
- **Option 4** - okay.
- **Option 5** - okay, with significant reinforcement of the network and a new source required.
- **Option 6** - okay.
- **Option 7** - okay.
- **Option 8** - okay with reinforcement of the network.
- **Option 9** - okay with significant reinforcement of the network and a new source required.

**Electricity**

Scottish and Southern Energy advises that the primary sub station has enough capacity for the housing needs providing they are not electrically heated. Option 6 is the most cost effective option because it is right next to the sub station.

**Economic facilities**

No specific comments on Tidworth and Ludgershall were received from the North and Mid Wiltshire economic partnership.

**Telecommunications**

All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.

**Historic legacy**

The County Archaeology Service provided the following comments on specific options:

- **Option 1** - No Scheduled Monuments. Limited, known, non designated archaeology and risk of previously, unrecorded archaeology.
- **Option 2** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology but risk of previously, unrecorded archaeology.
- **Option 3** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology but risk of previously, unrecorded archaeology.
- **Option 4** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology but risk of previously, unrecorded archaeology.
- **Option 5** - No Scheduled Monuments. Limited, known, non designated archaeology.
- **Option 6** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology.
- **Option 7** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology.
- **Option 8** - No Scheduled Monuments. No known, non designated archaeology.
- **Option 9** - No Scheduled Monuments. Limited, known, non designated archaeology.
- Proposed Employment Option - No Scheduled Monuments. Limited, known, non designated archaeology.
10.32 The council’s Conservation Team advise that Option 8 also lies within the setting of Tidworth House and, additionally, would impact on the setting of Tidworth Garrison - a representative sample of which is listed. Development here is highly unlikely to be acceptable. Option 9 lies to the west of the A338 and is a particular concern. The area constitutes the designed parkland setting of the Grade II* listed Tidworth House. Individually listed buildings affected also include the Church of St Mary and 452 Salisbury Road. Development in this location would be completely unacceptable.

Mineral extraction

10.33 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team point out that there have been investigations into putting a Household Recycling Centre on part of Option 2 which could cause problems.

Development management

10.34 No comments were received by the Development Management Team.

Social and community infrastructure

Early years and childcare provision

10.35 The Early Years and Childcare Team advise that there is an ongoing issue with childcare in the Tidworth/ Bulfdord area. In Tidworth, the nursery is full. There are a few pre-school services. There is not much capacity at Tidworth, and development here could therefore be an issue.

10.36 In Ludgershall, there are extended services and outreach children’s centre services at Castle Primary School. There is a big pre-school nursery building on the school site (funded by the former Kennet DC). If development is directed towards Ludgershall then the services will already be available, and this will also be good for the services, as places are then likely to be filled.

Primary and secondary education

10.37 The Local Education Authority advise that the situation in Tidworth is complicated. There have been discussions with the MoD, include parts of some of the options. Ludgershall has 160 spare places in its primary school.

10.38 Financial contributions for secondary schools would be needed if more than the MoD proposals of 500 civilian and 330 married quarters go ahead.

10.39 A new 1FE primary school would be needed for options 1 and 3. Option 2 is close to the new academy secondary school. Options 4 and 5 are further away from the existing school and is not as good an option.

10.40 The MoD has discussed putting 500 civilian homes on Option 6 and what would be needed together with proposals for Option 9. For 500 houses, a 1FE primary school would be needed, whereas if 920 houses were put on the site a 2FE primary school would be needed.

10.41 The MoD has discussed putting 330 married quarters on part of Option 9, together with proposals for Option 6. If more houses were put on this site then at least a 1FE primary school would be needed.

10.42 The Wellington Academy education facility has recently been completed in Ludgershall.
Primary care provision

10.43 Ludgershall has two newish GP surgeries and an MOD medical centre, in which the Primary Care Trust are accommodated. There is capacity for 5 years but not beyond that. Expansion would be necessary to cope with development. There are two practices in Tidworth. The development is likely to impact on services and there is a concern about the numbers proposed. Existing facilities are in good condition, better served than in other towns.

Libraries

10.44 The Library Service remarked on the large number of proposed housing. The MOD is an important consideration in this area. They are moving away from creating new towns out of old airbases and more towards encouraging development closer to towns. The MOD is also looking to more closely integrate service personnel into the existing civilian population.

10.45 In Tidworth, there is a joint library/ leisure service, with an Army library working out of this facility, whereas in Ludgershall, there is a new community centre, with funding from the sale of other land. The new library is significantly greater than the old one.

Table 10.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Tidworth and Ludgershall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidworth/ Ludgershall</td>
<td>1,200-1850</td>
<td>3000 - 4625</td>
<td>90 - 139</td>
<td>255,000 - 323,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire and Rescue

10.46 The Fire and Rescue Service advise that there are currently service provision issues in Tidworth and Ludgershall. Growth will only make these worse and extra infrastructure will be necessary. There is only one small station in Ludgershall which does not adequately cover Tidworth at the moment. This station is also isolated from other fire stations. The Fire and Rescue Service commented that the percentage increase for Tidworth and Ludgershall appears to be greater than for other towns.

Police

10.47 No specific comments on Tidworth and Ludgershall were received from Wiltshire Police Authority.

10.48 In the Wiltshire Police Authority's Estates Strategy (December 2008), the police station in Tidworth is identified for possible redevelopment/ replacement within 5 - 10 years. Considerations are the impact of MOD changes and there is the suggestion of a possible partnership arrangement.

Ambulance

10.49 The ambulance service has nothing permanent in the area; Amesbury is the closest permanent site. They would want a permanent standby point in the area to cope with the extra demand.
Cemeteries and crematoria

10.50 The council’s Leisure and Amenity Service advise that the existing cemetery is outside the settlements to the north of Option 3. There is no pedestrian access from Tidworth to the cemetery, and this would need to be addressed. There have been ideas of forming a river park in this area, but so far these have just been ideas, with no money behind them. An extension to the cemetery would be needed with this number of dwellings.

Leisure Facilities

10.51 The Leisure Team advise that there is a big leisure centre with capacity and they are unlikely to look to expand anything other than the gym facilities. Additional accommodation can be achieved by modifying a squash Court. They have no preference on the options.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

10.52 All of the flood zones given below are those given in the Environment Agency (EA) flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.

Option 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

10.53 Options 1, 2 3 4 and 5 are in Flood Zone (FZ) 1. Surface water drainage issues should be assessed.

10.54 Part of Option 1 is also in SPZ2. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater. Option 5 is in SPZ2. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure an appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

Option 6, 7 and 8

10.55 Options 6, 7 and 8 are all within or partly within SPZ1. The sensitivity of inner protection zones will limit the type of development allowed, i.e. will need to be non-polluting. Drainage schemes will also be subject to stricter conditions e.g. no foul discharges to ground.

Option 6

10.56 Most of Option 6 is in SPZ1, the rest in SPZ2. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

10.57 Part of Option 6 is in FZ2 and 3. A SFRA Level 2 is probably required. In relation to Option 6, the River Bourne corridor must be protected, and enhanced where possible.

Option 7

10.58 Option 7 is partly in FZ 2 and 3. A SFRA Level 2 is probably required. All of the option is in SPZ1. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

Option 8
All of Option 8 is in FZ1. The site is also wholly within SPZ 1. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

Option 9

Significant parts of Option 9 are in FZ2 & 3. A SFRA Level 2 would be required for this site. The River Bourne corridor should be protected and where possible enhanced.

Part of Option 9 is also within in SPZ3, and possibly SPZ2. The EA Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

Employment option

The employment option is in FZ1. There is no objection from the Environment Agency, at this stage, to the employment site at this location with regard to flood risk issues.

Biodiversity

Natural England suggest that the RSPB map of stone curlew nesting sites would be useful for considering Tidworth and Ludgershall. They note that there are potential landscape impacts on the AONB and nature impacts with regard to the county wildlife site but it provides good access to the countryside.

Option 1

The council's Strategic Landscape Team point out that there is a large tree plantation on site; this would possibly need to be retained. Option 1 is a more favoured option.

Option 2

There is extensive established woodland and rough grassland on this site; this would need to be assessed to see if it is priority habitat. The number of houses proposed is a concern for this site. The Strategic Landscape Team advise an ecological survey as soon as possible. They do not favour this option.

Option 3

This option is more favoured by the Strategic Landscape Team.

Option 4

This option possibly contains a chalk grassland habitat. The Strategic Landscape Team advise an ecological survey as soon as possible.

Option 5

The tree belts around the boundary of this option would need retaining and buffering.

Option 6

The River Bourne runs through this option. There are great crested newts and reptiles in the area. Buffer zones and mitigation would be needed.
Option 7

10.69 The Strategic Landscape Team have concerns about the loss of green space within the town; it is the only habitat available and could be important.

Option 8

10.70 The Strategic Landscape Team point out the proximity of the Salisbury Plain SAC; however, the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) should pick this up.

Option 9

10.71 This option is on parkland associated with Tidworth House; Natural England advise that this is potentially significant from a local landscape perspective. The site is adjacent to Furze Hill County Wildlife Site (CWS) on the east, and mature trees within the site (western parcel) might be a BAP habitat. The Strategic Landscape Team advise a ecological survey of the western parcel of this site as soon as possible.

Play areas and open space

10.72 Drainage may be an issue in Tidworth. The river running through the settlement does not have any water in it, but is a winter bourne – development should not therefore add any water to the river.

10.73 Playing pitches: there are lots of pitches around, but access is not forthcoming (MOD). There might be a need for more provision. Play provision has always been a problem in Tidworth and existing provision tends to get vandalised.

10.74 The situation in Ludgershall is similar to that in Tidworth with regards to playing pitch provision. Ludgershall has slightly better play facilities than Tidworth, but only just.

Rights of way and cycle networks

10.75 In general, better rights of way and cycle links between Tidworth and Ludgershall are needed. Table 10.3 shows the improvements and enhancements to the rights of way and cycle network required by new development in this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights of way and cycle network infrastructure</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The disused railway line permissive route – extend and formalise the route to Collingbourne Ducis from A342</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a traffic free cycle pedestrian route linking the town and the school through the development (along the south edge of the development/ north edge of the employment site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes formed by LUDG 11, CDUC 21, LUDG 13, NTID 10, (Somme Road) NTID 12A, LUDG 34 and LUDG 1 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a commuting/recreational route</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe cycling/pedestrian route developed between Tidworth and Ludgershall along or parallel to the A3026</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe cycling/ pedestrian route developed between Tidworth and CDUC 21 (north of the cemetery along or parallel to Pennings Road)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe cycle/pedestrian route, either through the development or along the A3026 into Ludgershall should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUDG 34 and LUDG 1 not to be incorporated into the development and safeguarded as a pedestrian route</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A safe crossing across the A3026 from the development and into the school should be developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUDG 2, as it goes through the development should be managed as a safe cycle/pedestrian use but the use of LUDG should be safeguarded as pedestrian only S of the development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTD12A and LUDG1 developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a commuting/recreational route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perham Down Road managed to provide safe cycling/ pedestrian access between the development and Tidworth</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTID 11 not to be incorporated into the development and safeguarded as pedestrian access only</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes formed by NTID 11, CDUC 21, (Pennings Road), NTID 26, NTID 13 and NTID 4 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STID 7, STID 21 and STID 16 not to be incorporated into the development and safeguarded as pedestrian access only</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STID 20 not to be incorporated into the development and safeguarded as Restricted Byway</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The circular routes formed by STID 21, STID 7, STID 5, STID 4 and STID 9 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Landscape**

10.76 All sites within Tidworth fall within the Strategic Nature Area (SNA) for chalk grassland.

10.77 There is a freight link proposed close to Option 1. The Strategic Landscape Team advise that it should only go ahead in conjunction with the proposed employment site.

10.78 Any development on Option 2 could be masked by retaining the mature trees on the site, except for the part in front of the school - this part of the development would be very visible.

10.79 The Strategic Landscape Team comment that Option 3 would be a natural development to the town.

10.80 There is a play area on Option 4, and there is a sewage works close by; these issues make the site less preferable.

10.81 The Strategic Landscape Team query whether the proposal would be adding to what is already on site in Option 5, or redeveloping the site.

10.82 Option 6 would be a natural development to the town.

10.83 Options 7 and 8 are infill development and the Strategic Landscape Team have no issues.

10.84 South Tidworth House and its historic landscape is a showstopper for the southern part of Option 9.

**Other environmental considerations**

10.85 No other environment consideration were identified at this time.
11 Warminster

Town context

11.1 Warminster is identified as a policy B settlement. It is one of the larger employment centres in Wiltshire and has been identified as a strategic employment centre. It is located on the edge of Salisbury Plain and has a significant military presence. It is located near a number of key transport routes and has good service provision. Work is currently underway to regenerate the town centre. A strategic housing allocation will help build on the employment role, maintain services and could contribute towards regenerating the town centre.

Overall level of growth

11.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver between 350 and 1350 additional dwellings in Warminster for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

11.3 Table 11.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Warminster, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 11.1 Proposed housing allocations for Warminster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>6,300 (for the west Wiltshire area, excluding Trowbridge)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>350 - 1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4 Warminster has been identified as strategic employment centre by this study. The study identified that there is currently more land than is required available for employment in Warminster. It recommends that 7.27 ha is supplied over the plan period. This comprises land at Warminster Business Park which is already allocated for development. There is also 36ha of land suitable for employment available at land west of Bath Road south of Cold Harbour Lane but it is recommended that this is reserved for supply beyond the plan period.

Draft strategic site options

11.5 Appendix 1 shows the draft strategic site options. These options could deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated, only part of the site would be developed.

Option 1 - Land east of Warminster

11.6 Option 1 (see Appendix 1) would deliver up to 1350 dwellings and comprises:

- MOD sites 5, 6 and 7 (see Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009).
Option 2 - Land north west of Warminster

11.7 Option 2 (see Appendix 1) would deliver up to 1350 dwellings and comprises:

- Land west of Bath Road
- Land at 44-48 Bath Road.

Option 3 - Land west of Warminster

11.8 Option 3 (see Appendix 1) would deliver up to 1350 dwellings and comprises:

- Land north of Victoria Road
- Land at the rear of Victoria Road
- Land off Victoria Road
- Land at Bugley Barton Farm
- Land at Warminster Common
- Land at Bradley Road
- Land at Folly Lane
- Land west of St Andrews Road
- Land at Bore Hill Farm

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

11.9 The Highways Agency points out that it will be important to show how the development aids the self containment of Warminster; sustainable transport will need to be factored in early. Existing train links from the town are good. In general, sites in close proximity to the town centre and train station are preferable in order to reduce reliance on the private car. Option 1 is their preferred site because there is potential for good bus and cycle links to the train station. Option 2 has good links to the employment sites. Option 3 is the least preferable site.

Local road network

11.10 The Highways Authority oppose sites being served off the A36, which they believe the options seem to imply, particularly Option 3.

Bus network

11.11 The Passenger Transport Unit say that Option 2 and Option 3 could be combined if so desired. There is no cost with Option 1. However, the cost of a bus service for Option 2 would be £200,000 per annum. Option 3 would also incur a cost of £200,000 but this option would be difficult to serve as it is in lots of little parts and, therefore, would be the least preferred option.

Rail network

11.12 There is a relatively low level of train services at the moment; Warminster may get improvements with the Melksham proposal.

Water supply and sewerage

11.13 Wessex Water prefer Options 1 and 3, while Option 2 is the least preferable option.

Waste
11.14 Option 1 would require the following:
- New sewage pumping station required
- New 200m length 450mm diameter sewer to discharge to the sewage treatment works, which are to the south of Warminster

11.15 Option 2 is difficult to drain and more work would be required. There is potential capacity via Crusader Park and through the centre of Warminster to the sewage treatment works. Subject to appraisal, flows may have to be pumped and some reinforcement considered

11.16 Option 3 has the potential for phased development, starting from upstream of the sewage treatment works. The first two pockets of development would require:
- New sewage pumping station
- New 430m length 150mm diameter rising main
- New 950m length 300mm diameter sewer

11.17 Surface water has also been considered and a scheme devised to serve these two sites as follows, subject to PPS 25:
- Site closest to the sewage treatment works – new 700m length of 450mm diameter sewer – with new outfall to river (authority required from the Environment Agency)
- Site to the west of site above – new 1400m length of 450mm diameter sewer – with new outfall to river (authority required from the Environment Agency)

11.18 The rest of the area further to the east would eventually drain in a similar way as Option 2 above with the following additional reinforcements. There may be environmental issues to overcome with these schemes:
- New sewage pumping station
- New twinned 400m length rising main 150mm diameter
- New 450m length 300mm diameter sewer
- New 350m length 300mm diameter sewer
- Two new bifurcation chambers
- New 400m length 450mm diameter sewer
- New stream outfall
- New 1100m length 300mm diameter sewer

Water supply

11.19 Option 1 would require network modelling. This site is on the periphery of the Warminster distribution system and includes a local high point called Chalk Hill and could require significant upstream reinforcement. Subject to detailed upstream improvement this could be of the order of £1 million.

11.20 The Warminster western ring main runs through Option 2 and therefore no off-site works are anticipated. However, access to the water main will need to be protected for maintenance or it will need diverting.

11.21 Option 3 will require the Warminster western ring main to be extended to supply this area and the high ground around Folly Farm may require a booster. Off-site costs are likely to be in the order of £1 million.
Gas

11.22 Wales and West Utilities have no issues with the planned development in Warminster.

Electricity

11.23 Scottish and Southern Energy say that the primary substation should have enough capacity, and there are very few cables in the Warminster sites. Option 1 is a more expensive option as it is a long way from the sub-station. Option 2 and Option 3 are fairly close to the sub-station.

Economic facilities

11.24 The North and Mid-Wiltshire Economic Partnership believe that the town will be left seriously short of employment land if the site identified on the eastern side of Warminster is not released for development. They suggest that additional provision is made for the extension of the Crusader Park and Warminster Business Park estates on the western side of town.

Telecommunications

11.25 All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

11.26 The County Archaeology Service confirm that there are no Scheduled Monuments on any of the Options and no known, non designated archaeology at Options 1 and 3, with only limited, known, non designated archaeology on Option 2.

Mineral extraction

11.27 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team point out that a household recycling centre may be going in the northern part of Option 2.

Development management

11.28 The Development Management service raise a question over the deliverability of Option 1 because the MOD is currently applying for permission for new accommodation on this site. However, if the site is genuinely available then it is an excellent site. It is sustainable, being within walking distance of the school, employment areas and the town centre. There are good links to the A36. The site is also south of the railway, which is good because there would be major access issues for any sites north of the railway.

11.29 Option 2 is a logical progression of Warminster. There is a question mark regarding the floodplain but there would be less impact on the AONB and countryside than Option 3.

11.30 Option 3 is well-related to the town and has good access to the A36. The site has the potential to link with the Victoria Road development, which it may be logical to extend. There may be issues with the setting of the AONB and the wider countryside.

11.31 Now that permission for the new Dents factory has been approved, the additional 7ha of employment at Crusader Park will be used quickly.
Social and community infrastructure requirements

Early years education and childcare

11.32 The Early Years and Childcare service highlight issues with too many free spaces in Warminster town centre which cannot be filled. There are no problems on the outskirts (all of the options are located on the outskirts). The Army (through Aspire) are building a large community building (including a nursery etc) in Warminster. The Avenue School and Nursery are central. The after-school service at New Close has not had any new enquiries recently. Any increase in housing in Warminster would help with filling up the spare places which currently exist.

Primary and secondary education

11.33 The Local Education Authority advise that a new 2FE primary school would be needed for 1350 houses. In terms of secondary school provision, the school is already too large and the current site does not have much space. It may be possible to redevelop on the separate playing fields, or to have a split site with a new development in one of the options. Option 1 is very close to the secondary school and would be preferred if a site for the expansion of the school could be provided, e.g. for a site for a sixth form over the road from the current school.

Primary care provision

11.34 The Primary Care Trust say that the hospital will remain in Warminster. Of the two GP surgeries in Warminster, the smaller branch surgery is temporarily based in the hospital and, to meet demand, is looking to relocate to an as yet unspecified location. For this to happen, land and a building would be required. There are capacity issues in Warminster and there is likely to be a requirement for new premises.

Libraries

11.35 The vision for Warminster in the emerging town plan may include the relocation of the existing library building. However, in the current proposals for the new building, the Library service anticipate having similar capacity to the existing building and have not take into account the proposed growth. This raises the question of whether it is wise to go for like-for-like when an extra 100sqm may be required. Therefore, a new library building will need to take into account the proposed growth. Furthermore, there is no service funding available for major refurbishment requirements in, among other towns, Warminster.

Table 11.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Warminster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>350 - 1350</td>
<td>875 - 3375</td>
<td>26 -101</td>
<td>74,375 - 286,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Police

11.36 The current Police Station in Warminster, classified as a Response Hub, is described in the Wiltshire Police Authority’s Estates Strategy, published in December 2008, as suffering from poor working conditions and is an under-utilised site, which does not impact on the rest of the force and there is the option of rebuilding on the current site. It is likely that redevelopment or replacement of the current site will need to take place in 2 to 5 years (2010 to 2013).

11.37 Extra housing is likely to particularly affect two areas of police work:

- Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs)
- Responses (to, for example, 999 emergency calls)

11.38 The Police Authority is keen to look at options for shared sites, which could be a parking space in a visible public area or office space within a community building. They are interested in further information from the council's strategic property service to see if there are opportunities cost reductions where they are leasing sites, e.g. the Road Safety Partnership base in Chippenham. There are no ‘showstoppers’ or preferences relating to the options.

Fire and rescue

11.39 The Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service recommend that extra infrastructure would be needed in Warminster. The station is already at capacity and is the busiest retained fire station in Wiltshire.

Ambulance

11.40 The Ambulance Service currently leases a building from the police for their station but they want to develop a new station. They have no preference between the options but the choice of option will change the search area for the new ambulance station. They are very fluid at the moment as they need to relocate.

Cemeteries and crematoria

11.41 The cemetery in Warminster is nearing capacity. With the present population, there are quite a few years left. They are looking to expand the cemetery, and have the land needed for this, but would be looking for financial contributions.

Leisure facilities

11.42 The Leisure service believe that the MoD would like to develop a large new sports facility for both military and civilian use along similar lines to that currently provided in Tidworth; this is likely to be in the east of Warminster close to Option 1. If the MoD proposal does not go ahead then the existing gym facilities would need to be expanded.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

11.43 All of the flood zones given below are those given in the Environment Agency flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.
11.44 Option 1 is within Flood Zone 1 and is the favoured option of the Environment Agency from a flood risk perspective. However, any development on this scale MUST be supported by a comprehensive strategy for the management of surface water because Warminster is an area known to suffer from surface water flooding, as well as fluvial flooding, and future development must not increase flood risk. The Environment Agency anticipate the Level 2 SFRA will need to include within its outputs identification of, and guidance on, the need for a Surface Water Management Plan, to include guidance on the applicability of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) techniques. This requirement is explained in greater depth in the Practice Guide to PPS25 (paragraphs 3.47 & 3.57).

11.45 Much of Option 2 lies within the current Flood Zones 2 and 3. A SFRA Level 2 would be required if development is proposed in or in very close proximity to the Flood Zone 2 or 3. The Environment Agency say that this is the least favoured option from a flood risk perspective. They are against development encroaching within the current Flood Zones, let alone the future Flood Zones (impact of climate change). Should this site be pursued, the outputs of the Level 2 SFRA will need to clearly demonstrate the application of the Sequential Test within the site. Only appropriate uses must be permitted within the Flood Zones, as required by PPS25. Again, any development on this scale MUST be supported by a comprehensive strategy for the management of surface water because Warminster is an area known to suffer from surface water flooding, as well as fluvial flooding, and future development must not increase flood risk. Additional comments as above (see Option 1).

11.46 Since Option 2 is within SPZ 2, the Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater.

11.47 Option 3 is within Flood Zone 1 but surface water drainage still needs to be assessed. Parts of the site lie immediately adjacent to ordinary watercourses with a catchment size of less than 3km². The Environment Agency's published flood map does not show the floodplain (Flood Zones) of watercourses with a catchment size less than 3km², therefore it is possible that parts of this site may be at risk of fluvial flooding today, and in the future. The watercourses should be protected and, if possible, enhanced. We anticipate the outputs of the Level 2 SFRA will need to consider this in detail as well as the management of surface water. Any development on this scale MUST be supported by a comprehensive strategy for the management of surface water because Warminster is an area known to suffer from surface water flooding, as well as fluvial flooding, and future development must not increase flood risk. Additional comments as above (see Options 1 and 2).

11.48 Part of site is in SPZ1, the rest is in SPZ2. The Environment Agency Groundwater Protection Policy (GP3) should be referred to, to ensure appropriate type of development is considered, in order to protect groundwater. The sensitivity of inner protection zones will limit the type of development allowed, i.e. will need to be non-polluting. Drainage schemes will also be subject to stricter conditions e.g. no foul discharges to ground.

Biodiversity

11.49 Option 1 is preferred by the council's ecologists, who point out the potential for bat roosts in the existing buildings and the need for surveys. Badgers and reptiles are also potential issues. There is also a need to allow an adequate buffer for the River Were, to which there is a potential risk from both Options 1 and 2.
11.50 Option 2 presents a significant risk to the Coldharbour Meadows County Wildlife Site (CWS) from increased public access (the CWS is already crossed by 2 rights of way). The site is already threatened by the development of 197 houses at Victoria Road, the ecologists highlighting the inadequate protection for the meadows. There may also be protected species issues, including badgers, reptiles, water voles and others. A survey of the Coldharbour Meadows CWS is essential before progressing with Options 2 and 3.

11.51 Alternative areas are needed to soak up some of the recreational pressure should Option 2 go ahead. Mitigation will be needed to reduce the negative consequences of this inevitable increase. For example, the green infrastructure habitat along the corridor towards Furnax Lane could be expanded. There are protected species issues in Furnax Lane, e.g. badger, reptiles and water vole. A wet woodland corridor could be created to compensate.

11.52 There is also a need to assess the impact of increased recreational pressure on Norridge Wood CWS, which is ancient woodland. There is only one right of way through the area so the risk is relatively low. However, the implications would still need to be examined for Options 2 and 3. There is the potential of a similar risk to the River Were from Options 1 and 2 and, thus, a need to allow an adequate green buffer.

11.53 Natural England also highlight the potential impact on the county wildlife sites from Option 2 and point out that the road presents a barrier to accessing woodland.

11.54 The points made by the ecologists relating to Option 2 above also apply to Option 3. In addition, with Option 3 there is the potential for increased recreational pressure on Cranmore Farm Meadows CWS due to rights of way access. They also advise developing the areas away from the River Were, rather than more nearby land parcels. There may also be protected species issues, e.g. badgers, water voles and reptiles.

11.55 Natural England point out that Option 3 would diminish recreational opportunities for existing residents.

11.56 With regard to the proposed employment site, the ecologists advise that Furnax Lane is already causing problems for protected species because of unregulated development. The main issues are reptiles, water voles and possibly badgers. A reserve area that links into the wider green infrastructure needs to be set aside for conservation.

Play areas and open space

11.57 The Play and Open Space service say that all existing play provision is in the town or to the south of the town and therefore some new provision would be needed for Option 3. A rugby club application may have permission on part of the land in Option 3.

Rights of way and cycle networks

11.58 The Rights of Way service say that, for Option 1 access to the Imber Range Perimeter Path and archaeology needs to be improved. Other rights of way and cycle network requirements for this option include:

- WARM 39 to be developed to a high standard to withstand increased use
- Battlesbury Hill to be carefully managed to absorbed increased use without damaging archaeological and nature conservation status
- WARM 39 and WARM 40 not to be incorporated into the development where it touches the development
The circular route formed by WARM 39, WARM 78 and WARM 40 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route.

A traffic free cycle/pedestrian route through the development should be utilised as access to the school.

11.59 Option 2 would require safe access into the town centre to be provided. Other rights of way and cycle network requirements for this option include:

- WARM 13 and WARM 10 not to be incorporated into the development where it touches the development.
- A traffic free cycle/pedestrian route through the development should be utilised as access to the school.
- WARM 9 as it passes through the development through to West Street should be managed as a cycle/pedestrian route.
- The circular route formed by WARM 74, CORY 20 and WARM 4 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route.

11.60 Option 3 would also require safe access into the town centre to be provided. Other rights of way and cycle network requirements for this option include:

- The circular routes formed by WARM 10, WARM 70, WARM 74, CORY 20 and WARM 4 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route.
- The circular routes formed by Cannimore Road, CORY 48, CORY 49, WARM 66 and WARM 1 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route.
- WARM 6, WARM 60, WARM 89 and WARM 65 not to be incorporated into the development where it touches the development but developed to a high standard to enable increased use.
- WARM 5 as it passes through the development through to Victoria Road should be managed as a cycle/pedestrian route.

Landscape

11.61 The council's Strategic Landscape Team advise that Option 1 may be able to take the extra housing without impacting on the landscape.

11.62 The visual impact on the AONB from Option 2 and Option 3 would need to be dealt with sensitively. Option 2 is not linked to the town, it is currently open countryside.

Other environmental considerations

11.63 The foul drainage and water supply requirements should be assessed as part of the SA, this may need to be produced as a water cycle study covering all of the options suggested for Warminster.

Water quality

11.64 The Environment Agency advise that the sewage treatment works at Warminster is a major consideration for the sustainability appraisal, particularly when considering the River Avon SAC. The Habitats Regulation Assessment currently being undertaken for the Wiltshire Core Strategy, should include particular reference Warminster.

Water resources
The river that runs through Warminster is a tributary of the River Wylye and is a SAC. This watercourse eventually runs into the Hampshire Avon. It is presently assessed under the CAMS methodology as being over abstracted. The Habitats Directive review of consents has concluded that major reductions in public water supply are required to ensure the integrity of the SAC is not compromised. This means that Wessex Water will need to significantly reduce abstraction from two of their PWS sources in the Wylye. The Environment Agency would recommend that a water cycle study, or equivalent, should be carried out for Warminster, to cover both water quality and water resources issues, if growth is still proposed for this settlement.
12 Westbury

Town context

12.1 Westbury is designated a policy B settlement and has experienced significant housing growth in recent years. The balance between housing growth and the provision of services and facilities available within the town needs to be addressed.

Overall level of growth

12.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver up to 350 additional dwellings in Westbury for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

12.3 Table 12.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Westbury, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

Table 12.1 Proposed housing allocations for Westbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>6,300 (for the west Wiltshire area, excluding Trowbridge)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0 - 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 identified a surplus of potential employment land in Westbury, of which it recommended that 28.52ha will provide an adequate supply for the plan period. This includes:

- Land at Station Road (existing Local Plan allocation)
- Development at the Railway Station Area
- Land at Hawkridge, Mill Lane
- Redevelopment of existing employment land at Northacre

Draft strategic site options

12.5 The draft strategic site options could deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated, only part of the site would be developed.

Option 1 - Land at Matravers School and land at Redland Lane

12.6 Option 1 would deliver up to 350 dwellings and includes the relocation of Matravers Secondary School to a location to be confirmed south west of Westbury.

Option 2 - Land to the north west of Westbury

12.7 Option 2 would deliver up to 350 dwellings and includes the following potential housing sites:

- Land at Station Road
Option 3 - Land to the north east of Westbury

12.8 Option 3 would deliver up to 350 dwellings and includes the following potential housing sites:

- Land north of the Mead
- Land north of Bitham Park
- Land at Gas House Farm

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

12.9 The Highways Agency believe that the scale of the proposed development is such that it should not be a concern for the strategic road network. However, there is a need to encourage people to use the facilities of Westbury rather than going outside the town. Links to the schools and employment areas will be important. The employment site is dislocated from the town, closer would be better.

Local road network

12.10 In terms of transport, the Highways Authority do not support the relocation of Matravers School to such a less sustainable location.

Bus network

12.11 Option 1 is the preferred option of the Passenger Transport Unit, as there is no extra cost. However, they would be concerned about where the school would relocate as this may lead to large bills for school transport. Option 2 would cost £200,000 per annum and existing services to this area are at capacity. Option 3 would not really cost anything and is, in fact, quite good for buses.

Rail network

12.12 Westbury has some of the biggest freight trains in the area running through the station. Network Rail point out that there is an emerging recommendation in the Route Utilisation Strategy to reinstate an old platform for passengers to provide additional capacity.

Water supply and sewerage

12.13 Wessex Water are aware that Option 2 has already been identified by a developer.

Waste

12.14 The sewage treatment works are to the north of the town. Development at Option 1 could be connected to a number of existing local sewers. Some reinforcement would be necessary, as would a network appraisal to consider the impact of the development upon downstream sewers. Option 2 is only a short distance away from the sewage treatment works but a railway crossing might require a possible gravity connection. Option 3 is also close to the sewage treatment works but would require a railway crossing. There would also have been a possible conflict with the proposed Westbury bypass, should it have gone ahead. Option 3 would also entail the following:
- Upsize 900m length 375mm diameter sewer to 600 diameter
- New 400m length 225mm diameter sewer
- Surface water – new 1100m length of 450mm diameter sewer – outfall to stream
- Scheme includes 5 railway crossings

**Supply**

12.15 In terms of water supply, at only 350 units this level of development is unlikely to trigger the need for significant off site works. None of the three options identified appear to have any obvious site specific requirements. However, Option 3 would entail the following:

- W4, W5, W10, W11 & W12 – will require new off site connection to trunk mains circa 250m south west of development W4 at ST 85660 51181 plus upsizing of existing 3” railway crossing at ST 86268 52084 and/ or ST 86546 51804 + enhanced on site mains, allow £500k.

**Gas**

12.16 Wales and West Utilities have no issues with the planned development in Westbury.

**Electricity**

12.17 Option 2 is across the railway line from the electricity sub-station and Scottish and Southern Energy recommend that consideration would need to be given to crossing the track. Option 3 is close to the primary electricity sub-station.

**Economic facilities**

12.18 The North and Mid Wiltshire Economic Partnership consider there to be a higher provision of employment land at Westbury than can be justified. However, they believe that this could be appropriate if Westbury is to be looked upon to meet some of the requirement from Trowbridge.

**Telecommunications**

12.19 All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.

**Historic legacy**

12.20 The County Archaeology Service report that there are no scheduled monuments on Option 1, neither are there any known, non-designated archaeology but there is the risk of previously unrecorded archaeology. Option 2, Option 3 and the employment sites have no scheduled monuments but a limited amount of known, non-designated archaeology.
Mineral extraction

12.21 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team wondered whether any development opportunities associated with the bypass been investigated but it is now a moot point. They also point out that there is a recreation site in Option 2. Their preferred option is Option 3.

Development Management

12.22 The Development Management service advise that Option 1 will be unpopular with local residents and they have already received concerns about the relocation of Matravers School. Otherwise, Option 1 is an excellent town centre location for housing with good access to the site. Option 2 is a logical choice because it is on previously developed land, consolidates the existing built form and it is close to the railway station. However, Option 3 is the least preferred option by the Development Management service, although it is the most logical green field site, with good road access. They support the decision not to put forward other green field sites in Westbury.

Social and community infrastructure requirements

Early years education and childcare

12.23 The Early Years and Childcare service highlight issues in Leigh Park, which is located to the south of the town. There is a pre-school facility in the area with a waiting list for a number of children. There is lots of other provision in the Westbury area, but this is difficult to access without a car. Public transport does not tend to be an option due to the cost and inconvenience involved. There has been talk of adding a nursery onto the Leigh Park development. Current provision on the outskirts of Westbury is fine. Leigh Park is the only real issue at present.

Primary and secondary education

12.24 The Local Education Authority would, ideally, like a site for a new 1FE primary school. A development of 350 houses is not enough for this but it is part of the long term vision for Westbury. Currently, there are 3FE infant and junior schools but it would be better to have a 2FE primary and a 1FE primary. This is part of the five to ten year plan for the town. The minimum requirement of the planned development would be a financial contribution for primary and secondary school provision. Option 3 would be preferred if a site for a 1FE was provided.

Primary care provision

12.25 There is one GP surgery in the town; the Eastleigh Surgery in the town centre. It is looking to develop a new property and should then have capacity to cope with the planned development. There may also be an issue with the provision of dentists.

12.26 Persimmon have offered to do a deal with the GP surgery for their land and they would then relocate to the west of the town. With the use of the Persimmon land moving forward, the severe capacity problems at the existing surgery will be solved and the new primary care centre should absorb the new growth. The Primary Care Trust (PCT) is happy to receive Section 106 and CIL money from development in the Westbury area. Westbury Hospital would become surplus to requirements once the new primary care centre is built - the PCT suggest an opportunity for housing development.
Libraries

12.27  The current library building in Westbury, a converted dwelling, is inadequate and not ideal. The library building has a gross internal floorspace of 527m$^2$ and the total site area is 3,458m$^2$. First floor access to wheelchair users and other people with impaired mobility is problematic. The Library Service would prefer to find an alternative building. They suggest there may be an opportunity with the council-owned car park.

12.28  Table 12.2 indicates the potential cost of the planned development of 350 houses in Westbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police

12.29  Extra housing is likely to particularly affect two areas of police work:

- Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs)
- Responses (to, for example, 999 emergency calls)

12.30  The Police Authority is keen to look at options for shared sites, which could be a parking space in a visible public area or office space within a community building. They are interested in further information from the council’s strategic property service to see if there are opportunities cost reductions where they are leasing sites, e.g. the Road Safety Partnership base in Chippenham. There are no ‘showstoppers’ or preferences relating to the options.

Fire and Rescue

12.31  The Fire and Rescue Service suggest that it may be best to look at Westbury in conjunction with Trowbridge and look at combining fire stations, with one station based at Yarnbrook.

Ambulance

12.32  The Ambulance Service has no facilities in Westbury and is struggling to find a site for a standby point; they would need a standby point to cope with the development.

Cemeteries and crematoria

12.33  There is currently adequate capacity at the cemetery, but there would be a need for financial contributions to bring this capacity into use.

Leisure facilities

12.34  The existing leisure facilities in Westbury may close if new facilities are provided in other locations. If the school relocation goes ahead then ideally a dual use facility could be developed on the school site. Developer contributions would be wanted to enable the upgrade to dual use.
Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

12.35 All of the flood zones referred to by the Environment Agency (EA) below are those given in the EA flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.

12.36 Option 1 is located in Flood Zone 1 and the Environment Agency have no objection relating to flood risk issues.

12.37 A small part of Option 2, Option 3 and the employment sites, is located in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Provided that development is kept out of these areas, and surface water drainage issues are addressed, the Environment Agency has no objection to the planned development over flood risk constraints. However, there is some floodplain on the west of Option 3 and in the employment sites that will restrict the land available for development.

Biodiversity

12.38 Natural England and the council's ecologists point out that the Westbury Bypass inquiry brought up bat feeding and flight path information that could be useful for looking at the sites.

12.39 The Environment Agency has no biodiversity issues with Option 1. However, the ecologists highlight potential protect species issues, e.g. badgers, reptiles and bats. They admit that it is the least valuable site in terms of existing biodiversity, however the site is clearly of community value and a variety of species (of bats) may be expected to forage over the grassland (hence the need for survey work). They have a preference for Option 1, followed by Option 3. With regard to Option 1, Natural England and the council's Strategic Landscape service are both concerned about the loss of green space within the town. Significant new planting is needed to enhance the site is this is developed, so as to ensure no net loss in an area of high community value. There is the opportunity to create an overall enhancement.

12.40 Option 2 is adjacent to the Westbury Lakes County Wildlife Site. There are watercourses and a pond on the sites. There may also be Great Crested Newts in the vicinity and the Environment Agency advise consultation with Natural England. This point is also raised by the ecologists, who advise assessing the effects of public pressure on waterfowl; there is likely to be a need for the watercourse to have a wide buffer. They also highlight the need to consider Great Crested Newts, badgers, reptiles and bats. Reptile numbers could be very high because of suitability of the area generally. Therefore, there may be a need to set aside land for mitigation (translocation site). There is also a small area of valuable habitat, highlighted in Appendix 4, that should be avoided by development.

12.41 Bitham Brook is to the west of Option 3 and the Environment Agency point out that water voles have been recorded on the brook. The ecologists advise ensuring that the habitat around the lake to the west is protected and includes a buffer. They suggest that the size of this area could be increased through developer contributions. There are also likely to be protected species issues relating to Great Crested Newts, badgers, reptiles and bats.

12.42 The ecologists highlight good opportunities to link existing habitat through new green infrastructure. However, there are potential issues with great crested newts and water voles, reptiles, badgers and bats (Bitham Brook).
Play areas and open space

12.43 In terms of casual play provision, the Play and Open Space service advise that there is already quite a substantial amount at Westbury. If and when the school moves, they recommend securing a planning condition to enable the public to use the new playing pitches.

Rights of way and cycle networks

12.44 The council’s Rights of Way service suggest that it might be helpful to talk to Network Rail about the safety of rail crossings and increased use in Westbury. They have no issues with Option 1 but are concerned that there are lots of barriers to accessing the rights of way network under Option 2. There also issues with road and rail crossings in Option 3.

Landscape

12.45 The Strategic Landscape service are of the opinion that Westbury can absorb development well. However, views from the ridge and, had it gone ahead, the raised sections of the bypass would need to be considered. Access to Option 2 could be an issue, as it is badly served by the road network. Option 3 would have made sense had the bypass gone ahead. For the employment sites, the south west part would be preferred by the Strategic Landscape service.

Other environmental considerations

12.46 The Environment Agency highlighted that an historic landfill is present within part of Option 2 and the employment sites. Assessment of any potential contamination should be undertaken, together with identification of any required remediation.
13 Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

Town context

13.1 Wootton Bassett is designated a policy B settlement and is one of the larger market towns in Wiltshire. It has a medium employment base and has been identified as a location for strategic employment growth. There is a sizeable MOD population in the town. It is in close proximity to Swindon and has a dormitory relationship with it, with high levels of out commuting. A small strategic site allocation should help support employment growth and retain and enhance facilities without exacerbating its dormitory role with Swindon.

Overall level of growth

13.2 The draft strategic site options were designed to deliver a further 200 - 400 additional dwellings in Wootton Bassett for the plan period 2006 - 2026. This figure was reached using a number of different sources, which are outlined in the Strategic Sites Background Paper October 2009.

13.3 Table 13.1 shows the proposed housing allocation for Wootton Bassett, which was shown to infrastructure stakeholders alongside the draft strategic site options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed changes</th>
<th>Completions 2006-09</th>
<th>Permitted (inc. s106 &amp; expected completions)</th>
<th>Outstanding allocations expected to be completed</th>
<th>Indicative additional dwellings required to 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wootton Bassett</td>
<td>5,200 (for the north Wiltshire area, excluding Chippenham)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.4 The Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy 2009 recommends that 11.81ha of employment land is provided in Wootton Bassett. This comprises:

- Land to the west of Templars Way (existing Local Plan allocation).
- Land at the former St Ivel Factory (already has outline planning permission).
- Land at Interface Industrial Estate (this is an existing Industrial Estate but there may be scope for expansion).
- A new area of search for 4ha of employment land. The suggested areas of search are an extension to Interface Industrial Estate, land north of Wootton Bassett and land west of Wootton Bassett. The study prefers the extension to Interface Industrial Estate.

Draft strategic site options

Option 1 - Land to the south of Wootton Bassett

13.5 Option 1 would deliver up to 400 dwellings and comprises:

- Land at Brynards Hill
- Land at Lower Woodshaw Farm
• Land south of Wootton Bassett sites A, B and C
• Land at the Templars Way Industrial Estate

Option 2 - Land within Wootton Bassett

13.6 Option 2 would deliver up to 340 dwellings and comprises:
• Land at the Rugby Ground
• Land at the WSBA Ground
• Land at the Radio Station off Lime Kiln
• Land to the rear of Public House off Station Road works

Option 3 - Land to the west of Wootton Bassett

13.7 Option 3 would deliver up to 400 dwellings and comprises:
• Land to the north west of Whitehill Lane Industrial Estate
• Land north of Whitehill Lane

Option 4 - Land to the north of Wootton Bassett

13.8 Option 4 would deliver up to 400 dwellings and comprises:
• Land west of Maple Drive
• Land adjacent to White Car Sales
• Land at Marsh Farm

Option 5 - Land to the east of Wootton Bassett

13.9 Option 5 would deliver up to 390 dwellings and comprises:
• Land north of Swindon Road

Physical infrastructure requirements

Strategic road network

13.10 The Highways Agency believe that it would be hard to come up with an option that will work in Wootton Bassett. There is a lot of out-commuting to Swindon over Junction 16 of the M4, which is an existing major concern of the Agency. Imaginative sustainable transport solutions will be necessary. Wootton Bassett is often considered ‘west Swindon’. It may be necessary to get a specialist to look at the sustainable/public transport – a key issue for this area.

Local road network

13.11 The Highways Authority would resist Option 1, which is south of the railway, as they consider it too remote. Option 5 would be resisted for similar reasons. They would also resist Option 3 and point to the long planning history of Whitehill Lane, which is arguable inappropriate to serve further significant development growth.
Bus network

13.12 Option 1 would incur a cost of around £200,000 p.a. A new bus service for Option 4 would cost around £200,000 p.a. but the development would be too small to justify this service; this would be a problem and is not a very good option. However, Option 2, which involves infill development, would be good from the perspective of public transport. Option 5 is also favoured, being fine in terms of existing public transport, as lots of buses already serve this area.

Rail network

13.13 No specific comments on Wootton Bassett were received from Network Rail.

Water supply and sewerage

General

13.14 Wessex Water, who provide and maintain the sewer system in Wootton Bassett, advise that there are flooding issues in Wootton Bassett; a scheme has been devised to improve the situation. This scheme will need to be completed before development could go ahead.

13.15 The railway is an obstacle to all of the sites.

13.16 Thames Water provide the water supply to Wootton Bassett. However, no specific comments regarding Wootton Bassett were received from Thames Water.

13.17 The Environment Agency are aware that the Sewage Treatment Works (STW) at Wootton Bassett are know to impact on water quality and that the current consent needs to be tightened. This STW was proposed for PR09 but was not on the final draft list. It has insufficient dilution as the flow in the receiving watercourses are not very large, especially during the summer months. Any increase in discharge volume would exacerbate the situation and therefore the consent would need to be tightened to ensure maintenance of load. This could result in a consent that would be very difficult or very costly for Wessex Water to comply with.

Option 1

13.18 This option is close to the sewage treatment works. However, a proposed extension to the Wilts and Berks Canal will cross the site.

13.19 The option is bisected by the railway cutting and the possible canal extension. The existing sewer to the nearby sewage treatment works, which crosses the site, is above ground.

Option 4

13.20 This option is the furthest away from the sewage treatment works drain/ pump to the west.

Option 5

13.21 The waste would drain eastwards from this option.

Gas

13.22 Wales and West Utilities have no issues with regards to development in Wootton Bassett. However, they point out that a GPSS pipeline runs through Option 1.
Electricity

13.23 The primary substation in Wootton Bassett has the capacity to supply the planned development.

Option 1

13.24 This option is close to the primary substation and, although there is a railway crossing, this is the best option as far as Scottish and Southern Energy are concerned. A pipeline and a 33kv line run through this site.

Options 2, 3 and 4

13.25 The distance from the primary substation and the railway line make these expensive options.

13.26 Option 5

13.27 A pipeline and a 33kv line run through this site.

Economic facilities

13.28 No specific comments on Wootton Bassett were received from the North and Mid Wiltshire economic partnership.

Telecommunications

13.29 All of the options are within existing telephone exchange boundaries. BT Openreach believe that any distance issues could be overcome with the use of fibre optics and foresee no showstoppers.

Historic legacy

13.30 The County Archaeology Service say that there are no known showstoppers and slightly less archaeological constraints.

13.31 Commenting on Option 1, the council’s Conservation Team say that the railway line provides a logical boundary to limit the extent of urban spread. This is reinforced by the need to protect the mud springs to the south here (and there may be others off Whitehill Lane) and the fact that the land is contaminated.

Option 1

13.32 The north east part of this option has well preserved Medieval earthworks, part of which are Scheduled (although the Scheduled bit is just outside of the option area). This is the least preferred option.

13.33 Option 2, 3, 4 and employment option

13.34 No Scheduled Monuments.

Mineral extraction

13.35 The Minerals and Waste Policy Team have no preference regarding the options for Wootton Bassett. However, they comment that Option 1 appears to cover a very large area and suggested that it should be narrowed down.
Development management

13.36 No comments were received by the Development Management Team regarding Wootton Bassett.

Social and community infrastructure

Early years and childcare provision

13.37 The Secondary School keep mentioning childcare. A few existing childcare providers are not full, but are not centrally located. There are two pre-schools in the area, and one after-school provider. If there are only an additional 150 dwellings to be provided in Wootton Bassett, then this would not warrant a big new childcare scheme.

Primary and secondary education

13.38 Assuming that the RAF pulls out of Lyneham and that the students from the West of Swindon development do not end up coming to Wootton Bassett then the secondary school should be able to take the extra dwellings. If either of those factors change then a financial contribution would be needed.

13.39 The primary school has spaces but is currently in temporary building; financial contributions would be needed.

Primary care provision

13.40 There are two GP surgeries in Wootton Bassett. The older surgery is already at capacity, while the newer one is struggling for space and is building an extension. Issues with capacity may mean development of existing premises, not a new building. However, it is possible that there could be a move to a bigger site from the current practice built in the 1980s.

Libraries

13.41 The current library building in Wootton Bassett is in a good location, near a parade of shops with a car park behind. There is the possibility of extending the existing building.

Table 13.2 Library service provision for planned growth in Wootton Bassett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Additional dwellings</th>
<th>Occupants (at average 2.5 per dwelling)</th>
<th>Spatial requirement (30sqm per 1,000 occupants)</th>
<th>£ (at £85 per occupant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wootton Bassett</td>
<td>200 - 400</td>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
<td>15 - 30</td>
<td>42,500 - 85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire and Rescue

13.42 Development in Wootton Bassett may be affected by the West of Swindon development. Extra infrastructure will be necessary. There are recruitment difficulties in Wootton Bassett.

Police

13.43 No specific comments on Wootton Bassett were received from Wiltshire Police Authority.
13.44 In the Wiltshire Police Authority's Estates Strategy (December 2008), the police station in Wootton Bassett is not identified for replacement or redevelopment in the next ten years.

Ambulance

13.45 There is a part time standby point at one of the GP surgeries in Wootton Bassett. The ambulance service has no real issues with the development; Wootton Bassett is served by Swindon, which performs well.

Cemeteries and crematoria

13.46 The council's Leisure and Amenity Team provided no specific comments on Wootton Bassett.

Leisure Facilities

13.47 The leisure facilities depend on what happens in Swindon; if plans to develop there go ahead then Wootton Bassett's leisure facilities would be closed and contributions would be given to Swindon. If this does not happen then capital would be needed to upgrade Wootton Bassett's facilities from developer contributions.

13.48 RAF Lyneham also complicates things at Wootton Bassett; if the site is developed then facilities at Wootton Bassett would again be likely to close.

Green infrastructure requirements

Flooding

13.49 All of the flood zones given below are those given in the Environment Agency (EA) flood map, which are only current day fluvial flooding. It is important that SFRA flood mapping is also used, as this includes other forms of flooding and takes into account climate change impacts.

Option 1

13.50 A significant area of Option 1 is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. A SFRA Level 2 may be required. A dam structure within site could be considered as a flood control measure if upgraded. The watercourse and associated floodplain (including functional) running through this site will constrain development.

Option 2

13.51 Option 2 is in FZ1 but the watercourse is in the vicinity of the southernmost site, which should be protected and enhanced if possible. Surface water drainage issues also need to be assessed.

Option 3

13.52 Part of the western employment site of Option 3 falls within FZ2 and 3. There are also several watercourses running through the sites. These should be protected and where possible enhanced. A SFRA Level 2 may need to be considered.

Option 4

13.53 This option is within FZ1 but there are watercourses running through much of the site, which should be protected and enhanced if possible. In particular, Thunder Brook runs through this site and may have associated floodplain and restrict land available for development. Surface water drainage issues also need to be assessed.
Option 5

13.54 Option 5 is within FZ1 but there are surface water drainage issues that need to be addressed.

Employment option

13.55 There are some watercourses within the employment option, which may have associated floodplain and could restrict land available.

Biodiversity

13.56 Natural England advise that there may be potential landscape impacts on the AONB

Option 1

13.57 The Environment Agency say that there are several watercourses running across this Option that would need to be protected and, where possible, enhanced. The site encompasses Wootton Bassett mud springs SSSI and is bordered by Hancock's Water and Brinkworth Brook.

13.58 Natural England suggest that the floodplain and archaeology should be used for green infrastructure. However, they believe that Wootton Bassett Mud Springs SSSI, which is within the site, could be a show stopper.

13.59 Goldborough Farm SSSI is to the south of Option 1 and the council's Strategic Landscape Team advise that the impact to the conservation features of the site would need to be assessed. They also recommend that Wootton Bassett Mud Spring SSSI (a geological designation) would need to be retained and a buffer zone set up as well as an assessment of the impact. A habitat corridor would need to be preserved along the railway and water course. There are records of bats and reptiles for the site so the habitat may need to be retained for mitigation. As a result, the Strategic Landscape Team do not prefer this option.

Option 2

13.60 Natural England and the Strategic Landscape Team comment that this Option would lead to a loss of green space within the town and, with records of reptiles and Great Crested Newts, the latter raises concerns that the connectivity of habitat would be reduced.

Option 3

13.61 The Environment Agency point out that there is a small tributary bordering the site. The Strategic Landscape Team highlight the tree copse adjacent to the site and suggest that hedgerows would need to be retained to keep connectivity.

Option 4

13.62 The Environment Agency advise that there are ditches present on site and that the area is next to Jubilee Lake County Wildlife Site (CWS), where there is a record of water voles at the lake. The Strategic Landscape Team, who are not in favour of this option, stress the need to retain hedgerows and habitat that connects the CWS with the wider countryside; provide additional recreational habitat located elsewhere on site to reduce pressure from increased public usage of CWS, and contribute towards the management of the CWS. Natural England emphasise the presence of the CWS within the housing and employment site and its public recreational usage.
13.63 The Environment Agency advise that there are some ponds on the site and a record of Great Crested Newts nearby. Surveys would be needed to determine their presence on the proposal site to inform possible mitigation requirements.

Play areas and open space

13.64 No comments were received from the council's Leisure and Amenity Service on Wootton Bassett.

Rights of way and cycle networks

Option 1

13.65 There is an application in at the moment (Spring/Summer 2009) for a country park and housing for part of Option 1. The railway is a barrier for access into town. There are barriers to cycle access into town from the southern end of the site.

13.66 The following rights of way and cycle links would need to be provided as part of any development of Option 1:

- The circular routes formed by WSAS 28 and WBAS 10 should be developed to a high standard to enable increased use as a recreational route
- WBAS 10 and WBAS 30 as it passes through the development through to Brynards Hill Farm should be managed as a cycle/pedestrian route
- WBAS 1, WBAS 28 and WBAS 10 not to be incorporated into the development where it touches the development but developed to a high standard to enable increased use
- Is part of this site to be designated a Country Park, if so how are links being made between the Country Park, the communities around it and as a conduit for visitors of the Country Park to get to the wider countryside?

Option 4

13.67 The Town Council want to make the area within Option 4 into a country park with links to Jubilee Lakes. A cycle route should be developed from the M4 into the town centre.

Option 5

13.68 This option will require the provision of better cycle links.

Landscape

13.69 No comments on landscape considerations were received.

Other environmental considerations

13.70 With regard to Options 1 and 4, the Environment Agency advise that there are historic landfills located adjacent to this site. Therefore, this site should be assessed to establish the potential for contamination, with remediation identified as required.
Draft strategic site options
Chippenham
We are looking to identify a further 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Chippenham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Preferred residential option (may include some mixed use)
- Preferred employment option

This map is based on Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright.

Unauthorized reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. 
We are looking to identify a further 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Chippenham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Residential option 2
  (may include some mixed use)
- Employment option 2
We are looking to identify a further 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Chippenham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Residential option 3
- Employment option 3

(may include some mixed use)
We are looking to identify a further 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Chippenham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Residential option 4
- (may include some mixed use)
- Employment option 4
Trowbridge
We are looking to identify a further 3,000 - 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Trowbridge. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 1: 3000 dwellings
- Employment option 1: 37ha
We are looking to identify a further 3,000 - 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Trowbridge. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 2: 3000 dwellings
- Employment option 2: 37ha
We are looking to identify a further 3,000 - 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Trowbridge. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 3: 4000 dwellings**
- **Employment option 3: 37ha**
We are looking to identify a further 3,000 - 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Trowbridge. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 4: 3000 Dwellings**
- **Employment option 4: 37ha**

This map is based on Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Wiltshire County Council 100022445 2009.
We are looking to identify a further 3,000 - 4,000 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Trowbridge. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 5: 4,000 dwellings
- Employment option 5: 37ha
Bradford-on-Avon
We are looking to identify a further 0 - 200 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Bradford-on-Avon. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 1: Up to 200 dwellings*
- Option 2: Up to 200 dwellings*

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
Calne
We are looking to identify a further 400 - 1,200 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Calne. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 1**: Up to 1200 dwellings*
- **Option 2**: Up to 1200 dwellings*
- **Option 3**: Up to 1200 dwellings*
- **Option 4**: Up to 1000 dwellings

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.*

Existing employment site
Existing employment site with capacity for intensification
Proposed employment site to be included as part of each option.
We are looking to identify a further 200 - 400 additional dwellings for the period 2006 - 2026 in Corsham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 1**: Up to 400 Dwellings*
- **Option 2**: Up to 400 Dwellings*
- **Option 3**: Up to 400 Dwellings*
- **Option 4**: Up to 400 Dwellings*

Proposed broad area of search for employment to be included as part of each option. Specific employment sites have not been identified.

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.*
Devizes
We are looking to identify a further 700-1100 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Devizes. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 1: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- Option 2: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- Option 3: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- Option 4: Up to 1100 dwellings*

Proposed employment sites to be included as part of each option.

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
Malmesbury
We are looking to identify a further 200 - 400 additional dwellings for the period 2006 - 2026 in Malmesbury. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 1: Up to 400 dwellings*
- Option 2: Up to 400 dwellings*
- Option 3: Up to 220 dwellings
- Option 4: Up to 125 dwellings

Proposed employment site (site is currently in use but may offer potential for expansion/reuse in future). To be included as part of each option.

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
Marlborough
We are looking to identify a further 200 - 600 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Marlborough. These could be delivered at the following locations:

**Option 1:** Up to 320 dwellings

**Option 2:** Up to 320 dwellings

---
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Melksham
We are looking to identify a further 600 - 1100 additional dwellings for the period 2006 - 2026 in Melksham. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Mixed Use Option 1**: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- **Mixed Use Option 2**: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- **Mixed Use Option 3**: Up to 1100 dwellings*
- **Existing employment site with potential to expand** (4 ha).

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
Tidworth
We are looking to identify a further 1200-1850 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Tidworth & Ludgershall. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 1:** Up to 920 dwellings
- **Option 2:** Up to 1850 dwellings
- **Option 3:** Up to 860 dwellings
- **Option 4:** Up to 260 dwellings
- **Option 5:** Up to 450 dwellings
- **Option 6:** Up to 920 dwellings
- **Option 7:** Up to 190 dwellings
- **Option 8:** Up to 520 dwellings
- **Option 9:** Up to 1850 dwellings

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.*
Warminster
Warminster has been identified for 350 - 1350 additional dwellings between 2006 - 2026. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Mixed Use Option 1**: Up to 1350 dwellings*
- **Mixed Use Option 2**: Up to 1350 dwellings*
- **Mixed Use Option 3**: Up to 1350 dwellings*

*Existing employment site with potential to expand (7ha).

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
Westbury
We are looking to identify a further 0 - 350 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2026 in Westbury. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- **Option 1:** Up to 350 dwellings
- **Option 2:** Up to 350 dwellings
- **Option 3:** Up to 350 dwellings
- Proposed employment site to be included as part of each option (Up to 25ha)

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.*
Wootton Bassett & Cricklade
We are looking to identify a further 200 - 400 additional dwellings for the period 2006-2016 in Wootton Bassett. These could be delivered at the following locations:

- Option 1: Up to 400 dwellings
- Option 2: Up to 340 dwellings
- Option 3: Up to 400 dwellings
- Option 4: Up to 400 dwellings* 
- Option 5: Up to 300 dwellings

Proposed employment site or existing site with potential for intensification to be included as part of each option.

Employment 'area of search' with option 1

Employment 'area of search' with option 3

Employment 'area of search' with option 4

Employment 'areas of search' are broad areas where 4ha of additional employment land could be located. Specific sites have not been identified.

*These options can deliver more than the number required. Where the options could deliver higher numbers than stated only part of the site would be developed.
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