

Rep ID: Calne1	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The brownfield target should be higher. It is vital that we destroy as little of our greenfield land as possible.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
It's all very well writing a list of priorities, but making promises you don't intend to keep is a futile exercise. A considerable number of housing developments have been allowed to go ahead in Calne in the last 10 years without any commitment to improving infrastructure to the local road network, reduction in traffic congestion, improving air quality or town centre regeneration. How will you ensure that any future development will deliver against these place shaping priorities?	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

'Site 7' has already been democratically rejected by the community in the current Neighbourhood Plan. Why is this now being reconsidered?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

'Site 4' would appear on paper to be the most appropriate, in part, due to access to the A4.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

How will the community be consulted on these proposals?

Rep ID: Calne2	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): NAME REDACTED'
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Area 4 seems gigantic and completely unnecessary. Is there really a need for all these?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes, mostly I guess.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No. Pool 4 is far too large, is a known area of flooding and the main road through Quemerford to Cherhill won't support all the extra traffic.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

1, 2 or 7.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes. All the rare wildlife. We have Kingfishers, Woodpeckers and more in our garden which will be scared away.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Internet is appalling to adding more houses will need serious investment.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne3	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Too much growth given the recent new developments. Higher brownfield target.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Need to prioritise Calne as a town but without turning it into a large, broad monstrosity which ends up with umpteen empty shops as there is too much empty or low quality housing, not enough demand, and destroying the 'small countryside town' desirable feel that it currently has. Better transport can be achieved by making sure development is on brownfield sites, close to the town centre so not too far to walk for people.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

There is enough choice.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Small blocks of desirable flats close to the town centre with a lower land footprint preferably on brownfield if possible. Ideal for starter homes, young professionals etc.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Desirability of young families, and young professionals will be looking for areas closer to the major cities like Bath, Bristol and Swindon. The north and western site locations are better for access to amenities and Chippenham train station. The eastern option is a huge and unnecessary grouping for development of 360 houses, is heading out towards the AONB and limited amenities in walking distance - instead it would just encroach on more green belt land which is already precious.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

More sustainable power options.

Further comments

Ideally ensure brownfield sites only are used and keep the Calne boundaries with green belt as they are. Houses and flats near town contributes to less traffic pollution as people can walk a few minutes to the shops. People who live on outskirts normally drive rather than walk if it is going to take longer than 5-10 minutes.

Rep ID: Calne4	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth is unambitious and would lead to Calne stagnating. A residual housing requirement of just 360 more houses to be approved before 2036 - when there are already several brownfield sites being considered for possible housing, would leave Calne needing to build perhaps fewer than 20 new homes pa. Meanwhile Chippenham is scheduled for a massive 7500 additional homes as well as 1 million sq ft of new employment land. Under your proposals Calne would get next to nothing in the way of investment in infrastructure, while Chippenham would get loads. This would impact very adversely on our local economy and I suspect Calne's housing market.</p> <p>The reason Calne has ended up building in excess of its quota of new houses is largely because land off Oxford are, opposite the Porte Marsh Trading Estate, which had been designated for employment, on appeal went to housing. The town desperately needs more local jobs. The new housing appears to be being bought mostly by people from Reading, Newbury, Oxfordshire etc who use Calne as a dormitory town and do a fairly long commute to work. They either shop on line or out of town and so the increased population is adding little to spending in Calne's town centre.</p>	

Air Quality has long been an issue in Calne and 8 years on Nitrogen Dioxide levels by the former White Hart (where the A3102 joins the A4) are the second highest in Wiltshire.

The proposed expansion of Chippenham, which will in effect bolt on the equal alert of a second Calne to the town, would inevitably add to the traffic passing through Calne and exacerbate our AQ pollution. Yet no impact assessments on either Calne's roads or it's local economy have been done.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

I agree with all these but will the fine words be backed up. Eg will the AQ issue finally be addressed? Will the Sustrans cycle track to Chippenham get the all-weather surface it needs to be useable during the winter months? Will land earmarked for employment be protected from speculative housing? And will WC insist on all new housing being fitted for renewable energy?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Definitely not site 8 (at Chilvester Hill) unless the development can be entered off the roundabout. A speculative proposal has come forward suggesting direct access onto the A4 which would be extremely dangerous. Definitely not site 7. Given the problems with AQ and congestion where the A3102 meets the A4 on Silver St, we must not allow further housing development that feeds directly into this AQMA, I would favour site 4 being the preferred site for future housing growth - and it would provide more than enough land for the residual 360 houses we are required to build. Ideally employment land could be designated between any new housing here and the Hills site to the rear providing a buffer zone. 360 houses is not many and it makes sense that only 1 new site is opened up to accommodate these.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

As I have said above - site 4.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes, the AQMA at New Rad/A4/Silver St. Ideally all new housing should be within a reasonable walking distance of the town centre - ie within 1 mile otherwise Calne will completely lose any sense of being a former market town as it sprawls into the countryside. Any new housing needs to be well connected with active travel routes to both neighbouring developments and ideally through to the centre of town.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I believe that the town would have enough school places and the new medical centre should meet local needs. Calne with Beversbrook, the Leisure Centre and the Recreation and is well served for sports facilities. The 403 Sustrans cycle route runs through the town and needs enhancing both north (the tack towards Chippenham) and east (towards Cherhill and Avebury). Transport is an issue with only the 55 Chippenham -Swindon bus route providing a service that people could commute to work or school by.

I should like to see more solar energy being provided locally (wind power is not really an option here) and hope both the Local Plan and the renewed Neighbourhood Plan, support this,

As I have said above, Calne needs more local employment, to reduce commuting, to improve AQ and to support sustainability. We currently get no investment from the LEP.

Further comments

I am cynical about the scale of the proposed expansion of Chippenham upon which there has as yet been no consultation of the town's residents or on the neighbouring towns and villages that would be impacted. The proposal seems to be a fait accompli with talk now of consulting on the exact route of the distributor road (NBC's not a relief road) but not on the principle of building

so many houses. What if your consultation were to find that this was hugely unwelcome and opposed by a majority of Chippenham residents? Would WC withdraw their plans or scale the, down? How important is local democracy in such decision-making? Do the men in Trowbridge know best or think they know best? The answer at last night's Forum that Chippenham is the right location for such a major development because of access to the M4 suggests Wiltshire expects many of the new residents to be commuting long distances. How can this be encouraged when WC has passed a Climate Emergency resolution? Chippenham also has the railway station but as users will know rush hour trains are currently packed - how many more commuters can be absorbed, and if not many, those people will drive to Bath, Swindon, Bristol, Reading etc. The decision to expand Chippenham so much has many negative consequences for Calne, one of which would be that our growth as a town would come to a virtual halt, as all new investment is channelled 6 miles north of us.

Rep ID: Calne5	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
More brownfield should be done before building on greenbelt.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The large lower zone would tie in with placing near the centre.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

2, 3 and 4 as this is keeping the development relatively within the town boundary reducing sprawl into nature areas particularly no development near areas like High Penn as already there is planning for industrial units and shops.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

As previous, site 1 is an important barrier between the development and nature.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

no

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne6	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
I am content with another 360 properties.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
In order to minimise impact and reduce traffic congestion an Eastern bypass must be built, but that won't come with only 360 properties.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Yes.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

1, 2, 7

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Calne is susceptible to flooding near to Quemerford so 4, 5 and 6 should be avoided.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

How will you achieve the education part of the startegy as all schools are nearing capacity.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne7	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Private Individual
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
There should be a brownfield target as a priority over green field development, which negatively impacts on the local community and those living in the immediate vicinity of any proposed green field site.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The top priority should be the impact any development has on the life of local resident. This includes their health, safety, environmental and ecological. It also must prioritise the potential destruction of their personal space, noise and physical / mental well-being. The upheaval to their lives and the negative impact it may have on the value of their property and ability to sell their	

home, would have a negative impact across the board, including residents that may have recently move in, be it a young family or retirees.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

It is the right pool of sites but we have very strong concerns to site no. 6, (SHELAA reference 3254) which immediately neighbours our property. Should this site be approved for Planning Application, we shall personally, vehemently object to any plans for building development, including but not limited to the concerns expressed herein.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brown field sites.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes. All of the aforementioned reasons, which negatively impact on people's personal lives.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

In respect of Site no.6, (3254), there will be issues which were already deemed as grounds for refusal of the previous planning application at this site, The issues include, very limited road access, Sewerage and extensive land drainage drainage issues because of very the heavy presence of clay, increased CO2 emissions and increased traffic, all in a very small area of land.

Further comments

Please be assured, there is already much opposition, even at this stage, to the potential development of Site 6 (3254) set out in your local plan. The development of this site and its location would be insignificant in respect of the number of potential homes needed in your future development plan for Calne. Agreement of this particular site would have a very negative impact on the residents and their attitude towards the Council's insensitivity and trust, should the proposal for this site be allowed to progress.

Rep ID: Calne8	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): n/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I do not agree that the scale of growth should increase from the current planned 2006-2026 strategy. I believe that the scale of growth should be lower. The Council is proposing to build 1550 homes on Greenfield sites- these greenfield sites are what defines Calne and makes it valued and attractive to its residents and visitors.</p> <p>There are limited brownfield sites available in Calne and increasing the number of houses and developments would destroy the green spaces the community values most. I agree that Brownfield sites should be the priority for any development; housing or employment but that the amount of development should be limited and reduced.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

I do not agree that these are the correct priorities.

Priority 3. states the need to improve local road networks and infrastructure whilst also improving air quality. This seems a contradiction in terms- surely building more roads to 'improve congestion' will reduce green spaces and therefore create more pollution and reduce air quality. Congestion through the town centre could easily be reduced by simply re-sequencing the traffic lights in the centre of town! To improve air quality the Council should aim to preserve and protect our green open spaces from development. Houses do not create the oxygen we need to breathe but trees do! Plant more trees.

Priority 6 should be a higher priority, especially when the current sustainable transport solutions that we value such as the 403 Sustrans cycle path are under threat from development on all sides including those in the Chippenham local plan and 'Future Chippenham' project.

Priority 4 should be a higher priority for the same reasons. We love Calne because of its small rural town character - to expand the town by the proposed amount destroys the reason so many people love Calne.

EDUCATION should be a priority for the town; with the increase in housing has anyone considered where all of the young people of Calne will be going to Secondary school? How will all the children travel to secondary schools from outlying villages (especially if the 403 Cycle path is threatened) This also has an environmental impact.

ENERGY should be considered- all new housing developments should be sustainably heated, with solar panels on the roof, passive use of energy, air source heat-pumps so that we do not need to contaminate our green spaces with endless solar farms.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I am concerned that SHELAA sites 636 and 710 are not featured in this map- does this mean that the Council has discounted their use or that their fate will be decided by landowners and developers alone? I strongly believe that site 636 and 710 should be saved in their current state as protected green spaces for the enjoyment of Calne residents. Development of area 4 on this map would surely lead to the need for further infrastructure such as a bypass from Quermerford to the north of Calne and for this reason I would object to the use of this land. Area 8 is sited very near to SHELAA sites 636 and 710 and would encourage the further development into these areas and for this reason and to protect the green spaces surround Calne I do not think this site should be considered for development.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

I do not believe it is appropriate to build on any greenfield site. Build a new secondary school. Build a small, pedestrianised ,independent retailer/community centre on the site of the Co-op.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I think that the Council has completely underestimated the value that local communities place upon green open spaces. In increasing the numbers of housing developments you lose the quintessential market town appeal of rural Calne which is why we love to live here. The value of these spaces and of living in a small town community has been amplified by the coronavirus pandemic in which thousands of residents have enjoyed access to the green open spaces in walking distance of the town. Currently residents of Calne are served by one State secondary school, which is underperforming according to OFSTED. Previously residents of villages in Calne Without have attended the two large secondary schools in Chippenham however, with proposed expansion of Chippenham and the catchment areas of the outlying villages switched instead to the one underperforming school in Calne. Although there is currently surplus places at Kingsbury Green Academy, there will not be surplus enough to provide for a further 1550 households and who wants their child to attend an underperforming school?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Education: Although Surplus spaces are available at Kingsbury Green Academy, no-one wants to send their child to a school which Ofsted says is underperforming. Are there enough surplus spaces once there are 1600 new households in Calne?
Energy: Contradictory to your 'Planning for' document, according to the SSEN availability map, the substation is constrained both upstream and downstream. Potential substation planning would be required to fulfil the needs of the proposed new housing developments.
Green and Blue Infrastructure: I am worried to see that SHEELA Areas 636, 3172 and 710 are not included in the GBI plans- these areas are currently green open spaces which should be included as strategic nature areas.

I am pleased that the Council have included the areas surrounding Derry Hill and Studley as Strategic Nature Areas and hope that this status will preserve these villages from further development which would ruin their rural character.

Further comments

I object to the Future Chippenham Plan which encroaches on Calne Without and effectively merges the villages of Studley and Derry Hill with Chippenham. There is nothing to consider or prevent this in the Calne Local plan. I would like to see a robust response from the council to this eradication of Local countryside and community identity. I have responded to the Local Plan consultation for Chippenham to this effect but would like to see consideration of this important issue from Calne Council also, who appear to be mysteriously quiet on the matter. The Council must act to preserve the green corridor of the Avon and Marden valley and the beautiful green spaces which are enjoyed by so many residents. The value of this green space has been highlighted by their use in the Coronavirus Pandemic, where they have provided local residents with areas to exercise in and improve their mental health by connecting with nature. The SUStrans 403 cyclepath and the fields and woodland adjacent to it has been a lifeline to those who can walk and cycle to their workplaces, and use it for leisure. To consider digging it up to lay a cable for a solar farm or building a bypass and housing over it is to completely underestimate its unique value. We do not need any more housing in Chippenham and we expect our representatives at the Council to fight for our community identity as small rural villages.

Rep ID: Calne9	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I think WC show no ambition for Calne. All the new investment and growth is targeted on Chippenham. Not only does our town miss out on LEP funds we don't even have the support of Wiltshire Council. A residual of 360 more home by 2036 will mean just a trickle of new building.ds each year. Already over 100 new homes are likely to get planning permission and be built well before 2026. Calne might end up adding just 10 or 12 new home pa from then through to 2036. That is a virtual standstill while Melksham and Chippenham get the investment and their Councils the CIL receipts to improve their towns.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

Agreed. Calne urgently needs more land for employment use. We have lost a lot that was earmarked for this to housing over the last few years. New residents moving into Calne often commute longish distances to Reading and Newbury and Bristol. It surely makes sense to seek to provide as much employment locally as possible.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I favour just one site being chosen - given the very small number of homes we are being asked to accommodate. I favour site 4 followed by 2 or 1.
I am strongly opposed to both 7 and 8 on traffic grounds. 8 would need to be accessed from the Chilvester Hill roundabout to make entrance and egress safe. And anyway the site can only take about 30 houses so is too small.
7 is off the A3102 which feeds into Calne by the White Hart at New Road (A4) which is an AQMA - and currently shows the second highest Nitrogen Dioxide levels in the whole of Wiltshire. To add potentially another 100+ cars to this junction at morning rush hour would significantly add to the daily congestion at this point and further worsen the Air Quality. In my view it should be removed from consideration on these grounds.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

As above

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Air Quality must be considered in locating any new housing. With only perhaps 150-200 new home to build, I think it would be best to concentrate these on just one site rather than have 4 or 5 small developments bolted on to the town. Sustainability needs to be given much greater importance in all respects - site location, method of building, house insulation, heating systems, cycle routes, access to public transport etc.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

At present Calne is I believe the only town in Wiltshire with no public Electric Vehicle charging points. The Sustrans 403 route between Calne and Chippenham is virtually unusable during 6 months of the year. It needs an all-weather surface but only WC are in a position to negotiate with the various landowners (7 I believe) whose land the track crosses. If this work was done it would open up the route for commuting as well as hugely enhancing the leisure and exercise opportunities the track offers.

Further comments

I am hugely concerned about the likely impact on Calne's roads esp A4 and A3102 of up to 7500 new homes being built to the east and south of Chippenham. As yet no traffic impact assessment has been done and it urgently needs to be.

Rep ID: Calne10	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
There should be a brownfield target. The scale of growth is far too high.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
No. This is all backwards. Development needs to have the environment at its heart. Not point 4. The infrastructure in calne is terrible. That needs to be point 2. A bypass that connects oxford road with the A4. Houses they fit in and wont stand out like lego houses. The new development around spitfire way looks awful. Stuck out there on the hillside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

It is not the right choice. Land owners and developer have only one thing on their minds. ££££. Not the people that will end up living there or the people that currently do!

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Land with good access, and that wong harm or distupt wildlife.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I think there is too much destruction of wildlife and fields hedgerows and nature in general in this plan. I dont thin Abbard brooke has been prtwtced enough, I thing the gravel pit and Tip are only just starting to come back to nature and this plan is going to reset a lot of that etc. I dont think the people of Calne interests have been taken into account at all.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Yes, more money for local communities centres (the Grove for example) and a bypass. With more than a nod to nature. Tree lined, proper energy efficient lighting, etc

Further comments

I dont feel Calne can take much more. Im actually very upset to learn this is happening. The new houses are just thrown up and look terrible. They all stick out like a sore thumb. There is very little acknowldgement of the damage done to trees, plants, and wildlife.

Rep ID: Calne11	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of development in Calne is criminal! With a population now of over 17000 with no facilities and only an M&Co in the centre it is scandalous that this has been permitted to happen! Lack of doctors, dentists and schools, lack of shops and amenities. Terrible!	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
It matters not what the local plan states! It has previously been ignored and overridden by developers on the South side of Calne. The town plan is a waste of time and effort as in reality it means nothing!	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No further sites should be considered for the next 10 years. Air pollution is at an all time high in the centre (and had been for the last 8 years or so). People should be held accountable for allowing this to continue!

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No further land is appropriate! Calne will be reaching Compton Bassett and Lyneham soon in one side and Corsham on the other!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes!

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The infrastructure requirements are highlighted with every objection raised against these developments!

Further comments

It is not worth making any further comment as it has no bearing on what will happen. The developers will continue to ride roughshod over Calne Town council and continue to turn Wiltshire into a concrete jungle!!

Rep ID: Calne12	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
All brownfield sites. We have lost masses of green fields views and nature thanks to the hills developments and now Wiltshire Council approved more houses on the other side of low lane clearly marked on the map as potential not preferred and outside the boundary as well as being marked as nature. Enough is enough. Start taking down unused buildings and building new convert empty places to homes.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Towns infrastructure is a joke. Too many houses not enough schools doctors dentists etc. Roads are gridlock even in lockdown. Clearly sorting out the infrastructure should come before allowing more houses. We are now basically a commuter town minus a train station. Wiltshire Council need to get to grips with fixing things before trying to add to an already struggling system.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Rip down what's empty on port Marsh and use for businesses houses etc. So many units are sat empty yet lidl want planning for a store plus more units to sit empty.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites redevelopment of derelict sites. The old community centre is sat rotting that would easily fit a few houses or flats. It's ignored in favour of pasture land and its not the only place.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You need plants to breath bees to pollinate. The way this council is going we better evolve to breath concrete because we will have nothing left.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Stop ignoring the local population who object. We live here yet Wiltshire Council ignores us

Further comments

Sick of losing so many beautiful walks and wildlife to houses. We have enough houses we need a road system that works we need doctors dentists schools we need a town centre where people can run a business without stupidly high rents and rates. The town is dying.

Rep ID: Calne13	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brown sites should be targeted first. They must be brown field site not green field, or changed to brown field for an excuse to build yet more houses.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The first priorities should be infrastructure. More Doctors, surgeries, more schools before building more houses. Schools and surgeries are at full capacity already. Also, we must regenerate the centre, it looks terrible.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Are we just building houses for the sake of it? Or is it for investors to come in and buy them? We should build by needs. Why when Chippenham council is pushing for more roads and 7,500 more houses should houses be built a couple of miles away. Is the plan to join the towns up?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Inside Calne. Why don't you use the centre for more houses. The centre has never been a consideration has it. If the council is so worried about green issues, why keep building over the countryside? Calne council don't even bother to clean up around the area.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

More social housing, New developments are mainly for investors and expensive for most people. Houses are built just to make money, not the need.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Should not be built on green fields.

Further comments

It's a shame that councils have decided just to keep building houses whether we need them or not, Social houses are needed, not big developments to be sold for investments.

Rep ID: Calne14

Consultee code: Other

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): BNP Paribas Real Estate

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes

Organisation being represented (if applicable): -

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Higher.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Yes.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

4

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

NA

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

NA

Further comments

NA

Rep ID: Calne15	
Consultee code: Statutory Body	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Sport England
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
No comment.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
I think there should be a target of creating a healthy, inclusive sustainable town. consideration should be given to Sport England and Public Health England https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design when designing new housing and in environmental improvements	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No Comment.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No comment

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No comment

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

No

Further comments

No

Rep ID: Calne16	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is way too high, especially for housing. Any new developments, whether housing or employment should be on brownfield sites only, so the target of 60 should be higher to accommodate what is being proposed.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
In my experience these are all empty promises. You will not deliver infrastructure, regeneration of the town centre, improve road network, reduce traffic or improve air quality. Only applications that generate revenue/profit will be pushed forward for approval. How can building the proposed number of new houses improve traffic or air quality when residents are forced to travel out of town because of the lack of amenities within the town.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Site 7 was democratically rejected for development in the current Neighbourhood Plan so shouldn't even appear on this list. I strongly object to any development on Site 7.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

If you have to build anywhere, then Site 4 makes the most sense due to access to the A4.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

There are many important factors that would negatively impact any development on Site 7:

- the road network would not support an increase in traffic associated with another housing development
- the negative impact on the Grade II listed Vern Leaze estate
- an increase in air pollution
- ecological damage

to name just a few.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

As I have already indicated any proposed improvements to infrastructure are empty promises that will not come to fruition

Further comments

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am strongly opposed to any further development of Site 7.

Rep ID: Calne17	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Plan A Limited
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Lidl Great Britain Limited	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne17
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
SEE PDF ATTACHMENT Calne17 DATED 26/02/21.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Response: No. The pool of potential development sites should include all existing Core Strategy site allocations, to include employment allocation BD1 to the east of Beversbrook Farm. It is unclear how much of the employment land requirement will be satisfied by existing site allocations and how much will need to be delivered on new site allocations. Accordingly, the strategy for allocating new sites is not clearly presented. This lack of clarity is further compounded by failure to acknowledge any existing employment land allocations in Calne that remain available to accommodate future development, which we comment on further below.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Response: New development should be focused upon the north eastern edge of Calne. This will reflect existing patterns of growth and enable the town's expansion to be accessible from the A3102, thereby reducing the highways impact upon the town centre. Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 8 allocates a site of 3.2ha located to the east of Beversbrook Farm and Porte Marsh Industrial Estate to accommodate new employment development. The site is also acknowledged in the made Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan. There is, however, no evidence that allocation BD1 has been taken into account in the SHELAA, with it not featuring in Appendix 5.2, which comprises plans and initial assessments of the sites considered for future development in Calne. Whilst it may not be a significant omission for the SHELAA not to take an allocated site into account, it is a significant flaw in methodology if future site allocations are only then drawn from the SHELAA. By excluding consideration of existing site allocations without planning permission, the adopted methodology for identifying land for allocation to meet future employment requirements in the emerging Local Plan is unsound.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Response: The allocation of new sites for employment use should not be pursued until existing Core Strategy allocations have been taken-up. Revise the settlement boundary in Calne to include existing and any new site allocations and address shortfalls in the application of the methodology adopted in the Housing Site Allocations Plan. For example, the existing residential development located to the west of Oxford Road, the Tesco store on Beversbrook Lane and any other implemented planning approvals in Calne should be included within the settlement boundary.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

SEE PDF ATTACHMENT Calne17

Rep ID: Calne18

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Yes. As much development as possible should be carried out on brownfield sites to eliminate the need to expand into the countryside. Calne has grown massively in recent years but the infrastructure has not kept pace with this growth.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

We agree with these policies but care should be taken that they are strictly adhered to.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Areas 5 & 6 on the above plan are an encroachment on the countryside and should be resisted. There has already been a large development on the south side of Calne and as we live here we have noticed a considerable increase in the volume of traffic on Stockley Lane. With regard to area 4 this is a very large area as a proposed development site and would have a major impact on the country side around Calne and increase the traffic on the A4 dramatically. Surely no council would allow a development of this size without carrying a major improvement to the road network.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

We appreciate the difficulty in finding appropriate building land so therefore any development should be well balanced so that it does not damage the environment and overload the local community infrastructures.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

None.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

None

Further comments

I was involved in the planning appeal regarding Marden Farm and was at the meeting with the planning inspector and felt that the whole process was a done deal so I am not sure how much notice will be taken of my comments or this whole process because the council and the government will do what they want to do regardless of anyone's wishes or views. I know this sounds cynical but that is how I feel.

Rep ID: Calne19	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Higher and brownfield.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Insufficient attention placed onto shopping requirements for the increase in housing Words in the priorities not direct enough Suggest you study Didcot's development (South Oxon). Lots of new housing and major retail development in the center of town This ensured residents stayed in the town to shop which was of major benefit to the area More effort needed to attract large shopping organisations.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

All looks good to me.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

As per previous houses and more shopping opportunities to keep people spending in the town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Again not enough stress put on shopping mall.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Do not think so

Further comments

Just to reiterate put the emphasis on keeping shoppers in Calne.

Rep ID: Calne20	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Far too much growth for Calne. However if must more brownfield use.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Only some. More housing and employment will not improve air quality nor help the environment.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Cannot really give an answer.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

This part clearly states "IF Calne is to expand" also "only a relatively small amount of land is required in order to meet strategic housing requirements " therefore 1.5.6 or 8 are small sites, 1 being nearer to the large Tesco and proposed Lidl and Port Marsh. The further you build out of town more cars will be used = more pollution. New employment buildings are earmarked for near the new Lidl but surely no more housing is needed else you will just be chasing your tail.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Brownfield first!!!

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Schools have spaces at the moment but more housing would compromise this. Doctors and dentists are already struggling. More choice in shops, there are too many charity, hair, beauty and takeaway and cafes, we need to encourage butchers, bakers, greengrocers instead of large supermarkets. As for infrastructure reopen the high Street and make a one way system

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne21	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Considering the amount of houses that have been built in Calne in the last couple of years I don't think we need to build any more on Greenfield sites, they should only be on Brownfield sites if any are built at all. I've lived in Calne pretty much all my life and it has expanded far too much already and it's going to spoil the Town if many more houses are built.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
We need more amenities not houses. We need more Doctors, dentists, shops, schools, there are not enough of these with the amount of new houses that have already been built.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I don't think we should really be building on any of the proposed sites as it's a loss of more green space round the town. I have real concerns about building off Wenhill Lane/Marden Way, it's a real habitat for nature with Buzzards, Red Kites, Owls and I'm sure a lot of others but we see the Buzzards and Red Kites every day over the fields you are proposing to build on. I am also concerned about the access and if extra cars would be coming down Marden Way, it's not wide enough for the traffic we get now with cars parked all down the road and double parked down Station Road. I'm sure the fire engine would struggle to get up to this estate some days.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

We probably need a bypass from the Marlborough side of town to stop all the traffic having to go through town but not if it means they are going to build houses as well.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne22	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
No real comment on the scale of growth but would like to see as much of the growth to be built on brownfield sites as possible.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
They seem good to me.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

I would hope priority is given to brownfield and in fill before greenfield sites. Has consideration be given how traffic from these sites will access the town and the wider area?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

1, 6 & 3

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

How traffic will get to and from sites? Effect on flow of traffic through rest of the town? How accessible is the town centre from the sites on foot or by bike?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Can't think of any.

Further comments

No

Rep ID: Calne23

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Lower, already massively over developed in last 10 years increasing congestion and pollution and only to accomodate commuters.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

sort out that [TEXT REDACTED] width restriction in the town centre which creates most of the congestion at rush hour.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

none needed

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

none

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

a connecting road from new tescos to a4 east of town, as all the housing is to the north and all the commuters go east, having to go through the stupid width restriction in the town centre, [TEXT REDACTED]

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

drs surgeries. If we dont need more then how come it takes 3 weeks to get [TEXT REDACTED] appointment? already over stretched by the last few years of unnecessary development

Further comments

[TEXT REDACTED]

Rep ID: Calne24

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

As a Calne resident I'm utterly appalled by all seven of the proposed sites for development. Site 4 is of particular concern due to its proximity to the headwaters of the river Marden, a chalk stream. Over the past ten years the strain created by the town's water demands has seen record low flows in the river, along with the inevitable habitat damage/loss this causes. To combat this we have several clean-up groups - now amalgamated in some way by the recently formed Sustainable Calne - along with Bristol Avon Rivers Trust, all working constantly to reduce the impact of the town's residents, sewerage leaks, commercial waste and general abuse of this small waterway. To surround this headwater as you propose would surely mean the death of the Marden and that's utterly reprehensible. As a town the last thing it needs is more residents when there are so many areas that are failing, LET ALONE A 70% INCREASE IN SIZE! The potential for making this a nicer place to live is there, but through redevelopment, not just bolting on more houses as per this proposal.

Rep ID: Calne25	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The current strategy of 1440 homes up to 2026 seems large but acceptable. Give this large number, Increasing this by only 170 to 1610 homes by 2036 is reasonable. There absolutely should be a brownfield target and this should be higher than the 60 homes over 10 years suggested. This should be closer to a third of all new homes built.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Infrastructure supporting homes built (such as building more schools, doctors surgeries, shops etc.) should be high priority. Also, Calne already has a large amount of housing development relative to the size of the town centre. Money should be spent	

rejuvenating and regenerating the centre to make it a pleasant and successful environment. This is in everyone's interests so that people want to live in Calne and to buy the new homes.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

An overall eye must be had on the shape of Calne as a town and to ensure it works coherently as a community. As such, it seems to me that smaller, integrated developments make more sense than anything too large. In particular, the size of site 4 is concerning, especially given the traffic implications of extra cars on the A4.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

As above, I feel that small well-designed developments that add aesthetic value to the area and allow new residents to integrate into the existing community are the most appropriate.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

It is important that any development is aesthetically pleasing, and allows residents to integrate into the community so that it adds value to the town of Calne (and also means that new developments are attractive and people want to buy these new homes). The environmental impact of any new developments is incredibly important - along with community engagement when new sites are chosen.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The Planning for Calne document covers the areas I would expect to see.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne26	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Link Sandpit road to Quemerford MOST important.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The old coop and car parks.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

co-op site (shops/pub/resturants etc)

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Calne is a great place to live just need to correct infrastructure with the future development planned to make Calne even better.

Rep ID: Calne27	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
TOO HIGH, HUGE SCALE OF BUILD SINCE 1998 AND ESPECIALLY MORE RECENTLY. CHANGING TOWN TO A COMMUTOR TOWN. NEED TO USE BROWNFIELD SITES ONLY.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS NEED TO BE IN PLACE FIRST TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT NOT THE OTHER WAY ROUND. STRICTER PLANNING SUPERVISION AND ENFORCEMENT ON NEW ESTATES TO ENSURE ENOUGH PARKING AND SAFE EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS. DEVELOPING A PLAN FOR TOWN CENTRE MEANS NOTHING IF IGNORED BY THE COUNCIL/GOVERNMENT WHEN DEVELOPERS TRY TO OVERRIDE IT.	

ROAD IMPROVEMENTS ARE LIMITED BY THE HOUSING FRONTING ONTO THE MAIN A4, LACK OF PARKING SPACES ALREADY RESTRICT MOVEMENT ALONG THE ROAD THUS ADDING TO THE HOUSING WITHOUT ADDRESSING A RINGROAD WOULD ONLY SERVE TO MAKE THE BOTTLENECK a3102/a4 WORSE AND INCREASING TENSION AND BAD-FEELING.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

PRIORITY SHOULD BE IMPROVING WHAT WE HAVE AND DEVELOPING BROWNFIELD SITES AREAS WHICH HAVE BE LEFT FOR YEARS. OLD RAF YATESBURY SITE, ALREADY HAS ACCESS ONTO A4, ALSO SPACE FOR A SHOP/FOOD RETAILER.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

BROWNFIELD SITES. ANY NEW BUILDS MUST HAVE SPACE FOR EXPANDING HOUSEHOLDS. THE EXISTING NEW BUILDS DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH SPACE FOR THEIR OWN CARS LET ALONE ANY VISITORS. CARS HAVE TO BE PARKED ON THE ROADS RESTRICTING ROAD PASSING AND ENCOURAGING SPEED AS CARS DART AROUND OBSTACLES IN ORDER TO GET PAST BEFORE ONCOMING VEHICLES. EMERGENCY VEHICLES ARE HAVING ISSUES ACCESSING SOME AREAS. DEVELOPERS KNOW THERE IS NOT THE WILL OR FINANCES TO FIGHT VIOLATIONS ND CONTINUE TO SQUASH IN EVERY AVAILABLE SPACE.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

AS MENTIONED A4 ALREADY HAS TRAFFIC POLLUTION LEVELS FAR IN EXCESS OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS WITH CHOKE POINTS IN ROADS WHICH CANT BE FIXED UNLESS HOUSING IS REMOVED TO CREATE MORE SPACE PLUS LACK OF PARKING MEANS MORE VEHICLES FIGHTING FOR A SPACE IN MAIN ROADWAYS, CAUSING SO MANY

SAFETY ISSUES. THIS IS NOT A CASE OF ENFORCEMENT BUT SIMPLY TOO MANY VEHICLES AND NOT ENOUGH SPACE. WITH MORE HOUSING PLANNED FOR CALNE AND SOME 7500 NEW DWELLINGS PLANNED FOR CHIPPENHAM WHERE ARE ALL THESE CARS GOING TO PARK. MANY PEOPLE TRAVEL INTO CHIPPENHAM FOR THE TRAIN AND ALREADY STRUGGLE TO PARK, THE WHOLE AREA IS GOING TO BE GRIDLOCKED IF WE DONT GET THE INFRASTRUCTURE RIGHT IN THE FIRST PLACE. WITH THE BEST WILL IN THE WORLD PEOPLE ARE NOT GOING TO GIVE UP THE CONVENIENCE OF THEIR VEHICLES.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

CALNE TOWN IDENTITY AND ASPIRATIONS. If people wanted to live in a commutor ghost town or city type built up area, they would buy elsewhere. people who have settled in Calne did so for the small friendly market town it was, the difficulty moving around the town has killed off the town centre and further building will only exacerbate this

Further comments

We spent a small fortune in both time and money developing a town plan and saying NO to any further development. All of which seems to be completely ignored. Local consensus says that these consultations are a complete waste of time and money as local peoples wishes are over-ridden or ignored.

Rep ID: Calne28	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
No objection to proposed scale of growth subject to necessary road infrastructure being provided. No view on brownfield target.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Calne suffers road congestion on the A4 and this is likely to be made worse by housing development especially to the south of the town. This congestion together with the Curzon Street blockage problem makes visiting the town centre unattractive and so hinders its regeneration. I would suggest a high priority be given to an eastern by pass and also to incorporating local shopping centres into housing developments which are more accessible by car than the current town centre.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No Comment.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

I think sites 1,2 & 3 should be the priorities. I would object to sites 5 to 8 as they would create more congestion on the A4. Site 4 may be possible in the future once an eastern by pass is built.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No Comment

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Eastern By Pass .Local shopping centres. See earlier comments.

Further comments

None

Rep ID: Calne29	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): n/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth anticipated for Calne is appropriate taking into account the scale of growth in the town within the current strategy, and the fact that Calne has suffered greatly in taking additional housing, due to the failure to deliver the housing requirement in Chippenham and Trowbridge. The infrastructure does not currently exist to support growth above this level. I do not support a brownfield target, due to the lack of brownfield site availability within Calne.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities are broadly supported, however there needs to be a greater focus on the policies to improve the long-term sustainability in response to the climate emergency. Land should be identified for longer-term protection, and support tree	

planting and biodiversity gains. In particular land lying within the Marden valley to the west of Calne provides great opportunities for achieving this priority. The strategy for the town centre regeneration needs to be landed quickly in light of the changes to the retail environment, and should be a mixture of sensitive housing with sustainable community solutions.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

This is an appropriate pool of potential sites, given the planned growth of Calne. The site selection report has defined the pros and cons in a logical manner. I would only question putting forward site 4 at Quemerford without a clear plan or commitment to invest in the infrastructure required to introduce an Eastern bypass.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Most appropriate sites would be 1, 2 & 3, given the current infrastructure in this part of the town, and the longer-term opportunity to introduce the link road to the East, where site 4 is a better option. Site no 7 will feed onto an already congested road into Calne, which will have severe impact on the air quality in the centre of Calne.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

With most of the opportunities to build, lying a reasonable distance from the town centre, unless there is a coherent regeneration plan for the centre, and appropriate linkages, this will miss a great opportunity and leave the town centre dormant, and impact on the social cohesion of the town.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The sites at Quemerford (4) will need to be part of an Eastern bypass solution, otherwise built independently of this will drive traffic into the town centre.

Further comments

In the site selection report, site 710 (Old Allotment Gardens, Castle Walk) is identified within the SHEELA, but no commentary or assessment is provided. The site is then sifted out from the options. The overall decision on this site to exclude is correct as this in fact a Local Green Space within the Calne Neighbourhood Plan, and identified as green infrastructure. There should be commentary added to reflect this, and it should be questioned why this land is still part of the SHEELA, given that it can only be built on in exceptional circumstances.

Rep ID: Calne30	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Retired
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The brownfield target for employment land should be increased by 25% to accommodate new types of employment that reflect emerging technologies that can create at least two local centres of excellence. A disparate approach to inward investment opportunities will not yield the high quality employment that Calne needs. The local plan should also ensure major developers do not create uninteresting swathes of cloned housing because these are the most profitable.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
This is a vital aspect of any new major town development. The town centre must be viewed as the glue which brings the whole community together and therefore development in disparate external locations does not help this. Means have to be provided for	

walkways, cycling and buses to bring the population of new settlements to the centre of Calne. Sites 1, 5 and 6 are therefore not ideal.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Local landowners are obviously keen to promote their land for housing development as it brings in an enormous profit. Pressure to accede to these forces should be resisted. In any event Quemerford (site 4) should not be subsumed into Calne as this community has long been separate and the A4 splits it. Expansion of the town along the Western boundary is possible but Site 2 and Site 3 offer better possibilities – site 3 offering the opportunity to create quasi brown field land which would otherwise be affected by the Hills Quarry. The Plan should place the sites it has identified in order of desirability and benefit - perhaps using a cost/benefit model.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Sites 2 and 3 because they are close to the town centre but otherwise site 7 because this too can offer close connection to the town without car use.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Existing long-established settlement boundaries should be identified and where the Plan suggests extending over them, good reasons should be provided. Brownfield land is not always ideal for new housing and using it for dedicated employment should be considered. Links with Bath University, Swindon colleges and other centres of learning may create opportunities for new environmental and economic business to be set up to revitalise Calne.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Communications are key and high speed internet/landlines should be part of the plan. Green energy systems and much more attention to building type, insulation, heat source and vehicle charging should also be part of the strategy and development policy. Local green transport should be linked into air quality management in the town.

Further comments

Planners should accept that we are now changing the way houses are used. Covid has shown more homeworking is here to stay. This means allowing builders to build garages and then having Local Planners remove permitted development rights is a waste of land resource and hugely energy-wasteful. These buildings are cold, damp and often just used for storage. Owners must be allowed to make better use of their homes and this will reduce pressure to build increasing numbers of them.

Rep ID: Calne31	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Too fast and the target should be lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Priorities wise, the town, doctors, schools etc cannot support further growth without causing overloading of commodities.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

The common answer around town is that town has reached its maximum for domestic properties.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have not allowed for further schools, doctors surgeries and other requirements.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

As already mentioned the infrastructure has not kept up with domestic expansion

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne32	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
We should not build new homes or employment land on greenfield areas. You are essentially ousting the wildlife from their homes to make room for more people. It's unethical. We should care for our environment and countryside, not cull it for our own benefit.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
How will you reduce traffic by building near the a4 on site 4? If you build a bypass you'll create more pollution. Essentially these aims are contradictory and vacuous.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No these sites should be left as is and you shouldn't build at all. Once the infrastructure and jobs/transport/community have been improved then build houses. Otherwise you're just beefing up a crumbling community.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

If I had to id say 1 2 and 3 simply due to their nearness to the industrial estate.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes, site 4 is teeming with wildlife, nature, natural beauty and rivers. Not to mention public footpaths farm land and the views! We would lose so many habitats to this - when I was [TEXT REDACTED] we were taught the importance of protecting the natural state of the land as the environment can't defend itself. I'll be disheartened to see this beautiful countryside further eradicated in such a hypocritical manner.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Tourism is an under utilised income. We sit on the A4, close to lacovk and Avebury yet make noteworthy to attract revenue through visitors. People tell me how beautiful calne is to drive through and how disappointed there's nothing for them to do if the stop. Yet oxygen was discovered here! St Mary's school has an old lunatick asylum on the grounds and there are priest tunnels under the town. This would be such a great tourist hub if anyone made an effort.

Further comments

Stop destroying natural habitats. Start investing in the people who already live in your town.

Rep ID: Calne33	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Yes brownfield already allocated is fine but not expand outside this.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The town centre infrastructure and amenities including doctors and schools need to align with the growth desperate need for a southern bypass, town centre regeneration including a vibrant evening economy. There's very little at present but the centre doesn't need retirement homes!	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

This is way too much development and needs to be cut by 50% at least. Calne already exceeds the target new homes by 2026.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Sites 1 2 and 3 - this area already has expansion of houses and also by the bypass with amenities such as Tesco and proposed Lidl. Also easy access to Swindon and Chippenham without entering the town. The others are unsuitable as will bring more traffic and destroy the countryside.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I have lived in Calne for 30 years and the scale of building and speed has been really shocking. The infrastructure and amenities has actually declined and needs to be addressed.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Southern bypass urgently needed

Further comments

None

Rep ID: Calne34

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Lower. No more growth in Calne.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None. Calne is big enough.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Traffic congestion

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne35	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Scale should be lower and brownfield a main target. With the decline in retail, there will soo. Be plenty of shopping centre sites that could be built on instead of our local Green belt.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Calne's main priority should be to provide infrastructure. There has been massive of new houses built i the last few years but the centre of Calne has very few useful shops and we still only have one secondary school.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

There are too many. Sites 4 and 7 are excessive.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Any housing should be for the young and include appropriate infrastructure

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne36	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brownfield development should be a priority. We don't fully understand the full effects of Covid in regards to working from home and changes in lifestyle and employment, this needs to be considered- how much is really needed?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes. I think the need for the town centre to meet the needs of local residents is vital, as well as being able to access the town centre on foot/bike to reduce the need to increase transport. An example of this would be to extend the cycling/footpath along Abberd Brook- connecting the new Regent Park and Rushes estates to town.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I have concerns about the developments 1-4 in terms of the effect on the landscape and increased traffic to leave the town, on existing busy roads. Site 8 would at least be closer to the existing road network and improvements could be made to castle street to increase pedestrian access.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

5-8 look more balanced as they are in less heavily developed areas where there is less housing. Sites 7 and 8 are already closer to roads and existing pedestrian routes to town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site one is closer to the Porte marsh area where the road is a 50 and pavements in awful condition- a horrible route to take children to school or to exercise. Sites 2 and 3 are next to areas of significant development already and are near the very smelly tip entrance. Site 4 is an area with difficult access issues, a sort after area to exercise and would need a big amount of upgrade to roads which I think would be detrimental to the landscape. Sites 5 and 6 would see little impact but are not close to any main roads or shops.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

My main concern is how to address the impact on the climate and power resources of more homes, the most recent developments have seen no obvious requirements of this nature. Solar panels, allotments, cycle paths, natural habitats are vital.

Recycling areas and electric car/charging points in town would be amazing. The town could have a successful car club with the right strategy's put in place.

Further comments

Please ensure any development is done with consideration to the environment and future proofing what Calne needs.

Rep ID: Calne37	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Calne Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
I think it will be lower than you suggest based on the impact nationally of Covid, and due to our exit from the EU.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
I don't agree with point 2, I would look to decentralise away from the existing town centre. This will ease congestion and pollution, by building shops and recreation on the north side of Calne.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Areas 2 and 3 should be removed until the Hills plants are closed.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Area 4, as long as it was tied to an Eastern bypass to prevent the need to go through Calne Center to get to the main shops. Unless it included shops/school and medical contingency within the development.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

More retailing would be needed locally, outside of the town Center.

Further comments

You need to better publicise these things and send to all Calne residents in the future.

Rep ID: Calne38	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne38a,b,c,d
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brownfield sites should not be ignored & should be used before greenfield sites. A brownfield target would focus attention on such sites and should be used.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Greater emphasis is required on infrastructure, particularly schools, health and providing a road system that can cope with increased population, air quality and affect on lifestyle must be protected, which additional housing would seriously affect.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Brownfield sites within the town centre e.g. old co-op sit should be developed first.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Existing roads must be able to cope with additional housing. For example the north bypass (Beverbrook) could cope with additional traffic. Could this be extended to support development of sites 1,2,3 and 4?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Need to ensure there is sufficient open space. That existing properties are not overlooked, and that there are more sports and social facilities available e.g. Beverbrook.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Ensuring there are small neighbourhood shops built into any planning.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne39

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):

no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

This seems like an incredible amount of growth for a rural town, especially one that doesn't have a railway station making it suitable for commuters. There simply isn't the work or the infrastructure to support such a level of growth. Also the clear impact on the character of the town will be huge with this number of new homes as it becomes more urban and loses the countryside and green spaces that make it special. If some expansion is necessary then brownfield development should absolutely be prioritised. There is a site on the A4 in Calne that used to be a petrol station that has remained derelict for years, plus the site of the Woodlands Social Club which likewise has been unused for years. These are just two examples of sites that could easily be used for affordable housing, but are just being left to rot.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

These are appropriate priorities in general but I can't see how any of it is achievable with the proposed massive level of housing growth.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Area 4 is huge and although I can see that the whole of it would not be built upon to start with, as soon as that Pandora's box is opened I can see the whole of it being concreted over and the overall size of Calne increasing by a third. It's madness to even consider an area that size. It should absolutely be protected as an area of natural beauty, a site of historic interest and a flood plain.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Absolutely brownfield should be prioritised and used wherever possible. In general larger sites should be avoided and the minimum area unlocked to provide the stated "required" increase in housing.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Only that where you categorise one area as being so huge you implicitly unlock that whole area for future development even if the short term plans would only use part of it. You should absolutely be parcelling each area up into distinct smaller zones that would need brand new consultation each time.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne town centre cannot support the proposed level of growth and will become overwhelmed with the proposed level of growth. This will increase traffic congestion and pollution, which has already been identified as a problem in Calne centre.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne40

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

It is difficult to understand the actual proposed additional housing, due to the over lap of 2016-2026. Why cant you say built & committed 2016-2026 = X, number required to 2016 = Y

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Agree housing is required, but must be in sustainable locations. Traffic in Calne town centre is horrendous.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Sites should be limited to the north of the town with access to the bypass to avoid town centre traffic.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites should be priority. If the numbers cannot be met then greenfield adjacent to recently developed land.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Houses should only be built on unproductive land, land currently used to produce crops should be discounted.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Town centre & specifically the pinch point on A4 by White Hart, on the Green and the Square

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne41

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Scale of growth should be lower, its destroying are green space around Calne. I'm disgusted with the plans for new houses up sandpit land and towards High penn.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Priorities for the town is correct, we need more supermarkets like Aldi and Lidl. The rapid growth of houses ruining the green space is shocking and surely cant be sustainable to the wildlife of Calne.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Simple answer to the above question is NO, ESPECIALLY ALONG SANDPIT ROAD AND THE HIGH PENN AREA. Families enjoy this green space through out the summer especially the field opposite Britannia drive. Wildlife is in abundance in these fields. foxes and badgers at night can be heard crying and playing. This is disgusting that the council are even considering this area for building.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Green spaces and eco friendly buildings.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

SANDPIT ROAD - Sandpit road is dangerous as it is now. Me and my family have were nearly killed crossing the road last July. This incident was reported the council along with many other emails stating the road itself is dangerous especially at the Britannia drive point where we live on a blind hill. I don't think you have even considered the natural habitat that thrives in these fields. Foxes, badgers, red kites other birds use this area as there home. Families enjoy walking dogs in the fields, children playing during the summer, family picnics in summer when the weather is warm all of these are real and true facts of this area that need to be considered.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

energy and green energy

Further comments

SANDPIT ROAD - Sandpit road is dangerous as it is now. Me and my family have were nearly killed crossing the road last July. This incident was reported to the council along with many other emails stating the road itself is dangerous especially at the Britannia drive point where we live on a blind hill.

I don't think you have evan considered the natural habitat that thrives in these fields. Foxes, badgers, red kites other birds use this area as there home. Families enjoy walking dogs in the fields, children playing during the summer, family picnics in summer when the weather is warm all of these are real and true facts of this area that need to be considered.

Rep ID: Calne42	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Much lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The major priority is to protect the countryside and the environment. Calne is a small market town which already suffers from substantial traffic issues (outside of lock down). Further proposed housing will simply generate further traffic generation and impact on air quality and noise pollution.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No - 4 & 7 in particular will destroy the countryside and environment and were previously democratically rejected by the current Neighbourhood Plan for development - why is the plan now being ignored or not referred to?!

In so far as site 7 is concerned:

- There will be a negative impact on the Grade II Listed Verne Lease estate
- The A3102/Silver Street is not able take a significant increase in traffic
- The negative impact on air quality
- The negative ecological impact
- Increased risk of flooding

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

There has already been such huge building development in Calne and my understanding was there is already a democratically agreed neighbourhood building plan supporting development at sites 1-3 where development is already taking place.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site 4 and 7 will have a devastating impact on the loss of the countryside. Site 7 will generate further traffic on A3102 and through the Wenhill estate, which is already incredibly congested causing both poor air quality and noise pollution.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I refer to the previous democratically considered neighbourhood plan. I do not consider that the full impact to the environment has been fully considered for some of the sites proposed and it appears that the previous detailed consultation of the people of calne is being totally disregarded.

Further comments

I reject the proposed sites 4 & 7 and request that the sites proposed remain as open countryside.

Rep ID: Calne43	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I'm not apposed to growth within the town and/or surrounding areas but further consultation and consideration must be included at every step of the way to allow for everyone to have their say. In relation to SHELAA495, this land should be kept 100% as a green open space for families to enjoy all year round. Planting of additional trees to help with the waterlogged clay soil, formal footpath and cycle routes, plus benches to sit and enjoy the outside space that we have. All to often are the natural outside spaces that we all enjoy for our mental health and wellbeing being dug up and built on without a second thought, by which time it's too late.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

I feel that Calne has already been expanded to its functioning capacity in terms of residential use. What the town lacks and desperately needs is a Town Centre (traffic free) which will attract new businesses and make Calne a thriving market town again. Butchers, Bakers, Green Grocers, High Street shops for clothing, sports, recreation activities, cafes, restaurants. This town used to have it all but since the Harris factory closed and the beautiful buildings that it contained were criminally torn down, the town has basically died. Traffic is horrendous and almost everyone who lives here has to travel to neighbouring Chippenham, Devizes or RWB to buy anything, which only adds to more traffic congestion and poor air quality for all.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Site 2, specifically SHELAA495 should be kept a green open space for all to enjoy. I'm not opposed to growth within the town and/or surrounding areas but further consultation and consideration must be included at every step of the way to allow for everyone to have their say. In relation to SHELAA495, this land should be kept 100% as a green open space for families to enjoy all year round. Planting of additional trees to help with the waterlogged clay soil, formal footpath and cycle routes, plus benches to sit and enjoy the outside space that we have. All too often are the natural outside spaces that we all enjoy for our mental health and wellbeing being dug up and built on without a second thought, by which time it's too late.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

I'm not opposed to site 2: SHELAA3610 if there were no other choices, but as previously stated I feel that Calne has already grown to capacity in terms of residential use. We need a functioning and welcoming Town Centre with thriving businesses. Once this is here, more people will naturally be attracted to the town and then and only then can more residential housing be considered.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

More investment into the Town Centre to attract new businesses to make Calne a thriving Market Town once more, like it used to be. If more homes are going to be built on the outskirts of the town and the boundaries moved, then the town must build an additional bypass running from the Tesco roundabout at the end of Oxford Road over the downland and through to connect to the A4 Calne to Marlborough road.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

If the town and surrounding residential areas are to be expended and built upon, then a Bypass is an absolute must to ensure the town can cope with the ever expending traffic and the added congestion and pollution that it brings.

Further comments

We moved to Calne in 2018 for its green and pleasant open spaces, clean air and countryside. Now this is being taken away from us, all of us and future generations. Enough is enough. No more building in Calne please. We should be promoting what we already have and not building more and more just for the sake of it. What's nicer - green fields, countryside, outdoor open spaces to relax and enjoy?, or bricks, concrete, tarmac, roads and crime? I know which one I prefer.

Rep ID: Calne44	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Calne is lacking the infrastructure to support further housing development. Schools are already stretched. There are a lack of GPs and dentists already. There are few services in the town and public transport is expensive. Pollution levels within the town are consistently measuring higher than is acceptable, suggesting that there is a need to decrease, rather than increase traffic. Therefore, I believe the scale of these plans are grossly out of proportion to what is reasonable. The scale proposed would directly impact the health of residents living in Calne and it's surrounding villages (increased traffic increases pollution. Lost green space impacts mental health etc). The scale would be unsustainable, given that services are already stretched.</p> <p>A brownfield target needs to be justified. Is there really a housing crisis in Calne? What are the potential environmental impacts of so many sites being used on flora and fauna? How will the town and the villages tangibly benefit from building houses on these sites?</p> <p>None of these question have been fully answered, as Wiltshire Council have not asked them.</p>	

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

These are all great priorities - but at what cost? I would rather Wiltshire Council address the current issues first, before planning to create new ones for the future.
If building housing is the only way to increase revenue to fix our broken roads, lower the costs of social care, support services for the young and old, then I believe Wiltshire Council should use it's collective voice to lobby for change. Building extra houses will directly conflict with all of these priorities. It will benefit the few and ignore the majority.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Site 4 seems vast. The two primary schools nearest to this site are already at high capacity. Site 5 is unnecessary. The last building development that took place near here, failed to build the elderly care facility that was promised. No sites should be considered in Calne or the areas around Calne, until the issues within the town (lack of facilities, transport, sports centre etc) are fit for purpose.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Where would you like me to start?

Calne is an economically deprived town that is turning into a commuter town. Following the closure of the large factory in the 1980s, it has never fully recovered. Over the years rents have been increased, forcing shops to shut. Housing has been built, while promises of sustainable changes have been broken.

There has been no accountability for this. Each new development promises affordable housing, this is clearly an empty promise as affordability and building targets appear to have a mismatched agenda. Where is Wiltshire Council's commitment to first time buyers or those that need to rent good quality, but affordable homes?

The social impact of increased building will mean that stretched services will be stretched further. Who is going to look after the medical, educational and safety needs of the new residents?

Economically the only benefit I can see for this is that new residents will support the major supermarkets and possibly the restaurants and shops within the town.

Environmentally all of the submitted plans are a disaster. We are facing an environmental crisis, our town has shockingly high pollution levels. How many more children need to die, before people accept that pollution kills (see here <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2020/12/16/air-pollution-recorded-cause-death-girl-9-uk-first/>). I don't believe any promises to uphold green building plans, as time and time again, the desire to make a profit overrides the need to protect, sustain and renew.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Shame you have included jargon here (blue/green?) this is a barrier to collecting opinions?

Police and crime?

Roads - more cars/large lorries will damage our already damaged roads?

Social care needs - not every new resident will be healthy or remain healthy. What about their needs? What about the fact that we have an ageing population?

What about young people? Having grown up here, moved away and returned, I'm glad we have a skate park. But what about a properly funded youth club (shame that this was shut down).

Further comments

I would love to hear how the ideas that are collected are going to be collated, analysed, reviewed etc. I feel that our local voices will be ignored as the decision to build on these sites has already been decided? Please prove me wrong that this is not simply a tick box exercise to fulfil some directive. Calne has needed major investment for many, many years. What it doesn't need is to be let down further by our elected representatives helping to increase profit for big building firms.

Rep ID: Calne45	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I do not agree to the scale of the housing growth. Any growth should be employment-led rather than housing-led, otherwise the population of calne will be increasing without relevant employment, and this will guarantee people commuting out - and this will lead to further carbon emissions. For any developments that must take place the brownfield target needs to be the priority and this is where the majority of developments need to take place. The suggestion of building 60 homes on brownfield sites shows that this is not the priority, and that needs to change.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

Minimising the impact of infrastructure on the environment needs to include the specification that any developments will prioritise brownfield sites - otherwise this will not be minimising the impact. An important priority that should be included is also committing to developing green spaces, including tree planting and maximising biodiversity. This must be included in order to combat the carbon emissions of proposed plans. And if you intend to improve our air quality, planting trees is the way to do it.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

If any developments take place, these need to be on brownfield sites, rather than greenspaces, to limit the impact on our environment.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

An important environmental factor that has been ignored is the carbon emissions these developments will produce. A climate change impact assessment needs to be introduced for all proposed developments, as you're intending on limiting the environmental impact. This needs to be assessed against the council's carbon reduction targets.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne46

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

SCALE OF GROWTH IS FAR TOO MUCH AND DESTROYING NATURAL GREEN SPACE AROUND CALNE. Building on the fields around sandpit road and high penn is an insult to nature and the green space families enjoy during the summer and even during winter when it snows. YOU WILL BE DESTROYING THE HOMES OF FOXES, BADGERS, RED KITES AND ALL OTHER WILDLIFE IF YOU BUILD ON THIS GREEN SPACE.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

I don't think you have even considered the natural habitat that thrives in these fields. Foxes, badgers, red kites other birds use this area as their home. Families enjoy walking dogs in the fields, children playing during the summer, family picnics in summer when the weather is warm all of these are real and true facts of this area that need to be considered.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

SIMPLE ANSWER NO DUE TO COMMENTS ABOVE.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

GREEN SPACE AND ECO-FRIENDLY LIVING.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

SANDPIT ROAD - Sandpit road is dangerous as it is now. Me and my family WERE nearly killed crossing the road last July. This incident was reported to the council along with many other emails stating the road itself is dangerous especially at the Britannia drive point where we live on a blind hill. I don't think you have even considered the natural habitat that thrives in these fields. Foxes, badgers, red kites other birds use this area as their home. Families enjoy walking dogs in the fields, children playing during the summer, family picnics in summer when the weather is warm all of these are real and true facts of this area that need to be considered.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Sandpit road is a death trap. As stated, before the road is inadequate for more traffic.
If any of your colleges would like to pull out of Britannia drive with a car going at 50 MPH over the blind hill section - please feel free to try DANGEROUS IS AN UNDERSTAMENT

Further comments

My review on the proposed building at sandpit road –

- Destroying green space, destroying the homes of animals we all love, destroying green space where families like to be connected with nature, destroying country walks

Rep ID: Calne47	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Whilst the original target of 1440 homes does seem quite high (given Wiltshire has more than met its government targets), the small increase of only 360 extra homes until 2036 seems reasonable. There should be a brownfield target and it should be significantly higher than 60 homes over 10 years. I would expect this to be closer to a third of all new homes built.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Town centre regeneration for Calne is incredibly important - the town already has a much larger population than the centre would suggest and we need to ensure that Calne is an attractive and thriving place to live - this should be important to developers as well to make sure people want to live here and purchase the new homes to be built. Support development (such as GP surgeries,	

schools, local shops) close to the new developments is also very important - the new homes and residents cannot be allowed to overwhelm the town's existing services.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The potential sites have been well considered and I don't think there are any others that I would expect to see.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Smaller, integrated developments which are aesthetically appealing and fit into the existing environment are much more attractive and allow new residents to integrate into the existing community. Larger developments are always less successful. I am therefore concerned with the size of some of the potential sites (especially site 4) - keeping developers costs down by choosing only one site should not be a priority, it is much more important to consider the finished homes and the council must protect existing residents and the environment of Calne when deciding the size of each new development site.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

As above, smaller, aesthetically pleasing developments that fit into the existing area should be a priority. The design of developments is incredibly important to ensure that they are not a "blot on the landscape".

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

N/A

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne48	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Certainly higher if at all feasible. The brownfield target should maximise this. At a time when global warming environmental issues are so apparent, with emerging plans for rewilding having a fundamental part to play in combating climate change, it is fundamentally wrong to be taking action to further develop any greenfield land unless completely unavoidable.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities seem well balanced.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

In an effort to avoid unnecessary urban sprawl the Council should be concentrating on development around existing infrastructure and access to employment areas. In considering substantial development to the east of the town the opposite is being proposed. The documents do not provide any information on studies conducted to indicate likely travel to work needs of potential new residents. Currently, the main areas of employment, apart from Calne, are in Chippenham and Swindon. Sites to the east of Calne will necessitate greatly increased traffic on the A4 through the, at times, heavily congested town centre or, in the case of Swindon, equally undesirable increase of traffic through the World Heritage Site at Avebury. Increased traffic on the A4 will make additional problems with egress from adjoining residential areas at peak times. The suggested bypass to the east will both be an expensive development and result in additional loss of green field land. Any decision that would necessitate such development should be very open about the scale of these costs and in their absence it would be underhand to approve inclusion of such work in the Strategy.

A better alternative is to concentrate development adjacent to the north and west of the existing bypass which already provides better transport routes to Chippenham and Swindon and is considerably closer to the industrial development areas thus facilitating walk to work being a more practical consideration. This area is also much more convenient to existing supermarket and health care provision. This would in turn support the stated priorities to support development that is well connected to Calne Town Centre; provision and promotion of sustainable transport and active travel, and minimise the impact of development and associated infrastructure on the environment to help to meet the Calne Town Council Climate and Environmental Emergency Pledge.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Any development should make full use of all available brownfield sites before encroaching onto greenfield sites. Within the documents there seems not to be any identification of the market requirements of different types of housing; bedroom number, apartments/flats, social housing requirements, etc. These factors will make different impacts upon the potential sites and the density of development and therefore on the land area requirement. Neither do the documents appear to state what numbers of dwellings and of any particular type are envisaged for any of the potential sites. Different densities will have different impacts

on transport and other infrastructure. Without this information being available for consideration, both this consultation and the Council's future decisions are undermined.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

SITE 4

As previously stated there is no information provided on the likely numbers of houses that might be built on any of the sites or, indeed, even details of the land areas involved for comparison. Nevertheless, Site 4 appears to be by far the largest of the proposed sites. Without further information it is difficult to quantify the probable impact of developing this area. However, a number of issues are very apparent:

- In physical area alone it is clear the site would overwhelm the adjacent village of Quemerford
- Without prior development of a bypass there would be:
 - o considerable impact of congestion and worsened air quality in the Town Centre
 - o substantial additional egress problems for all residential areas adjoining London Road / Quemerford
 - o increase in traffic volumes through the World Heritage Site at Avebury
- Further major road development should not be part of the Strategy while alternative sites adjacent to the west bypass are not fully utilised and further could be sought in that location
- Urban sprawl in full view of North Wessex Downs AONB from the area around the Lansdowne Monument and the Cherhill White Horse
- Included flood risk areas should not be built on under any circumstances. Local mitigation measures will only create further problems downstream.
- The Grade I settlement should be totally protected from development.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

None identified at this time.

Further comments

No additional comments.

Rep ID: Calne49	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The risk of green space and wildlife impact.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Land running alongside the bypass towards bremhill and Chippenham this keep traffic away from the centre.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes the sandpit site has nature reserve to the top. All are wildlife is being driven away. Hedgehogs are in decline and fields and Hedges not replaced.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne50	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne50. See also Calne87.
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

There have been impact constraints cited on these sites , however I believe that each site could have large areas of water , ie one or more lakes or large ponds , which will , in addition to supporting much wildlife ,act as surface water attenuation for the new houses to prevent flash flooding , parks , tree plantations , and a new cycle and pedestrian footpath routing from Quemerford to the Oxford Road.

The whole area could become a very attractive wildlife and ecological addition to Calne and would further attract people such as ourselves from other areas to the town in addition to providing housing for local residents.

By this sort of planning I believe the Residents of Calne will benefit from the required increase of land supply for housing plus a large and very attractive recreational area supporting bio diversity and wildlife , with new tree planting added to improve air quality and further attract wildlife.

Hence whereas at present only very few can appreciate the natural wildlife of the area , by providing large recreational park and wildlife areas along with new housing the whole Community would benefit.

The Calne Referendum on future sites which was carried out recently showed 62% in favour of development of these Northern sites and not those to the South.

I believe that a future Calne Plan should show proposals for large areas of open recreational space and cycle paths , together with new housing along sites 1,2,3,4. This should be put to the Calne Community as a Referendum.

Further comments

I wish to respond to the above Local Plan for Calne , with particular concern for one site in particular. In the 2018 Calne Neighbourhood Plan site 6 (SHELAA site 3254) had been previously investigated and reported by the prestigious AECOM as NOT suitable to be carried forward as a suitable development site. (see original report attached). Now in 2021 this site has been resurrected but omitting the part of the AECOM report which cited reasons such as Heritage , proximity to listed farmhouse , wildlife , ecology , services , distance from facilities , for not proceeding with this site.

Since this original AECOM report was written our own estate [ADDRESS REDACTED] has been completed , with residents such as ourselves many of whom like us who came to Calne from other Towns and Counties across the country, very much appreciating Rookery Farm as a veritable haven of Oxygenating trees , supporting Rooks , kites , woodpeckers , a barn owl , plus a display of bats seen in the evening , great crested newts. Indeed it was one of the factors which made our decision to leave our home in Chippenham to come to Calne, as was the case with many other residents here.

The very name Rookery Farm is testament to the centuries of a colony of Rooks who along with the Kites occupy the tall trees on the Farm. The old Victorian Farmhouse itself dating back to approx 1835 has a lovely carved ornate barge board apex roof and has itself been a home to one of Calne's noted Sculptors. As such it is part of Calne's Heritage and should be retained intact as such.

Our own estate [ADDRESS REDACTED] has been a huge improvement to the hitherto derelict concrete and asbestos pig farm on contaminated land that stood here before , and has now become a local park - type centre of recreational exercise for the whole Community and is on the route of several Calne public footpaths. As such I believe it sets a blueprint for future Calne development combining large recreational areas , ponds , tree plantations alongside new housing.

The close proximity of Rookery Farm to not only [ADDRESS REDACTED] Residents but also the many public footpaths which both adjoin the farm and also cross its driveway entrance, means that the Farm has become a lovely centre of wildlife which is appreciated as an amenity for the Community.

Additionally the choice of this site goes against several of the priorities stated in the 2018 and also 2021 Neighbourhood Plans in that there should be no development without infrastructure improvements to the local road network, a reduction in traffic congestion and an improvement in air quality. Since the 2018 plan there has been no improvement to the traffic congestion or air quality through the town , indeed the addition of Cherhill View plus Silver Street developments have further deteriorated both congestion and air quality particularly at the White Hart junction.

Furthermore the recent addition of Tesco Plus Lidl on the Northern side means that residents of Stockley Lane estates plus Silver Street ,many of whom previously drove along Stockley Lane to shop in Melksham Lidl and Aldi will now travel through Calne Town to reach the large grocery stores. For the above reasons in my / our [ADDRESS REDACTED] opinion/s the future sites to be carried forward must be those closest to (a) employment on Porte Marsh (b) out of town shopping (c) by - pass to Chippenham (d) easy access to Swindon Road. Therefore sites 1,2,3, potentially 4 would fulfil these requirements. There would be the potential for a future North /Eastern by pass from Quemerford to the Swindon Road by linking roads from the above sites , to Sand Pit Road at one end , and possibly joining the A4 at Quemerford.

Rep ID: Calne51	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>It is clear from reviewing all the town plans, that Calne has been unfairly identified for significant growth, whereas Bradford and Salisbury are virtually unscathed. The planned sites for Chippenham, if taken forward would destroy the local countryside south of the town and are unacceptable. Housing is needed in Wiltshire but there are many brown field areas, beyond the proposed town plans, where this could take place. Calne, in particular has already received massive housing growth and in my opinion is almost close to capacity. Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely. In addition, further development within Calne and surrounding areas will lead to massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, as highlighted in "Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018".</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be	

achieved?

Developing and improving the centre of Calne (retail commercial), improving existing low-cost housing, reducing traffic (noise and particle pollution), installing cycle lanes and safe, easy, close access to walking paths into the countryside, should be higher priorities for the town of Calne. Finding alternative waste disposal and treatment sites for Wiltshire, other than Calne, would also be welcome. In addition, the natural habitat and highly valued green spaces around Calne are at risk under your current proposals and any further reduction is unacceptable.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The area to the west of the bypass (A3102) has not been considered at all and given that access is clearly superior to other candidates, it is surprising that this has not been put forward. It would enjoy improved transport links and have far less impact on the surrounding countryside around Calne. The areas east of Calne have already been overdeveloped and any further encroachment would have significant detrimental impact on the well-being, both physical and mental, of the existing residents in the areas around Sand Pit Road, that enjoy the areas 3616, 495 and 3610 as part of their regular exercise, not to mention the huge ecological impact that would occur.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Although the number of houses (360) may seem small and innocuous, it is still too many, with residential development creeping ever closer to our green spaces around Calne. Careful use of existing brown field sites: for example: the bottom of Silver Street, White Horse pub on A4 and Co-op supermarket site, could provide low-cost flats to satisfy low-cost housing, located close to public transport.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered

generally or in respect of individual sites?

Sites 495 and 3610 (section 2):

- Provide important wildlife corridors to area 3611, which has already been correctly dismissed on the grounds of environmental disruption. 3611 has nesting Lapwings and other critical species and development of areas 495 and 3610 could create significant disruption to these creatures' habitat.
- These areas provide much needed access to the countryside for all residents of Calne, particularly those residing around the Sand Pit Road area. Further development takes us all further from direct access and places yet another development to cross to get to the fields and woods that we enjoy on a daily basis.
- Furthermore, there are bat boxes situated in area 495, indicating the presence of bats, an endangered and protected species.
- Development will increase traffic along Sand Pit Road and Oxford Road, which are already traffic hot spots in terms of noise, disruption and particle pollution.
- Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.
- Development along Sand Pit Road (north east) will look down on residents on the south west side of the road, directly encroaching on the privacy of those residents.
- The same concern would be shared by residents along Oxford Road.
- House prices for existing properties along Sand Pit Road and Spitfire Road could suffer as a result of further development.
- Concern should be given to potential flooding as run off from higher ground runs into agricultural land and is handled in a safe and ecological manner. Development will replace these areas with tarmac and cement which will cause massive problems given the entire area is heavy clay.

Sites 3168, 489, 451 and 498 (section 3):

The above comments for 495 and 3610 apply, with the additional concerns:

- Spitfire Road is used by commercial vehicles and is already becoming unsafe to access on foot, particularly by families and dog walkers looking to access the countryside via the bridle path.
- Further development here will exasperate these problems.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne has been identified as being “well served by the A4”. This is true but the existing congestion, particularly at peak travel times is unacceptable. The noise and particle pollution that this creates is also unacceptable. Calne has been developed to capacity and cannot support any more properties that access via the A4. This problem is then pushed towards Oxford Road and eventually Sand Pit Road due to the existing development and will only get worse with the completion of the extended Persimmon Homes development, along with the commercial traffic now increased via Hills Waste. The existing traffic is noisy and polluting and the AQMA should be extended, noise levels reduced, and traffic calmed. Whilst these concerns have been identified; they should be given increased importance in locating new development. Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.

Further comments

Calne is surrounded by some of the most beautiful countryside in England and should be cherished and valued. The residents of Calne are fed up with being the rubbish tip for Wiltshire as well as being largely ignored when it comes to improving the quality of life in our town and surrounding areas. We receive little or zero support for our environmental and ecological concerns and when we object, our concerns are brushed aside.

Calne is already stretched in terms of traffic, noise and particle pollution. We are already experiencing a massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, as highlighted in “Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018”.

Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely, not to mention the mental and physical wellbeing of the residents of Calne. The only credible area for consideration for development is the area west of the bypass. Sites 495, 3610, 3168, 489, 451 and 498 are particularly unsuitable for development for the reasons provided within this document. According to the “Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018”:

“Housing in Calne and Calne Without has expanded rapidly over the last few years against the wishes of the local residents, with planning permissions totalling approximately 1,100 dwellings since 2010 having been granted on Appeal. These developments have brought little or no community benefit beyond the housing itself. This is evidenced in the Wiltshire Core Strategy which states: “As a large proportion of development has already come forward in the plan period, future development during the remainder of the plan period should be phased to ensure that infrastructure and employment provision appropriately supports

development in the town. "(Paragraph 5.39). The Wiltshire Core Strategy also states that: "Developer contributions from future housing growth should also help to deliver infrastructure necessary in the town, which has not been delivered at an appropriate rate through historic development." (Paragraph 5.41)"

Furthermore, the same document claims: "Concerns that additional housing will have a negative impact on the already congested road network. Calne has an Air Quality Management Area due to pollution levels currently in excess of Government limits at certain points in the town, mainly along the A4 (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/air-quality/air-quality-management-areas). There is a need for improved cycle and pedestrian links to encourage people not to use cars in an attempt to prevent further reductions in air quality. The Calne Air Quality Action Plan (August 2016) (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/reports) identifies as its top priority "to reduce the number of motor vehicles, especially HGVs, which pass through the Calne Air Quality Management Area wherever possible."

And the solution to this was to allow Hills Waste to build a road to connect Sand Pit Road to their site, moving their heavy, noisy and polluting vehicles onto Sand Pit Road at unsociable hours. Moving a problem is not solving a problem and the proposed development areas only serve to highlight that little or no consideration is given to the existing residents of Calne when decisions are made about the town.

Rep ID: Calne52	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
It would be good to understand the brownfield sites we have around the Calne area.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Need development of the town centre. Support on infrastructure (police, schools available more 6th form choice) etc	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

I understand development is needed, the area around the large Tesco is a good area. Potential development/ scale for new school could be managed in this area.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Smaller developments and scalability to ensure existing infrastructure can support.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Expansion will impact the air quality in the town centre. Congestion if plot 7 goes ahead will have a negative impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Need to support the 'green spaces' around our town. Lockdown has seen the community appreciate the space we have. Castlefields and surrounding areas for families.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne53	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes, however the infrastructure needs to be put in place first. Calne has already increased vastly in the population over the last 20 years but the infrastructure has remained the same!!	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Too many small sites. Should concentrate on building on the bigger areas of land.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Areas 2,3 and 4

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site 5 has a large pond with under ground springs feeding it, a flood area. Also area is on the edge of an area with outstanding natural beauty. Wild life of encrusted newts, bats, wild ducks and many more.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Roads not adequate for the extra traffic

Further comments

The infrastructure needs to be in place before the building work is commenced or at least at the same time.

Rep ID: Calne54	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>It is clear from reviewing all the town plans, that Calne has been unfairly identified for significant growth, whereas Bradford and Salisbury are virtually unscathed. The planned sites for Chippenham, if taken forward would destroy the local countryside south of the town and are unacceptable. Housing is needed in Wiltshire but there are many brown field areas, beyond the proposed town plans, where this could take place. Calne, in particular has already received massive housing growth and in my opinion is almost close to capacity. Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely. In addition, further development within Calne and surrounding areas will lead to massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, highlighted in Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be	

achieved?

The development of the centre of Calne (retail commercial), the improvement of existing low-cost housing, reducing traffic (noise and particle pollution), installing cycle lanes and safe, easy, close access to walking paths into the countryside, would be better priorities for the town of Calne. Finding alternative waste disposal and treatment sites for Wiltshire, other than Calne, would also be welcome. In addition, the natural habitat and highly valued green spaces around Calne are at risk under your current proposals and any further reduction is unacceptable.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The area to the west of the bypass (A3102) has not been considered at all and given that access is clearly superior to other candidates, it is surprising that this has not been put forward. It would enjoy improved transport links and have far less impact on the surrounding countryside around Calne. The areas east of Calne have already been overdeveloped and any further encroachment would have significant detrimental impact on the well-being, both physical and mental, of the existing residents in the areas around Sand Pit Road, that enjoy the areas 3616, 495 and 3610 as part of their regular exercise, not to mention the huge ecological impact that would occur.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Although the number of houses (360) may seem small and innocuous, it is still too many, with residential development creeping ever closer to our green spaces around Calne. Careful use of existing brown field sites: for example: the bottom of Silver Street, White Horse pub on A4 and Co-op supermarket site, could provide low-cost flats to satisfy low-cost housing, located close to public transport.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered

generally or in respect of individual sites?

Sites 495 and 3610:

- Provide important wildlife corridors to area 3611, which has already been correctly dismissed on the grounds of environment disruption. 3611 has nesting Lapwings and other critical species and development of areas 495 and 3610 could create significant disruption to these creatures' habitat.
- These areas provide much needed access to the countryside for all residents of Calne, particularly those residing around the Sand Pit Road area. Further development takes us all further from direct access and places yet another development to cross to get to the fields and woods that we enjoy on a daily basis.
- Furthermore, there are bat boxes situated in area 495, indicating the presence of bats, an endangered and protected species.
- Development will increase traffic along Sand Pit Road and Oxford Road, which are already traffic hot spots in terms of noise, disruption and particle pollution.
- Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.
- Development along Sand Pit Road (north east) will look down on residents on the south west side of the road, directly encroaching on the privacy of those residents.
- The same concern would be shared by residents along Oxford Road.
- House prices for existing properties along Sand Pit Road and Spitfire Road could suffer as a result of further development.
- Concern should be given to potential flooding as run off from higher ground runs into agricultural land and is handled in a safe and ecological manner. Development will replace these areas by tarmac and cement which will cause massive problems given the entire area is heavy clay.

Sites 3168, 489, 451 and 498:

The above comments for 495 and 3610 apply, with the additional concerns:

- Spitfire Road is used by commercial vehicles and is already becoming unsafe to access on foot, particularly by families and dog walkers looking to access the countryside via the bridle path.
- Further development here will exasperate these problems.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne has been identified as being “well served by the A4”. This is true but the existing congestion, particularly at peak travel times is unacceptable. The noise and particle pollution that this creates is also unacceptable. Calne has been developed to capacity and cannot support any more properties that access via the A4. This problem is then pushed towards Oxford Road and eventually Sand Pit Road due to the existing development and will only get worse with the completion of the extended Persimmon Homes development, along with the commercial traffic now increased via Hills Waste. The existing traffic is noisy and polluting and the AQMA should be extended, noise levels reduced, and traffic calmed. Whilst these concerns have been identified; they should be given increased importance in locating new development. Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.

Further comments

Calne is surrounded by some of the most beautiful countryside in England and should be cherished and valued. The residents of Calne are fed up with being the rubbish tip for Wiltshire and getting little or zero support for our environmental and ecological concerns. Calne is already stretched in terms of traffic, noise and particle pollution. We are already experiencing a massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, as highlighted in Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018.

Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely, not to mention the mental and physical wellbeing of the residents of Calne. The only credible area for consideration for development is the area west of the bypass. Sites 495, 3610, 3168, 489, 451 and 498 are particularly unsuitable for development for the reasons provided within this document

According to the “Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018”:

“Housing in Calne and Calne Without has expanded rapidly over the last few years against the wishes of the local residents, with planning permissions totalling approximately 1,100 dwellings since 2010 having been granted on Appeal. These developments have brought little or no community benefit beyond the housing itself. This is evidenced in the Wiltshire Core Strategy which

states: “As a large proportion of development has already come forward in the plan period, future development during the remainder of the plan period should be phased to ensure that infrastructure and employment provision appropriately supports development in the town.” (Paragraph 5.39). The Wiltshire Core Strategy also states that: “Developer contributions from future housing growth should also help to deliver infrastructure necessary in the town, which has not been delivered at an appropriate rate through historic development.” (Paragraph 5.41)”

Furthermore, the same document claims: “Concerns that additional housing will have a negative impact on the already congested road network. Calne has an Air Quality Management Area due to pollution levels currently in excess of Government limits at certain points in the town, mainly along the A4 (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/air-quality/air-quality-management-areas). There is a need for improved cycle and pedestrian links to encourage people not to use cars in an attempt to prevent further reductions in air quality. The Calne Air Quality Action Plan (August 2016) (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/reports) identifies as its top priority “to reduce the number of motor vehicles, especially HGVs, which pass through the Calne Air Quality Management Area wherever possible.”

And the solution to this was to allow Hills Waste to build a road to connect Sand Pit Road to their site, moving their heavy, noisy and polluting vehicles onto Sand Pit Road at unsociable hours. Moving a problem is not solving a problem and the proposed development areas only serve to highlight that little or no consideration is given to the existing residents of Calne when decisions are made about the town.

Rep ID: Calne55	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>It is clear from reviewing all the town plans, that Calne has been unfairly identified for significant growth, whereas Bradford and Salisbury are virtually unscathed. The planned sites for Chippenham, if taken forward would destroy the local countryside south of the town and are unacceptable. Housing is needed in Wiltshire but there are many brown field areas, beyond the proposed town plans, where this could take place. Calne, in particular has already received massive housing growth and in my opinion is almost close to capacity. Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely. In addition, further development within Calne and surrounding areas will lead to massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, highlighted in Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be	

achieved?

The development of the centre of Calne (retail commercial), the improvement of existing low-cost housing, reducing traffic (noise and particle pollution), installing cycle lanes and safe, easy, close access to walking paths into the countryside, would be better priorities for the town of Calne. Finding alternative waste disposal and treatment sites for Wiltshire, other than Calne, would also be welcome. In addition, the natural habitat and highly valued green spaces around Calne are at risk under your current proposals and any further reduction is unacceptable.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The area to the west of the bypass (A3102) has not been considered at all and given that access is clearly superior to other candidates, it is surprising that this has not been put forward. It would enjoy improved transport links and have far less impact on the surrounding countryside around Calne. The areas east of Calne have already been overdeveloped and any further encroachment would have significant detrimental impact on the well-being, both physical and mental, of the existing residents in the areas around Sand Pit Road, that enjoy the areas 3616, 495 and 3610 as part of their regular exercise, not to mention the huge ecological impact that would occur.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Although the number of houses (360) may seem small and innocuous, it is still too many, with residential development creeping ever closer to our green spaces around Calne. Careful use of existing brown field sites: for example: the bottom of Silver Street, White Horse pub on A4 and Co-op supermarket site, could provide low-cost flats to satisfy low-cost housing, located close to public transport.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered

generally or in respect of individual sites?

Sites 495 and 3610:

- Provide important wildlife corridors to area 3611, which has already been correctly dismissed on the grounds of environment disruption. 3611 has nesting Lapwings and other critical species and development of areas 495 and 3610 could create significant disruption to these creatures' habitat.
- These areas provide much needed access to the countryside for all residents of Calne, particularly those residing around the Sand Pit Road area. Further development takes us all further from direct access and places yet another development to cross to get to the fields and woods that we enjoy on a daily basis.
- Furthermore, there are bat boxes situated in area 495, indicating the presence of bats, an endangered and protected species.
- Development will increase traffic along Sand Pit Road and Oxford Road, which are already traffic hot spots in terms of noise, disruption and particle pollution.
- Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.
- Development along Sand Pit Road (north east) will look down on residents on the south west side of the road, directly encroaching on the privacy of those residents.
- The same concern would be shared by residents along Oxford Road.
- House prices for existing properties along Sand Pit Road and Spitfire Road could suffer as a result of further development.
- Concern should be given to potential flooding as run off from higher ground runs into agricultural land and is handled in a safe and ecological manner. Development will replace these areas by tarmac and cement which will cause massive problems given the entire area is heavy clay.

Sites 3168, 489, 451 and 498:

The above comments for 495 and 3610 apply, with the additional concerns:

- Spitfire Road is used by commercial vehicles and is already becoming unsafe to access on foot, particularly by families and dog walkers looking to access the countryside via the bridle path.
- Further development here will exasperate these problems.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne has been identified as being “well served by the A4”. This is true but the existing congestion, particularly at peak travel times is unacceptable. The noise and particle pollution that this creates is also unacceptable. Calne has been developed to capacity and cannot support any more properties that access via the A4. This problem is then pushed towards Oxford Road and eventually Sand Pit Road due to the existing development and will only get worse with the completion of the extended Persimmon Homes development, along with the commercial traffic now increased via Hills Waste. The existing traffic is noisy and polluting and the AQMA should be extended, noise levels reduced, and traffic calmed. Whilst these concerns have been identified; they should be given increased importance in locating new development. Sand Pit Road has already been identified as a major traffic problem, with local residents being at risk of serious accident or death crossing the road. This matter was reported to the town council.

Further comments

Calne is surrounded by some of the most beautiful countryside in England and should be cherished and valued. The residents of Calne are fed up with being the rubbish tip for Wiltshire and getting little or zero support for our environmental and ecological concerns. Calne is already stretched in terms of traffic, noise and particle pollution. We are already experiencing a massive “negative impact on an already congested road network and road safety concerns”, as highlighted in Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018.

Any further development would destroy much cherished and well used green spaces around Calne, destroying valuable habitat for nature and removing badly needed corridors for these creatures to move safely, not to mention the mental and physical wellbeing of the residents of Calne. The only credible area for consideration for development is the area west of the bypass. Sites 495, 3610, 3168, 489, 451 and 498 are particularly unsuitable for development for the reasons provided within this document

According to the “Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan – Referendum Plan January 2018”:

“Housing in Calne and Calne Without has expanded rapidly over the last few years against the wishes of the local residents, with planning permissions totalling approximately 1,100 dwellings since 2010 having been granted on Appeal. These developments have brought little or no community benefit beyond the housing itself. This is evidenced in the Wiltshire Core Strategy which

states: “As a large proportion of development has already come forward in the plan period, future development during the remainder of the plan period should be phased to ensure that infrastructure and employment provision appropriately supports development in the town.” (Paragraph 5.39). The Wiltshire Core Strategy also states that: “Developer contributions from future housing growth should also help to deliver infrastructure necessary in the town, which has not been delivered at an appropriate rate through historic development.” (Paragraph 5.41)”

Furthermore, the same document claims: “Concerns that additional housing will have a negative impact on the already congested road network. Calne has an Air Quality Management Area due to pollution levels currently in excess of Government limits at certain points in the town, mainly along the A4 (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/air-quality/air-quality-management-areas). There is a need for improved cycle and pedestrian links to encourage people not to use cars in an attempt to prevent further reductions in air quality. The Calne Air Quality Action Plan (August 2016) (www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk/reports) identifies as its top priority “to reduce the number of motor vehicles, especially HGVs, which pass through the Calne Air Quality Management Area wherever possible.”

And the solution to this was to allow Hills Waste to build a road to connect Sand Pit Road to their site, moving their heavy, noisy and polluting vehicles onto Sand Pit Road at unsociable hours. Moving a problem is not solving a problem and the proposed development areas only serve to highlight that little or no consideration is given to the existing residents of Calne when decisions are made about the town.

Rep ID: Calne56	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): WebbPaton
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Jim Angel	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The growth in Calne is not high enough. The plan should be from 2021 rather than 2016, also should consider the supply of suitable development land for a 30 year period rather than 15 years, based on the current National Planning Policy Framework consultation. We question whether the brownfield land sites are actually available for 60 dwellings and can be viably developed. More employment land should be identified in Calne, there is a larger requirement than just 4 hectares.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Yes. My client owns Site 2 being the Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 495, 3610) . This is within a Promotional Agreement with Robert Hitchins.

My client also owns the western end of site Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c). Three landowners owning the western end are working together to promote their land . Site 4 could deliver a A4 to Sandpit Road relief road if the number of dwellings allocated to Calne are large enough.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Site 2 being the Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 495, 3610), and if more land is required Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c).

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

A relief road from the A4 to Sandpit Road should be considered.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne57	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Too high - brownfield only.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
No. What priority is being given to the environment? How many people currently live in Calne, work in Calne if there are no the jobs available locally then why are we building more homes here. Towns grow traditionally when more jobs are created - no the other way around - which just put more cars on the roads.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

See above - if most people living in our market towns are already 'commuting' to work elsewhere - then any new housing should be where the majority of jobs are. Of course developers wish to build where they can make more money it is not the job of councils to provide these extra profits!

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Land nearest to places of work.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Completely - if there are insufficient jobs being created in our local market towns - then there is no justification in building more homes in those towns/country. Towns should grow naturally - more job development more people/homes. What is currently proposed in places like Calne cannot be justified either economically or environmentally.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

See above + we haven't got enough school places or doctors surgeries currently let alone after a third more homes. I go to Sutton Benger for GP appointments.

Further comments

Please stop facilitating the developers wishes by allowing them to build on sites that they can make more profit from. If most jobs are being created in our bigger towns + cities - that's where new housing should be. This is what responsible local authorities should insist upon - otherwise yet more roads and increased pollution as a result.

Rep ID: Calne58	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): WebbPaton
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Robert Hislop	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The growth in Calne is not high enough. The plan should be from 2021 rather than 2016, also should consider the supply of suitable development land for a 30 year period rather than 15 years, based on the current National Planning Policy Framework consultation. We question whether the brownfield land sites are actually available and can be viably developed.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Yes. My client owns part of Site 4 Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 1104a/b/c). He would like to see development on his land. he has joined with his 3 neighbours to promote area 1104 a/b/c together.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

My client owns part of Site 4 Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 1104a/b/c). He would like to see development on his land. he has joined with his 3 neighbours to promote area 1104 a/b/c together.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

A new Calne A4 to Sandpit Road relief road.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

A new Calne A4 to Sandpit Road relief road.

Further comments

No

Rep ID: Calne59	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Given the recent growth in Calne, the proposed scale of future growth is appropriate. There should be a brownfield target to reduce the impact on the surrounding environment.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities are generally right, although the order may not be right and will need to be confirmed in the review of the neighbourhood plan for Calne. Protection of existing open spaces and recreational areas such as the parks and cycle path should also be a priority. Improvements to air quality are essential and should not be limited or linked to further housing development.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Given the relatively small scale of future housing, infill and brownfield sites should be looked for. Site 4 is an extremely large area for this scale of development. Piecemeal development of site 4 could lead to poorly connected developments or pressure from developers to exceed the proposed increase in housing. I would therefore propose site 4 is limited to to SHELAA sites 3642 and 487.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The most appropriate land is adjacent to existing development with adequate local roads to connect to. Developments should be appropriate to the local area, rather than generic housing stock.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Traffic and parking need to be considered.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The existing open spaces and recreational areas within Calne need to be protected and adequately maintained by Wiltshire Council, without pushing these responsibilities onto new home owners.
The local economy relies heavily on people commuting out of the area for work. More effort needs to be put into developing local job opportunities, or working hubs that would encourage less commuting.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne60	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth for Calne is far too high. There has been no investment in the current infrastructure meaning that schools, doctors and pharmacies are overrun. The roads are not designed to carry the amount of traffic that is currently running so building more developments, especially the amount proposed will not only reduce the quality of life for the current residents but will seriously affect the desirability and the feeling of the town. The effects on the environment by building along quemerford and therefore along the streams would seriously affect flora and fauna of the area and the potential for building on yet another floor plain will inevitable result in disastrous results in the long term.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

There is no mention of schools in this plan. There have been no detailed explanation of how the road infrastructure can be improved to reduce congestion and emissions and actually the proposed second ring road has been rejected time and time again by the council. Without definite plans on how infrastructure and local amenities are going to be improved I can't see how any further development would be even close to sustainable. Bearing in mind that current population is not having its needs met in terms of infrastructure.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No further development sites should be considered until there is a solid confirmed plan on meeting the needs of the current population.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

See question 9

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes, although the need for housing is obvious there has been massive development in Calne over the last 5 years with no improvement to the infrastructure. This needs to be addressed before any further development can be considered.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Education, sports and leisure facilities, health, transport, the local economy

Further comments

It must be carefully considered whether building more housing is the right way to invest in Calne at the current time. Without serious consideration for the road and infrastructure of the town you will destroy this market town, making it a suburb of Chippenham and lose its identity completely. The community here would suffer massively and the quality of life of the current population, which is already struggling with health care and education requirements, would decline significantly without careful and sensitive planning and improvements.

Rep ID: Calne61	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth in calne is unsustainable with zero investment in infrastructure for decades despite continual developments of free and a council ready to allow the ugliest worst planned developments in the area. The one thing we have left is our green space which is now up for sale to the greediest bidder.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
These are the right priorities, but they are hollow statements that have gone unfulfilled for decades. The people of calne don't want more houses, we want community and local services. I'm ready to leave after 20 years of hope.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. Where is the demand for houses coming from in calne? This is a National target which is being lumped on a small town with no infrastructure no services no school development plans because it's the dumping ground of Wiltshire council, Land owners need to learn they are custodians of the green space. Most of the land identified is vital to sustaining agriculture and our natural environment.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Nowhere until proper investment is made in service for the town. Not a poxy community hun at a supermarket, actual investment from the greedy developers you allow to rape our countryside for profit. The council seem unable to orchestrate a development fit for community development, no shops, no pubs, no restaurants. Everyone in the town goes elsewhere to do anything. Why do you not insist on complimentary community, social and educational investment from the developers allowed to build the ugliest most heavily saturated estates in the region??? It's unacceptable.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes. You've missed all social, economic and environmental factors in the recent developments around sand pit road. Densely packed housing, cars parked to grid lock capacity, ugly ugly developments without a single shop, pub, restaurant..... it's an embarrassment to be frank.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Consideration is pointless without action. It seems these subjects are all considered yet never materialise?

Further comments

Yes. It's simple, insist on high quality developments as every other town seem capable of doing to some extent. We are a rural market town yet the developments seen recently are poor quilts both in terms of design and supporting infrastructure. We are building a community without attachment to its surroundings.
I have lived in the area for 20 years and reading this latest proposal makes me want to leave and give up on the hope that calne can have development to match its incredible community of people. Stop dumping all the crap on our town.

Rep ID: Calne62	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>We need a brownfield target, I moved here in 2014 into the newly developed housing estate off Sandpit Road. The scale of development along the road to Tesco and at the bottom of the site in this short time is incredible. All on undeveloped land. I have now moved to another undeveloped site in Calne opposite the Atwell Wilson museum which is proposed to have additional housing. Whilst I understand the need for further homes, all we are doing is expanding out of Calne on undeveloped sites. What is needed is a better use of existing land that has old/ex industrial sites to make the most of unused land closer to the town.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

Agree to consolidated approach looking at both green and brownfield sites, and not selecting the easy option of developing on fields. I think the bike path to Chippenham and the walks along the River Marden and along the town by the old Berks and Wiltshire canal are a real bonus and should be protected and enhanced where possible. The challenge for any high street business with on line shopping is a real challenge but there are some pubs/restaurants/coffee shops that we should protect to attract people in. The industrial site at Porte Marsh should be fully used before seeking additional land. How will the development of the Chippenham 'new road' affect Calne, is there an opportunity to link to this via bike/foot paths etc?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I think it would be a shame to look at 4 in view of the lack of development currently. I think developing 1, 2 and 3 should required a new road connection to ease traffic use of smaller roads.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

1,2 and 3 with homes to support identified employment area.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

What is the long term plan for the Hills Recycling Centre? Could any plans be incorporated into development etc

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne63	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The current scale of growth seems far to big for Calne, ie, Persimmon Homes, Taylorwimpey, David Wilson Homes and Barratt Homes. Yes there should be a Brownfield target, it should be a low as possible for environmental reasons: poor governance, food waste, biodiversity loss, plastic pollution, deforestation, air pollution, carbon footprint and agriculture.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
You have some of the right priorities, however, these should be focused on existing building development plans already in place and more support infrastuture.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Areas 1,2, 3, 4 seem the better locations to focus on, these already have the road infrastructure in place to support extra traffic access to the newly built Tesco's and access to the A4 Swindon and the bypass into Chippenham.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Areas 1,2, 3, 4 seem the better locations to focus on, these already have the road infrastructure in place to support extra traffic access to the newly built Tesco's and access to the A4 Swindon and the bypass into Chippenham.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

If plot 7 goes forward as the Plan calculates that there are just over 300 home to be built over a 15 year period, it make more sense for the council to identify existing developments with the infrastructure to support the extra volume of traffic as this is not in place for plot 7 which would be a negative impact on air quality in the town centre and existing rural areas, Station road is busy enough with cars parked for castle field and the cycle track access causing issues for existing residences in Wenhill Heights and the new Station Meadows estate, including access for Calne Town Fire Station. Also, access for emergency vehicles to both Wenhill Heights and Station Meadows is very poor due to current parking conditions. Therefor additional traffic through Station Road does not seem feasible.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The current infrastructure is inadequate for the existing growth of the town, we need more GP practices with better parking facilities, Orthodontists with better parking facilities, more education facilities to cover the current school population, a full time Police station is required and a full time Fire station, these all need to be addressed before any thought of increasing the population of the town!

Further comments

I believe that if Plot 7 is to go ahead will be a mistake, we need to focus on reducing pollutants in the air because is important for human health and the environment. Poor air quality has harmful effects on human health, particularly the respiratory and cardiovascular systems. Pollutants can also damage plants and buildings, and smoke or haze can reduce visibility, we should be focusing on increasing the growing of more trees and plants, encourage the natural wildlife and saving natural resources.

Rep ID: Calne64	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Far too high overall.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Site 7 had previously been rejected as I understand it. The A3102 cannot sustain further traffic. This area has always been known as particularly bad for flooding.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

More homes being built create more air pollution. Not enough schools, dentists or surgeries to cope with extended population. Surely the increase in population requires more law enforcement and yet there are plans to sell the Police Station.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne65	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The target of an additional 360 homes to be planned for and built between now and 2036 does not appear to be unreasonable. However, several smaller developments spread over the 15 year period, using brownfield sites where possible, should be the preferred option, rather than seeking to approve larger greenfield developments.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities are well intentioned, but I fear that large housing developments and major local road network changes could have a detrimental impact on the town. There is a danger that the spaces created between any new roads and existing homes could	

eventually be filled with yet more houses thereby increasing the pressure on the town's infrastructure and road network even more.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

As stated, there is an average additional requirement for less than 25 homes per annum between now and 2036 (a total of 360). Rather than ultimately approving and building on a few of the large development sites on the current potential list, I think that several smaller brownfield sites should be identified and considered instead. The identification and approval of a few large extensions to the town will because of their size and concentrated nature result in a subsequent detrimental impact on traffic congestion, air quality and the environment.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

I believe the following criteria should be applied when considering the type of land upon which to build:

- 1 - Brownfield sites
- 2 - Sites adjacent to existing or proposed industrial/larger retail developments
- 3 - Sites with lowest landscape impact
- 4 - Sites with lowest heritage issues
- 5 - Sites with lowest environmental issues

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

No

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne66	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
An increase of over 20% from the existing planned new housing target even spread over the 10 years is excessive. The further housing will predominately attract commuting and the existing road infrastructure is seriously overload at peak times leading to serious environmental pollution.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The highest priority must be given to the Made Calne Community Neighbour Plan 2018 recommendations H1 through H5. This Made Plan and these specific recommendations endorsed by the community referendum and must be the driving force when considering furue housing requirement.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. Only sites North of the River Marden i.e. Sites 1, 2 3 & 8 should be considered. Sites 4 through 7 would overload the A4 A3102 Silver Street junction and the town centre crossroads causing unacceptable pollution from stationary traffic at peak times This has now been rightly identified in the Local Plan Review as of major importance. Sites adjacent to the Northwest side of the A3102 Greenacres Way Calne bypass should be considered to maximise use of that road.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Only agriculture land of low grade. Additionally the sites should offer or provide/develop low impact access to the town centre and public transport infrastructure.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The requirement to deliver social and low-cost housing in the area is insufficiently addressed, not allowing planning requirements to be eroded in implementation. Environmentally the effect of stationary traffic on the A4 and A3102 at peak times.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Additionally at all times the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in the A3102 Silver Street A4 junction area and at the A3102 The Square A4 Curzon junction at all time combined with the speed of traffic.

Further comments

The Calne Neighborhood Plan should be updated and further endorsed by referendum to reflect any proposed planned changes.

Rep ID: Calne67	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	
Site 7. Far too many houses in such a small place. Silver street couldn't cope with the volume of traffic.	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Think the town. A small town as well has been overdeveloped We are in danger of losing the country side. And natural habitat for wild life.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The town is far too small to take on such big developments. Damaging to wild life losing the country side.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The infrastructure could not cope with that many new houses. Roads too narrow.

Further comments

I think calne has had enough new houses built in the last few years. It's a small market town therefore far too small to take on any new developments.

Rep ID: Calne68	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Miranda Aulman Counselling
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
I think that the amount of extra homes is far too high.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
I really dont think they can be achieved, given the huge growth of Calne over the last 15 years very little has been done to support the infrastructure. In fact I believe things have got worse. We only currently have two doctors surgeries, still only two NHS dentists, bus routes in and out of Calne are atrocious and pollution due to the extra cars higher. Also where is the employment land coming from. Yet more green land destroyed for houses and businesses.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Either 2 or 3, they are closer to the ring road.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No 7 has all ready been dismissed as inappropriate due to already congested roads, Silver St is not able to cope with an further increase of traffic.

It will have a very negative impact on the Grade II listed Verne Lease estate. There will be a very negative impact on air quality due to the already congested Siver St. There will also be a negative ecological impact and increased risk of flooding.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

I would like to know why Site 7 is now a possibility when it has already been rejected in the current Neighbourhood Plan. I would like to know what has already been changed to now make this an appropriate place for further hones when Silver St already has had a huge increase of vehicles from the new estate built on the old Bentley fields.

Rep ID: Calne69	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is too high and will swamp the town and change its unique physical and community dynamic. yes there should be a brownfield target in order to stop the destruction of Greenfield land. 60 out of 360 on brownfield sites is far too low! is the further employment land now required already included in the plan?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Some road networks cannot be improved how do you propose to widen the road on A3102/Silver street? it cannot be done and the pavement is already inadequate for pedestrians! planned development particularly site 7 will increase traffic significantly. How can you possibly improve air quality with 1400+ new homes and the carbon foot print these and their multiply vehicles will	

create. Your priorities do not include ecological impact, flood risk increase, or impact/opinion from Heritage on the grade II listed Vern Lease estate particularly with regard to site 7. what about nature, habitat, wildlife, biodiversity and the environment these are all top priority global issues yet we keep on destroying and building!

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

NO I strongly OBJECT particularly to sites 7, 4 and 3. site 7 will have a negative impact on the Grade II listed Vern Lease Estate that Heritage have already had issue with. Silver Street/A3102 is NOT able to take a significant increase in traffic. Negative impact on air quality for all sites. Negative ecological impact, increased risk of flooding particularly as site 3 and 4 is already partially on a flood zone area. People have had to be re-homed due to subsidence on the sandpit development this is not acceptable! Chippenham have fought against their plan we do NOT want to increase our development to accommodate there shortfall just to keep Wiltshire numbers up Calne deserves better!

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

maybe 1,8 ,6 and 5 at push but I am against nay further housing in Calne we have had plenty in the last couple of years and they are not even all sold!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Negative ecological impact, increased risk of flooding particularly as site 3 and 4 is already partially on a flood zone area. People have had to be re-homed due to subsidence on the sandpit development this is not acceptable! Negative impact on the Grade II listed Vern Lease Estate that Heritage have already had issue with impact of the carbon foot print of 1400+ houses! The scale of growth is too high and will swamp the town and change its unique physical and community dynamic.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Road networks, silver street A3102 will not take increased traffic the A4 from New road to upper Quemerford with road side residential parking will be overrun as it becomes the main thoroughfare from site 4. Increase in housing will require increase in infrastructure which is not allocated on the map therefore will require more development in the future when it becomes apparent the current infrastructure cannot cope. Will this proposed increase in housing require another school if so where will this go? we already have two sports facilities how many more will we need? we already have a new doctors surgery planned will we need another if so where will this all go? Calne is praised for its community events such as the famous bike meet winter and summer festivals, how many more residents can we pack into the town centre for the Christmas light switch on and maintain public safety and an enjoyable experience for all?

Further comments

I strongly OBJECT to planning particularly on sites 7, 4 and 3 for reasons stated in my previous answers. Site 7 for the Patford House surgery element had very sound researched objections with concerns from highways and heritage and went through with out of date wildlife and ecological assessments, all of those objections still stand and will still impact any further development within site 7. Site 7 was protected and outside of the boundary of Calne based on the Neighbour hood plan we all voted on that should be in place until 2026 so why is site 7 even on this map/consultation, it should be protected until at least 2026! That was the voice of the people and the expectation of the plan we voted on how is this allowed to be dismissed? Yes I do wish to be kept informed as page 8 otherwise things get passed under the noses of the residence!

Rep ID: Calne70	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is too high and will swamp the town and change its unique physical and community dynamic. yes there should be a brownfield target in order to stop the destruction of Greenfield land. 60 out of 360 on brownfield sites is far too low! is the further employment land now required already included in the plan?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Some road networks cannot be improved how do you propose to widen the road on A3102/Silver street? it cannot be done and the pavement is already inadequate for pedestrians! planned development particularly site 7 will increase traffic significantly. How can you possibly improve air quality with 1400+ new homes and the carbon foot print these and their multiply vehicles will	

create. Your priorities do not include ecological impact, flood risk increase, or impact/opinion from Heritage on the grade II listed Vern Lease estate particularly with regard to site 7. what about nature, habitat, wildlife, biodiversity and the environment these are all top priority global issues yet we keep on destroying and building!

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

NO I strongly OBJECT particularly to sites 7, 4 and 3. site 7 will have a negative impact on the Grade II listed Vern Lease Estate that Heritage have already had issue with. Silver Street/A3102 is NOT able to take a significant increase in traffic. Negative impact on air quality for all sites. Negative ecological impact, increased risk of flooding particularly as site 3 and 4 is already partially on a flood zone area. People have had to be re-homed due to subsidence on the sandpit development this is not acceptable! Chippenham have fought against their plan we do NOT want to increase our development to accommodate there shortfall just to keep Wiltshire numbers up Calne deserves better!

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Negative ecological impact, increased risk of flooding particularly as site 3 and 4 is already partially on a flood zone area. People have had to be re-homed due to subsidence on the sandpit development this is not acceptable! Negative impact on the Grade II listed Vern Lease Estate that Heritage have already had issue with.
impact of the carbon foot print of 1400+ houses! The scale of growth is too high and will swamp the town and change its unique physical and community dynamic.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Road networks, silver street A3102 will not take increased traffic the A4 from New road to upper Quemerford with road side residential parking will be overrun as it becomes the main thoroughfare from site 4. Increase in housing will require increase in infrastructure which is not allocated on the map therefore will require more development in the future when it becomes apparent the current infrastructure cannot cope. Will this proposed increase in housing require another school if so where will this go? we already have two sports facilities how many more will we need? we already have a new doctors surgery planned will we need another if so where will this all go? Calne is praised for its community events such as the famous bike meet winter and summer festivals, how many more residents can we pack into the town centre for the Christmas light switch on and maintain public safety and an enjoyable experience for all?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I strongly OBJECT to planning particularly on sites 7, 4 and 3 for reasons stated in my previous answers. Site 7 for the Patford House surgery element had very sound researched objections with concerns from highways and heritage and went through with out of date wildlife and ecological assessments, all of those objections still stand and will still impact any further development within site 7. Site 7 was protected and outside of the boundary of Calne based on the Neighbour hood plan we all voted on that should be in place until 2026 so why is site 7 even on this map/consultation, it should be protected until at least 2026! That was the voice of the people and the expectation of the plan we voted on how is this allowed to be dismissed?

Further comments

I strongly OBJECT to site 7, 3 and 4 for all the reason stated in my previous answers. The Patford house element of site 7 had well researched objects with concerns from Heritage and Highways and out of date ecological assessments all of these objections will still apply to any further development of site 7.

Rep ID: Calne71	
Consultee code: Other Advisory Bodies	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Wiltshire Scullers
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
NA	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Na	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Na

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No comment

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

If land is being developed by a water course then provision should be made for rowing club and educational facility.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Na

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne72

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

The growth is to much for our town and amenities. More Brownfield sites should be used, if you NEED to have more housing.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

None of these sites should be considered. You are looking to develop on Greenland and double the size of Calne, we already have new housing that isn't selling and being built on unsuitable land that floods.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The type of land being built on is not always suitable. The nature and countryside that you wish to destroy and push out of town. The environmental impact on the town. The road structure in and around Calne is not suitable for double the amount of traffic that you propose to increase with the building and housing potentially you suggest. Schooling is already stretched as well.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The environment and green areas.
Policing of the town, by selling the police station and crime rates rising and no local authorities

Further comments

I feel that the potential planned development that you have put in place for the next 15 years will destroy our lovely town. Losing its identity and green areas and what we all love some much. The countryside on our door step.

Rep ID: Calne73	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): individual
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Lower brown field target only.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Provide all new houses with heat pumps, not gas heating! On new houses provide adequate parking for at least two cars, send the parking wardens round; and book everyone who parks on the grass verge, (it is the same offence as parking on the pavement, most homes have a parking space but prefer to park outside their house). Plant more trees as they eat up pollution and stop traffic noise, and stop people parking on the verges.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Area 3 & 4 encroaches on the flood plain, bearing in mind global warming, I don't think area 8 or 1 is necessary.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

2 & 3 & 7

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Abberd way has become environmentally unfriendly, due to increased traffic especially at weekends, pollution needs to be checked there, no further development until additional means of easy access provided.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Provide a road or tunnel, from Tesco's round about to round about by Calne recycling, Compton Bassett, this would reduce pollution in Calne. Make sure that the infrastructure, sewage, storm drains, electricity (bearing in mind as people buy electric cars). Water Supply adequate for major fire. Energy provide new houses with heat pumps.

Further comments

Please mark drop sensory pavements with NO PARKING at any time road markings (for the blind or sight diminished, and mobility scooters).

Rep ID: Calne74	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): n/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth has too high an impact on greenbelt sites, more brownfield targets should be identified.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. There should be more brownfield sites located, all of these sites impact too widely on greenbelt sites. I particularly object to the land sited for development at 709 and linked to 3251, 3312, 3311. All of these sites are areas of outstanding beauty areas within the countryside. There would be a heritage impact relating to Bowood and Vernleaze and the views of the valley would be totally spoilt. Land off 709 would spoil views from existing developments, "ADDRESS REDACTED" for instance would longer have a view! There is a public footpath that runs through this land and this urban sprawl would have a detrimental impact on the country side. There are endangered bats on these sites and owls, ancient trees and other wildlife would severely be impacted. These proposed developments are too close to Bowood estate where there are herds of deer and hares etc which roam freely in these development sites. There is also woodland and trees that should be protected. These sites back onto the edge of a conservation area and should remain protected to build so close to a conservation site would be detrimental to the environment. These sites are also a popular walking spots for those who use the Sustrans cycle way and for ramblers and dog walkers using the public footpaths enjoying the Bowood estate to build houses would severely impact the countryside and spoil enjoyment for so many. To site houses on any of these sites would hugely impact traffic, Wenhill Lane is too narrow and cannot accommodate traffic and neither can Marden Way. The junction at Station Road is too busy already and if the access was from the A3102 this would also cause congestion and would be dangerous. The additional houses in this area and increased traffic would impact air quality further, Mile Elm has already been confirmed as having poor air quality and this would further impede the situation. Furthermore, it is a known local fact that the land at site 709 had 100's of pigs buried on the site that had Anthrax. As you will be aware Anthrax is deadly and can remain in soil for many many years so this site would not be safe. To build on these sites would create significant urban encroachment into the countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this.

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne75	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
To high, should be lower, more brownfield sites needed. Over our plan for houses anyway so not needed.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. There should be more brownfield sites located, all of these sites impact too widely on greenbelt sites. I particularly object to the land sited for development at 709 and linked to 3251, 3312, 3311. All of these sites are areas of outstanding beauty areas within the countryside. There would be a heritage impact relating to Bowood and Vernleaze and the views of the valley would be totally spoilt. Land off 709 would spoil views from existing developments, "ADDRESS REDACTED" for instance would longer have a view! There is a public footpath that runs through this land and this urban sprawl would have a detrimental impact on the country side. There are endangered bats on these sites and owls, ancient trees and other wildlife would severely be impacted. These proposed developments are too close to Bowood estate where there are herds of deer and hares etc which roam freely in these development sites. There is also woodland and trees that should be protected. These sites back onto the edge of a conservation area and should remain protected to build so close to a conservation site would be detrimental to the environment. These sites are also a popular walking spots for those who use the Sustrans cycle way and for ramblers and dog walkers using the public footpaths enjoying the Bowood estate to build houses would severely impact the countryside and spoil enjoyment for so many. To site houses on any of these sites would hugely impact traffic, Wenhill Lane is too narrow and cannot accommodate traffic and neither can Marden Way. The junction at Station Road is too busy already and if the access was from the A3102 this would also cause congestion and would be dangerous. The additional houses in this area and increased traffic would impact air quality further, Mile Elm has already been confirmed as having poor air quality and this would further impede the situation. Furthermore, it is a known local fact that the land at site 709 had 100's of pigs buried on the site that had Anthrax. As you will be aware Anthrax is deadly and can remain in soil for many many years so this site would not be safe. To build on these sites would create significant urban encroachment into the countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified. You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this.

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne76	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): n/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
More brownfield sites required, if you have to build at all use brownfield not Greenfield.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The scale of growth has too high an impact on greenbelt sites, more brownfield targets should be identified. Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. There should be more brownfield sites located, all of these sites impact too widely on greenbelt sites. I particularly object to the land sited for development at 709 and linked to 3251, 3312, 3311. All of these sites are areas of outstanding beauty areas within the countryside. There would be a heritage impact relating to Bowood and Vernleaze and the views of the valley would be totally spoilt. Land off 709 would spoil views from existing developments, "ADDRESS REDACTED" for instance would no longer have a view! There is a public footpath that runs through this land and this urban sprawl would have a detrimental impact on the country side. There are endangered bats on these sites and owls, ancient trees and other wildlife would severely be impacted. These proposed developments are too close to Bowood estate where there are herds of deer and hares etc which roam freely in these development sites. There is also woodland and trees that should be protected. These sites back onto the edge of a conservation area and should remain protected to build so close to a conservation site would be detrimental to the environment. These sites are also a popular walking spots for those who use the Sustrans cycle way and for ramblers and dog walkers using the public footpaths enjoying the Bowood estate to build houses would severely impact the countryside and spoil enjoyment for so many. Lockdown has identified how important enjoyment of the countryside is on mental health to take this away would be wrong. To site houses on any of these sites would hugely impact traffic, Wenhill Lane is too narrow and cannot accommodate traffic and neither can Marden Way. The junction at Station Road is too busy already and if the access was from the A3102 this would also cause congestion and would be dangerous. The additional houses in this area and increased traffic would impact air quality further, Mile Elm has already been confirmed as having poor air quality and this would further impede the situation. Furthermore, it is a known local fact that the land at site 709 had 100's of pigs buried on the site that had Anthrax. As you will be aware Anthrax is deadly and can remain in soil for many many years so this site would not be safe. To build on these sites would create significant urban encroachment into the countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site

of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified. You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this.

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne77	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is too much for a town that has already had huge increases over the past few years. Excess development ruins the character of the town and reduced the quality of life for all. Brownfield site use should be the priority and should have very challenging targets set against it.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The Environmental aspects should be a higher priority and so too should the regeneration of the town centre. A vibrant and appealing town centre will improve walking and local use of facilities rather than encouraging people to travel to Chippenham or Swindon with all the environmental impacts. Priorities needs to be visibly followed and elected officials needs to be accountable.	

The movement of the medical centre to the Melksham road for example devalues the town centre sets up numerous extra car journeys and makes it inconvenient for most residents to get to yet it has been approved. What credibility does this current activity show given against these priorities.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No comment other than I would prefer fewer. The other documents state that very few of these will be used yet their inclusion suggests a more larger agenda of expansion and that the planners are not being open or honest with the town but doing the groundwork for further expansion.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Land that gives good access to the main routes to the North and West of the town. This allows access to the M4, Swindon and to Chippenham. Land to the East will cause huge transport issues and further illegal air quality issues in the town and new residents will have to commute through the terrible A4 Silver street junction and the town centre. The cost of the required infrastructure road improvements must be costed into developments in the East as South side.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Public open spaces have been a premium during Covid. These developments impinge on the local access to the countryside and open spaces for exercise and play. Developments need to have open spaces available for all and planned into development many of which have tiny gardens and houses crammed into the development. Without that people will drive to get out of the town with all the negative environmental impact. Saying that Beaversbrook has pitches is only ok if you live near there. In addition the transport paper makes no mention of cycle ways. The Cycle path to Chippenham and through the town needs to be properly

developed not ignored. People would cycle but will do even less as traffic congestion rises and air quality drops. Cycling is good for health and mental wellbeing and this needs to be properly built into any plan not just ignored as it appears to be.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Cycle paths and properly managed footpaths need to be established and maintained to encourage walking and use of the local facilities.

Further comments

This plan appears to offer no alternative to current residents other than more people squeezed into the town. Proper improvements to infrastructure , cycle paths and footpaths combined with road improvements and town centre regeneration would all be seen as a positive, yet the detail to support these is missing. The cynical would say these are a low priority but in reality these could really sell growth to the community. Indeed many of these benefits should be seen as conditional for further development.

Rep ID: Calne78	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
It's too much. We don't need that many homes in cAlne and the loss of natural green space would be devastating to the local area and wildlife	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Priorities should be to protect the natural rural Space that is Calne. There isn't the roads to support this kind of growth or the facilities for this many new families.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No they are lovely natural spaces site 4 is massive. And site 7 is on the edge of lovely Bowood. Too many natural habitats for local wildlife being destroyed.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The bypass side of town as this is already busy and is an area of outstanding natural beauty which some of the areas on the south side of town are.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Animals habitats. Pollution, loss of trees and natural land to drain when it rains. Not enough doctors, dentists, schools in the area for this kind of growth.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Amenities and facilities for locals are already so limited I don't think we need that kind of growth

Further comments

CAIne is a small market town let's keep it that way!

Rep ID: Calne79	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
I think the area surrounding Derry Hill and has undergone many new builds in recent years and time to consolidate and leave the area to be enjoyed by residents, including the cycle tracks.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
No, not the right priorities. What about prioritising current residents?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No. Calne itself is bursting with new build, not enough infrastructure in terms of roads, schools, GPS etc to cope.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Near the motorwa6

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Many. Social impact on current residents, environmental impact on surrounding countryside, already disappearing at an alarming rate.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

As said previously.

Further comments

I am commenting in particular on the site proposal for 80 houses in Derry Hill and Studley. We have had the impact of several new builds over recent years and the time must come now to STOP and assess impact. The Most recent new build finished in 2020. Also the surrounding walking areas will be impacted or completely gone. Please give us a break. Go build somewhere else. We are so very tired of parcels of land being sold off every few years and planning consent being approved, despite so much local opposition.

Rep ID: Calne80	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
I think 360 homes is about right.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The preservation of the countryside around Calne should be a priority.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Proposed site 4 would involve destroying the countryside and the beautiful river valley. Developing this site would involve high costs working around the river valley. This site should only be considered as a very very last resort.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Proposed sites 5,6, 1 and 8. Smaller increases at multiple sites rather than one big new development.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The overall character of Calne as a market town. It's better to develop more sites a little than creating one large new conurbation added to our town.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Retail site plus better public transport

Further comments

Important to preserve the character of our town. Better to develop a number of sites a little than create an additional huge new conurbation.

Rep ID: Calne81	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): n/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is to much for the infrasucture of this town.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Prioritise should be focusing on much greener issues and protecting th environment / countryside of our town.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

site 7 is totally unacceptable and has previously been dismissed for many reasons especially as there is no possibility of widening the corner at Silver street , most days this road comes to a standstill when two large vehicles enter the corner from opposite directions . often the traffic backs up to the bowed entrance ! every weekday pre-covid silver street comes to a standstill especially school and work traffic peak times .flooding is also a huge concern as the drainage water from the new Fry's site has been flowing into the river Marden which during this winter burst its banks in areas , more drainage from any development on site 7 would be a catastrophe . Nothing has changed from previous planning application for this land which was dismissed for many reasons... apart from Lord Lansdowne giving up a bit of land cheaply for the development of the new surgery as tis now gives him more chance of gaining planning permission for the surrounding area ?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

land 2,3 &4 without a shadow of doubt , the road infrastructure etc is already in place and these areas have ongoing new builds at present.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

land 7 , this land needs to be viewed by the planning committee to see how much wildlife is there and the destruction to habitat and the air pollution this will cause with a few hundred more vehicles sat in queueing on silver street . Also the flooding this will cause to the river garden and Fynamore gardens where we have seen significant amounts of rain water running down our streets since Fry's started building in the opposite fields .

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

please see previous notes

Further comments

Not land 7.

Rep ID: Calne82

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Since moving to Calne 7 years ago Calne has grown from a small town to a disproportional size to the amenities it has.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Calne needs more variety of shops to support the population already here.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

There are far too many sites.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The town centre needs developing.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

I moved to Calne to enjoy the surrounding countryside but it is all gradually disappearing.

Rep ID: Calne83	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth has too high an impact on greenbelt sites, more brownfield targets should be identified.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased growth will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified. You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this.

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne84	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth has too high an impact on greenbelt sites, more brownfield targets should be identified.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. There should be more brownfield sites located, all of these sites impact too widely on greenbelt sites. I particularly object to the land sited for development at 709 and linked to 3251, 3312, 3311. All of these sites are areas of outstanding beauty areas within the countryside. There would be a heritage impact relating to Bowood and Vernleaze and the views of the valley would be totally spoilt. Land off 709 would spoil views from existing developments, "ADDRESS REDACTED" for instance would longer have a view! There is a public footpath that runs through this land and this urban sprawl would have a detrimental impact on the country side. There are endangered bats on these sites and owls, ancient trees and other wildlife would severely be impacted. These proposed developments are too close to Bowood estate where there are herds of deer and hares etc which roam freely in these development sites. There is also woodland and trees that should be protected. These sites back onto the edge of a conservation area and should remain protected to build so close to a conservation site would be detrimental to the environment. These sites are also a popular walking spots for those who use the Sustrans cycle way and for ramblers and dog walkers using the public footpaths enjoying the Bowood estate to build houses would severely impact the countryside and spoil enjoyment for so many. To site houses on any of these sites would hugely impact traffic, Wenhill Lane is too narrow and cannot accommodate traffic and neither can Marden Way. The junction at Station Road is too busy already and if the access was from the A3102 this would also cause congestion and would be dangerous. The additional houses in this area and increased traffic would impact air quality further, Mile Elm has already been confirmed as having poor air quality and this would further impede the situation. Furthermore, it is a known local fact that the land at site 709 had 100's of pigs buried on the site that had Anthrax. As you will be aware Anthrax is deadly and can remain in soil for many many years so this site would not be safe. To build on these sites would create significant urban encroachment into the countryside

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified. You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne85	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth has too high an impact on greenbelt sites, more brownfield targets should be identified.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Missing priorities for additional shops, healthcare and infrastructure for all these new houses. The house numbers are too high, we should remain a small market town, this increased grown will lose the charm and community feel from Calne. These plans do not afford sustainability and would be of massive detriment to our countryside.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. There should be more brownfield sites located, all of these sites impact too widely on greenbelt sites. I particularly object to the land sited for development at 709 and linked to 3251, 3312, 3311. All of these sites are areas of outstanding beauty areas within the countryside. There would be a heritage impact relating to Bowood and Vernleaze and the views of the valley would be totally spoilt. Land off 709 would spoil views from existing developments, "ADDRESS REDACTED" for instance would longer have a view! There is a public footpath that runs through this land and this urban sprawl would have a detrimental impact on the country side. There are endangered bats on these sites and owls, ancient trees and other wildlife would severely be impacted. These proposed developments are too close to Bowood estate where there are herds of deer and hares etc which roam freely in these development sites. There is also woodland and trees that should be protected. These sites back onto the edge of a conservation area and should remain protected to build so close to a conservation site would be detrimental to the environment. These sites are also a popular walking spots for those who use the Sustrans cycle way and for ramblers and dog walkers using the public footpaths enjoying the Bowood estate to build houses would severely impact the countryside and spoil enjoyment for so many. To site houses on any of these sites would hugely impact traffic, Wenhill Lane is too narrow and cannot accommodate traffic and neither can Marden Way. The junction at Station Road is too busy already and if the access was from the A3102 this would also cause congestion and would be dangerous. The additional houses in this area and increased traffic would impact air quality further, Mile Elm has already been confirmed as having poor air quality and this would further impede the situation. Furthermore, it is a known local fact that the land at site 709 had 100's of pigs buried on the site that had Anthrax. As you will be aware Anthrax is deadly and can remain in soil for many many years so this site would not be safe. To build on these sites would create significant urban encroachment into the countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

A local charity has already indicated that Wiltshire is over its quota of building homes and we should not be considering any further development particularly on Greenfield sites. You should look to repurpose existing brownfield sites, such as the old site of the Co-op in Calne, or the old Garage on London Road. Redevelop the brownfield sites and leave the Greenfield ones alone - no-one wants it!!!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified. You have missed the environment impact of destroying the countryside with housing that simply isn't needed or justified.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, there is not enough leisure, facilities, healthcare and the town council has committed to reduce their carbon footprint, building more houses goes against this

Further comments

We have already built over our housing allocation for Wiltshire and therefore further developments should not even be considered.

Rep ID: Calne86	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Effect on countryside.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No further sites.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Ensure countryside is not effected.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Effect on countryside.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

No.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne87	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne87 (see also Calne50)
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth is too high for a rural town relying on an old roman road (A4) designed for much lower volumes of traffic. I myself moved out of London, then out of Chippenham due to over congested housing and roads. Calne has (to date) managed to keep a good balance of quality rural life and preservation of countryside which had drawn most of us on this state to Calne. This estate has replaced an old derelict pig farm and so was brownfield.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

The right priorities seem to me to have been succinctly summed up in the Calne 2018 Neighbourhood Plan. i.e: - preservation of Calne heritage & history - preservation of biodiversity - sites must not exacerbate traffic and air pollution
This is achievable by passing the town centre with roads taking traffic to areas of employment and new shops (Tesco, Lidl, Aldi) without going through town centre, i.e via a by-pass

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

This is most definitely not the right pool of sites, Calne Town Council employed the distinguished AECOM to review and report on a list of potential sites in 2016/2017 which stated that site 6 Rookery Farm (previously site 3254) was not appropriate to be taken forward for the CGNP. Its a good distance from community facilities, services, heritage constraints, close proximity to listed farmhouse, habitats for preserve species, reptiles, bats, trees.
Upon a previously dis-used & derelict pig-farm and has been turned into a park - type estate with ROW footpaths leading around Rookery Farm. Hence the farm contributes immensely as an amenity to all in the community who use the walks and live in the area. It is full of wildlife which needs to be protected from over development, the trees of Rookery Farm provide oxygen at a time of pollution and vital to the air quality of the area. The farmhouse itself dates back to Victorian times and exhibits an attractive Victorian carved ornate barley board apex roof. Hence this site should be removed from the latest 2021 list of potential sites.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

From the list of site, all sites north of Quemerford due to the possibility, near of long term, of linking the sites with roadways to take traffic, by passing the town centre, up to employment areas (Porte Marshe), new shops (Tesco, Lidl, Aldi) and to the north (Swindon). It could be possible to link up from the A4 Quemerford to San Pit Road by lining sites 2,3, and 4 via new development roads (note this was done successfully in Pewsham, Chippenham).

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site 6 Rookery Farm development would merely harm or destroy important heritage and environment, with little or no added benefit to the community. Using the same parkland setting as used on Cherhill View as an example, each new development on sites 1,2,3,4 should maximise the natural surroundings, by large area of footpaths, a cycle path from Quemerford to the north, improve existing ROW footpaths, add many trees, community orchards etc

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The existing road routes from Stockley Lane, Quemerford through Calne is already a congestion and pollution issue. This would worsen by adding more developments to sites 5,6,7. As said above a new route up from the A4 to north Calne would alleviate many existing and future issues in town centre. This could be achieved in time by planning developments 1,2,3,4 with roads linked together which could form a new northern by-pass.

Further comments

Speaking for myself, wife and many residents on [ADDRESS REDACTED] who moved into Calne from Chippenham, Surrey, Northampton, London, most of us were not Calne residents. This Redron estate was particularly attractive due to it's beautiful surroundings and park type setting. We are all very concerned with the potential destruction of trees, wildlife and natural habitats which would ensue by development of site 6. Rookery Farm (is is one of the only farms actually named after a species) for a reasons, the rooks, kites, owls, newts, bats have occupied the...

Rep ID: Calne88	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Growth is too much. We need to hold on house building & obtain a new secondary school and more shops etc. It cannot support the population at present. Lower target.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes. Environment is key. Development 7 does not factor this in. Do not build housing here. Animals/wildlife will be destroyed if you do.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. Do not build more houses at site 7. See above. This is a lovely area for walking and cycling. More houses will destroy this.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites. You also need to reconsider empty sites. Covid means the high street must change. People need to live in actual town centre.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes. Site 7. The wildlife will be destroyed here. Also concerned re A3102. Road in a bad way anyway. Too much traffic going onto A4.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

If you are building these houses more school, GPs, dentists etc all required. Also need another supermarket.

Further comments

I am really worried about the impact of site 7 on the landscape & wildlife. Lots of deer, kites, owls etc. their homes will be destroyed.

Rep ID: Calne89	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Calne has grown significantly in the 4 years we have lived here and infrastructure has not been increased to support this. It is clear that with the current building work all decent countryside views will be deteriorated.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Infrastructure is key, as well as not disrupting current residents - listen to their views as they have to live with these decisions.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Listen and take note of the neighbourhood plan which selected northern and eastern sites only for development.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Ste 2 and 4

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Why not regenerate brownfield sites and other run down areas, than huge new estates.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Roads are lacking in investment, particularly Silver Street. More turning on crests of hills are accidents waiting to happen.

Further comments

How is covid 19 factored into this? Where are overt reference to neighbourhood plan?

Rep ID: Calne90	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
More brownfield than green.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Yes. More electric cars. Keeping the cycle route from Calne to Chippenham. More green areas for walking.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

Calne has an enormous amount of new houses being built, too much land is being built on.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brown land nor green.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The environment is the most important factor. The plan must include specific measurements to reduce carbon emissions. Don't forget global warming. Our planet is in serious danger.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Health and well being require more green spaces, preservation of trees and measure to cope with floods. Attractive places for our overweight population to exercise and preservation of wildlife.

Further comments

We don't want to live in a concrete world with floods and no green spaces or everyone fighting over what green space is left after the destruction of our county.

Rep ID: Calne91	
Consultee code: Statutory Body	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Wessex Water
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Where developing on brownfield sites opportunities must be realised to redirect surface water from the foul water networks and limit the surface water flows from site using multi benefit SuDS schemes.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

From initial desktop appraisal services to the west of Calne have more potential spare capacity. Strategy to accommodate the current East of Calne developments have been stretched to serve more development than originally proposed. Significant development in this area could lead to significant improvements. Site 4 is within the odour and flies consultation zone for Compton Bassett Sewage Treatment Works. We will object to development at this location if it is within 250 metres of the works (flies) and within the 3 OUEm3 (or above) odour contour as defined by odour modelling. Multiple services cross the site and will require suitable easements.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Please see above under CA3.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

We welcome early involvement in contributing to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We take this opportunity through consultation to identify any particular serious constraints in accordance with our statutory undertaking. We have concerns of development at Eastern Calne; particularly within Site 4.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne92	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
360 homes to 2036 is manageable as long as Wiltshire Council can maintain a 5 year housing supply to keep out speculative development. 60 homes on a brownfield site is ok as long as a site can be found. As many homes should be built on brownfield sites as possible instead of green fields.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
There have been improvement plans in place for Calne town centre for the last 15 years or more and so far developments have failed to produce any of them. The only thing we have is a retirement home plan that nobody wants. Cycle routes in Calne are poor especially to where I live in Quemerford. For me there is no option other than to cycle on the A4. Putting cycle tracks at the	

side of roads doesn't work as has been proved in Chippenham. Dedicated tracks away from main roads are the only answer. The cycle routes from Calne to Chippenham and to Avebury are quiet but basically just rough muddy footpaths suitable only for off road leisure cyclists. While the latest plan may only be for 360 houses to 2036 and that attempts have been made in the plan to protect the local environment, what happens after 2036 when all the land proposed has been used? Do we then have to start considering building on what at the moment is land that should be protected? Looking into the distant future at some point how we house people in this country is going to have to be seriously looked at otherwise we will eventually build on all the land most people want to protect. Lessons should have been learned since the sixties and over Grenfell Tower over the issues surround high rise buildings. High rise is fine as long as it is not used for families with young children or anyone guilty of anti social, drug or other criminal related problems. Up is the only way of stopping rural spread.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

This is the limit for Calne without causing damage to the surrounding environment. What happens after 2036? Do we then start to damage what we are now trying to protect?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

One two three five six and eight. Some land for self build would be good as builders put 20% at least profit margins on to housing. A four bedroom house currently selling for £450,000 can be self built for £250,000 and to a higher spec. More room for self builds would help to ease the affordability of housing.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

How will they connect to Calne centre with proper hard surface cycle and walking routes?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

So far the lack of developer contributions for the improvement of the town centre. Calne Council undertook consultations on the regeneration of the town centre over 15 years ago. The only thing we have got is a speculative planning application for retirement housing that nobody wants. I know that shops have taken a hammering during this pandemic but if we short sitedly turn our town centre into dwellings there is no going back. Railways were ripped out in the sixties and now many communities wish they still had them. Lets not do the same with our shops.

Further comments

Careful consideration needs to be made about protecting the environment before housing. Unfortunately as long as the population of this country continues to increase then we are going to need more housing. That's the issue that has to be addressed or the destruction of our green spaces will continue.

Rep ID: Calne93	
Consultee code: Other Advisory Bodies	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Wenhill Resident's Association
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The pace of residential property growth is too high. The scale of growth proposed will change the character of the town. The brownfield target should be higher. Query. With what is approved currently (areas in light brown) doesn't this deal with sufficient growth?</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
<p>Preserving the special character of Calne should be a priority. There has been no action on rejuvenation of the town centre despite numerous consultations. This should also be a priority.</p>	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No comment

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No comment

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The proposed increase in housing will result in increased vehicle movements and congestion in the town. Environmental damage will increase. Bus services will be adversely affected. It is not practicable to prioritise bus services through the main congestion points, esp. on parts of the A4. Increased housing will result in increased pressure on local shops. Prior to lockdown the town centre car park was often full. Parking restrictions and availability have been reduced. Therefore local shops will be marginalised in favour of new superstores on the edge of Calne.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

One surgery has closed, and has not yet been replaced. It is already very difficult to see a doctor. The proposed new surgery will need to be expanded in scope to cater for the additional households. Additional local shops will need to be provided, together with parking. Additional services, such as refuse and recycling centre capacity, will be needed.

Current vehicle access along Marden way couldn't support the volume of traffic, and Wenhill Lane is unsuitable, so access would have to be new and probably via Silver Street. The size of the development means there would be issues of safety and traffic volume, and well-being of older residents.

Further comments

Query. What was the reason behind the neighbourhood plan which was taken through a consultation period: Where are the outcomes?

Query. Did the recent consultation review suggested that this plot wouldn't be reviewed for approx. 10 years – taking us up to 2027/8

Rep ID: Calne94	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
We do not need the scale of growth being proposed. Yes, there should be a brownfield target.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities are all OK but they are in the wrong order. With the vital need surrounding green space for both physical and mental health (as highlighted during the pandemic) and protection of the environment to ensure minimum climate change, priority No. 4 should be the most important for a lovely tone like Calne. WE MUST NOT CONCRETE THE SURROUNDING AREA FOR THE SAKE OF MORE HOUSES AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. It is a crude, ill thought out but easily drawn, randomly chosen extension of urban development to the South, East and West of the town which would simply increase its size.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

It is amazing to note that the most obvious part of the town, to the North of the A3102 (Bypass) does not appear to get a mention, even though there are already road connections in place. I can't find any explanation as to why this potential development area is not being considered, when Area 4 (a beautiful part alongside the Marden Valley) seems to be in the firing line.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Please see my answer about priorities.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

This question is based on the notion that the town must grow. We should ensure that the current population has proper infrastructure, including doctor's surgeries etc. before building more.

Further comments

A thoughtfully irritating exercise. As if a year of lockdown hasn't depressed us enough, then reading through these dreadful proposals to destroy the countryside around our town has left me feeling very down indeed.

Rep ID: Calne95	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of the growth is significantly over estimated and based on out-of-date data. The charity CPRE is preparing to submit evidence to show the number of houses proposed under the Wiltshire Local Plan is a serious over-estimation. Their analysis shows that Wiltshire has already delivered 140% of its target and has built 40% more houses than was required of it between 2017/18 and 2019/20.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
These priorities are laudable, but how does building on green sites which means significant infrastructure help meet the carbon targets? Abandoned brownfield sites and empty properties need to be addressed to bring them into domestic use, prior to any more planning applications being approved on greenfield sites.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

These sites are far too numerous for the need. Why are there no brownfield sites included in this pool, such as the woodlands site and the abandoned coop site?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None of the above - There is plenty of brownfields and undeveloped land (Such as the Coop, the Pippin and the old youth center) within the town to meet the need up to 2036.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes, for the environment, no building on undeveloped land should be approved until every meter of brownfield site-building has been completed and occupied. Brownfield sites lie undeveloped yet permissions are approved for building on greenfield sites. This needs to stop.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Why has there been no consideration for policing been considered in the plan?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne96	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne87 (see also Calne50)
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth is too high for a rural town relying on an old Roman Road(A4) designed for much lower volumes of traffic. Calne has to date managed to keep a good balance of quality rural life and preservation of Calne's Heritage and countryside which has drawn many of us on this new estate to Calne. This estate replaced an old derelict concrete and asbestos pig farm on contaminated land and was therefore brownfield. The scale of Housing growth should be lower but emphasis on Bio diversity sites such as waterside park areas with restaurants which would require employees to Maintain therefore employment.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

The Calne 2018 Neighbourhood Plan was comprised with co operation of local residents and this plan stressed the objectives : preservation of Calne's Heritage and History, improve bio - diversity , sites must not exacerbate traffic and air pollution. These criteria would be achievable by By - passing the Town Centre taking traffic up From Quemerford to the areas of employment and out of town shops in the North. New houses should be built along sites 1,2,3 . Site 4 from Compton Basset westwards to become an area making full use of the river to form a large country park with small lakes , tree plantations , wildlife park , public cycle - Paths and footpaths leading to Town Centre and shops in the north. There could be a riverside pub/ restaurant which would give employment to the area in addition to a welcome area of exercise and relaxation for the community. This should become part of Calne's 5 year plan and would become a significant attraction to this town.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

This is definitely NOT the right pool of sites. Calne Town Council employed the distinguished AECOM to review and report on a list of sites in 2016/17 which stated that site 6 Rookery Farm (previously site 3254) was NOT appropriate to be taken forward for the CCNP siting distance from community facilities, Services, Heritage constraints with proximity to a listed farmhouse, habitats for protected species , newts , bats and the need to retain the surrounding trees.

Since then our own [ADDRESS REDACTED] has been completed upon a previously dis - used and derelict pig farm and has been turned into a a beautiful country - park type estate with tree plantations , public ROW footpaths leading around Rookery Farm. Hence the farm contributes immensely as an amenity to the whole community , not just estate residents, who use the walks for regular exercise. The farm and tall trees are full of wildlife which needs to be protected from over development. The trees of the farm provide oxygen at a time of increased pollution and therefore necessary for the air quality of the area. The very name Rookery Farm is testament to the. Loony of Rooks that have occupied the site for centuries. Added to these now are Kites , woodpeckers , barn owls , bats and many others.

The farmhouse itself dates back to Victorian times and exhibits an attractive carved barge board apex roof. Hence this site should be removed from the 2021 list of potential sites as building more houses here would simply destroy a centre of bio diversity and wildlife that has taken centuries to build.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Sites 1,2,3 would supply sufficient houses for the 360 quoted. These sites would not increase traffic or air pollution through town , and are closest to Employment areas , plus the new shops and closest to access Swindon Toad and the existing by pass to Chippenham. Site 4 as said above could supply a mixture of houses in addition to the formation of a large riverside park area (similar to Chippenham's Monkton Park). This could include riverside Pub/ restaurant , enhanced tree plantations, lakes and wetland areas supporting wildlife , public cycle paths and walks.

Sites 1,2,3,4 could be linked by a by - pass from Quemerford (possibly Compton Bassett) up to the Oxford road which would alleviate the increasing traffic problem through town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site 6 Rookery Farm would merely harm or destroy important Calne Heritage and the environment with no added benefit to the community. As said previously I feel the importance of enjoyment of the natural wildlife and countryside has been missed so far on some existing housing estates which seem to have merely concentrated on packing in the highest packing density of houses to the area. Cherhill View has broken the mould with its large areas of recreational walks with its residents and surrounding community enjoying the countryside. This in part was due to the initial legal contract when the access to the land was obtained , however I feel that a similar insistence could be made at planning to ensure that the new housing in Calne is provided with similar access to large areas of walks , tree plantations , community orchards.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The existing road routes from Stockley Lane and Quemerford through Calne are already congestion and air quality issues. I note that this was mentioned in the 2018 CCNP but since then the extra traffic from Stockley Lane and Silver Street has worsened both congestion and air quality, particularly around the White Hart junction.

This will worsen considerably once the new Lidl opens as at the moment traffic from our [ADDRESS REDACTED] travels to Melksham down Stockley Lane towards Haddington out of Calne , but will subsequently add to the traffic in Town to reach the new shops.

For this reason a new by pass up from Quemerford to join up with the Oxford Road / Beversbrook roundabout could be produced by joining sites 1,2,3,4.

Further comments

Speaking for myself , wife and many residents on the [ADDRESS REDACTED] who moved into Calne from all parts of the UK , many not Dom Calne , this Estate was particularly attractive due to its beautiful surroundings and country park type setting. We are all very concerned with the potential destruction of trees , wildlife habitats and potential loss of or development of the old attractive Victorian Rookery Farmhouse. The farmhouse itself dates back to approx 1830 and the very name itself is testament to a colony of Rooks dating back centuries. It is one of the few farms in Wiltshire actually named after a species of wildlife , and the trees , Rooks , Kites , Newts , bats , owls , woodpeckers that have occupied the site for centuries need to be protected! Please remove this site from the Neighbourhood Plan.

Rep ID: Calne97

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

The scale of growth you have outlined - i.e. 360 new houses before 2036 - does not seem unreasonable. Brownfield sites should be used wherever possible.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Again seems about right - although there is a dire need for regeneration of the town centre which is on it's knees through lack of shops and restaurants for example.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I do not think the 2 small developments of 5 and 6 should go ahead. Building near AONB should be avoided for obvious reasons.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites should be used and greenfield avoided where possible.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The pollution on the A4 during rush hours particularly should be addressed. Avoid putting housing near it if possible.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne is desperate for some shops! It needs food shops - bakers, butchers, greengrocers. Everyone I talk to says they would support them and a restaurant or two would be absolute bliss!!

Further comments

As a relative newcomer to the area, I miss a local town centre to shop in and to support, and many people I speak to feel the same way. You always have to drive to go shopping when it would be wonderful, now and again, to be able to walk into Calne and pick up some groceries and support the local shop keepers.

Rep ID: Calne98	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Fynamore Gardens Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Nil growth.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
We have a plan and need to keep to it .	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No, this is too much developing without any infrastructure in place.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Will building until outer relief road is built to take traffic out of Calne centre.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Bad air in Calne too much traffic.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Ring road.

Further comments

Site 7 entrance is very dangerous, plus the wildlife in that area will be destroyed. Do not allow this site to be developed I am sure that Lord Lansdowne has other greenfield sites he can sell.

Rep ID: Calne99	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The growth rate is far too high. Cale has seen a massive increase in the number of houses in recent years on green field sites. More brownfield sites should be used and the growth rate lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Every new house adds to the CO2 level in the atmosphere and on present evidence takes us green field land. The priority must be on minimising climate change by meeting the Calne Town Council Climate and Environmental Emergency pledge.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No new Green Field sites should be in the plan for development.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No further development as Calne will no longer be a market town but a massive urban housing conurbation totally out of scale with the size of town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The climate change emergency must be the driving force. No more houses which add directly to CO2 emissions.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The more houses there are the more people move into the area and the worse the traffic and air pollution. Not to mention the increased demand on electrical power, water supply and sewerage disposal. There is obviously a limit to expansion before the character of a town and surrounding area is lost and that limit has been reached for Calne.

Further comments

I do not want to see Calne expand any more. There are already too many houses being built on Greenfield sites. Climate change is here. We cannot carry on building more and more as if nothing has changed. The council's responsibility is to protect the planet for future generations and that can only be done by limiting growth in the area for which it has responsibility.

Rep ID: Calne100	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Absolutely lower and brownfield sites should be developed before any additional development of greenfield sites.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Before addressing additional housing provision the potential impact upon existing inadequate transport infrastructure needs to be resolved and should always include the provision of new cycle routes.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No, sites 2 and 3 contain the existing solar farm and are therefore not appropriate for housing so long as the solar farm exists. Site 4 is far too large. Site 7 was presented as an alternative choice to the development now being completed North and East of Low Lane, site 7 was overwhelmingly rejected at consultation stage for the Community Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites and small (less than 1ha. sites).

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

There is no appreciable diversity of retail with insufficient provision on the South side of town.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Provision to mitigate the inadequacies created by previous inappropriate planning.

Further comments

Having observed planning over many decades my conclusion is to consider that this exercise in future planning is futile, recent experience has shown that well meaning planning, duly considered by local people who have chosen to involve themselves in the process and who have personal knowledge of their environment, find that their considered and informed planning gets to be overtaken by decision makers responsible for granting approval who respond to influences other than the issue.

Rep ID: Calne101	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Calne Resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brownfield sites should be more utilised for house construction instead of destroying green fields which benefit the whole community for leisure and to watch and observe nature.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Calne needs better facilities for health, the new doctor's surgery is well overdue with the existing two surgeries struggling. The transport network needs a bypass to avoid the hold ups in the town centre (and air pollution) to divert traffic on the A4 to Marlborough and beyond away from the centre. With all the extra housing already built, further shops and retail opportunities are	

needed to keep people local. Improvements for walkers and cyclists are also needed to reduce carbon emissions. Education also needs more places for the children which will need schooling in all the new housing.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

To avoid destroying any more green countryside, and rural views which is part of Calne's appeal, sites 2,3 and 4 should not be used. Currently these are fields regularly walked and enjoyed by residents and development of these would destroy many views and local amenities. Site 4 has potential flooding issues and is too near Hills' works.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The town centre needs development to service the increased population. The town centre has lost many shops in the recent years so people have to travel to Chippenham, Swindon or Bath for shopping. Calne needs to be revitalised to stop it becoming a satellite town with shops, restaurants and evening entertainment venues. Sites 1,6 and 8 are the least damaging to prevent it's historic character becoming lost.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes, health, education, transport, retail and leisure issues need to be considered in conjunction with all these schemes. How many of these sites will have a school, a local shop, pharmacy or other local retail ? How will the increased traffic, pollution arising from the extra cars be handled? Any thought about electric charging points and more solar energy production on the new houses? How energy efficient will the new houses be? Where will all these new people work?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Better transport links to avoid hold ups and pollution in the town centre. More cycle tracks and footpaths to reduce car use. More doctors, dentists fore the increased population.

Further comments

Calne has increased drastically in size in recent years but the infrastructure and facilities have not changed: in fact they have decreased. Why have so many new houses been allowed to be built without a corresponding increase in services and facilities? Retail shops have gone and we now have beauty shops, hairdressers and coffee shops because everyone goes elsewhere to buy clothes, shoes, furniture etc.

Rep ID: Calne102

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Home Owner

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The council should only be developing on brown field sites. It is the amount of green field areas that makes Calne so much more attractive than its neighbouring towns. We need to maintain this.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

If more houses are needed , they should be built on the outskirts of the town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I live in Marden Way and the field (site 7) you are proposing is a habitat for lots of wildlife. It is a well walked footpath used by locals, dog walkers and ramblers.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Calne needs much better facilities in the town centre before considering any future building of more dwellings.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne103	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Calne resident
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brown field target should be higher.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
I do not see how by building more houses it will improve the infrastructure, reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. Our air quality in Calne is often found to be some of the worst in the area. Build the infrastructure first (extra schools, roads, amenities, increase public transport etc) then the houses. Quite often Calne is gridlocked with traffic and it will only get worse and our poor public transport links means that more and more people have to have cars rather use buses.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Not in my opinion.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Calne is already full to over flowing with houses - nothing is suitable.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

If these proposals are allowed you will be destroying the green fields around our market town. This pandemic has proven how much space we as a town need to be able to get out and about without the travellingall country walks have been rammed with people getting out and about and if you take away that ability you are effecting the health and well being of the future generations. In fact, if you allow more housing you will be contributing to the ill health of the local residents, by taking away their amenity land and allowing the increase in pollution.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

We currently have the A4 and A3102 coming in and out of Calne - roads that have been here for decades, designed and built to cope with the traffic levels of the time. This area has been so over developed that the current road structure is not really fit for purpose and if more houses are allowed to be built locally where are all these cars going to go.? Sat nav has encouraged people to use the back lanes and these are now real danger areas with cars racing around. This will only get worse.

Further comments

According to the countryside charity CPRE the number of houses proposed under the Wiltshire Local Plan is a serious over-estimation. According to an analysis of the Housing Delivery Test (2020) the county has delivered 140 per cent of it's target. How can Wiltshire Council still say there is a need for more houses.

On site 7 - combined with the new proposed Doctors surgery and treatment centre and the new housing proposal this will result in hundreds of extra cars up the A3102 and through the town centre every day. This road is already grid locked in the morning and afternoon.

What point is there of having a Neighbourhood Plan - when it was deemed less than 2 years ago (after public consultation) that the boundary for Calne was round the back of Fynamore Gardens but the new Wiltshire development proposals completely disregard what was agreed? What faith can the People of Calne have in any development proposal put out in the guise of "Public consultation".

We don't have enough doctors to cope with the current amount of people, we still only have one secondary school (since I came to Calne in 1965), there is not enough retail property in Calne. I do not believe that more housing will create a bigger economy for Calne- as people go outside Calne to shop (due to lack of choice) and if we have more housing with more cars - where are they going to park in Calne centre? Despite Calne growing by thousands of houses in the last 40 years, we do not have a proportionate increase in the amount of retail property in our town....not really progress is it? The current rate of development is making Calne a commuter town and not a community town

With all the new houses - the average house price in Calne has jumped so high now that local people on local wages can no longer afford to purchase the new houses or even the old ones- they are not being built for local people at all....

Rep ID: Calne104	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth is too high. Calne will loose so much of the wonderful wildlife and habitats that makes Calne a unique town to live in!	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The high street need more support and less out of town retail e.g large supermarkets! More support for independent businesses.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

No! I live in Quemerford and have done for over 20yrs. Before Covid traffic in Calne is a big problem. Daily I encounter huge traffic jams driving from Quemerford to Mile Elm and on to work. Traffic speeds through Quemerford and drivers do not stick to the 30mph limit. The last thing we need is for a large housing development to the North of Quemerford! These 8 sites would increase Calne by about 50%!! Calne would lose the community feel and would become similar to Chippenham. Wildlife would be hugely impact and we lose all the things that make Calne a wonderful town to live in. site 7 should also not be developed on as there has already been too much development on this side of Calne.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Affordable house with good sized family homes with a central park to give it a community feel and focus. Calne needs another primary school before anymore housing developments!

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes support the families in need of affordable good sized houses in a nice area to bring up children.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Education is so important and should be the number one focus.

Further comments

Please keep Calne the wonderful town it is and don't ruin it by over development and turn it into Chippenham or a mini Swindon!!!!!!

Rep ID: Calne105	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth for this town is excessively high. There has been / is ongoing significant development and residential growth over the past 10 years. The identified areas represent approximately (based on visual analysis of the map) an increase of 80% of current built-up areas of Calne (after the aforementioned growth). This will irrevocably change the character of the town, and devalue the heritage aspects. Furthermore the building is on greenfield sites - Brownfield sites should be identified.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Acknowledgement of the historic value and heritage value of Calne should be much higher priority. This requires ensuring the character of the town is protected.	

Development and rejuvenation of the town centre – with public access and utility, as well as market, shops should be prioritised.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The sites identified should be dropped. No additional sites in the Calne area should be considered.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The only development for the town should be rejuvenation of the town centre.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The proposed increase in residential accommodation would overload the current transport infrastructure. The increased vehicle movements and resulting congestion (which is already significant at peak periods on the A4 and A3102) would increase pollution within the town. This would be damaging to health and to the heritage buildings within Calne and its environs. Parking availability has been reduced, with the closure of one of the two town-centre supermarkets. The proposal would put increased pressure on the local shops, and the lack of parking would drive people to out-of town facilities – further marginalising the Calne Town Centre shops.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Doctor's surgery capacity is limited, and it has proven extremely difficult (even pre-Covid) to get appointments. The local surgery closed with the advent of Covid, and replacement building has not completed. Additional Surgery capacity would be required, and funding would be needed.

Current traffic along A3102 (Silver Street) already backs up beyond Fynamore Gardens in peak periods. The development area 7 on the map would require access from that same road, with Wenhill Lane (Public footpath) being unsuitable, and of insufficient width.

Traffic through Calne (from development areas 4-7) to Chippenham (for rail access) via the A4 has significant bottlenecks in the town centre. This would require a bypass on the western flank of the town, through the Bowood Estate, which would be environmentally unsound.

Further comments

We developed a Neighbourhood Plan, which was voted on and accepted. Query: How much consideration of this plan has been given in drawing up these proposals?

Query: Why did I not receive any communications on this plan direct from Wiltshire Council? I am a council tax payer, and the only way I found out about this plan was via a mailing from a local councillor. It arrived with limited time for response and consideration, during a period of Lockdown, with Stay at Home orders, rendering visits to Council Town / County halls to view plans impossible. This is unsatisfactory and appears to be an attempt to bypass democratic activity.

Rep ID: Calne106	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): None
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I think that the plan to build 360 homes is a good basis but to just add houses to the town without thought of how they fit into and link with the community is not enough. If some of the central brownfield sites are used we could find that the number of new sites needed is reduced significantly. This could be good but there are places where additional houses and employment land might add cohesion to the community. In addition the money related to such projects could benefit the community. Around the edges of the town there are quite a few brownfield sites that could accommodate a few houses or employment sites.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

All of these should be included as priorities but the statements are too generic. The regeneration of the town centre is contained in the masterplan and that is important. However, the private ownership of the land makes means to achieve the desired result very difficult. Real thought – through the Neighbourhood Plan review and public consultation- should take place about what kind of regeneration will benefit the community of Calne in a post-Covid world. No mention is made of new technologies that could have an impact on the town and the type of employment land that is offered. Also there is no mention of developing the use of green energy on existing buildings.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

It could be. But maybe we shouldn't be looking to have one big area of new housing but parts of several. This would allow for different designs of housing that would fit into the pre-existing environment – and by this I do not mean the same as what is there but a range of more exciting and interesting designs that a smaller development would be more suitable for. Small, affordable, well planned terrace housing (see Sterling prize of 2019) can provide more energy efficient and community focussed housing than much of the newer housing in Calne. This might also attract small or medium sized building companies using local architects and other local firms. Large housing estates are often characterless.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Poor farmland, brownfield and in places where cohesion of the town would be improved. Land that is nearer to the central part of the town so residents can access the schools and shops by foot or bike.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

In reality the idea of an Eastern by-pass is not going to happen without a massive development in that area and that would not be a positive development for the town – and I am given to understand that it would anyway not have the desired impact on traffic reduction because of the routes being used. Therefore, other strategies are needed to address air quality and traffic congestion. I believe any new building must seek to have an impact on traffic reduction. This means new housing should be within walking distances of schools and we should be looking to develop employment land as a priority to reduce out-commuting. The last year has shown us that access to walking and cycling – or just being - in green spaces has become hugely important for mental and physical well-being. As far as possible this need to be within walking access and not adding car journeys. Growing the town through smaller developments would have less impact on reducing the good access that many people in Calne currently have.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Housing developments through, S106 or CIL money, provide the finance for projects such as new cycleways, improved walkways, open green spaces, playparks etc . How could such projects be financed with only, on average, less than 25 houses per year? We already have a deficit in this where new housing estates have been built without that provision. Little mention is given to this and yet it is an important consideration.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne107

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

I have recently read the local plan power point presentation given in January and it causes concern over the potential volume of development for Calne and the apparent lack of appreciation what impact any of these sites will have on the local infrastructure and amenities.

The sites all appear to be in green belt areas and in particular the options 4, 5, 6 & 7 impact unnecessarily on already compromised areas of the town.

Option 4 is particularly abhorrent due to its size and the nature of green space used by residents to get exercise close to home without having to use their cars to gain access. I object to all of these proposals in the strongest fashion.

Rep ID: Calne108	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/a
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Wiltshire has already delivered 140% of its target and has built 40% more houses than was required of it between 2017/18 and 2019/20. There is a huge list of live and likely planning applications across Wiltshire seeking to make full use of the continuing shortfall in the five-year land supply in Wiltshire.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Broadly agree with these priorities although any new housing must be restricted to brown field sites thus no building on green field sites/meadows.. I am against any proposal for an eastern relief road as this will merely encourage new building on the attractive eastern side of calne.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No - most of these sites are either already rejected through the planning process or are areas of green fields with views across to Cherhill.

Option 4 is too vast and will remove for good the green attraction of Calne. The area is also not linked to the road network and any eastern link road will merely encourage more building. Wiltshire has already delivered 140% of its target and has built 40% more houses than was required of it between 2017/18 and 2019/20.

There is a huge list of live and likely planning applications across Wiltshire seeking to make full use of the continuing shortfall in the five-year land supply in Wiltshire.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Encourage use of brown field sites and areas close to existing employment.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne109	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Householder
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Growth should be in line with demand but proportionate to the available infrastructure, with as much brownfield development as possible.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Agree with the priorities, however it is important that housing does not outstrip local employment opportunities, to avoid creating a town from which everyone commutes, with the negative environmental impact this causes.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Seems reasonable.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Areas 1, 2 or 3 based upon ease of access to the majority of other local centres of employment and commerce, either directly or via the ring road.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Anything that feeds more traffic through the town centre will cause negative environmental and social issues. There are already a number of problems in terms of access via the A4 'corridor' and the A3102 during rush hour periods, including school start/finishing times, which will inevitably be exacerbated if site 7 and potentially site 4 are selected.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

An eastern bypass would undoubtedly assist with traffic and pollution problems and obviously have a direct impact upon the best choice of development sites, with sites with access to the bypass being most favourable.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne110

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Higher target for development to brown field sites.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Lack of infrastructure to south of Calne.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. This is to many as it stands.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Parcel 1,2,3.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

We need to concentrate on joining the town North and south. No infrastructure to the south creating traffic issues along A4. All shops are to the North.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Not enough to the south

Further comments

Calne is a small market town and has NO need to expand,we are building on green field sites and destroying our heritage,wildlife and country side.]
Let them build it all in Chippenham and Melksham as it seems they get all the infrastructure to go with it

Rep ID: Calne111	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth rates of new housing developments in this town should be less than in recent years. The needs for development land could be met as far as possible on brownfield sites in order to help minimise the loss of greenfield land. The Council suggested target of 60 homes I believe should be raised in relation to brownfield sites over the next 10 years. The actual number would require further consideration.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The need to address and achieve carbon reduction in the town is very important going forward and a better flow of traffic to assist this. At present traffic entering the town do so by the A4, A4102, Wood Street, and the Square. At times the air quality in the	

Square is very bad due to the narrow road and traffic at various times each day. Similarly, air quality in New Road that often is extremely busy with slow moving, and stationary traffic. Any additional building on the site 7 off the A4102 will inevitably result in an increase of traffic, and a build-up of vehicle emissions/pollution to the only routes into the town the Marlborough side. This is not good.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The sites at 7 (off the A4102) as I have stated will result in further traffic and emission issues. To access such as the motorway from additional housing in this area will mean entering New Road to Curzon Street. It would be better to consider the sites at 2, 3 and 4 on the Map showing potential development sites for assessment. Building further out and providing a good PARK AND RIDE facility into the town would help the many small businesses within the town to grow and continue. Many are struggling, and it will be a great pity if the town becomes empty of smaller shops and businesses and only charity type shops.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Referring to the Map showing potential development sites for assessment, I believe the areas 2, 3 or 4 offer the best way forward for additional housing. These areas could also offer better routes to and from the motorway. The replacement doctor surgery has been sited to enter onto the A4102, and in my view that is not an easy place to drive to at various times during a normal day. The traffic coming into the town on the A4102 can be quite busy, and the same goes for travelling to this site from Calne via New Road. This is a further consideration for avoiding additional housing leading onto that road.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

There should be a facility for such as the Police to have at least an office that can easily be visited by the public to make reports, or to pass on information. Not all use information technology especially older age groups. A form of recreation/meeting facility

would be useful with adequate parking. All trees that have been removed should be replaced wherever; these have an impact on the environment air quality and wildlife. Additional open areas should be made available to cater for any large-scale increase in the local population.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I do agree that significant development growth should deliver an eastern bypass which has I understand has been a long-standing local aspiration. Rail travel is sadly not available without a journey to Chippenham. I again suggest a park and ride secure facility may prove most useful to increase visitors to the town, and help car and bus onward travel to railways.

Further comments

I hope and trust the council will consider carefully the impact of continued building, and increased occupation of small towns in this county, particularly Calne. Too much development will lead to many lovely places, with history being ruined. It is extremely difficult to go back once that happens. Unfortunately, some landowners only care about the improvement to their finances, and profit. I ask that in the case of Calne the balance is carefully maintained.

I feel this response form should have been held over until at least the end of lockdown, so the opinion of the many older residents could be considered. They presently cannot be visited, and many have limited, or do not use Information Technology. This is discrimination in my view, and sad in this day and age.

Rep ID: Calne112

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Calne Our Place

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Calne has built it's fair share of houses in the past twenty years. The targets listed above should be the maximum considered. Brownfield sites should be used as much as possible to reduce future building on greenfield sites.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

The Calne Town Centre Development must be priority number one. All other developments must support the regeneration of the town centre based upon the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan updated as a result of the Covid 19 impact on the economic, social and environmental strategies for Calne in the future years.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Yes, the process to decide on these potential sites is logical but building on any of these sites must be a last resort to protect Calne's unique natural and historic environment in future years.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield sites first, Priority is to develop the town centre first.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

No.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The local economy is high priority and should be boosted by careful development of tourism projects like the Calne Great West Way and a vibrant town centre development to promote jobs in a social and environmentally friendly way which protects Calne's history and heritage.

Further comments

The town centre development must be a coordinated programme with the involvement of all stakeholders driven by the requirements of the community. A piecemeal approach dominated by developers which has been followed in the past will be a failure. The series of Retirement Home Planning Applications in recent years proves this.

Rep ID: Calne113	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth rates of new housing developments in this town I believe should be less than in recent years. The needs for development land should be met as far as possible on brownfield sites in order to help minimise the loss of greenfield land. The Council suggested target of 60 homes I believe should be raised in relation to brownfield sites over the next 10 years. The actual number would require further consideration.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The need to address and achieve carbon reduction in the town is very important going forward and a better flow of traffic to assist this. At present traffic entering the town do so by the A4, A4102, Wood Street, and the Square. At times the air quality in the	

Square is very bad due to the narrow road and traffic at various times each day. Similarly, New Road often is extremely busy with slow moving, and stationary traffic. By any additional building on the site 7 off the A4102 this will inevitably result in an increase of traffic, and a build-up of vehicle emissions/pollution to the only routes into the town the Marlborough side.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The sites at 7 (off the A4102) as I have stated will result in further traffic and emission issues. To access such as the motorway from additional housing in this area will mean entering New Road to Curzon Street. It would be better to consider the sites at 2, 3 and 4 on the Map showing potential development sites for assessment. Building further out and providing a good PARK AND RIDE facility into the town could help the many small businesses within the town to grow and continue. It will be a great pity if the town becomes just empty of smaller shops and businesses.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Referring to the Map showing potential development sites for assessment, it is my belief the areas 2, 3 or 4 offer the best way forward for additional housing. These areas could also offer better routes to and from the motorway. The replacement doctor surgery has been sited to enter onto the A4102, and in my view that is not an easy place to drive to at various times during a normal day. The traffic coming into the town on the A4102 can be quite busy, and the same goes for travelling to this site from Calne via New Road. Another argument for avoiding additional housing leading onto that road.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

There should be a facility for such as the Police to have at least an office that can easily be visited by the public to make reports, or to pass on information. Not all use information technology especially older age groups. A form of recreation/meeting facility would be useful with adequate parking. All trees that have been removed should be replaced wherever as these have an impact

on the environment air quality and wildlife. Additional open areas should be made available to cater for any large-scale increase in the local population.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I do agree that significant development growth should deliver an eastern bypass which has I understand has been a long-standing local aspiration. Rail travel is sadly not available without a journey to Chippenham. I again suggest a park and ride secure facility may prove most useful to increase visitors to the town, and help part car and bus onward travel to railways.

Further comments

I really hope the council will consider carefully the impact of continued building and increased occupation of small towns in this county. Too much development will lead to many lovely places, with history being ruined. It is extremely difficult to go back once that happens. Unfortunately, some landowners only care about the improvement to their finances, and profit. I ask that in the case of Calne the balance is maintained.

I do feel this response form should have been held over until at least the end of lockdown, so the opinion of many older residents could be considered. They presently cannot be visited, and many do not use Information Technology. This is discrimination in my view, and sad in this day and age.

Rep ID: Calne114

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

There is too much growth.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

The roads are already congested with an increase in air pollution. It is very easy to say there will be improvements in the infrastructure but there is little evidence to ensure it will happen as a priority.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

NO - there should be less.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

There is a shortage of GPs and dentists as it is already impossible to get appointments. How will this social impact be managed overall.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Health is a big factor - too many people in too small a space, polluting the air and littering (thank goodness for Calne clean up crew) the surrounding lanes, either road congestion or people speeding dangerously.

Further comments

Less building and less impact on the environment please.

Rep ID: Calne115

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): local resident

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

1104a & b: I think there is an error in the heritage assessments of these lots. In figure 2 of the site selection report, the scheduled ancient monument lies in 1104b but there is no monument shown in 1104a. However, the assessment of 1104a refers to a monument, whereas in 1104b there is no reference to the monument that is present. Also, in 1104b, there is an old river bed that lies along the northern boundary of the monument - this flows in wet weather, flooding our garden and Fidlers Lane (where we live) on a number of occasions in recent years.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne116

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Too high. The amenities and infrastructure in the town do not match the amount of growth already absorbed by Calne. The town is congested on most days and has already become a soulless estate town with little in the way of facilities.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

The correct answer to improved air quality, congestion and environmental impact is reduced development. It is naive to think these things will improve with increased growth and development. Number of vehicles will increase and the environment damaged by development.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The local community voted previously to protect the Marden Valley and this should be respected. Sites on flood plains should be opposed. Development sites that move residents further from access to greenfield access should be avoided. Calne is a rural market town and that is one of its strengths. Constant and expanding development changes the nature of this and creates ever larger soulless estates with no facilities. None of these sites will improve the character of Calne or life for current residents.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Loaded question. Calne has seen a huge amount of development in recent years and should not accept anymore beyond brownfield site projects. Facilities and amenities do not match these targets and environmental targets, congestion improvements and air quality targets cannot be met by this continuous expansion of a small rural market town.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The essential rural character of Calne has always been missed in the recent development of the town and the expansion of identikit estates that pay little attention to the environment or the needs of local people do nothing but degrade quality of life in Calne and the surrounding villages. Housing for the young of Calne is always ignored in favour of larger homes that favour developers.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Facilities in the town are poor and this encourages travel to Swindon and Chippenham. This travel is poor for the environment, takes place on inadequate infrastructure and does not serve the economy of Calne which increasingly is a dormer estate for these larger towns. Any development will only increase this problem without sufficient attention paid to the lack of entertainment, medical and cultural facilities.

Calne is poorly served by public transport and further development will encourage further car use in an environment that is already threatened by current usage levels.

There has also been inadequate thought given to levels of light pollution in recent planning and development.

Further comments

Little consideration seems to be given to the surrounding villages and communities with regard to these developments and their impacts. Has analysis of the impact of increased traffic, noise and light pollution been carried out with regard to the communities surrounding Calne?

Rep ID: Calne117	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): N/A
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Growth is inevitable but growth appetite needs to be tempered in relation to factors such as current local need (the need for jobs, the need for housing) and the ability for them to envision a safe prosperous future before you even start to look at increasing what is really a population growth exercise in the area. The need for security of the current population (jobs, housing, schools etc) and the proper thought process in management of thousands of new people each with their own with new transport infrastructure, new schools and medical support is not an easy task to get right.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

My biggest concern is the lack of proper planning to transportation needs. Already (excluding COVID-19 lockdown) Calne's routes are choking with vehicles as most people are heading out of town on a working day as no real job exist to support the population of Calne. The A4 is now a blocked route from people heading to Chippenham to the M4 or the train station or to Swindon. Calne seriously needs to consider quality of life of Calne's residents by considering new transport options to these towns or bring in enough business to support the workers, the latter I think is highly unlikely. Why is a MRT or small train system not being considered to Chippenham, Devizes and Swindon?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The facilities have all gone from the South East of Calne and trying to get from Quemerford to Tesco or even Sainsbury is a no go at many peak times through the town. I even go to Devizes as facilities are quicker and less stressful to get to (No petrol stations, no supermarkets etc).

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Anything as long as proper roads and transport is sorted. The correct facilities need to be provided and all have a proper 21st Century environmental approach.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I would suggest the site is not important as many locals near those sites will complain or approve. What is more important is putting in houses and infrastructure that is environmentally future proof and not buildings as we have seen built at Stockley Lane or near Kingdbury Green. They are houses, garages and roads designed in the 1980s and stuck in a horrible default of thoroughly uninspiring housing and local amenities.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Transport, transport, transport! Get this right based on your perceived population growth and everything will fit in to place.

Further comments

Please, look a newer technology for houses, space for people to have quality exercise, facilities to support communities on the South East side.

Rep ID: Calne118	
Consultee code: Parish/Town Council	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Calne Without Parish Council	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne118a/b
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth needs to be matched to deliverable employment opportunities underpinned by an Industrial Strategy to ensure coherence and evidence to support any proposed development. We agree there should be a brownfield target, ideally identified through the neighbourhood plan. Calne Without Parish encircles Calne and is keenly aware that any expansion to the boundaries of Calne will impact the Parish. It is for Calne Town Council to provide detailed responses to the questions asked about the potential development of Calne within the existing boundaries. A key concern of this council is that any growth should be sustainable and have minimal impact on the surrounding rural communities. To that end we would expect any further housing development to be supported by a comparable amount of employment land and opportunities to minimise, and ideally reduce, the significant levels of commuting that result from dormitory developments as is currently the case. Commuting has a major impact on the surrounding environment through ever increasing traffic. A significant omission is any credible modelling of the likely traffic impact of the proposed developments, not only in the immediate vicinity but more broadly.</p>	

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

The priorities should be determined in the neighbourhood plan. All of the items proposed seem relevant and should be included with the addition of technology infrastructure. Calne Town Centre development should be driven by deliverable funded plans.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Not necessarily, the planned update of the local neighbourhood plan should not be tied by these sites. The target of 360 houses, if agreed, should be fed into the neighbourhood plan production process and the sites evaluated as part of this.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

It would seem appropriate to examine the feasibility of joining together the fragmented development that has already occurred expanding in new areas. In the villages very small-scale developments should be considered on the sites where housing used to be. Focus should be made on job creation in Calne and the villages before houses are built. The houses should be of a design that we will be proud of in the future. The houses should be of a size that local young families can afford. The county has aspirations to build and promote tourism based on existing heritage and wonderful countryside, this will not be achieved by having tightly packed villages and towns full of houses with no local character or distinction. Design considerations will be very important.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Yes. Calne and the surrounding villages are largely dormitories. Through the Local Plan we must develop the infrastructure, facilities and environment to encourage people to live, work and play where they live. We need to ensure that the technological infrastructure supports the development of industries that can exploit this and supports effective home working – both home-based businesses and working from home for a larger business; a likely post Covid norm. Environmental factors applied to house building techniques must be a key requirement and incentive, if we are to advance the carbon neutral agenda.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Although the report suggests adequate infrastructure exists or is planned to satisfy any development requirements in terms of education, health and leisure this council has concerns that it will not meet all the needs for the expansions planned. The Council would like to draw your attention to its concerns over the consultation process being carried out during a period of national lockdown. Many members of the public have expressed difficulties in finding the appropriate section of the Council website where they can access the documentation and in taking an active part in the presentations. Those who do not have internet access or limited ability to use it have not been told about the consultation, have not been able to read the draft plan or take part in the presentations. Calne Without Parish encircles Calne and is keenly aware that any expansion to the boundaries of Calne will impact the Parish. It is for Calne Town Council to provide detailed responses to the questions asked about the potential development of Calne within the existing boundaries. A key concern of this council is that any growth should be sustainable and have minimal impact on the surrounding rural communities. To that end we would expect any further housing development to be supported by a comparable amount of employment land and opportunities to minimise, and ideally reduce, the significant levels of commuting that result from dormitory developments as is currently the case. Commuting has a major impact on the surrounding environment through ever increasing traffic. A significant omission is any credible modelling of the likely traffic impact of the proposed developments, not only in the immediate vicinity but more broadly.

There may be scope for some well-designed, very small-scale developments in the smaller villages. Many small villages lost housing stock in the last century, and there are potential brownfield sites where houses used to be located which could be considered for development again. Any infill development in the small villages should be well designed and also of a size to meet local needs, smaller houses to tempt the children of villagers to stay within the community, ideally within easy reach of employment.

The site selection shows little consideration of how the proposed extra houses will fit into the whole. Some of the sites mentioned in Calne may have some merit as they pull together existing randomly positioned housing developments into something that

looks more cohesive. But the work needs to be done through the Calne/Calne Without neighbourhood plan refresh before any firm proposals are made.

As mentioned in our views on the spatial strategy houses on their own are detrimental to a local area without associated employment opportunities and infrastructure, not limited to roads. There must be a clear deliverable plan to provide key components on community development with facilities and spaces to provide social development and interaction for both children and adults. As well as the key components for communication and the ability to support work from home e.g. 5G mobile services and very fast broadband services.

Air quality linked to traffic congestion, is an issue in Calne, which is somewhat counter-intuitive given its rural surroundings.

Traffic volumes in the rural communities that are used more and more as 'rat-runs' is also an issue. Building more houses in and around Calne, including thousands in nearby Chippenham and Melksham will only add to the problem. If more road infrastructure is considered an answer to the problem, which it is difficult to accept given the associated environmental issues, and no evidence that more roads reduce congestion it should not come at the expense of more houses to pay for it.

The consultation document suggests (point 17) – “In Calne, the Town and Parish Councils may also be able to progress higher growth options through the neighbourhood plan that have local community support, for example, to deliver specific types of infrastructure”. We consider that no decision on this should be made until the new version of the neighbourhood plan has been completed.

Further comments

Calne Without Parish Council is grateful for the opportunity to respond to the consultation initiated by Wiltshire Council initiated on 13th January 2021 about the Wiltshire Local Plan. These comments represent the views of the current Parish Council and could be subject to change following the election of a new Council in May 2021 and the emergence of further details as outlined in the next steps section of the consultation documents.

The requirement to provide comments by 9th March 2021, is a relatively short period of consultation for such significant and wide-ranging proposals with major implications for our area and residents. The very limited time and Covid restrictions has constrained our ability to consult widely within the Calne Without Parish community. This must therefore detract from the whole process and call into question the efficacy of the consultation process and the associated timetable. We are concerned that it does not meet the statutory requirements for consultation on a Local Plan, particularly in respect of publicity, notification and access for those with limited or no capability to participate through online media.

Notwithstanding our concerns about the process, which we are aware has been formally questioned, we acknowledge that this is a first stage in the process and that Wiltshire Council will review the emerging strategy in the light of all the comments that it receives to the consultation and that proposals could therefore change.

The commitment to draft and finalise place shaping priorities for each main settlement in consultation with the relevant Town and Parish Councils and that these will help to shape the form and location of development proposals in the draft plan is welcomed.

The further consultation at the end of 2022 will allow this Council to engage further with its' community on the emerging proposals and modify, if appropriate, its response. Adequate time should be allowed for appropriate community consultation.

We consider the pledge to undertake further sustainability appraisals to develop effective mitigation measures to ensure the most benefits possible from the development of each site to be a key component of further work. As is the commitment to ensure they are delivered properly coordinated with the infrastructure necessary to support them. Assuming that infrastructure is considered in the broadest sense.

We recognise that this consultation (January 2021) requires responses to some specific questions, and these are addressed below. However, we would wish to offer some general comments as an introduction to each component. As mentioned in our views on the spatial strategy houses on their own are detrimental to a local area without associated employment opportunities and infrastructure, not limited to roads. There must be a clear deliverable plan to provide key components on community development with facilities and spaces to provide social development and interaction for both children and adults. As well as the key components for communication and the ability to support work from home e.g. 5G mobile services and very fast broadband services.

Air quality linked to traffic congestion, is an issue in Calne, which is somewhat counter-intuitive given its rural surroundings.

Traffic volumes in the rural communities that are used more and more as 'rat-runs' is also an issue. Building more houses in and around Calne, including thousands in nearby Chippenham and Melksham will only add to the problem. If more road infrastructure is considered an answer to the problem, which it is difficult to accept given the associated environmental issues, and no evidence that more roads reduce congestion it should not come at the expense of more houses to pay for it.

The consultation document suggests (point 17) – "In Calne, the Town and Parish Councils may also be able to progress higher growth options through the neighbourhood plan that have local community support, for example, to deliver specific types of infrastructure". We consider that no decision on this should be made until the new version of the neighbourhood plan has been completed.

Rep ID: Calne119	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne119a/b/c
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Given the general absence of land use constraints across much of Wiltshire when compared with adjoining Authorities, the housing targets are only ever likely to increase and therefore a greater focus will need to be placed on continually identifying additional 'windfall' sites which are suitable and achievable.</p> <p>It is important that recognition is given to the role that existing brownfield sites or previously developed land that lie on the edge of existing settlements may play in assisting in the spatial strategy in delivering on the housing targets set out. 'Windfall' sites represent a significant opportunity across Wiltshire and whilst they are not specifically allocated in the Local Plan, it is right that such allocations are made and ultimately supported by the Council.</p> <p>The current target of 60 homes over the 10 year period would appear to be quite low given the emphasis that is placed on Brownfield sites over the loss of greenfield land. The target needs to be realistically achievable, but a higher level should be set at this stage in the review process and they should not be restricted to sites located within settlement boundaries as there are</p>	

sites that are suitable and available that may lie outside of these boundaries that could still play a role in delivering on the targets set by the Council.

We are the owners of a site just to the north of Calne on the Oxford Road which is a Brownfield site and has yet to be recorded on your register. This has the capacity for at least 5 new homes which would meet 8% of the 10 year target immediately.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Housing and employment opportunities should remain the key priorities albeit creating sustainable communities must underpin these.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

As noted, we are the owners of a brownfield site on land at Woodbine Cottages that is located just to the north of Calne on the Oxford Road. This has yet to be considered as part of the Council's Review or the SHELAA. This can deliver at least 5 new homes and given the approved and planned growth and expansion of the north side of Calne along the Oxford Road, the redevelopment of our site for residential use would be appropriate and would clearly assist in meeting the 'Brownfield' or Windfall targets set out in the emerging strategy.

The Site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable within the next Plan period if not sooner and a concurrent submission under the 'Call for Site' has been prepared to support this.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The site at Woodbine Cottages measures approximately 0.5ha and benefits from two established means of access onto the A3102 Oxford Road. The site comprises several small commercial units with a larger open yard and has been used for a variety of uses for the past 20 years. The site was originally purchased in the late 1970's when it comprised a number of residential

cottages and as such there is a historic precedent for residential use on what is to be considered previously developed land or a brownfield site. Whilst the site is located just to the north of the Calne Settlement Boundary, this does not preclude the development opportunity that the site presents. This is reinforced by the planning permissions granted by the Council over the last few years on land to the east and south of the site which have effectively extended Calne to the north and alongside our site on the Oxford Road. We have also noted the very recent planning application on behalf of Lidl (Ref: 21/00081/FUL) which is bringing forward significant development adjacent to our site on the eastern side of the Oxford Road.

Whilst these sites were identified in earlier and 'saved' versions of the District Local Plans, the continued expansion of Calne is supported in the 'Planning for Calne' and the 'Site Selection Report for Calne' documents that form part of this current consultation. Indeed, these documents identify a number of other sites that are comparable to our site and in some cases are demonstrably not as well located, as accessible, as sustainable or as suitable for residential development. Our site is also not located in any of the areas or categories identified as 'Exclusionary Constraints' applied by the Council in the 2017 SHELAA. The 2017 SHELAA notes that sites that are included within the assessment should be drawn from the call for sites as well as a number of sources which include, vacant and derelict land and buildings, additional opportunities in established, sites in rural locations and sites in and adjoining villages or rural settlements. Our site would readily fall into one or more of these categories and should therefore be considered suitable.

In addition, the SHELAA sets out that there are three components to the assessment of sites and broad locations, and these are assessed as follows –

- a. Suitability - The site is suitable for residential development given its historic residential use and the location and proximity to Calne such that facilities and services are provided nearby without the need for extensive travel.
- b. Availability - The site is within our sole ownership and is therefore available for redevelopment subject to securing the appropriate planning permission.
- c. Achievability – There are no impediments to delivering and achieving residential use on the site given its location, existing access, historic use and absence of any explicit planning constraints on land use or redevelopment.

It is noted that the southern boundary of the site adjoins the site identified as a Scheduled Ancient Monument but the sensitive and appropriate redevelopment of the site would have aAs noted, we recognise the pressure to deliver on housing and employment targets whilst protecting greenfield land. Brownfield or previously developed land, even if this is located outside of defined settlement boundaries, should be identified and supported for development. negligible impact on the setting of the SAM given the necessary assessments and studies that would accompany any future planning application.

As noted, we have submitted our site as part of the 'call for sites' for the next iteration of the SHELAA, but for the sake of completeness and to assist the Council is considering our site for residential use, we have summarised the site below against the key criteria applied by the Council -

Accessibility - The site benefits from two existing access points providing direct access onto the A3012 Oxford Road. The site is approximately 100m from the 'Town Centre' providing immediate access to facilities including the Tesco foodstore and the large retail and business park. This will be further enhanced if the proposed Lidl store opposite our site is approved and built out.

Flood Risk - The site is not located within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and is therefore considered to be appropriate for residential development

Heritage - The site is not constrained by Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings. As noted, there is a SAM on the site adjacent but given the scale of the SAM, it is not considered that residential use of the site would compromise or threaten its setting or character.

Landscape – The site is already in use as a brownfield site and its redevelopment for residential use should be seen as an opportunity to enhance its setting and character. Given the extensive planting, tree cover and topography of the land, the site is not visible in longer views.

Traffic – The redevelopment of the site for residential use is unlikely to generate any more traffic movements on the local highway network than the current use.

In summary, the site meets the five assessment 'tests' and should therefore be considered suitable for, and promoted as, residential development as part of the evolution of the Local Plan alongside review of the SHELAA. The development of the site could deliver at least 8% of the identified brownfield housing targets set out in the 'Planning for Calne' report.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

N/a

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

A major omission is consideration of the impact on roads and the highway network, not just adjacent to the proposed developments but more broadly. This must be modelled so that key risks and issues can be identified, and mitigations planned and budgeted for so that delivery is coherent and sustainable.

Further comments

We write in respect to the current consultation as part of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review and as owners of the land at Woodbine Cottages located on the west side of the Oxford Road on the northern outskirts of Calne (refer to enclosed plan). This submission comprises our comments on the emerging documents and reflects our intention to secure support for the redevelopment of our site in line with the emerging Local Plan strategy and the demand for additional housing sites across the Plan area.

We have enclosed the requisite submission forms in respect to the 'Emerging Spatial Strategy' and 'Market Town - Calne' which provide a series of comments on the emerging plan and the more site-specific reference to our site in Calne. In order to further support our submission, we have provided a more detailed assessment below.

Local Plan Approach

The emerging Local Plan and the spatial strategy identifies that there is a requirement to deliver more housing than previously planned in order to meet the growing demand and support Central Government's aspirations which have been further reinforced in the recent Planning White Paper. This is reflected in the forecast provided in the consultation reports which state that between 40,840 and 45,630 new homes will be required through to 2036 within Wiltshire. On a more local scale, the Plan identifies a requirement for 1,610 new homes in Calne albeit some of these have already been 'reserved'. Given the general absence of land use constraints across much of Wiltshire when compared with adjoining Authorities, the housing targets are only ever likely to increase and therefore a greater focus will need to be placed on continually identifying additional 'windfall' sites which are suitable and achievable.

The most recent SHELAA for Wiltshire was published in July 2017 and at that time we did not seek to promote our site in Calne for residential development. However, given the growing pressures identified above and the location and characteristics of the site which would readily lend itself for residential use, we are now proposing the site be considered for residential development concurrently through this Local Plan review and also the ongoing 'call for sites' process that informs the annual review of the SHELAA.

Rep ID: Calne120	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Scale of growth too great. Brownfield sites, if available and if necessary, should be utilized. Too much countryside and green areas are being utilized for buildings.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
These are not the right priorities. The town center is small and quant and should not be changed to accommodate unnecessary development / growth. There are not enough relevant shops, cinema and other facilities for everybody to use. Continued development is ruining the town.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The sites indicated on Figure 1 map are proposing too much development on green fields / countryside, especially in locations?, 6, 5,8 & 4. If development locations are needed for the remaining 360 houses, as stated in the Site Selection Report, then development should be continued in the areas that are adjacent to areas ready being developed i.e. Locations 1, 2 & 3.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Not on countryside or green fields. Increasing housing will lead to increased crime as there is nothing for younger people to do which will cause further issues with anti-social behavior. If a location is required to build the 360 remaining houses then the east side of Location 4 adjacent to Lower Compton should be seriously considered. This has good access to the A4 and would not cause congestion to the south of Caine along the A3102. Otherwise as previously mention in Locations 1, 2 &3.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

With ref to Location 7. This is a green field location on a hill. There is an abundance of wildlife including, deer, pheasants, hedgehogs, numerous birds incl. Nuthatch, Lesser Spotted Woodpeckers, Gold Finches, Green Finches, Wrens, Chaffinches, Black Caps, Robins and many more. There are also bats that are seen nightly. Access and egress onto the A3102 would cause considerable additional congestion and impact the school. The combination of additional traffic entering the roundabout at London Rd would cause an increased log jam.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

In location 7, building additional houses, would cause considerable additional drainage issues. As stated in 5. there are considerable issues with access and egress onto the A3102. Increased queues. This causes increased danger to the school children crossing this road. There is also an issue with the line of sight to the south. Additional traffic will cause additional congestion at London Rd Roundabout/ London Rd

Further comments

Further to the new medical center being granted planning permission, against strong objections that were ignored, it is common knowledge the land was sold at an enhanced lower rate. This was possibly done to benefit the land owner, being granted permission for housing development in location 7, once the town boundary can be changed in 2026. The area has been turned down previously by the council and should not be considered again. I hope the council will stand firm this time and will reject this proposal for development in location 7 and not be allowed to be manipulated by wealthy land owners who hold a lot of sway in the town to benefit and to line their pockets further, at the detriment to the countryside and wildlife. Vern Leaze is a Grade II listed property with lovely trees and gardens. Building in location 7 will surround the property like the Alamo. As stated previously there are far better suited locations than this area.

Rep ID: Calne121	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Lower.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
We need more facilities, Doctors, Schools, Shops etc - not more houses.	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

The area around the outskirts to Chippenham IE Tesco. Area for schools to be built and homes without the traffic through Calne town.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

We feel plots 1,2 and 3 would be better as they are near the main roads to Wootton Bassett and Swindon, This would be better for Calne town centre which already is at standstill at certain times of the day.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Plot 7 is in an area where there is already a school, leisure centre, new housing and a large medical centre being built. This would have an effect on air quality and congestion getting to Melksham.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

As already mentioned in Q5 Silver Street is already very slow moving. Once the medical centre is built this will be the only road to reach it as well as the other facilities mentioned above.

Further comments

What compensation will be given to homes that will be devalued due to additional homes. IE loss of views / privacy.

Rep ID: Calne122	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth for the town is too high and will adversely affect the character of the town. The brownfield target should be higher. There is already land put aside for growth – is this not sufficient for the growth of calne?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Preserving the character of Calne should be a priority. There should be more action on regenerating the town centre and the road network around the town to reduce the current traffic congestion in the town centre. Development should be avoided on the south side of calne as the road network does not support the current road traffic.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. Development should be on the bypass road on the Chippenham side of Calne where the road network supports traffic to Chippenham and Swindon.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The town centre can not support additional traffic that increased housing will bring. Most new residents are commuters as there is no increase in business/job opportunities in the local area. Bus services will be adversely affected and the current bus stop in the town often causes hold ups with 2 buses stopping at the same time. Increased housing will result in increased pressure on local shops. Prior to lockdown the town centre car park was often full. Parking restrictions and availability have been reduced. Therefore local shops will be marginalised in favour of new superstores on the edge of Calne.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

There is a proposal for a new surgery on silver street. This is a dangerous place for pedestrians to cross the road towards the school as it is on a bend where you cannot see clearly up the road and cars travel too quickly in both directions and you cannot see past the roundabout. This road is busy enough and does not have capacity for more vehicles. There will be a safety issue if more housing is allowed along silver street towards mile elm.

Further comments

What was the reason behind the neighbourhood plan which was taken through a consultation period: Where are the outcomes? Did the recent consultation review suggested that this plot wouldn't be reviewed for approx. 10 years – taking us up to 2027/8

Rep ID: Calne123	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The scale of growth for the town is too high and will adversely affect the character of the town. The brownfield target should be higher. There is already land put aside for growth – is this not sufficient for the growth of calne?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Preserving the character of Calne should be a priority. There should be more action on regenerating the town centre and the road network around the town to reduce the current traffic congestion in the town centre. Development should be avoided on the south side of calne as the road network does not support the current road traffic.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No. Development should be on the bypass road on the Chippenham side of Calne where the road network supports traffic to Chippenham and Swindon.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

The town centre can not support additional traffic that increased housing will bring. Most new residents are commuters as there is no increase in business/job opportunities in the local area. Bus services will be adversely affected and the current bus stop in the town often causes hold ups with 2 buses stopping at the same time. Increased housing will result in increased pressure on local shops. Prior to lockdown the town centre car park was often full. Parking restrictions and availability have been reduced. Therefore local shops will be marginalised in favour of new superstores on the edge of Calne.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

There is a proposal for a new surgery on silver street. This is a dangerous place for pedestrians to cross the road towards the school as it is on a bend where you cannot see clearly up the road and cars travel too quickly in both directions and you cannot see past the roundabout. This road is busy enough and does not have capacity for more vehicles. There will be a safety issue if more housing is allowed along silver street towards mile elm.

Further comments

What was the reason behind the neighbourhood plan which was taken through a consultation period: Where are the outcomes? Did the recent consultation review suggested that this plot wouldn't be reviewed for approx. 10 years – taking us up to 2027/8

Rep ID: Calne124	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Pro Vision Planning
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne124a/b
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
<p>3.1 We have shown above that at a strategic level Calne clearly has capacity for further growth without breaching high level environmental thresholds. Nevertheless, large-scale growth in certain directions is constrained.</p> <p>3.2 The Town generally is contained below the 95 m contour to the west and east. To maintain the character of the town and to avoid visual intrusion on its landscape setting, further development should not take place above that contour.</p>	

3.3 To the west, the scale of growth is constrained by Bowood House and Park; the steep slopes rising above the existing edge of the built-up area; and the disused canal which forms a green lung leading into the centre of the Town and which forms an important part of the designated Conservation Area (and its setting).

3.4 Growth in a northerly direction would extend development into open countryside breaching a clearly established defensible boundary (the A3102); involve the loss of Grade 2 Agricultural Land; impact on a scheduled ancient monument; potentially impact on an area regarded as being a “Strategic Nature Area” (Wiltshire Local Plan Planning for Calne); and be relatively distant from the Town Centre.

3.5 To the south, development is constrained by the site of the medieval rural settlement at Quemerford (a scheduled ancient monument); the setting of the AONB; Grade 2 agricultural land; Flood Zones 2 and 3 and distance from and connectivity to the Town Centre.

3.6 It is therefore the Town’s eastern flank, the established direction of growth in recent years (including a Neighbourhood Plan allocation), which has the greatest environmentally unconstrained capacity, and which is well connected and accessible. Whilst, the pattern of further development would be shaped by the higher ground, this clearly remains the logical direction for further strategic growth.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The location and extent of the Site is shown shaded yellow on the Plan below (see attachment Calne124c). It has an area of approximately 5 hectares. The Site was first promoted for development in conjunction with adjoining land to the north, when duly made representations were submitted on the pre-submission draft of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan in July 2017 (see Appendix A). In the event, that Plan deferred to the Neighbourhood Plan to make housing allocations at Calne and did not adopt the principle of making a contingency allocation as we had proposed. The extent of the proposed allocation put forward at that time is illustrated below.

1.4 In the context of the SHELAA and generally to contribute to the evidence base of the Local Plan Review, a more detailed representation was submitted in respect of the Site alone on the 16th of April 2020. This included a series of Urban Design Studies demonstrating its suitability for development in the manner proposed.

1.5 Nevertheless, the Site was not included in the Council’s SHELAA (2017) nor, apparently has it been considered in the emerging LPR. It is not therefore included in the “Pool” of potential sites identified in the LPR, notwithstanding it is sandwiched between land that has been included in the Pool to the north and south (Sites 3 and 4) and adjoins the Town’s recently extended built up area to the west. The exclusion of the Site from site selection exercise is irrational and its omission from the Planning for

Calne Pool of sites a serious oversight in the plan making process. 4.2 We have critically reviewed the assessment of each site and added our comments on the Council's assessment in red below:

Site 1: Land south of High Penn Track, Calne (SHELAA site 3616)

- Potential for heritage impacts as the site is close to the scheduled medieval settlement site at Beversbrook. Agreed
- New housing development is being built-out adjacent to the western boundary of the site.
- The site could form a suitable urban / rural edge if the north of the site is set out as planted green infrastructure linking in with the local nature reserve to the east. But the consented site to the south (now being built out) already provides an extensive area of open space along its eastern and northern boundaries which provides an attractive and functional edge to the built-up area.

Site 1 would represent development beyond this planned urban edge.

- The Impact on Penn Wood Local Wildlife Site does not appear to have been assessed.

Site 2: Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 495, 3610)

- Potential for access onto Spitfire Road or Sand Pit Road. Agreed
- Likely low flood risk and heritage impacts. Agreed
- In landscape terms, site will need further assessment of impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the east. Development on the prominent "finger" of high ground above the 95m contour would have an unacceptable landscape and visual impact. The north part of the site (approximately 50% of the total site area) is therefore unsuitable for development)

Site 3: Land to the east of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 488, 489, 451, 3168)

- Areas of flood risk associated with Abberd Brook along southern boundary.
- The site is closer to the AONB than some other sites and therefore may be more sensitive to development. There is no evidence that this site forms part of setting of the AONB.
- The site is in close proximity to Hills Quarry Products operations, therefore there will be potential noise and dust issues which will require further assessment. The existing Hills Quarry Products operations on the adjoining site do not give rise to noise or dust issues that cannot be adequately mitigated by providing for an intervening landscaped buffer area (see below).

Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c)

- A large split site which has the potential for landscape impacts, particularly towards the eastern part of the site. Agreed. Development will have an impact on the AONB.
- Potential for impacts on the existing mitigation and enhancement of the former extraction and landfill at Sands Farm and on Sands Farm. Agreed
- Quarry County Wildlife Site. Impact can be mitigated and there is scope for enhancement.
- Some areas of flood risk through the southern part of the site. Agreed
- Potential impacts on the scheduled monument (medieval rural settlement at Quemerford) and on the setting of Grade I listed Hayle Farm on the eastern edge. These are very substantial constraints.

- Site may need to provide an access onto the A4 to the south. Development on this scale would require access to the north and south (effectively providing an eastern by-pass for the Town)

- Potential loss of Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land

Site 5: Land at Stockley Lane (SHELAA site 700)

- Access onto Stockley Lane.

- The site is open to views out to the countryside to the west but relatively well screened to the east.

- Development of the site could be seen as encroachment into the countryside. The AONB is approximately 330m to the south and an assessment of impacts on the AONB will be needed.

- The site is poorly related to the existing pattern of development.

- The site is too small to make a meaningful contribution to meeting local housing need.

Site 6: Rookery Farm (SHELAA site 3254)

- Access could be achieved onto Cherhill Way.

- Site is adjacent to new housing at Marden Farm.

- Site is well screened by existing trees and hedgerows – these features would need to be retained on-site where possible.

- The site is too small to make a meaningful contribution to meeting local housing need but could be allocated to help meet requirement for small sites.

Site 7: Land off Wenhill Lane (SHELAA sites 709, 3211, 3251, 3312)

- Access would need to be provided onto the A3102. Would require a secondary (emergency access)

- Potential for impacts on the Bowood House and Gardens to the west and on the setting of Grade II* listed Vernleaze. Avoiding harm to the setting of the listed building is a significant constraint.

- Existing landscaping would need protection and enhancement to provide suitable screening on this urban / rural edge out to the west.

- Development above the 95m contour would result in unacceptable visual and landscape impact. Development on the lower west facing slopes would be poorly related to the existing built-up area.

Site 8: Land South of Chilvester Hill (SHELAA site 3172)

- Potential to access A4/A3102 via existing roundabout. Site relatively well screened to the south and west although there are long distance broken views to the east of Cherhill escarpment.

- Potential heritage impacts on Grade II listed Berhills Farm.

4.3 In conclusion, the Calne Site selection Pool should be limited to:

- Site 2 (part)

- Site 3

- Site 4 (part)

- Site 6
- Site 8 and
- Land at Low Lane (Site 9), for the reasons set out below.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Ommission Site 'North of Low Lane'. 5.1 The Site is a very roughly rectangular shaped parcel of land lying immediately adjacent to the most recent parcel of new housing on the eastern edge of Calne (known as Phase 3 Land north of Low Lane). Its location and extent are shown edged red below.

5.2 It forms part of a mosaic of small pastures that are laid out on the low valley of the Abberd Brook, with land rising to above 95m OD to the north (at Penn Hill Farm) and to the south (at Sands Farm). Abberd Brook itself runs along the Site's northern boundary. The Site rises to the south east, gently at first and then more steeply to Low Lane which follows the 95m contour.

5.3 To the north east the Site adjoins the former Concrete Products site which is accessed via Spitfire Road. This site is in the process of being re-purposed to accommodate a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) (formerly located at Lower Compton), in accordance with the planning permission granted in August 2018 (17/10554/WCM). A condition of that planning permission was the construction of an HGV relief road (Linking Sandpit Road to Lower Compton) which substantially reduces HGV movements through the town Centre AQMA.

5.4 The Site Selection Report for Calne includes land to the north (Sites 2 and 3) and to the south (part of Site 4) within the "Pool" of potential development sites. The Site is therefore entirely enclosed by existing development to the north and south and by planned development to the east and west. It would be entirely irrational to exclude this land from any comprehensive plan for further growth in this direction.

5.5 The Site has very few known constraints. It partly falls with the Calstone and Cherill Downs SSSI outer impact zone and the Calne Low Local Nature Reserve lies to the east. Development on the more steeply sloping parts of the site will need to be carefully planned to avoid ridge lines breaking the skyline. The narrow flood zone 2 and 3 along the Abberd Brook affects the north western edge of the Site.

5.6 The proximity of the Hill Quarry Products site is however a potential constraint that will require careful assessment and consideration as part of the master planning of the Site. In addition to the new MRF, there is one small active sand quarrying operation approximately 100m of the Site's north eastern corner.

5.7 The planning permission for the MRF identifies a range of associated uses including aggregate bagging plant, material test laboratory, vehicle depot and workshop, Lintel manufacturing and offices. The MRF and all these associated uses are carried out

within the existing building. The only external uses are therefore vehicle wash down, parking, and limited external storage – as illustrated on the approved site layout drawing below. The approved scheme includes landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement, noise and dust control and management (including new landscaped bunds), hours of operating restrictions and an Access Road Maintenance Plan.

5.8 As part of the submitted Environmental Statement in support of the MRF /HGV Relief Road proposals, noise and air quality impacts were assessed.

5.9 Operational sound levels to sensitive receptors were calculated for the operation of the site and internal link road. Under normal operation of the site, the impacts at sensitive receptors were assessed to be of very low adverse impact resulting in a negligible significance of effect at the majority of receptors. For the remaining receptors the impacts were of low adverse impact resulting in minor significance of effect. Of course, the promotion site (and the adjoining SHELAA sites 488, 489, 451, 3168) were not identified as being sensitive receptors, but the noise contour modelling (see for example below) demonstrates that predicted noise levels in the range of 40-50 dB (LAeq 1hour). Whilst further detailed assessment would be required at the master planning stage, there is no reason to believe that the Site cannot be developed to achieve a satisfactory noise environment (internally and externally).5.10 Overall, the operational air quality effects of the proposed development, with the approved mitigation measures in place, were judged to be 'not significant'. 5.11 The site is capable of being well connected to the surrounding existing and planned residential neighbourhoods and to the town centre. The Abberd Brook has been identified as forming an important link in the "Green and Blue Infrastructure Corridors" that radiate from the Town. The development of the Site would provide the opportunity to enhance this infrastructure. Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access can be provided to the west via the existing development area (the site layout allows for such a connection – see below). 5.12 Landscape Consultants WHL prepared a "Preliminary Landscape and Visual Assessment of the Site in January 2019. This is reproduced at Appendix A. The development constraints diagram from that Report is reproduced below. 5.13 The Proposed Development Principles and Parameters for the Site can be summarised as follows (and are illustrated below):

- Principal access to the west via the recent housing development.
- Pedestrian cycle access to Low Lane.
- Green corridor along the northern boundary adjoining Abberd Brook forming part of the "Green and Blue Corridor Strategy".
- Green buffer between new residential development and the industrial activities to the north (with appropriate noise mitigation strategy).
- Lower density development on the more steeply rising land to the south east.
- The developable area is likely to be limited to about 4ha with a capacity to accommodate up to about 120 dwellings.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered

generally or in respect of individual sites?

In response to the Council's consultation on the Local Plan Review this representation:

- examines whether the emerging preferred spatial strategy for the Chippenham MHA will be effective.
- In the context of "Planning for Calne" considers the potential directions for growth
- Reviews the Council's Site Selection Report for Calne.
 - Explains why land north of Low Lane should be included in the Pool of sites. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken by WHL is submitted to support this representation.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

This representation is made on behalf of Hills UK Limited in relation to land in their sole ownership north of Low Lane, Calne (The Site). It is in response to Wiltshire Council's Regulation 18 Consultation on the emerging draft of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR) to 2036.

Further comments

6.1 The LPR's proposed strategy of delivering a step change in the rate of growth at Chippenham will not be effective and has not been justified.

6.2 The LPR's proposed strategy of suppressing the level of growth at Calne is not justified. The Town is neither so environmentally constrained nor so sensitive that it cannot accommodate further strategic growth - particularly to the east.

6.3 The exclusion of the Site from the "Pool" of potential sites at Calne in the Site Selection Report for Calne is irrational and unjustified. The Site is clearly suitable for development in the manner proposed, either on its own or in conjunction with the adjoining sites that were included in the Pool. It would be entirely irrational to exclude this land from any comprehensive plan for further growth in this direction.

Rep ID: Calne125	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
The sites taken forward, if they were all developed, would effectively double the size of the town. This would put tremendous strain on the existing infrastructure and particularly the A4 and A3102, which run through the centre of Calne. Developments to the east of Calne would encroach on Lower Compton and Cherhill, reducing the existing green gap.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
Development to the west and southwest of the town would give the town itself a better balance. Development of local facilities such as schools, shops and employment would need to match.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The MOD appear to have downgraded their facilities and operational requirements at Lyneham. With its existing infrastructure and housing estates, surely this is an opportunity to utilise a huge existing brownfield site?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Existing under-utilised brownfield sites (a lot of MOD land); land left derelict by now closed or relocated industry; farmers unproductive fields; absentee landlords/builders sitting on undeveloped land.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Calne, like many towns, is crying out for truly affordable housing, both private and social. Young people born and brought up in Calne are continually priced out of the market and many have no hope of ever owning their own property. The town needs 1 and 2 bedroom houses and apartments for young first time buyers together with truly affordable rented accommodation. These homes need to be very close to the town centre and/or bus routes, as many young people either cannot afford to drive or are choosing not to.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Some serious thought needs to be given to improving the access to the A4, both eastwards and westwards and the A3102, northwards and southward, to take the pressure off Calne centre.

Further comments

The Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan in 2017 has already refused development of the sites 709, 3311, 3312 and 3251 and a large percentage of the community were opposed to the development.

Rep ID: Calne126	
Consultee code: Other Advisory Bodies	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): The Campaign to Protect Rural Wiltshire (CPRE)
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne126
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The scale of growth overall in the county is questioned.</p> <p>The scale of growth at Calne should be constrained completely until the Neighbourhood Plan has completed an assessment of the town centre brownfield sites in the light of the new economic conditions as a result of Covid. Until the potential is understood, and the options with estimate levels made public, a target is unrealistic. Residential permissions on allocated employment have been very damaging. The imbalance of jobs to houses in now acute. No new employment allocations should be made, certainly not as much as 4ha, until the issue of the town centre potential is understood. At present there are 56,000 sq ft of employment space advertised in the town, and a further 1.67 ha of employment land advertised at the High Penn site. In additions the application for units at the Lidl site total 52,000 sq ft.</p>	

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

The priorities are in the wrong order. Should start as below. Many of the other points are meaningless. Develop a plan for the town centre and a proper vision for its role in the future. Deliver infrastructure suited to the Climate Change Emergency. Wider spread, better quality cycle and pedestrian paths and routes, more and more regular local bus services, improved central market to sell local goods, create a forward looking environmentally conscious town which creates liveability and character.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

These sites should not be considered until after the Neighbourhood Plan has carried out a comprehensive appraisal of brownfield land in the urban area. No more greenfield land should be allocated until a 5-year review. This constraint is essential to achieve some kind of balance between employment and housing, sustainability and commuting. Brownfield sites, large and small, must be considered. Redevelopment and density will be key. Car parking areas should be considered and evaluated. The type and form should be 1, 2 or 3 bedroom units which are for discounted market sales with some social housing. The future economic conditions are wholly unpredictable, but the demographic need will be for those retiring from work and those looking for first time occupancy. Small town centre units close to services.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

No greenfield land should be developed, and no development considered until an up-to-date review of the economic and employment case is delivered which can give categoric evidence that new housing in Calne is required.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

That Calne has become a commuter town and with this comes a lack of social cohesion and integration. Developing and encouraging small business, start-ups and the town centre will contribute positively towards social, environmental and economic factors in the long term. Proposed sites do none of these.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Improved town connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians. Major roads A4, A3102 (N&S), and Bypass to carry safe cycling, built or marked on road. Urban routes to be hugely improved so schools, surgery, town centre and housing are inter accessible and attractive to use. Re-skilling, and skilling, of local workforce to trades with local jobs (light industry, communications technology, environmental /green technology) in order to avoid distance commuting. Facilitate start-up businesses in affordable units and use town centre space as public face. Employment and economic growth We believe it is impossible to say what shape work will take in the future, but other surveys suggest that with regard to offices flexible working is here to stay with employees spending part of the week in the office, part at home.

The Employment Land Review by Hardisty Jones 2018 which accompanies the current review makes the following points:

- a. Employment in Calne has stagnated since 2009
- b. Mixed use developments have not been a success (Landowners and developers being unwilling to promote land for employment use due to expectation of higher land value returns with housing permissions)
- c. Calne. In the present plan 6 ha of employment space were offered, 3.2ha from 2011 brought forward, 3ha added. Other than development of Tesco and its related car park, and the possibility of a further supermarket on Oxford Road, the employment allocation has gone to housing.
- d. Over past years there has been an established excess of supply over demand of employment land up until 2021
- e. The new demand, 2021 forwards, is for logistics and warehousing. These are land hungry but with low employment levels. Suitable for sites such as Jt17 M4 or on the A350 corridor.
- f. There is an anticipated skills shortage in not only technical fields but qualified trades (plumbers, electricians, glaziers, bricklayers) this must be addressed.

The Swindon and Wiltshire Local Housing Needs Assessment report 2019, shows high out commuting levels all over Wiltshire with Calne being the highest level of all.

Nearly 5,000 out commuting from a population of just under 9,000. This imbalance of local jobs to housing growth is stark and undeniable. The reliance on car use is shocking and in the light of climate change issues, growth of retail shopping and home working, it is an unsustainable growth pattern. Calne housing growth has to be adjusted down until realistic predictions on employment growth and type are presented with up-to-date evidence. Employment growth allocations and predictions should be subject to an up-to-date assessment by the Neighbourhood Plan for the area, most importantly a realistic analysis of the central urban area for multiple use work units and residential. It will take into account potential conversions under PDRs within the town centre.

This will be crucial to a re-evaluation of the central space when considering a multiple use approach to new models such as e offices, residential accommodation through PDR, a greater use of markets and stalls days and events, with a pop-ups approach to retail in order to promote growth of small businesses. A thorough analysis of Porte Marsh Industrial Estate is needed to establish any wasted space in order to encourage densification.

What has to be considered is the forthcoming rise in unemployment, re-skilling of workers, housing affordability in a new economic climate, housing type appropriateness in that new economic climate and the positioning of what is still a small town in a high value environment.

Present average wage is £25K and average house price £280.00, will this be the same by 2022.

We believe there should be a moratorium/constraint on any housing allocations beyond identified brownfield, windfall and conversions for 5 years, then a review.

In 5 years, the longer effects of Covid and Brexit will be clear and a revised strategy for the town for the period 2026-2036 can be formulated.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne127

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

The scale of growth in Calne is too high, especially with the town not having much to offer to the residents. If the council feels like it is necessary to build more houses, then green area should not be used and brownfield site, of which there are many, should be considered. One of the factors that people come to Calne for are countryside as well as easy access to the A4, this shouldn't be used to build buildings for or congest the area with traffic, especially to the South of Calne.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

With growing up from the age of 3 in Calne, I feel like these are not the right priorities for the town. Your main focus is to be building houses in the town, when actually, I feel, that the main focus should be to provide the locals with places to socialize, to

have relevant shops (so people don't have to go to Chippenham to get basics) cinemas/ entertainment for people to use, and restaurants that people can go and meet friends. Over the last few years, as a town our crime rate has increased and my worry is that if you priorities building houses then this will grow.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Evidently Caine is required to find space for approximately 350 homes, including 10% on brownfield land over a 14 year period. However I feel, from looking at the map provided that you are trying to develop too much on greenfield site and countryside. When considering any development in the town center, as you stated in your Site Selection Report, this should be within areas that are already built up within the town. This way traffic will still run smoothly, locals will also be used to the areas that are already built up, wildlife will not be harmed and the safety of younger children walking to school will not be at a higher risk.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

I feel that we need to look at the traffic in the town before considering where we are building the next 360 houses. If we add more houses to the South of Caine, this will result in most traffic having to go through the town center to head North, East, and West. In the South of the town, we don't have any shops or petrol stations meaning that the traffic will build up for work commuters and also general outings. The East side of Location around Lower Compton area will allow the residence to have good access to the A4 and would not cause congestion to the South of Calne along the A3102.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

When looking at the map and each location especially location 7, this is green field and located on a hill. With limited viewing to come out of the turning it will cause danger not only for school children but also oncoming traffic. There is also rare wildlife that live in the area such as bats. Daily there are deer walking through the field and pheasants, birds and many more types of wildlife.

Location 7 would also have a huge impact on the traffic coming into the town center at rush hour, resulting even longer delays. When coming from the South West of Caine, most cars head North, this could end up resulting in more car accidents, traffic jams, accidents with school children. We have one Secondary School in Caine, why would you think it was suitable to add more traffic to the area when there are better locations.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

If you were to build additional house in location 7, then this will cause increased queues with traffic. Also resulting in health and safety issues with school children. The access to the estate will be limited view for oncoming traffic as it is on a hill. I have personally already had some near misses when coming down the hill and residents trying to get out the estate (Stoke Meadow) quickly. Additional traffic will cause additional congestion at London Road Roundabout by the White Hart and also London Road itself. Also, in Location 7, there are also drainage issues, resulting in flooding in the winter, adding more houses will cause considerable additional issues.

Further comments

As stated above, there are far better suited locations to be built on then location 7. Recently, there has been planning permission for a new medical center, of which I didn't think was the right area for the town. You are adding to the traffic, which was already an issue and there are still houses to be built in Stoke Meadow (of which aren't selling). Previously, when wanting to build on location 7, the area had been turned down by the council due to many reasons. Why should this location be considered a second time? As stated previously there are far better suited locations than this area.

Rep ID: Calne128	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Accepting that there should be growth I would ask that any developments include a large number of smaller units suitable for starter homes and single person/couple use. There should be a high brownfield target. Currently in Calne a greenfield site is being built on whilst a brownfield site (previously woodland social club) remained undeveloped. The site is now being sold.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The priorities are right but should be advanced in a different order. The current development of Phelps Parade and the surround area is a mess and it's re-development should be a priority. The local road network should be improved, especially in relation to reducing air pollution, before additional traffic is introduced to the area through the proposed housing growth.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Within the town centre the co-op site is unused and includes the store area plus 2 car parking areas - one in front of the store and one across the river Marden. Marlborough has some very sensitive river side developments in the town and this would be possible in this area. I would argue very strongly against any development that is an encroachment into the countryside. The attractive surrounding countryside is an important reason for living here. Site 4 is much too large and its effect on the River Marden and the biodiversity it supports unacceptable. I am also concerned that development on this site would result in a significant increase in traffic along the London Road. This road which often has parked cars on both sides of the road, especially when the primary school is open, is easily congested and air quality is known to be poor. Development of site 4 is also counter to the idea that after extraction and landfill at Sands Farm the area would be returned to open countryside.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Use all available brownfield sites before considering any greenfield sites. Build more affordable starter homes rather than larger 3/4/5 bedroom properties. Re-development of the town centre especially Phelps Parade.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Please place value on the countryside around our towns and especially important protect our rivers. Flood plains are not appropriate sites for building. Consider carefully the impact of development on the traffic flow along the A4/London Road and the increase in pollution it will bring. We already have to contend with HGV's and large farm vehicles along this road.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Within the document it states that surplus secondary places are available at Kingsbury Open Academy. Unfortunately because of unfavourable comparisons with the OFSTED reports of other secondary schools in Chippenham many parents in Calne chose to send their children to out of catchment schools. This is another reason why I believe traffic increases, if development of site 4 is allowed, will have a very negative impact.

Further comments

Please consider very carefully developments on sites 4,5 and 6 in relation to increasing traffic on A4 London Road and increasing air pollution.

Rep ID: Calne129

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Very bad you have built to much.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

No we need shops, schools.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No idea what the pool is.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

None we are losing our walk and cycle track.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

We need shops, butchers, bakers.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Do not understand

Further comments

Please leave we move age. your have doubles the amount of houses. It takes about 3 weeks to see a Dr

Rep ID: Calne130

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

It would be good to understand the brownfield sites we have around the Calne area.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Need development of the town centre. Support on infrastructure (police, schools available more 6th form choice) etc

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

I understand development is needed, the area around the large Tesco is a good area. Potential development-scale for new school could be managed in this area.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Smaller developments and scalability to ensure existing infrastructure can support.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Expansion will impact the air quality in the town centre. Congestion if plot 7 goes ahead will have a negative impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Need to support the 'green spaces' around our town. Lockdown has seen the community appreciate the space we have. Castlefields and surrounding area for families.

Further comments

Need to have a proper bypass around Calne. Too many lorries driving through a small town.

Rep ID: Calne131

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):
no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

Based on the current building in progress, it should now slow to enable essential services to be added.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Several proposed areas will increase traffic in areas already high in car ownership on the roads.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

What if anything is happening to the area behind Pippin + Sainsburys, was there not plans to improve shopping + hospitality.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfill. Areas that have been left after closures i.e. Co-op consider other side of Bevers Brook by-pass.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Plot 7 - hugh increase in traffic flow through residential area. Protect green space for mental well-being.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Review access through Calne via Cuzon Street? Do we have enough doctors, school, south bcc retail

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne132	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Pegasus Group
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Robert Hitchins Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne132
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The level of growth identified in paragraph 9 is based on the local housing needs assessment of Wiltshire for the period 2016-2036 and indicates a higher level of growth than the standard method for the Chippenham HMA and the figure for the Chippenham HMA is higher than for the other HMAs. The adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, identifies a requirement for 1,440 homes. The Emerging Strategy for Calne only proposes a requirement of 1,610 homes for the plan period 2016-2036, some 170 more dwellings than in the adopted Core Strategy. This figure is only marginally higher than the Core Strategy and does not reflect the need to significantly boost housing supply and or reflect the role of Calne as a market town and its potential for growth. The high level assessment in the Alternative Development Strategies indicates that after Chippenham and Melksham, Calne is least constrained. Development at Calne can support the place shaping priorities, being well connected to the town centre, promoting sustainable travel. Options for higher growth should be considered to support the delivery of infrastructure to relieve congestion in the town centre and Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) within the town which would support the place shaping priorities. Furthermore, given the difficulties experienced in terms of housing delivery at Chippenham, Calne could</p>	

continue to play a complementary role to Chippenham as a focus where development is being delivered. According to the Council's figures once completions and commitments have been taken into account footnote 1 on page 3, 627 dwellings have been built between 2016-2019 and, at 1 April 2019, 625 homes are already in the pipeline i.e. they have planning permission, resolution to grant planning permission or are allocated for development in the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan (2018). Consequently the residual figure for the remaining plan period to 2036 of only 360 dwellings. It is noted that a brownfield target is proposed for the period 2021-2031 of 60 dwellings which has the intention of reducing the requirements for greenfield land to be identified in the local plan (paragraph 11 of the Emerging Strategy document). Paragraph 13 of Planning for Calne states that: "Needs for development land should be met as far as possible on brownfield sites in order to help minimise the loss of greenfield land. The Council suggests that a target of 60 homes should be built on brownfield sites over the next 10 years." Two key issues arise, firstly the plan period and secondly the reliance on brownfield sites. As referred to in our response to the Emerging Strategy it is considered that the plan period should be 2020 – 2040. Therefore allowing the plan to be positively prepared and sufficiently flexible to respond to rapid change (para 11 of the NPPF). Succinct and up to date plans should provide a positive vision for the future for each area, a framework for addressing housing needs and other social, economic and environmental priorities. The plan needs to be aspirational, but also deliverable and strategic policies for Calne should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward and at a sufficient rate to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period.

As proposed the plan is only being rolled forward 10 years from the end date of the adopted Core Strategy i.e. 2026 to 2036, it is considered that the ability to provide a long term strategy for the town is being compromised as the strategic policies in the plan should look ahead at least 15 years from adoption to respond to long-term requirements and opportunities (paragraph 22 of the NPPF).

Whilst the principle of brownfield development is encouraged these sites are often fraught with difficulties in terms of delivery timescales. The promotion of an effective use of land set out in the 2019 NPPF is not a return to a brownfield first policy approach of the past. The Council's growth strategy should be a balanced rather than sequential approach. Housing delivery is optimised by the widest possible range of housing site sizes and market locations, which provides suitable land buying opportunities for small, medium and large housebuilding companies.

There needs to be a range and choice of sites in order to meet housing needs. The Council should avoid "town cramming", which would provide insufficient variety in house typologies to create balanced communities with the right types of new homes to meet the housing needs of different groups. There will be a limited capacity for higher densities and more taller buildings, which will only be appropriate in certain locations. A blanket approach to the intensification of housing densities everywhere would be inappropriate as a range of differing densities will be needed to ensure development is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The future deliverability of intensely developed residential schemes will also be dependent on the viability of PDL and market demand for high density urban living post Covid-19. The promotion of an effective use of land set out in the 2019 NPPF is not a return to a brownfield first policy approach of the past.

The widest mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways, creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector, responds to changing circumstances, treats the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and provides competition in the land market. A diversified portfolio of housing sites also offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

As referred to in the preceding paragraphs place shaping priorities need to be bespoke to the settlement and relate to the development and use of land. It is considered that whilst some of the place shaping priorities for Calne are supported, consideration should be given to the longer term and reflect the strategic opportunities at Calne.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

It is noted that the Council is focussing its assessment on a smaller pool of potential sites. In order to satisfy the tests of soundness, the Council need to demonstrate that they have considered all reasonable alternatives. It is noted that at this stage there is no SA of the sites and the intention appears to reduce the number of sites to be considered before they are subjected to a sustainability appraisal. The sustainability appraisal needs to consider and compare all reasonable alternatives as the plan evolves, including the preferred approach, and assess these against the baseline environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area and the likely situation if the plan were not to be adopted. Reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in the plan. They need to be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made. As a consequence of the plan period to 2036 (paragraph 28) there is on a relatively small amount of land required to meet the strategic housing requirements. Paragraph 28 then states that: “this will be identified by the neighbourhood plan. The review of the neighbourhood plan can also consider whether further land is needed for development to meet the community’s need.” Subsequently paragraph 28 states that: “ One or more sites will be selected for housing in the Local Plan and the rest of the pool of potential development sites will remain as they are.” An objection is made to this approach, it is not clear whether it is the intention to include sites in the Local Plan and or whether this is to be left entirely to the Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Plan should include strategic policies

for Calne. As referred to above, strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, strategic policies should address the strategic priorities for the area and provide a clear starting point for any non-strategic policies. Paragraph 23 states: "...Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area..." Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area and should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan or spatial development strategy and should shape and direct development that is outside of those strategic policies. Eight potential sites have been identified at Calne for further assessment of their development potential. Planning for Calne states at paragraph 30 that "given the relatively small amount of land that needs to be planned for Calne, not all of any particular site may be required at this time," but then the paragraph continues "that it would be sensible to consider the area as a whole when decision making." A short-term piecemeal strategy will not assist in meeting longer term objectives. Consideration should be given to a strategy which would assist in meeting the strategic priorities over a plan period at least to 2038.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Land to the north-east of Calne (north and south of Spitfire Road) is considered to represent an unconstrained and sustainable direction for future growth. It is well related and connected to the town centre, employment areas to the north and to the A3120 corridor and is well placed to benefit from improvements to public transport. Robert Hitchins Limited, an experienced developer/land promoter who over the last few years has brought forward numerous housing and employment sites across Wiltshire, Gloucestershire and Worcestershire, controls SHELAA referenced sites 488, 489, 3168& 3610, all found suitable available, achievable, deliverable and developable. Land to the north of Spitfire Road (SHELAA ref 3610) is within Site 2 (southern section) which the Planning for Calne report refers to as : "Site 2: Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 495, 3610)". Land to the south of Spitfire Road (SHELAA ref 488,489 and 3168) is the majority of Site 3 which the report refers to as: "Site 3: Land to the east of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 488, 489, 451, 3168)". Together these sites can provide for residential development and the provision of a new local centre (on the corner of Spitfire Way and Spitfire Road) to serve the immediate needs of existing and new residents on this side of the town as well as providing employment generating opportunities. Land to the south of Spitfire Road can provide for around 150 new dwellings and local centre, the land to the north around 450 dwellings. Pegasus on behalf of RHL has previously made representations regarding land to the south of Spitfire Road, putting the land forward for consideration though the SHELAA and in submissions made (August 2019) in response to the conclusion on the

August 2019 Alternative Strategies. These included concept plans and delivery trajectories. The Site Selection report reviews the sites in the SHELAA and identifies sites for further assessment. Stage 2 of the assessment refers to a RAG assessment of the sites in terms of accessibility and wider impacts and sets out a judgment against each of the SHELAA sites, taking into account both the accessibility and wider impact considerations and strategic context. Sites are categorised overall as low accessibility (red), medium accessibility (amber) or high accessibility (green). It is not necessarily clear how some of these assessments have been made, they appear to have been made without any justification and reference to any evidence base. Site SHELAA ref 451 (part of Potential site 3) is assessed and is considered suitable for further assessment as there are no overriding significant impacts that justify rejecting the site at this stage. The assessment considers that the site could be combined with adjacent sites 488, 489 and 3168 to consider one logical extension to the town. This is supported. It is not clear why the site has been rated “amber” in terms of accessibility and traffic a whilst it may appear detached from the urban edge it has the potential as the assessment acknowledges to form part a logical extension to Calne. Site SHELAA ref 488 (part of Potential site 3) is assessed as above (is the same RAG assessment) for site 451 and considered suitable for further assessment as there are no overriding significant impacts that justify rejecting the site at this stage. The assessment considers that the site could be combined with adjacent sites It would be appropriate to combine this site with adjacent sites 451, 489 and 3168 to consider onellogical extension to the town. The analysis concludes that there is no justification for rejecting the site at this stage.

Site SHELAA ref 489 (part of Potential site 3) which is adjacent to site 451 is assessed but is rated amber in the assessment for all categories except landscape. This site is not adjacent to the revised settlement boundary but is adjacent to SHELAA sites 451 and 495. The assessment concludes that the site:

“On its own the site is remote from urban edge but could be developed with other adjacent sites. Part of the site is Flood Zone 3 associated with Abberd Brook. Heritage impacts likely to be minimal. The site is closer to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty than some other sites therefore may be more sensitive to development. There may be potential for using some of this site for mitigating the rural / urban edge in combination with other surrounding sites here. The site is in close proximity to Hills Quarry Products, therefore potential noise and dust issues which will require further assessment. No justification for rejecting site at this stage. Take forward for further assessment. It would be appropriate to combine this site with adjacent sites 451, 488 and 3168 to consider one logical extension to the town.”

The fact that the site is to be taken forward into the next assessment is supported.

Site SHELAA ref 3610 Land off Spitfire Road, Calne (N) (which is part of Potential site 2) is assessed, the site adjoins recent new development to the west and is also adjacent to site 495 which is adjacent to the settlement boundary. The site is low flood risk - entire site is Flood Zone 1. In heritage terms, no likely impacts are noted. In landscape terms, the site is rated amber, whilst site 495 is rated green. The justification appears to be that the site will need further assessment of impacts on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The assessment state that there is “Potential for using some of this site to the north and east for mitigating the rural / urban edge in combination with other adjacent sites.” The assessment concludes that – as there are no likely significant

impacts the site could come forward with other adjacent sites, site to be taken forward for further assessment. Whilst this is supported it is considered that the site should come forward with land to the south of Spitfire Road as referred to above. There are some inconsistencies in the assessment, as there is no justification for the RAG rating, there is no cross reference to any evidence base for the assessments made, for example SHELAA sites 1104a, b and c are all rated green in respect of flooding, yet the Map showing the sites, clearly subject to flood risk. It is not clear why these sites have been rated green and site 489 rated amber. In summary Site 2: Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA site, 3610) and Site 3: Land to the east of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 488, 489, 451, 3168) are considered to offer the most sustainable opportunities to accommodate the future needs of Calne.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Our major concern is that as the plan period commences at 2016, is limited to 2036 consequently it fails to look to the longer term and provide a strategic approach for the future of the market town which could if considered provide more scope and opportunities to address the strategic priorities of Calne.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne133	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Planning Sphere
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): CG Fry and Son Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne133
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The representation contends that in order to meet the required plan-making test of 'soundness' and maintain mixed-tenure housing delivery in the Chippenham Housing Market Area over the plan period to 2036, it will be necessary for the Council to allocate of the subject site in the Local Plan Review. This is on the basis that the subject site is the most sustainable prospective development site in Calne, and is available, technically deliverable and viable. 4.0 Response to the Consultation</p> <p>(i) National Policy Context</p> <p>4.1 Paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires that plans should be '...(a) prepared with the objective of contributing towards sustainable development'; and '...(b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable'.</p> <p>4.2 In respect of non-strategic policies, Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states that LPAs should allocations to promote sustainable development, and Paragraph 29 states that '...policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence' and '...take into account relevant market signals'.</p>	

4.3 Paragraph 59 requires that as part of the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, '...it is important that sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed...'

4.4 Paragraph 61 states that the '...size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies... ..'

4.5 Paragraph 68 states that '...small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly'.

4.6 Paragraph 72 states that '...The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.... b) ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access;...' 4.16 Using the Council's Traffic Light Assessment, we have undertaken a similar appraisal utilising the site-specific evidence base. This is set out in the table below:

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

(iii) Comment on the subject site (Site 2 in the Site Selection Report)

4.14 It is understood that the external consultants acting for the Council have assisted in assessing prospective development sites. Wiltshire Council's high-level summary assessment relates to Site 7, as shown in Figure 4 of the Site Selection Report for Calne as one of the 'final pool of potential sites for further detailed assessment'.

4.15 The assessment of Site 7 has been summarised in the report under the four SHELAA individual reference numbers, but it is acknowledged that the four sites should be assessed as a single site. The high-level 'traffic light' assessment of the constituent elements of the subject site is set out below in Figure 4:

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The subject site, known as Land at Wenhill, extends to 16.07ha, as outlined in red in the Site Location Plan at Appendix A. 2.2 The site comprises agricultural land over four fields: 1-4 as annotated in Figure 1 above. The part of Field 1 excluded from the proposed allocation site will be developed for a new medical centre under planning permission (20/01057/FUL) – see planning history summary below. It is proposed that the vehicular access permitted under Medical Centre application will be adapted to serve the proposed housing allocation.

2.3 The Transport Technical Note at Appendix E describes the subject site's location, and accessibility in respect of existing facilities, services and public transport, and a proposed access strategy in respect of existing and proposed points of vehicular and pedestrian/cycle access, as annotated on the Parameter Plan at Appendix B. An existing public right of way (PROW), Wenhill Lane, bisects Fields 3 and 4 and provides vehicular access to two farm dwellings owned by the Bowood Estate. A further public right of way, which is used as a Sustrans cycle route (No.403), lies further to the north beyond Field 4. This route connects back into the Town Centre.

2.4 Fields 1 and 2 include a block of unmanaged woodland and can be described as pastureland. Field 3 and 4 are in arable use. A full description of the site topography and landscape setting is set out in the accompanying Landscape Visual Appraisal (NB. an executive summary is shown at Appendix C and the full document is separately submitted as Appendix H). The report also sets out a proposed landscape strategy to inform the future evolution of masterplan based upon the Parameter Plan at Appendix B.

2.5 The heritage context includes: archaeological potential; the grade II* listed Vern Leaze (NB. now known as 'Highlands') on the eastern side of the site; and the grade I listed park and garden at Bowood to the west. The relationship of the subject site with these heritage assets is considered in the Heritage Statement at Appendix F.

2.6 An Ecological Appraisal, which has been partly informed by in-season ecological surveys that were conducted to support the Medical Centre application, has highlighted bat activity along vegetated boundaries of the site (refer to Appendix D). This information along with advice in respect of achieving biodiversity net gain has informed the landscape and wildlife buffers as shown on the Parameter Plan at Appendix B. Further surveys are planned for the 2021 ecology surveying season.

2.7 An Infrastructure Statement has been prepared which covers utilities and sets out a drainage strategy (refer to Appendix G) This has identified the presence of live and de-commissioned oil pipelines which cross part of the site, and their associated easements. An outline surface water and foul drainage strategy has also been formulated, and has fed into the 'green and blue' infrastructure strategy, which has also informed the Parameter Plan at Appendix B. (ii) Existing Lawful Use and Planning history

2.8 The subject site is agricultural land. Planning history recorded on the Council's public access system includes the following decision relating to the Medical Centre on the frontage part of Field 1. Site preparatory works are due to commence in Q2: 2021.

2.9 Other relevant planning history is referred to below:

(iii) Existing planning policy context and constraints

2.10 The Development Plan for the site comprises:

- Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015);
- Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan (made January 2018); and
- Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan (adopted February 2020)

2.11 Applicable designations from the WCS are shown in Figure 2 below:

2.12 The Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan (CCNP) has not added any additional designations that apply to the subject site. Therefore, the WCS Core Strategy proposals map shows the current planning policy context. (iv) Summary of previous site promotion

2.13 The site was previously promoted in the CCNP. Representations were as also submitted to the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan process.

2.14 The subject site was assessed in 2015/16 in the Site Appraisal for the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan, which was undertaken by external consultants, AECOM who were acting for the CCNP Steering Group. The assessment was undertaken against all four SHELAA land parcels that make up the subject site and formed part of the CCNP examination evidence base.

2.15 Following the AECOM appraisal, the Lemon Gazelle Community Interest Company undertook a further assessment that homed in on two focused choices, which were subject to community consultation: (i) Land North of Low Lane (SHELAA 486); and (ii) the subject site at Wenhill. A balanced decision was made to include the Land North of Low Lane as a development plan allocation under Policy H1 of the CCNP. The site has subsequently been permitted (LPA Ref: 14/11179/OUT, 16/12380/REM; and 17/00679/OUT), and is in the process of being implemented. This has now completed the expansion of the town on its north west perimeter.

3.0 Suitability of the Site for a Mixed Tenure Housing Allocation

(i) Legal ownership and delivery mechanism

3.1 The landowners are formally collaborating. Heads of Terms for an Option Agreement with CG Fry and Son Ltd have been agreed. At the time of writing the Option Agreement is in the process of being drafted and is expected to be finalised by Q2:2021.

On this basis, the subject site is available for development by an SME developer, CG Fry and Son Ltd.

3.2 CG Fry and Son Ltd is a family-owned regional house builder and has track record in delivering high quality residential schemes throughout the South West. Recent track record in Wiltshire includes: Silver Street, Calne adjacent to the subject site (due for completion by Q4: 2021); and the Core Strategy strategic site at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon (due for completed by

Q2: 2021). Other completed CGF developments in Wiltshire include: Derry Hill; Tisbury (Hindon Lane); and Mere (Woodlands Road – the old Hill Brush Factory site). (ii) Development Parameters

3.3 Further to the technical surveys and initial multidisciplinary assessments that have been completed, a Parameter Plan has been formulated to indicate the potential developable area extent. This in turn has led to initial capacity assessment, which suggests that approximately 200 homes can be accommodated on the subject site.

3.4 The elements of the indicative Parameter Plan include the following:

- Principal vehicular access: is proposed from the A3102 Silver Street utilising the permitted Medical Centre access, which forms a staggered cross roads junction arrangement by adding a new side arm to the existing ghost island right turn lane priority junction that serves the CG Fry site on the opposite side of the road. An alternative 'compact roundabout' is also feasible, as described in the Transport Technical Note at Appendix E.
- Secondary (emergency access): the main internal spine road crosses over Wenhill Lane (a private road and PROW) that bisects Fields 3 and 4. Access to Wenhill Lane from the north would be restricted by demountable bollards. The two farm cottages that served from Wenhill Lane would then take access via the new Spine Road through the site and beyond to the A3102 Silver Street.
- Heritage mitigation: housing is proposed on Fields 1, 3 and 4. Field 2 will remain largely undeveloped so as to preserve the setting of the grade II* listed Vern Leaze. A link for the internal spine road in its north west corner will be discretely designed and mitigated.
- Landscape mitigation: the most sensitive views of the site from public vantage points are the south. Analysis of site topography and levels and key publicly accessible viewpoints has informed the location of proposed built development on the Parameter Plan at Appendix B. A substantial structural planted shelter belt of native tree species is proposed on the western boundary. This will re-enforce and create new wildlife corridors whilst also providing screening. It is also envisaged that new wildlife corridors and avenues of street trees will be provided within the proposed residential areas.
- Ecological mitigation: the site is not located in a bat consultation zone. However, surveys have established the location of a Lesser Horseshoe roost near to Vern Leaze, and bat commuting activity along the south and western boundaries of the site. This is not unusual nor especially difficult to mitigate and thus the Parameter Plan makes provision of dark vegetated corridors along the site perimeter. There is sufficient land available to deliver the required minimum 10% biodiversity net gain on site – on the assumption that this will be a mandatory requirement following the enactment of the Environment Bill. The finalised masterplan will be subject to an agreed Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP), which will be implemented by the future private management company that will be set up to maintain the areas of common ownership.
- Drainage and easements: the Parameter Plan acknowledges the easements associated with the live and de-commissioned oil pipelines that cross the site. NB. the same pipeline crosses CGF's Silver Street site and this has not proven to be a major constraint on development following early engagement with CLH's surveyors. Surface water drainage will be conveyed in a

system of swales and attenuation basins and then discharged at less than the existing greenfield rate to the existing water system of ditches and watercourse to the south. Foul drainage will connect to existing mains systems.

(viii) Proposed further work in progress to develop the evidence base

3.5 Following the submission of the Regulation 18 representations, the project team will commission the following further work:

- A full topographical survey
- Liaison with oil pipeline engineers to establish the precise location and depth of both the live and de-commissioned oil pipelines that cross the site.
- Arboricultural survey
- Geophysical survey
- Infiltration testing
- Liaison with Wessex Water in respect of foul drainage connections
- Feasibility study to investigate the proposed pedestrian/cycle link from Field 4 to the Sustrans cycleway (403) to the north

3.6 The project team will be willing to share this information as part of an evolving technical evidence base with the Council's Spatial Planning Team.

3.7 At the appropriate time, CGF, will appoint a masterplan architect / urban designer to formulate an illustrative masterplan, which will be landscape/heritage-led. This will then be tested internally before being progressed as a pre-application enquiry. Feedback from the pre-application enquiry can then be added to the technical evidence base in advance of the Local Plan Review examination in due course. CGF will commit to undertaking public consultation in advance of submitting any formal planning application.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

(ii) Spatial Strategy and distribution of growth in the Chippenham HMA

4.7 Calne falls within the proposed Chippenham Housing Market Area, which replaces the former North and West Housing Market Area. The change from three to four HMAs is broadly supported. However, for the reasons explained below, we do not

consider that the spatial strategy for delivering the growth is sound on the basis of deliverability, or through acknowledgement of societal change that has been accelerated by the covid pandemic.

4.8 The Regulation 18 spatial strategy for the HMA is reliant to high degree on the delivery of the strategic growth options at Chippenham. At the other end of the settlement hierarchy, it is noted that the Regulation 18 Spatial Strategy is relying upon Neighbourhood Plans to deliver housing growth at Large Villages and other rural settlements in the rural hinterland outside principal settlements and market towns across the whole county.

4.9 Wiltshire Council has a poor track record in timely delivery of large urban extension strategic sites, such as Ashton Park in Trowbridge and the West Warminster Urban Extension, both of which were allocated in the adopted Core Strategy and have not yet commenced. At the other end of the scale, Neighbourhood Plans have failed to make any real meaningful contribution to housing delivery in Wiltshire, although it is acknowledged that CCNP is an exception through the inclusion of a residential allocation.

4.10 Given that the covid-pandemic has accelerated the trend towards flexible home-working and internet shopping, and that there is now a clear road map to the decarbonisation of private transport (electric vehicles), with transformation expected to take place over the plan period to 2036, we submit that the proposed Regulation 18 spatial growth strategy is too weighted towards the principal settlements. We consider that more growth should be directed towards market towns and rural areas. This approach would place less reliance upon volume home builders to deliver a small number of complicated strategic sites (for which there is poor delivery track record in Wiltshire) and would enable a greater role for SME regional housebuilders to deliver the housing requirement through a larger number of smaller scale housing developments in market towns and rural areas.

4.11 In the context of Wiltshire Council not currently being able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply across its whole administrative area (NB. 4.56 years in the last published Annual Monitoring Report with a base date of April 2019), combined with the NPPF requirements, as summarised above, and the importance of the SME sector in delivering smaller and medium sized sites to diversify choice of new housing provision, it is in our view imperative that the Council allocates sufficient smaller/medium sized sites at the Market Town level of the identified settlement strategy. This is particularly important in the Chippenham HMA where the deliverability of large-scale strategic sites is both technically and politically challenging.

4.12 Under the proposed growth strategy for Calne, the Local Plan Review identified need for Calne is 1,610 homes over the plan period 2036. Having regard to existing commitments the residual need is 360 homes of which circa 60 are expected to come forward through windfall/brownfield opportunities – NB. we have not seen the detailed evidence to substantiate this figure. This leaves a residual requirement of c.300 homes over the plan period to 2036. While the subject site could assist meeting two thirds of this requirement, we consider that Calne, in comparison to some other market towns, is relatively unconstrained and has capacity to receive a greater number of homes.

4.13 Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, and to ensure the delivery of new open market and affordable homes in Calne, it will be imperative that additional housing allocations are made in the Local Plan Review, over and above the proposed 300 number, to ensure continuity of supply in the Chippenham Housing Market Area over the plan period to 2036.

Further comments

1.0 Introduction

1.1 PlanningSphere have been instructed to make representations to the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (Regulation 18) on behalf of CG Fry and Son Ltd who are the prospective option holders of land at Wenhill, Calne. The subject site is outlined on the Site Location Plan shown at Appendix A.

1.2 This representation follows previous submissions of development plan representations promoting this site through both the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan and the Calne Neighbourhood Plan plan-making processes.

1.3 The representation contends that in order to meet the required plan-making test of 'soundness' and maintain mixed-tenure housing delivery in the Chippenham Housing Market Area over the plan period to 2036, it will be necessary for the Council to allocate of the subject site in the Local Plan Review. This is on the basis that the subject site is the most sustainable prospective development site in Calne, and is available, technically deliverable and viable.

1.4 The representation is supported by technical and delivery evidence set out in the Appendices. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss the promotion of this site through subsequent stages of the Local Plan Review with the Council's Spatial Planning Team in due course.5.1 In strategic planning terms, the growth distribution strategy set out in the Regulation 18 consultation draft is too weighted towards large scale complex sites adjacent to principal settlements. Having regard to societal and technological changes that have been accelerated by the covid-pandemic, we advocate a more decentralised strategy to meet the growth requirement with more development distributed to market towns and rural areas. Such an approach would enable the SME housing building sector to play a greater roll in the delivery of the housing requirement, which would ensure a more diverse and even supply of new housing over plan period. SME developers also tend to deliver housing at a higher build and design quality than volume home builders, as has been shown in consumer satisfaction surveys. Market towns and larger settlements in rural areas remain sustainable places in which to develop and should not be allowed to decline at the expense of hard to deliver strategic site allocations.

5.1 In strategic planning terms, the growth distribution strategy set out in the Regulation 18 consultation draft is too weighted towards large scale complex sites adjacent to principal settlements. Having regard to societal and technological changes that have been accelerated by the covid-pandemic, we advocate a more decentralised strategy to meet the growth requirement with

more development distributed to market towns and rural areas. Such an approach would enable the SME housing building sector to play a greater roll in the delivery of the housing requirement, which would ensure a more diverse and even supply of new housing over plan period. SME developers also tend to deliver housing at a higher build and design quality than volume home builders, as has

been shown in consumer satisfaction surveys. Market towns and larger settlements in rural areas remain sustainable places in which to develop and should not be allowed to decline at the expense of hard to deliver strategic site allocations.

5.2 In order to meet the test of soundness, the Council should allocate the subject site on the basis that it is: (i) available, (ii) technically deliverable, and (iii) is viable for delivery early in the plan period.

5.3 In summary, the allocation of the subject site would deliver the following benefits:

- A sustainable location relatively close to and well connected to the town centre in comparison to other potential available sites in Calne.
- A site suitable for delivery of circa 200 homes by an SME home builder and viable to deliver a 30% element of affordable housing provision.
- A safe and suitable vehicular access solution from Silver Street.
- The ability to mitigate the impact of development on the wider landscape and preserve the setting of the grade II listed Vern Leaze.
- The ability to address ecological constraints (bats and badgers) and deliver a biodiversity net gain on site.
- The site is situated within Flood Zone 1 and surface water attenuation can be managed as part of an integrated green and blue infrastructure strategy.
- Provision of a substantial areas of onsite publicly accessible open space and allotments.
- Provision of public access through the site connecting into the wider footpath and cycleway network maximizing the opportunities for non-car access.

5.4 Given we have demonstrated that the subject site is suitable and technically deliverable, we request the Council acts proactively to plan for housing need in Calne and allocates sites 709, 3251, 3311, 3312 for approximately 200 No. dwellings and associated public open space.

Rep ID: Calne134	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Planning Sphere
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): The Reversioners	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne134
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>4.0 Response to the Consultation</p> <p>(i) National Policy Context</p> <p>4.1 Paragraph 16 of the NPPF requires that plans should be ‘...(a) prepared with the objective of contributing towards sustainable development’; and ‘...(b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable’.</p> <p>4.2 In respect of non-strategic policies, Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states that LPAs should allocations to promote sustainable development, and Paragraph 29 states that ‘...policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence’ and ‘...take into account relevant market signals’.</p> <p>4.3 Paragraph 59 requires that as part of the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, ‘...it is important at sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed...’</p>	

4.4 Paragraph 61 states that the ‘...size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies... ..’

4.5 Paragraph 68 states that ‘...small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out relatively quickly’.

4.6 Paragraph 72 states that ‘...The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities....’

b) ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access;...’

(Our emphasis in bold)

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

3.0 Suitability of the Site for Mixed-Use Tenure Housing Allocation

(i) Legal ownership and delivery.

3.1 The freehold interest of the subject site is owned by The Reversioners Trust. In the event that an allocation is secured, the landowner will seek to partner with a local SME developer to deliver the site. It is anticipated that the site could be delivered early in the plan period.

(ii) Development Parameters

3.2 The Parameter Plan at Appendix C and extracted in Figure 3 below identifies the potential developable area of the subject site. On this basis we consider that the site has potential to accommodate up to c.70 dwellings and public open space.

3.3 Key points to note in respect of the proposed allocation are summarised below:

- Access: there are two potential points of vehicular access from Old Road both – both simple priority junctions with adequate visibility splays. A direct pedestrian / cycle link is available to the A4 to the north through the existing woodland buffer.
- Landscape / Ecology: a precautionary 15m buffer for green and blue infrastructure, and a dark wildlife corridor is shown around the perimeter. The north east corner could be used for allotments or additional woodland planting. It is also envisaged that the internal access road would be tree-lined and that there would be a central focal area of open space. Given the existing use of the site for arable farming we consider that it will be possible to deliver the 10% biodiversity net gain requirement that will be a

mandatory requirement following the enactment of the Environment Bill later this year. The finalised masterplan will be subject to an agreed Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP), which will be implemented by the future private management company that will be set up to maintain the areas of common ownership.

- Drainage Strategy: mains foul drainage is available from the A4. Surface water will be attenuated on site and released at less than the existing greenfield runoff rate, with the appropriate climate change factor applied.

3.4 Noting that the subject site has not been assessed as part of the Site Selection Report, as this was only undertaken in Principal Settlements and Market Towns, we have undertaken our own assessment, as summarised in the table below:

(iii) Further work

3.5 In the event the site is reconsidered by Wiltshire Council for allocation, the landowner would undertake the following work to evolve a technical evidence base:

- Measured survey
- Infiltration testing and drainage design
- Detailed access design and traffic surveys
- In-season ecology surveys
- Heritage assessment and geophysical survey
- Landscape appraisal

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

2.1 The subject site extends to 4.33ha and is located within the existing built extent of Derry Hill. The site has defensible boundaries on all sides and is bounded by: the A4 to the north; and Old Road to the south and east. The site is bounded by existing residential development to the east, south and west. The outline of the site is shown in the extract from the Council's SHELAA plan in Appendix A.

2.2 The site lies approximately equidistant from Calne and Chippenham. There is an existing regular bus services in both directions along the A4. There are a range of existing services and community facilities in Derry Hill that include: a primary school; public house; village shop; two churches; and a village hall.

2.3 There are also various permanent and seasonal employment opportunities in the wider Derry Hill / Studley area. The subject site therefore benefits from good levels of non-car accessibility and connectivity and is one of the most sustainable Large Villages in the Chippenham Housing Market Area.

2.4 The subject site is relatively flat and is well contained from longer range views by a tree belt on its northern boundary, and woodland associated with the Bowood Estate to the south.

2.5 The site is proximate to but lies outside designated Grade 1 listed park and garden at Bowood. The nearest listed buildings lie to the west of the site and include:

- Grade II listed Studley Lodge
- Grade II listed Village Hall
- Grade II listed Christchurch

2.6 None of the dwellings along the site perimeter on Old Road are listed.

2.7 The site lies within Flood Risk Zone on the EA's Flood Map for Planning. The subject site lies within the 'Large Village' of Studley / Derry Hill. The site is effectively an enclave between the two polygons that comprise Derry Hill's defined settlement limits. It is notable that following the implementation of 'Bowood Gate' by Crest Nicholson, immediately to the north of the A4, the settlements of Studley and Derry Hill are now effectively contiguous and function as a single settlement, albeit bisected by the A4. The site was initially promoted as part of the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan process. The initial assessment undertaken by AECOM on behalf of the CCNP Steering Group is shown at Appendix B. We disagree with the comments on access as a subsequent initial feasibility assessment has confirmed that the site can be accessed from Old Road.(ii) Existing Lawful Use and Planning history

2.8 The site is used as arable agricultural land. There is no relevant planning history.

(iii) Existing planning policy context

2.9 For the purposes of this application the Development Plan for the site comprises:

- Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015);
- Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2018); and
- Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan (adopted February 2020).

2.10 The subject site lies within the 'Large Village' of Studley / Derry Hill. The site is effectively an enclave between the two polygons that comprise Derry Hill's defined settlement limits. It is notable that following the implementation of 'Bowood Gate' by Crest Nicholson, immediately to the north of the A4, the settlements of Studley and Derry Hill are now effectively contiguous and function as a single settlement, albeit bisected by the A4.

2.11 An extract from the Wiltshire Core Strategy proposals map is shown in Figure 1 below:

(iv) Promotion history

2.12 The site was initially promoted as part of the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan process. The initial assessment undertaken by AECOM on behalf of the CCNP Steering Group is shown at Appendix B. We disagree with the comments on access as a subsequent initial feasibility assessment has confirmed that the site can be accessed from Old Road.

2.13 Representations were subsequently submitted as part of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan process in September 2017. The Council decided not to include any allocations in Derry Hill/Studley at that time as a speculative application made by Crest Nicholson at Studley had been approved. That scheme has now been implemented and there are no other committed development sites in Derry Hill / Studley in the pipeline.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 In strategic planning terms, we are concerned that the growth distribution strategy set out in the Regulation 18 consultation draft is too weighted towards large scale complex sites adjacent to principal settlements. Having regard to societal and technological changes that have been accelerated by the covid-pandemic, we advocate a more decentralised strategy to meet the growth requirement with more development distributed to market towns and rural areas. Such an approach would enable the SME housing building sector to play a greater role in the delivery of the housing requirement, which would ensure a more diverse and even supply of new housing over plan period. SME developers also tend to deliver housing at a higher build and design quality than volume home builders, as has been shown in consumer satisfaction surveys.

5.2 In summary, the allocation of the subject site would deliver the following benefits: • A site suitable for delivery of circa 70 homes by an SME home builder and viable to deliver a 30% element of affordable housing provision. • A safe and suitable vehicular access solution from Old Road. • Good levels of non-car accessibility for a Large Village • Potential to assist in sustaining an existing wide range of local services and community facilities. • The ability to mitigate the impact of development on the wider landscape through new planting on a site that is contained by defensible boundaries. • The ability to address ecological constraints and deliver a biodiversity net gain on site. • Development on land located in Flood Zone 1 and the ability to attenuate surface water on site. • Provision of publicly accessible open space and the potential for allotments. • Provision of public access through the site connecting into the wider footpath and footway network.

5.3 Given we have demonstrated that the subject site is suitable and technically deliverable, we request the Council revises its spatial strategy, and acts proactively to plan for housing need at Large Villages and allocates site 3302 for approximately 70 No. dwellings and associated public open space.

Further comments

1.1 PlanningSphere have been instructed to make representations to the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (Regulation 18) on behalf of the owners of the subject site, The Reversioners Trust. The subject site lies to the north of Old Road, Derry Hill, and is on the Site Location Plan shown at Appendix A.

1.2 This representation follows previous development plan representations that have been submitted in respect of the subject site's promotion through the Calne Community Neighbourhood Plan and the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan.

1.3 The technical delivery of the site has been established through preliminary technical assessments in respect of access, and other high-level assessments following the identification of the site constraints.

1.4 The enclosed representation contends that the subject site should be allocated in order to meet the required plan making test of 'soundness' and maintain mixed-tenure housing delivery in Chippenham Housing Market Area.

1.5 We would welcome an opportunity to discuss the evolution of a more detailed technical evidence and the promotion of the site through success stages of the Local Plan Review plan making process with representatives of the Council's Spatial Planning Team in due course.

5.1 In strategic planning terms, we are concerned that the growth distribution strategy set out in the Regulation 18 consultation draft is too weighted towards large scale complex sites adjacent to principal settlements. Having regard to societal and technological changes that have been accelerated by the covid-pandemic, we advocate a more decentralised strategy to meet the growth requirement with more development distributed to market towns and rural areas. Such an approach would enable the SME housing building sector to play a greater role in the delivery of the housing requirement, which would ensure a more diverse and even supply of new housing over plan period. SME developers also tend to deliver housing at a higher build and design quality than volume home builders, as has been shown in consumer satisfaction surveys.

- Good levels of non-car accessibility for a Large Village
- Potential to assist in sustaining an existing wide range of local services and community facilities.
- The ability to mitigate the impact of development on the wider landscape through new planting on a site that is contained by defensible boundaries.
- The ability to address ecological constraints and deliver a biodiversity net gain on site.
- Development on land located in Flood Zone 1 and the ability to attenuate surface water on site.
- Provision of publicly accessible open space and the potential for allotments.
- Provision of public access through the site connecting into the wider footpath and footway network.

Rep ID: Calne135	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>On reviewing the plans, the areas identified to take forward, are adjacent to areas that have already seen significant increase in housing and commercial development over the last 10 plus years and ongoing to date. These plans risk the eroding of the natural habitats and the potential for impact on water courses and their drainage which support the wildlife and eco systems. There is undoubtedly a requirement for more housing on a national and local level, but I think the emphasis and focus should be on smaller developments on Brownfield sites.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

Focusing on green and ecological development that harnesses and embraces the natural environment, thereby reducing the significant impact of increased traffic would have on the environment through noise and harmful pollution and the increasing impact that would have on the mental wellbeing of residents within the designated and proximity areas. Priorities should be on development of Calne town centre, to diversify and leverage new economic growth potential, build on the historical nature of Calne as a market town, retain the embodiment of Calne as a market town, touching back to the environmental friendly theme, increasing the number of cycle routes and the development of pedestrian walk ways to access the countryside that surrounds Calne.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The development of the area to the west of the bypass (A3102) stands out as a potential site , as it would benefit from the existing road infrastructure, providing access routes to the A4 and to the A3102 without increasing the traffic volume throughput on existing established and soon to be completed developments.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Repurposing of brown field sites within the town centre envelope and change of purpose existing buildings.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

- the topography is such that any developments will overlook and over shadow the existing residential developments with the potential of a loss of privacy and a loss of horizon.
- The increased traffic volume will see an increase in pollution and noise impacting the health and wellbeing of existing residents

- The increased traffic volumes would also increase the risk to accidents, on Sandpit Road, which has already been reported to the council as being extremely dangerous, with a potential of risk to life.
- There is concern around the natural water courses and their drainage run offs, which if replaced with a tarmac and developed site would have significant impact on existing residential areas and for the wildlife that access them

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

The existing infrastructure is not designed nor capable of supporting the increased traffic volumes, presenting additional and increased risk to health and well being , from noise, pollution and risk of physical injury. Thought should be given to diverting the Sand Pit road to connect with the Tesco Round about on A3102

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne136	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Turley
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Castlewood Properties Ventures Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>We are supportive of the proposed scale of growth at Calne as this befits its position in the settlement hierarchy and reflects the range of facilities, services and employment opportunities available. We recognise and would support a higher level of growth than that proposed if it is demonstrated to be necessary in order to secure the transport solutions that would help alleviate issues such as traffic congestion and local air quality in the town centre.</p> <p>We recognise that paragraph 117 of the NPPF looks for strategic policies to make as much use as possible of brownfield land to address objectively assessed needs, which would include housing. Having a brownfield target could be a means of achieving this. However, we would caution that delivery of housing on brownfield sites will need to be carefully monitored to assess whether the target is being reasonably achieved. If not, then a future Local Plan Review will need to consider whether a revised brownfield target would be more appropriate.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be	

achieved?

We consider the priorities identified to be appropriate for meeting the needs of Calne. However, some further information is needed to qualify these priorities. In particular, as to what would constitute “a consolidated approach to any housing growth” as identified at paragraph 23(i) since this would likely guide the approach to housing delivery and needs to be available for scrutiny by the development community to ensure it is deliverable.

Many of the priorities identified require significant investment in infrastructure and regeneration. It will be critical that Calne continues to deliver sufficient growth in terms of housing and employment to justify the funding needed to deliver these priorities or to help secure part of this funding from developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy. This growth will help ensure there is sufficient viability and vitality to address the identified place shaping priorities.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

We consider this is the right pool of development sites for the Council to consider.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Given past delivery rates of new homes on brownfield land it is highly unlikely that Calne’s housing needs can be met in full using brownfield land. Therefore, the Council is justified in its intent to allocate some greenfield land for development.

The Penn Hill Farm site (also known as Land to North of Sandpits Lane) which was identified under SHELAA reference 495 and forms part of potential development site 2 is appropriate to build upon to help deliver Calne’s housing needs.

In the Stage 2 site assessments set out in the Site Selection Report for Calne the Penn Hill Farm site scored joint highest in the RAG assessment alongside SHELAA sites 487 and 492. Penn Hill Farm is therefore considered to be suitable for development. Its promoter and developer would also take this opportunity reiterate to the Council that Penn Hill Farm remains available for development in the short term, i.e. within the next 0 to 5 years.

Penn Hill Farm has been combined with SHELAA site 3610 to form potential development site 2: Land to the west of Spitfire Road. Potential development site 2 is noted in the Planning for Calne report, after paragraph 30, that there is potential for access

onto Spitfire Road or Sand Pit Road and likely low flood risk and heritage impacts. However, it is identified in landscape terms there would need to be further assessment of impact on the AONB to the east. We would agree with this assessment and have prepared further evidence to support the case for allocating the Penn Hill Farm site for development.

We have prepared a Vision Document for Penn Hill Farm that is appended to these representations and identifies the site's opportunities and constraints and puts forward a vision for how these can be addressed to create a successful new place. Noting the concerns raised about impact on the AONB to the east we have been undertaking initial assessments of landscape and visual impact as set out in the appended Landscape and Visual Technical Note. These have resulted in a framework masterplan being devised that would focus development on the western fields at Penn Hill Farm. This would bring the developable area of Penn Hill Farm in line with the boundary of the previously proposed North-East Calne Urban Extension that was a preferred strategic allocation during the preparation of the currently adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, albeit this allocation was eventually dropped. It is worth noting however that the west of Penn Hill Farm remains the only part of that originally identified strategic allocation area which is yet to be granted planning permission for residential development. The two eastern fields which are the most visually prominent would be kept free from development in order to preserve the undeveloped slopes that contribute to the landscape setting of Calne. The eastern fields would provide a significant area of public open space for the wider community which would provide vantage points for long distance views towards the AONB. Introduction of new strategic planting and reinforcement of existing boundaries will help maintain a treed horizon line in views towards Penn Hill Farm and provide additional screening to the prominent nearby Calne Industrial Estate. These measures will ensure that any adverse impacts of landscape and visual effects from the development of Penn Hill Farm could be mitigated to an acceptable degree and would also provide the existing wider community of Calne with new substantial new areas of public open space with new vantage points to enjoy views of the AONB.

Given Calne's position in the settlement hierarchy as a Market Town it is appropriate for it to accommodate a proportion of the County's housing need given its range of existing facilities and services and access to employment opportunities. In terms of the housing to be provided in Calne we would remind the Council of the requirements of paragraph 61 of the NPPF which states "the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes)."

The Council will need to plan for sufficient homes to ensure that the needs of all these groups are met but in particular we would highlight the need to provide sufficient homes for older people. The settlement profile for Calne identifies that in the years 2016 to 2036 the older population is expected to increase by 50% in the 60-74 age group and 105% in the 75+ age group. As noted in the PPG (Reference ID: 63-001-20190626) "offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care

and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking.” Older people seeking to downsize into smaller homes can also help free up larger family homes for resale on the housing market. A recent report by the Centre for the Study of Financial Innovation titled Two Little, Too Late? Housing for an ageing population, authored by [NAME REDACTED] (https://www.arcouk.org/sites/default/files/Too%20little%20too%20late__FINAL%20-%20June%20%202020.pdf), identified that while up to a third of older households are open to the idea of downsizing their property few actually do so with a lack of suitable properties being cited as a key reason.

To add variation in the supply of housing and to meet the needs of Calne’s growing population of older persons the Vision for Penn Hill Farm also incorporates a continuing care retirement community where older persons can live comfortably safe in the knowledge that their changing care needs will continue to be met without the need to continually move home. This will help the older people of Calne and its surroundings stay connected with the community where they already live and avoid severing connections in order to find appropriate levels of care. Being able to deliver care directly at home such as would occur at Penn Hill Farm also reduces pressure on primary healthcare provision provided at Calne’s two existing GP surgeries and on secondary healthcare provision provided at local and regional hospitals and community healthcare settings.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we’ve missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

In considering the Penn Hill Farm site it is important to consider the significant economic benefits of the jobs that will be created at the proposed continuing care retirement community. These would include jobs related to care, health and wellbeing, management, catering and grounds management which would generate employment at a range of skills levels including entry level jobs for the young people of Calne.

Similarly, the proposed continuing care retirement community at Penn Hill Farm would generate significant social benefits in providing care for older people in the domestic setting thereby enabling them to stay independent for longer, retain ties with the local community and reduce the burden on the local health service. Moreover, there is the potential for family homes to be released back onto the housing market to ensure churn and that local people can secure a home appropriate to their needs.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

We acknowledge there is a long-standing local aspiration for an eastern bypass to be delivered at Calne. However, to secure the necessary funding for this we would anticipate that a significantly higher level of growth than is currently proposed in the Emerging Spatial Strategy would need to be provided for. Therefore, improvements to existing transport infrastructure will likely need to be prioritised in order to meet the place shaping priorities identified at paragraph 23.

Further comments

We have no further comments to make.

Rep ID: Calne137	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>I would like to submit my comments on the proposed scale of Calne's future housing growth which need to be submitted by 9th March 2021.</p> <p>I do not understand what processes were originally used to determine the scale of the imposed growth of Calne so far. The number of houses built over the last 20 years is out of all proportion to the original size of the town or to what the town can successfully sustain. If the government insist on big house building schemes in Wiltshire is this simply allocated on a build by numbers basis with no thought to what a town can support? How is it that locally plans are rejected and then after successive appeals they are allowed? (Housing at Low Lane for example).</p> <p>The town centre is without doubt woefully inadequate to serve the existing population as are many of the services needed to support the population. Air pollution is a problem in the town centre and connectivity within and through the town is an issue. I understand that because Calne is not on a major trunk route it does not qualify for additional finance as do Chippenham and Melksham. Unless this basic infrastructure is improved there should be no further house building. The proposed housing development sites are all on the outskirts of the town which means each new house will likely bring in at least one more car, more</p>	

likely two. Car ownership will be necessary to get to work, shopping, recreation, as some of the sites eg. in Quemerford, Stockley Lane, Rookery Park are a long way from the town centre.

Future development needs to take much more account of our natural capital. Continued development destroys the environment and over expansion is not something that is either sensible or desirable no matter what numbers Calne has been "allocated".

Calne residents do not want more houses at least until the existing problems are solved. The potentially huge development sites (1,3,4 and 7) will further eat into the countryside and have huge impacts on wildlife in the Marden Valley. The variety of wildlife we have is impressive. Once gone it can never be restored. A bit of landscaping or tree planting on new developments doesn't address the problem. Surely we should only be building on town centre and brown field sites.

Also Site 4 borders the edge of a huge landfill site. Can we really guarantee that longterm it is healthy for people to live so close to? What studies have been carried out?

We need to be much more forward thinking. In 10 years time the talk will be of the planning mistakes we are making now: poor quality housing, housing density which is unacceptable, lack of thought about what is really important. Just because developers offer to throw in some road building or a play park doesn't make the development more acceptable. Economic health is dependent on our environmental well-being. The CPRE have recently done studies into natural capital which should be required reading for our planning authorities.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Unfortunately individuals who are against ruining things for the futue seem to have no voice.

Rep ID: Calne138

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable):

Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No

Organisation being represented (if applicable):

Does this representation refer to attachment(s):

no

If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:

CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?

From looking at all of the town plans it seems abundantly clear Calne has been identified unfairly to have such a large amount of significant growth very still ongoing massive development in calne and the implications of this haven't been felt yet in terms of the strain on the infrastructure if anymore is done then it will lose its identity as a town and all that it residents like further development would destroy much of the available green spaces and the events of the last year have shown how important these are to be available for the residents to use and enjoy without having to travel far this is without considering destroying the irreplaceable habitat for nature.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Before any more housing should be considered for calne the traffic issues need to be addressed both finding a way to reduce the bottlenecks as well as the volume of commercial traffic which would involve finding alternative waste disposal and treatment sites for Wiltshire. Further consideration should be given to the development of new centre of calne to provide and maintain their services that is used by the community better footpaths cycle lanes an access to green spaces is also important.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The areas East of Khan have already been overdeveloped and any further encroachment would have significant detrimental impact with areas of 3610, 495 and 3616 all being heavily used by local residents on a regular basis sandpit Rd struggles with the traffic speed and volumes already I'm but is without the sites currently being developed and having residents let alone and then adding to it further the area to the West of a bypass (A3102) have not been considered at all and given the access would be far better I am amazed it hasn't been put forward as it would avoid many of the impacts of the other proposed areas.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Careful use of existing brownfield sites for example the bottom of silver St, White Horse pub on the A4, and coop supermarket site could provide low cost flats to satisfy low cost housing located close to public transport the green spaces should be left untouched as much as possible for everyone's enjoyment.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Sites 496 and 3610:

This land is about 1 of the highest points in area and the runoff of water for field is already considerable and but only get worse with on this land. Any properties would overlook properties on the other side of sandpit Rd encroaching on their privacy. The cost of building on land with these contours would be expensive and uncommercial if it were to be sold for development. The increase

of traffic on sandpit Rd if these areas are built on would make an already busy Rd more dangerous especially with all the commercial traffic both up to the farm and along to the waste site this has already been reported to the town council as and identified as a major traffic problem.

This area provides much needed and used areas for local residents to exercise and enjoy. It provides important wildlife corridors to area 3611 which has already been correctly dismissed on the grounds of environment disruption 3611 has nested lapwings and other critical species and the development of areas 495 and 3610 could create significant disruptions to these creature's habitat. There are also nesting bats in the development areas identified. House prices for existing properties along sandpit road and Spitfire Rd could suffer as a result of further development.

Sites 3168, 489, 451, and 498:

The above comments for 495 and 3610 apply, with the additional concerns:

Spitfire Rd is used by commercial vehicles and is already becoming unsafe access on foot particularly by family that unbearable cruise looking at access for countryside via bridle path further development here will exasperate these problems.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

There are already issues on sandpit Rd with the commercial traffic now increased Via Hills waste. These issues have been reported to the town council and identified as a major traffic problem so these concerns should be given increased importance when the sites are being considered. There is also a considerable bottleneck down Oxford road which would only get worse

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne139	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Strutt and Parker
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): The Whinney and Keeping Partnership	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne139
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne.</p> <p>The Framework has an unequivocal emphasis on housing delivery, with the introduction to the 2019 consultation proposals clarifying that the country needs radical, lasting reform that will allow more homes to be built, with the intention of reaching 300,000 net additional homes a year. The Framework states at paragraph 59 that to support the Government's objective of "significantly boosting the supply of homes", it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.</p> <p>As far as the overall housing requirement to be met by the Local Plan Review is concerned, the Government's Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that "The standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in</p>	

determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour.” Therefore, we support the Council’s approach in calculating housing need for the authority area in two ways, providing a minimum and a higher figure. The lower figure in the range of housing need assessed by the Council represents the minimum that results from using a national standard method. The Local Housing Need Assessment (LHNA) figure, used in the consultation papers, takes account of longer term migration, economic forecasts and a contingency produces the upper range result. In our view, this higher level is more robust when planning for the longer term and does more to meet national and local needs for more homes.

Calne is one of the major settlements located within the Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA), along with Chippenham, Corsham, Devizes, Malmesbury and Melksham. The Council’s emerging strategy for this HMA assimilates the results of the sustainability appraisal which tested a number of alternative development strategies rather than adopting any individual strategy in its entirety.

Paragraph 3.32 of this consultation’s Emerging Spatial Strategy topic paper recognises the potential for growth above current Core Strategy levels at Calne and comments that this higher scale of development would be predicated on this increase being necessary to help provide transport solutions to alleviate issues such as traffic congestion and local air quality issues in the town centre. We make further comments on this matter in our response to question CA6, but it is clear from the results of the Sustainability Appraisal summarising within the Emerging Spatial Strategy topic paper that the three towns of Chippenham, Melksham and Calne are the least constrained settlements and consequently should be the foci for growth within the Chippenham HMA with an aspirational level of growth apportioned appropriately between them.

Therefore, it is surprising and perhaps disappointing that in terms of its emerging strategy and delivery proposals, the Council seeks to overwhelmingly allocate new development within the Chippenham HMA as large urban extensions to Chippenham and Melksham with only a modest apportionment of 1,610 homes to Calne over the 20-year plan period 2016-2036. Indeed, as illustrated within the table below, when expressed as a percentage of total homes to be delivered across the HMA, the proportion proposed to be delivered at Calne is actually less for this Local Plan Review (8%) than in the current Wiltshire Core Strategy (10%): The table above illustrates the overwhelming reliance of the emerging strategy upon as yet unallocated (or ‘residual’) development at Chippenham (and to a lesser extent at Melksham), where recent experience has demonstrated the difficulty in delivering urban extensions in the town as evidenced by the lengthy emergence of the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD. Indeed, the Council makes a number of references to the difficulty in delivering large numbers of new homes at Chippenham (paragraphs 3.28, 3.46 of the Emerging Spatial Strategy).

By comparison, Calne, a settlement that the Council identifies in its own Sustainability Appraisal as one of the three settlements most capable of accommodating growth within the HMA, is apportioned just 4% of the residual growth for the HMA over the 17 years from 2019 to 2036. This is a figure 13 times less than Chippenham and 6.5 times less than Melksham. In absolute terms, the residual requirement for Calne of 360 homes equates to just 21 new homes in the town per year.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Council already acknowledges that some greenfield sites will need to be allocated at Calne either in the Local Plan Review or a forthcoming review of the Calne and Calne Without Neighbourhood Development Plan, it is our view the Council's emerging spatial strategy is not a sound or sustainable strategy for the HMA for the reasons set out in our response to this question and also our response to the questions posed within the Emerging Spatial Strategy topic paper. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the Council reconsiders its emerging growth strategy relating to Calne and apportions a more appropriate level of growth to the town whilst reducing its unrealistic reliance on Chippenham, commensurate with the conclusions of its own evidence base.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne.

We support the Council's stated Delivery Principles outlined within the consultation, particularly that each main settlement (including Calne) will have a set of 'place shaping priorities' to guide how and where development will take place and what distinct priorities there may be to manage change in the local environment.

We also support the Council's place shaping priorities outlined at page 5 of the Planning for Calne topic paper and believe these could be facilitated and achieved through a future development allocation at Quemerford Farm either as a standalone site or as part of a wider allocation:

- i. A consolidated approach to any housing growth, with the protection and provision of new employment land;
- ii. Support development that is well connected to Calne Town Centre and encourage delivery of infrastructure to support sustainable development;
- iii. Ensure infrastructure improvements to the local road network, reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality;
- iv. Minimise the impact of development and associated infrastructure on the environment to help to meet the Calne Town Council Climate and Environmental Emergency Pledge;
- v. Develop a plan for town centre regeneration that will ensure continued investment in the town centre;
- vi. Provision and promotion of sustainable transport and active travel, including new and improved bus routes and walking/cycling infrastructure.

Further information on the land at Quemerford Farm can be found in our response to question CA4.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne.

The land at Quemerford Farm (shown on the plan appended to these representations, and outlined in blue) extends to 35 hectares (86.6 acres) and forms a large part of the potential site identified by the Council as 'Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c)'. Further information on this site can be found in our response to question CA4. The Whinney and Keeping Partnership wish to retain the land outlined in green and yellow.

We support the Council's site selection process to date, the pool of identified potential development sites and its stated aim to allocate land for development through the Local Plan where it is necessary to do so. We feel it will be necessary to allocate land within the Local Plan Review to ensure the scale of the County's housing and employment needs are met and to ensure a supply of deliverable land. As outlined in our response to question CA1, in order to achieve a sound strategy for the HMA, the size of the allocations at Calne should be increased within this pool of sites to reflect the town's position as one of the three most sustainable in the HMA along with Chippenham and Melksham.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne. The land at Quemerford Farm (shown on the plan appended to these representations, and outlined in blue) extends to 35 hectares (86.6 acres) and forms a large part of the potential site identified by the Council as 'Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c)'. For clarity, the land at Quemerford Farm includes part of SHELAA site 1104a (including the westernmost and southernmost parts closest to the urban edge) as well as the entire SHELAA site 1104b. The Whinney and Keeping Partnership wish to retain the land outlined in green and yellow.

The Council's assessment of the wider Site 4 outlined in the topic paper highlights the following considerations:

- "A large split site which has the potential for landscape impacts, particularly towards the eastern part of the site.
- Potential for impacts on the existing mitigation and enhancement of the former extraction and landfill at Sands Farm and on Sands Farm Quarry County Wildlife Site.
- Some areas of flood risk through the southern part of the site.

- Potential impacts on the scheduled monument (medieval rural settlement at Quemerford) and on the setting of Grade I listed Hayle Farm on the eastern edge.
- Site may need to provide an access onto the A4 to the south”.

Whilst the Council considers it most logical that the whole wider ‘site 4’ would come forward, the wider site would clearly be a substantial eastern expansion of the town, possibly to cater for Calne’s growth needs beyond the end of the Local Plan Review period or in future reviews of the Local Plan. As such, whilst we are currently engaged in dialogue with neighbouring landowners regarding the possible future promotion of land east of Calne and strongly support any potential allocation of the wider ‘Site 4’, we would wish to stress that the land at Quemerford Farm could equally come forward separately as a standalone site, either in its entirety or in an appropriately phased manner.

Indeed, the Council’s site assessment has identified no constraints that would prevent the land coming forward for allocation in the Local Plan Review. Development of the land at Quemerford Farm would read as a logical extension to Calne, infilling the area between Low Lane to the west and Quemerford and the A4 to the south. It would not bring about any sense of coalescence with surrounding settlements and any development would be read against a backdrop of the current town when viewed from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the east. The site is not subject to any prohibitive landscape, heritage or ecological designations and with appropriate connections secured to the A4, would integrate well in terms of accessibility as well as being well-placed to profit from any potential future eastern bypass of the town.

Whilst the site is rated ‘green’ in the Council’s site assessment for flood risk, the River’s Brook which runs through the centre of the site is identified by the Council as a potential Green and Blue Infrastructure Corridor could be incorporated as an attractive blue infrastructure corridor within any comprehensively masterplanned scheme which could connect with the town centre.

The Council’s site assessment outlines potential impact upon the scheduled monument (the medieval rural settlement at Quemerford), however it is envisaged that any development would avoid this area, leaving the monument in situ with minimal impact to its setting which is already read against the adjacent development along the A4. It would also act as a buffer between the present development along the A4 and any new development on the site. Additional landscaping would be incorporated to address the boundary with the Conservation Area at the western edge of the site and it is considered that development of the site would not adversely impact the setting of any listed buildings. Any potential landscape impacts would be comprehensively assessed and addressed through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment with areas of landscaping provided as appropriate.

It is our firmly held view that Site 4 represents the most appropriate site at Calne for a sustainable, strategic scale development. It would deliver much needed new market and affordable housing, fund key infrastructure improvements and provide new public open space. Collaborative working between landowners and promoters would ensure the delivery of a new bypass linking the current development north of Low Lane with the A4 at Quemerford to provide a new route to help alleviate congestion and help improve town centre air quality.

National planning policy has a particular emphasis upon 'deliverable housing sites'. As such we can confirm that the land is 'deliverable' as defined within the glossary of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now, and would be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing would be delivered on the site within five years.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne. The Council identifies across the topic papers published for consultation that the impact of the current COVID-19 pandemic is also likely to increase home working permanently, reducing net out commuting to other settlements and further boosting local demand. Therefore, we recommend that the Local Plan Review reflects this move to homeworking by providing opportunities for appropriate levels of development within towns such as Calne and that these are supported by the necessary infrastructure to enable homeworking.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

These representations have been prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate / Strutt & Parker on behalf of the Whinney and Keeping Partnership, owners of land at Quemerford Farm, Calne.

Whilst it is clear that the land at Quemerford Farm could form a standalone extension to the town, we also support the wider allocation of the potential 'Site 4' in the Local Plan Review. This wider allocation would undoubtedly facilitate the delivery of an eastern bypass for Calne which the Council describes in the consultation documents as a "long-standing local aspiration". Such a route would make a major contribution towards alleviating identified issues such as traffic congestion and poor local air quality in the town centre. A large urban extension of this scale would also allow opportunities to introduce important carbon reduction measures and efficiencies impractical or unviable on smaller sites, which would be desirable given the Council's commitment to balancing growth with combatting climate change, as well as deliver further improvements to the town's economic, social and environmental infrastructure.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne140	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Turley
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Rainier Developments Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne140
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>As explained in the section on the Spatial Strategy and Chippenham HMA above, we consider Calne is capable, and suitable to accommodate a higher level of growth. Sites such as land at Chilvester Hill are available to realise this level of growth. We do not object to the identification of a brownfield 'target' as an approach which encourages the use of brownfield land but does not 'require' it. For the reasons set out above we consider that there are clear limitations to the supply of brownfield sites and that green field land at Calne will need to be identified to accommodate housing growth.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

We have no objection in general to the priorities set out. However, if the wording presented is intended to be the starting point for planning policies it needs to be more clear, precise and based on a clear and transparent evidence base. Wording such as seeking a 'consolidated approach to any housing growth' is imprecise and unclear. It is not apparent how a proposal would accord with this requirement. In addition, we consider that a further priority should be included which is to ensure the role and function of Calne is maintained as an important local employment centre and as a key location to accommodate sustainable growth in the County.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

We consider this is the right pool of development sites for the Council to consider at this time.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

[NAME REDACTED] site at Calne is known to the Council through its identification in the Site Selection Report, and given the recent planning application on the site (determined under application ref. 20/06684/OUT). It is highly unlikely that Calne's housing needs can be met in full using brownfield land. Therefore, the Council is justified in its intent to allocate greenfield land for development. Land south of Chilvester Hill (SHELAA ref. 3172 and Site ref. 8) 2 is appropriate to build upon to help deliver Calne's housing need.

The site has been identified as a potential development site for assessment (Site ref. 8 and ref. 3172). The Site Selection Report provides the site assessment results and concludes that it should be taken forward as there was 'no justification to reject'. We agree with this conclusion, however have comments on the scoring of the site against the various criteria.

Accessibility, Flood Risk and Landscape are all scored green, which is an assessment we agree with.

Traffic however is scored red; it is not clear the reason for this as the text makes no mention of any highway or traffic related observations. A full Transport Assessment was submitted with the application for the development on this site and the Council's Highways Engineer raised no objection to the application. In terms of accessibility, the site is well-related to the existing facilities and services in Calne, including a primary school, convenience stores, supermarkets and Porte Marsh Industrial Estate which hosts a range of employment opportunities. The site is located within walking distance of bus stops, which are served by half-

hourly services to Calne, Chippenham and Swindon. Frequent train services are also available at Chippenham Railway Station which can be reached by bus from the site.

The Transport Statement demonstrates that the proposed development would not generate a significant number of additional vehicular trips, and will not have a material impact on the highway network. Access was proposed as part of the application and this was deemed acceptable. Overall there are no highways or transport issues raised during the determination of the application. It is requested that the scoring for Traffic is revised to green.

With regards to heritage, it is acknowledged that the site is adjacent to a listed Farmhouse. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the adjoining farmhouse is the only heritage asset that would be impacted by the proposals. During the determination of the application on the site it was agreed that the level of harm arising from the proposed development is at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial. We consider that there are no heritage reasons that prevent the site being allocated for residential development, any less than substantial heritage impact can be considered through the development management process.

Set out below are responses to the questions set out in the Planning for Calne paper where these matters have not already been addressed above. It is highly unlikely that Calne's housing needs can be met in full using brownfield land. Therefore, the Council is justified in its intent to allocate greenfield land for development. Land south of Chilvester Hill (SHELAA ref. 3172 and Site ref. 8) 2 is appropriate to build upon to help deliver Calne's housing need.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

We do not consider any important social, economic or environmental factors have been missed.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

No comment at this time.

Further comments

These representation are prepared by Turley on behalf of Rainier Developments Limited ('Rainier') in response to the current Wiltshire Local Plan Review ('LPR') consultation on the Emerging Spatial Strategy and settlement specific Planning Documents. This submission is made in relation to land south of Chilvester Hill, Calne, which is attributed SHELAA Ref 3172, and on which a planning application was recently considered under application ref. 20/06684/OUT. Our representations are structured to firstly comment on the 'Emerging Spatial Strategy' consultation document which considers the County wide spatial strategy for the LPR. We then consider the 'Planning for Calne' consultation document which sets out the proposed role in this strategy for the market town of Calne. We support the Council's intention to prepare the LPR and welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft proposals. The plan period should be adjusted to ensure that it runs for at least 15 years post adoption. We support the Council's intention to prepare the LPR and welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft proposals. The plan period should be adjusted to ensure that it runs for at least 15 years post adoption. We support the continued identification of Calne as a Market Town that should accommodate further growth in the LPR. We consider that it would not reflect the settlement's status in the hierarchy to constrain the level of future growth to just 360 homes above the existing commitments. The level of new housing planned for at Calne should be increased. The site at the south of Chilvester Hill is suitable for residential development and should be identified as a location to accommodate the future growth at Calne in the LPR. Various technical reports accompanied a recent application on the site and evidenced that development can be achieved suitably, and reflect an integrated approach to securing economically, socially and environmentally sustainable development. The site is free from constraints and available for development now. We look forward to engaging further with the preparation of the Local Plan Review, and associated consultations in due course. Should you have any questions about our representations or would like to discuss the development potential of the Site further then please do not hesitate to contact us.

Rep ID: Calne141	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Blue Fox Planning
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne141
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

2.1 Land controlled by Persimmon Homes, comprises 14ha of agricultural land, located to the east of Calne, north of the A4 (Quemerford) and south of Low Lane. The site forms part of the area identified as 'Area 4' within the Calne Site Selection Report, being part of a development area that is to be taken forward for further assessment as the final pool of potential sites.

2.2 The land is controlled by Persimmon Homes on a Freehold basis and the extent of this area, set within the wider east of Calne development opportunity area is shown on the attached Concept Plan, this is supported by an Opportunities and Constraints Plan.

APPENDIX 1: EAST CALNE CONCEPT PLAN

APPENDIX 2: EAST CALNE CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES PLAN

2.3 Within the Site Selection Report land controlled by Persimmon is grouped with adjacent land and in combination the report considers that: 'These sites abut each other to the east of Calne and north of Quemerford and have no strong physical barriers separating them. The sites combined would form a logical unit for further assessment.'

2.4 The summary assessment table set out in the Site Selection Report identifies key considerations such as flood risk and heritage assets, but recognises that these do not represent barriers to development at this location.

2.5 Of most significance in the high-level assessment set out in the Site Selection Report are matters related to landscape, specifically to the east. Notwithstanding, the Site Selection Report does acknowledge that the potential for adverse landscape impacts will be dependent upon the extent and location of any development, with fewer impacts considered likely if development is located nearer to the centre of Calne.

2.6 In support of our representations a Landscape and Visual Constraints Study has been prepared. The findings of this baseline study assist in terms of identifying potential constraints resulting from any key views, landscape features or designations.

APPENDIX 3: EAST CALNE LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL CONSTRAINTS STUDY 2021

2.7 The full report is provided at Appendix 3, but in summary the findings of this study can be explained as follows.

2.8 The site is located outside of the AONB, therefore there will be no physical effect on the AONB itself, however, due to the proximity of the site to the AONB, the site, as well as Calne and the rest of the study area, are located within the AONB's setting. The town, as well as the new developments under construction on the edge of it, already provide an extensive area of urban development in this landscape, which reduces the susceptibility to change to the proposed development area which is well-related to it.

2.9 Therefore, although there will be a reduction in the agricultural land-use in this part of the AONB setting, the proposals will be in keeping with the type of development that already features heavily in the area. It should be noted that not all of the area will be appropriate for development, and that strategic areas of landscaping and open space will help to mitigate the effect of any development within the landscape.

2.10 Although there are extensive views across the landscape from within the AONB, views from the AONB are relatively limited, with partial views from the east, and more open views from the southeast and south.

2.11 It should be noted that these elevated locations provide wide panoramic views across the study area and beyond, and that only a small part of the view will be changed from an agricultural to urban land use, but one which will be seen in the context of urban Calne. Furthermore, the site's boundary and on-site vegetation will help to break up and soften views of any development and can be supplemented with an additional landscape framework that can further reduce the effect of the development on views from the AONB. Thus, whilst the site is visible, views from the AONB, whilst available, will not be dominant or even unduly prominent.

2.12 The precise scale and distribution of development at this area will be determined by site specific studies and investigations and this will include a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, but given the scale of this development area, there are significant opportunities to bring forward development that is sensitive and responsive to its constraints and main sensitivities, with a particular consideration of the landscape impacts.

2.13 We are therefore encouraged that this development area is considered acceptable to advance to subsequent stages and further detailed assessment.

2.14 Persimmon Homes is in active discussions with adjacent landowners and site promoters to advance proposals to bring forward a comprehensively planned development area, one which is based on a detailed understanding of the opportunities and constraint that exist at this location. Such discussions are advanced and the prospects for an agreement are extremely positive, enabling a holistic approach to be undertaken to advance proposals at this location.

2.15 Further updates on such discussions can be provided to Wiltshire Council throughout the plan-making process. 2.16 Development at Area 4 has the genuine potential to facilitate significant infrastructure delivery, principally the creation of a road link from the A4 (Quemerford Road) to the south, connecting to recent development and the associated road network to the north of Low Lane. The high-level concept plan prepared in support of these representations demonstrates how this physical road connection could be achieved (See Appendix 1).

2.17 Development at this location, along the lines expressed in the Concept Plan, provides genuine opportunities to deliver infrastructure improvements which can facilitate wider benefits to Calne, related to traffic movements and the existing issues related to Air Quality at the town centre.

2.18 The delivery of this road link can support long-held objectives which are noted within the summary of public consultation, set out in the Chippenham HMA ADSs. By way of example, page 17 of the ADSs, references feedback from earlier rounds of

consultation and notes that: “an opportunity widely suggested was that planning further development should open up the opportunity of an eastern relief road.”

2.19 This is again referenced in the summary of Town and Parish Workshops where it was stated that: “Options for higher growth were discussed to enable the delivery of road infrastructure to relieve congestion in the town centre and Air Quality Management within town.”

2.20 Land at Area 4, including land controlled by Persimmon Homes, has significant development potential which can support the role and function of Calne as a Market Town, whilst also facilitating the delivery of significant infrastructure improvements alongside other benefits associated with traffic congestion and matters related to air quality in the town centre.

2.21 It is within this context that this land is promoted and supported as a suitable and appropriate development location at Calne. However, for reasons set out within our representations, there is concern that the proposed strategy for Calne is not sufficiently justified and critically, may act as an artificial constraint to development that can support significant infrastructure improvements.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we’ve missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

5.1 On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd, we welcome the opportunity to submit representations in response to the Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review. Our representations are concerned with the proposed strategy for Calne as part of the Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA).

5.2 Our representations explain how land controlled by Persimmon Homes to the east of Calne, as part of Area 4, can make an important contribution to housing delivery and, in combination with adjacent land, support the delivery of major infrastructure improvements, specifically the completion of an eastern road link at Calne.

5.3 Previous piecemeal speculative development to the east of Calne has resulted in the northern half of the eastern link road being provided. There is now an opportunity, through the plan-led system, to support the completion of this road and facilitate significant improvements to traffic movements through the town and help to address long-standing issues related to air quality.

5.4 There are concerns that the scale of growth proposed at Calne is artificially reduced and that is not based on a robust evidence base to justify why this is appropriate.

5.5 We are concerned that the baseline strategy, i.e. rolling forward the current strategy, has been not been taken forward as the preferred strategy for Calne, in favour of alternatives which are premised on lower housing numbers.

5.6 We have set out our concerns with the SA and how this process fails to provide adequate justification to support the strategy now proposed at Calne. Furthermore, we question why, given the historic rates of delivery at Calne, the SA does not consider levels of growth above the current strategy as a reasonable alternative.

5.7 It is our conclusion that the most appropriate strategy for Calne is one which rolls forward the current strategy, i.e. reasonable alternative CH-A, and in doing so increase the requirement at Calne from the 1,610 currently proposed to the baseline figure of 2,050. Where higher levels of growth would be supported by an assessment of an additional reasonable alternative, then this should be reflected in the final quantum that is to be directed to Calne.

5.8 Finally, we seek clarity in terms of the role of the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan at Calne. There appears to be some uncertainty regarding the scope and remit of the Local Plan in terms of assessing and allocating sites, due to specific reference within the Planning for Calne Paper which appears to confirm that it will be for the Neighbourhood Plan process to bring forward the scales of development proposed. 5.9 As set out within our representations, Persimmon Homes is engaged with adjacent landowners and site promoters at east Calne, with a view to achieving development at Area 4 as part of a comprehensively planned development, based on a detailed understanding of the constraints and opportunities at this location. Such discussions are advanced and on-going and we would welcome the opportunity to provide further updates to the Council on this matter.

Further comments

1.1 On behalf of our client, Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd, Blue Fox Planning Ltd is instructed to submit representations in response to the March 2021 Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review public consultation.

1.2 The representations set out herein are focused on the land controlled by Persimmon Homes at 'South of Low Lane, Calne'. This land of circa 14 hectares forms part of a wider land parcel which is identified in the Wiltshire Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), site reference: 1104a (Land at Quemerford).

1.3 Alongside adjacent SHELAA sites (1104b, 1104c and 3642), this land has been identified within the Site Selection Report for Calne as 'Area 4', part of the final pool of potential sites to be taken forward for further detailed assessment through the preparation of the Local Plan.

1.4 The Council has produced the 'Planning for Calne' Paper which sets out the proposed approach over the plan period to 2036. The basis of the Planning for Calne Paper is that the settlement is identified as needing to accommodate 1610 homes for the plan period to 2036, which means a requirement to provide a further 360 homes above that already committed. Alongside housing, 4ha of employment land has also been identified.

1.5 It is explained within the Planning for Calne Paper that only a relatively small amount of land is required to meet strategic housing requirements and that this will be identified through the Neighbourhood Plan. The suggestion being that the Local Plan will not allocate sites at Calne. If this is the case, then it is not clear what role the Local Plan has in terms of the assessment of sites at Calne, if this process will be within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.

1.6 It is stated within the Planning for Calne Paper (paragraph 17) that Town and Parish Council's may also be able to progress higher growth options through the neighbourhood plan that have local community support, for example, to deliver specific types of infrastructure. Such an approach is supported as a matter of principle, but this appears to confuse the relationship between the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan process. It appears to relate to growth above that which is identified through the Local Plan Review process. Yet, as explained previously, there is a clear suggestion that the Neighbourhood Plan process will be responsible for delivery the scales of growth identified in this current consultation.

1.7 Greater clarity is therefore required in terms of the 'further detailed assessment' of those sites identified in the final pool and how this relates to the Neighbourhood Plan process at Calne.

1.8 Our representations consider in detail the justification and methodology behind the development strategy for Calne, specifically the process of determining the scale of growth that is required.

1.9 For reasons set out within our representations, it is considered that the approach to Calne is neither robust or positively prepared and that in the context of the wider Chippenham Housing Market Area (HMA), the overriding emphasis of development at Chippenham curtails the proper and meaningful consideration of higher levels of growth at Calne.

1.10 It is our conclusion, based on the representations set out, that the housing requirement at Calne should be increased to reflect the figures that emerge from the rolling forward of the current strategy.

1.11 In providing for such levels of growth, this can support development that has the potential to deliver significant infrastructure and in doing so, help to address specific issues at Calne, related to traffic and air quality. Land controlled by Persimmon Homes south of Low Lane, forms part of a development area that can facilitate the delivery of a road link, providing connections from the south at the A4 (Quemerford) with recently constructed development to the north (north of Low Lane).

1.12 In support of our representations a high-level Concept Plan has been produced as a means of demonstrating how development within 'Area 4' can facilitate the road link referenced above.

1.13 At present, the proposed strategy and associated need for a further 360 homes, does not provide the strategic context that could allow such infrastructure to be delivered as part of a comprehensively planned development to the east of Calne.

Rep ID: Calne142	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Carter Jones
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Atwell Wilson Motor Museum, Calne	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne 142
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>In answer to “What do you think to this scale of growth?”, it is acknowledged and welcomed that the dwelling requirement for Calne is proposed to increase however, we consider that this level of growth still does not go far enough to meet the identified local need for the area and enable employment growth.</p> <p>Whilst we have doubts in relation to what the brownfield target is likely to achieve, we note in “The Planning for Calne” consultation document that the Council is suggesting that a target of 60 dwellings should be built on brownfield sites in Calne over the next 10 years. The redevelopment of the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum site, which lies within the settlement boundary, could go some way to meeting this target and delivering some of the 360 dwellings identified to meet the assessed need for the town. However, to facilitate the relocation and expansion of the museum into a state of the art community facility, we consider that additional residential development will be required to enable the relocation and assist in employment opportunities to be delivered.</p>	

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

In answer to the question CA2 in relation to the priorities for Calne, we agree with the consolidated approach to housing growth and the provision of new employment land, in addition to the promotion of sustainable transport and active travel. Indeed, the redevelopment of the existing Atwell Wilson Museum site, that is within the settlement boundary, accords with the priorities for the town. However, we note the absence of reference to the importance of visitor attractions to the footfall of the town and the revenue that arises from tourism. We therefore suggest that Calne's priorities be extended to include reference to retaining and enhancing visitor attractions, such as the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum, to help increase the town centre's footfall.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

In response to question CA3 in relation to the right pool of potential development sites, we consider that the opportunity afforded by the relocation of the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum and development of the land within and south of the settlement boundary out with the flood plain should also be explored. The museum site itself could go some way to meeting Calne's brownfield target in addition to enabling the expansion and creation of a state-of-the art visitor attraction and community hub.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

In answer to question CA4, we consider that there needs to be a mix of sites, on both brown and green fields, that can provide a range of dwelling types and tenures of both market and affordable dwellings to meet the identified local need. As per our response to question CA2, we consider that the LPR should recognise the importance of visitor attractions to the local economy and the social benefits of community facilities to the residents. A new facility for the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum will create the opportunity for a modern educational and community environment that can be used by schools and community groups alike, creating a sense of place and pride for Calne. Sustainable and active travel routes can be created through the site, which currently does not benefit from the public right of way network, connecting the new museum and proposed residential

development to the town centre. New publicly accessible green and blue infrastructure will be provided on the site linking into the existing networks and providing wider biodiversity enhancements. Our client's land at the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum extends to circa 18.3 hectares / 45.2 acres on the southern side of Calne. As acknowledged in the adopted Core Strategy and the vision for Calne, Market Towns have the potential for significant development that will increase jobs and homes in order to help sustain and enhance their services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable sustainable communities.

The Atwell Wilson Museum itself is situated within the settlement boundary, south of Stockley Lane, with the remainder of the land (as identified on the attached red line plan) extending south to Knights Marsh Farm and east to Upper Quemerford Mill and Lake View road, with Stockley Lane also forming the western boundary.

The site is bisected in a north south direction by an unnamed watercourse and the land, whilst generally flat, falls gently in the direction of the watercourse. The Grade II Listed Upper Provender Mill lies out with the eastern boundary of the site and the Grade II Listed building The Croft is situated to the north at Stockley Lane outside of the site. There are no public rights of way within the site neither are there any trees that are subject to a Preservation Order. The site is not designated greenbelt and is not within the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Whilst the museum has extended several times over the past decade, to enable it to continue to offer the facilities of a modern visitor attraction, and viably function as a museum facility, it wishes to relocate and expand to new facilities to the southern portion of the Trustees ownership in the vicinity of Knights Marsh Farm.

The new facilities will be better able to host an expanded offering of specialist exhibitions in addition to providing an education facility equipped with community café, work hub and meeting rooms. A children's play park with picnic facilities could also be incorporated into the plans providing a new community benefit and wider visitor attraction for the town.

It is proposed that the land within the settlement boundary and that to the south, out with the flood plain, could be developed for circa 150 – 200 dwellings. Land to the east of the watercourse, out with the floodplain, could also be available for residential, employment or biodiversity net gain purposes subject to further technical investigation. It is considered that development in this vicinity, west of Lake View road, could provide betterment for the community in relation to the existing drainage issues in the area. Indeed, development proposals will be informed by the Council's themes contained within the "Addressing Climate Change and Biodiversity Net Gain" paper by limiting development to Flood Zone 1; incorporating SUDs drainage solutions and natural flood management measures; enhancing and creating new green and blue infrastructure; providing a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain to be managed in perpetuity; development will be designed to achieve a net zero carbon standard and will seek to minimise embodied carbon and environmental impacts; electric vehicle charge points will be provided both at the new museum facilities and in the residential development; and will be designed to encourage sustainable and active travel modes.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION (JANUARY – MARCH 2021 – REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF ATWELL WILSON MOTOR MUSEUM, CALNE

We write on behalf of our client, the Trustees of the Atwell Wilson Museum, Calne, in response to the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR) 'Issues and Options' (Regulation 18) consultation.

The Atwell Wilson Motor Museum was founded in Calne in 1981 by Richard and Hasell Atwell and is home to a permanent collection of vehicles from the 1920's onwards. The Museum also hosts a collection of vehicles on special loan which enables a variety of exhibitions to be held periodically to encourage regular visitors. The site has not previously been promoted through the adopted Development Plan.

As illustrated on the attached red line plan, the Trustees own approximately 45.2 acres / 18.3 hectares of land to the south of Calne which provides the opportunity for residential development and a relocation and / or modernisation of the museum to create a sustainable mixed use development outside the flood plain to help Calne address the housing shortfall, in addition to creating employment opportunities, a tourist attraction and community benefits. Active travel routes will be created throughout the site linking to the facilities in the town and the surrounding green and blue infrastructure will be enhanced and augmented providing biodiversity net gain.

This representation comments on the Local Plan Review Consultation Documents, namely:-

- Emerging Spatial Strategy
- Planning for Calne

Additionally, we provide comment on the following supporting documents:-

- Local Housing Needs Assessment - Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council (Opinion Research Services April 2019)
- Local Plan Review Interim Sustainability Appraisal – January 2021
- Chippenham HMA: Formulating Alternative Development Strategies
- Employment Land Review – Hardisty Jones April 2018
- Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – JBA Consulting May 2019

The representation is structured in the following sections: 1. Wiltshire LPR Consultation Documents 2. Supporting Evidence Documents 3. Land at The Atwell Wilson Motor Museum, Calne These representations demonstrate the opportunity for a relocation and modernisation of the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum which will create a sustainable mixed use development outside the flood plain to help Calne address the housing shortfall, in addition to creating employment opportunities, a tourist attraction and community benefits in a parkland setting. The site has the potential to become a natural extension to Calne which will increase the footfall in the town through the anticipated visitors.

We are pleased to have had the opportunity to comment on this stage of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review. We trust that the information provided assists the Council with its ongoing work as part of the LPR process. We look forward to further and continued dialogue with the Council regarding development options at the Atwell Wilson Motor Museum, Calne and would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss our proposals in more detail. We look forward to arranging this meeting in due course.

Rep ID: Calne143	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Terrence O'Rourke Ltd
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Gleeson Strategic Land	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne143
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Key to the production of a positive plan is a strategy that ensures that the right number of homes are delivered in the right locations. This task needs to be carefully considered to ensure the right level of development is directed to the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>As a market town, that has potential for significant sustainable growth, Calne is well placed to accommodate the proposed number and additional dwellings. It has a sustainable concentration of employment opportunities due to its proximity to the M4 and well-established services and facilities give it a key role to play in meeting housing need. It is important that sufficient housing growth is delivered at Calne to ensure its role and function can continue.</p> <p>Calne has a wide range of services and facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library • Tourist information • Primary and secondary schools • Further education, including sixth form • Museum • Leisure Centre • Places of worship • GP surgeries • Dental surgeries • Pre-schools and nurseries • Three large supermarkets • A number of convenience stores and • A range of high street and independent shops. 	

The main industrial estate, Porte Marsh, is located on the norther edge of the town and Calne accommodates several key employers.

The SA concludes that Calne is “less environmentally constrained” than other settlements in the Chippenham Housing Market Area (page 21). It is correctly recognised in the plan as being capable of accommodating additional housing growth.

Calne can and should accommodate more housing growth. The plan period is extended to 2036 years but only an additional 360 homes to be identified in Calne, yet 627 homes were delivered in the period 2016-19. Calne will need more housing growth to ensure there is sufficient housing for its younger generations and to support the wide range of shops, services and facilities the settlement has to offer, particularly in a post-Covid world.

In regard to the brownfield target, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the target can be achieved in the plan period, in the form of historic delivery rates in the town from brownfield sites or in the form of a brownfield register. Without any evidence, reliance should not be placed on delivery from this source and the plan should ensure sufficient sites are allocated to deliver housing to meet local needs and sustain the town.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Land south of Marden Farm, Stockley Lane (SHELAA reference: 3453)

Gleeson are promoting land to the south of Marden Farm for residential development as a natural expansion to the Marden Farm development, approved at appeal in 2014. The site is on the southern edge of the settlement and is accessible to the town centre via a network of local roads and footpaths (see appendix 1 for a site location plan).

As noted above, land at Marden Farm, to the north east of the site, was granted planning permission at appeal in 2014 for 125 dwellings and a care home (ref: APP/Y3940/A/13/2206076), confirming the suitability and sustainability of this edge of the town, which benefits from proximity and connective to the town centre and local schools and leisure facilities. All of these facilities are within a short walk of the site.

The Site Selection Report for Calne excludes site 3453 from being taken forward in the plan due to likely landscape impacts on the nearby AONB. However, there is no landscape evidence provided with the plan to demonstrate that the landscape impact would be unacceptable on the nearby AONB and this report does not consider whether there is any mitigation that could be used, in the normal way, to mitigate any potential impacts, for instance landscape planting.

The Site Selection Report is inconsistent in its approach. Site 700 is adjacent to the site 3453. Site 700 is to be taken forward for consideration, the documents identifying no justification for rejecting it at this stage. There is no landscape evidence or study referenced to justify the position and no explanation provided as to why neighbouring sites are treated differently. Both sites 700 and 3453 should be taken forward for further study. Landownership boundary does not determine landscape impact. Further assessment should be undertaken to understand to what extent site 3453 could contribute land for new homes, potentially in combination with site 700 and any additional benefits the inclusion of site 3453 could deliver.

In addition, the site selection report suggests there are potential cumulative flood risk issues, but the site is not within or near and flood zone and this is not considered for other neighbouring sites. There is no evidence to back up this sweeping statement.

Site 3453 is a logical extension to the Marden Farm development. However, the Council's own evidence is flawed and draws an inaccurate conclusion in respect of this site. The site is a lost opportunity and the omission of the site from being taken forward in the planning is disappointing. Land south of Marden Farm has been excluded from the potential development sites for no logical or consistent reason when a review of other sites being taken forward is undertaken. Like site 3453, other sites are taken forward that have been scored as having a high-level effect on the landscape but also in other categories including traffic. There are also some sites that are taken forward to the next stage that include significant areas of flood zones 2 and 3 or designated heritage assets. There seems to be no

consistency of approach and it seems site 3453 has been incorrectly excluded from being taken forward.

Site 3453 should be taken forward to enable a more detailed and comprehensive landscape and visual appraisal to be undertaken which could inform a landscape - led masterplan for the site that would overcome the concern in terms of the site's proximity to the AONB.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

The land to the south of Marden Farm, site 3453 is located in a sustainable location and provides a suitable site to deliver new homes to help meet housing need.

The site has been wrongly excluded in the site selection report as set out in response to question 3. The approach to site 3453 is illogical. The neighbouring site is taken forward but it is excluded. Whilst other sites that have been categorised in one area as

having a high impact on landscape or transport or have been identified as containing large proportion of the site within flood zones 2 and 3 have been taken forward. There is no consistency of approach. This flaw in the evidence basis needs to be addressed to ensure all suitable and sustainable sites are considered for growth.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Site 3453 has been excluded from being taken forward in the site selection plan due to proximity to the AONB and potential impact upon it. There is no supporting landscape evidence to demonstrate that this is the case and no consideration of how mitigation measures may be used in the normal way to address any potential impact on the AONB from development here. The text also indicates that there may be cumulative flood risk on the site but the site is not within, indeed is some distance from flood zones 2 and 3 and there is no evidence to justify this statement. The site is suitable and located in a sustainable location on the southern edge of Calne where it will benefit from close proximity to the local schools, the town centre and leisure facilities.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

There are no known infrastructure requirements associated with site 3453 that would prevent the development of this sustainable site.

Further comments

Please refer to pdf attachment Calne143 for full comments including site plan for SHELAA ref 3453. This includes Appendix 1: Site Location Plan.

Rep ID: Calne144	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Savills
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Viridor	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne144a/b/c/d/e
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>3.2. The paper sets out that under the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 there is a requirement for 1,440 homes at Calne. In comparison the consultation strategy proposes a requirement of 1,610 homes for a plan period of 2016-2036. It goes on to explain that the residual calculation, whereby homes already built and those already in the pipeline are deducted, results in a requirement for a further 360 new homes to be accommodated up until 2036. It concludes that both the Local Plan and neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development.</p> <p>3.3. Drawing on the objections set out in section two of this document, Viridor objects to the current 'scale of growth' allocated to Calne as it not justified by the evidence and would also fail other tests of soundness including that the strategy is not in accordance with national policy and is also not positively prepared. In summary Viridor contend that the scale of growth at Calne must be significantly increased beyond the 1,610 homes currently set out in order to:</p> <p>a) respond to the increased housing requirement arising from a longer plan period and a review of the assumptions behind the residual requirement; and,</p>	

b) provide a more balanced spatial strategy that directs less housing to Chippenham and a greater proportion to the less constrained market towns, and particularly Calne, so as to ensure a more timely, lower risk and more sustainable housing delivery.

3.4. Further to the above Viridor set out that this can best be achieved by focussing a greater scale of growth to the south east of the town on 'site 4' (as identified in the PfC consultation paper at figure 4 on page 24), which includes land within their ownership, where an important component of road infrastructure to the wider benefit of the town can be realised and a sustainable development delivered as shown in the vision document at appendix 1, which includes an indicative road connection routing and options. This would accord with the Emerging Spatial Strategy Consultation Paper statement at para 3.21 which sets out that a larger scale of development at Calne is 'necessary to help provide transport solutions to alleviate issues such as traffic congestion and local air quality in the town centre'. Further detail on this point is provided below.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

3.6. Viridor supports these place making priorities which they consider will make an important contribution to achieving sustainable development at Calne in accordance with planning policy. The Viridor land at Calne, together with the adjoining land parcels to the south, are well placed to meet and deliver these place making principles as they represent a sustainable location for housing within walking distance of the town centre and are able to deliver both biodiversity net gain improvements and contribute to other aspects of the Town Council Climate and Emergency Pledge, whilst delivering sensitive urban design and a sense of place.

3.7. However, in order to achieve these objectives and priorities there is a need to distribute a greater volume of new housing to Calne than that currently envisaged, and for this to be specifically focussed to the south east of the town at site 4 (which includes adjoining land to their ownership) in order to achieve the stated objective of 'ensuring infrastructure improvements to the local road network, reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality'.

3.8. It is considered that only through the allocation of 'site 4' for a larger and more strategic scale of housing development can a large component of a new road link be realised to the east of Calne, potentially continuing the link being constructed north of Low Lane through to Quemerford as shown in the indicative plans included in the Vision document and access options plan at appendix 1 and 2. Such a link, once complete, could ultimately reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the town centre by providing an alternative route.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

3.9. Viridor support the range of potential development sites identified at Calne and believe that no further sites should be considered, although highlight that they also control adjoining land to the north east of site 4 (as shown at appendix 2) which is currently being restored to agricultural use from previous landfill operations, and this could potentially be of benefit to provide for additional landscape screening planting, public footpath links or bio-diversity net-gain for a development on land at 'site 4'.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

3.10. As set out above, Viridor strongly support Site 4 (i.e. the land identified in figure 2) as the most appropriate at Calne upon which to build a sustainably located strategic scale residential led development. In addition to providing much needed new new housing, including family and affordable provision, it could fund infrastructure and bring forward new public open space, and provide a high quality of urban design. A key benefit is that it would also help deliver the opportunity for the majority of an internal road network capable of linking the housing under construction to the north of Low Lane with the A4 at Quemerford, thereby providing an alternative route for traffic passing north/south through Calne.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

3.11. An important emerging aspiration for Calne identified in the consultation papers is the provision of road infrastructure improvements to help reduce traffic congestion and provide air quality improvements. Viridor would therefore strongly support a specific policy that further defined this aspiration.

3.12. As set out above, only site 4, or a smaller sub-component of the western land, can deliver a significant part of a future link to the east of Calne from Low Lane to Quemerford. This important factor should be weighted strongly in any assessment of the most appropriate land for residential development.

3.13. This key benefit arising from the development of site 4 is in addition to the provision of much needed new housing, including family and affordable provision, and the provision of funds for other infrastructure, alongside the provision of new public open space and high quality urban design as more fully set out above. 3.14. In conclusion, the unique contribution that site 4 could make to road infrastructure improvements, and more specifically as a key part of a potential alternative route for through traffic between the A4 at Quemerford and Low Lane should be identified in policy. In terms of the issues raised at para 30, page 8 of the document, Viridor responds as follows:

- The western component of the Viridor land is within a 10 minute walking and cycling distance of the town centre as confirmed by the Vision Document, with direct access via Low Lane and other routes.

- As stated above, the Viridor land, and the wider Site 4 parcel, can positively contribute to delivering solutions to traffic congestion and help address poor air quality in the town centre through the provision of new infrastructure.

- Development of the Viridor land can contribute to the town centre through new residents utilising the existing shops and services. 3.15. In terms of the specific comments regarding 'Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c)' Viridor respond as follows:

- whilst landscape impacts are referenced in the Consultation Paper as a possibility in the eastern part of the Site, Viridor consider that these impacts can be mitigated. In any event, a smaller quantum of development could be implemented on the western land parcels.

- In terms of the reference to the 'potential for impacts on the existing mitigation and enhancement of the former extraction and landfill at Sands Farm and on Sands Farm Quarry County Wildlife Site' it is considered that the CWS is well separated from the land proposed for development, as shown in the Vision Document at Appendix 1. In addition, as Viridor control a large component of the landfill site currently being restored to agriculture, there is potential for a complimentary mitigation scheme to be advanced.

- In terms of the reference to the 'Potential impacts on the scheduled monument (medieval rural settlement at Quemerford) and on the setting of Grade I listed Hayle Farm on the eastern edge', it considered that these impacts can be mitigated through a careful site selection and masterplanning exercise, particularly given the large area of land available.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

4.1. Viridor has reviewed the Site Selection Report for Calne and notes the conclusions provided in respect of land within their ownership, SHELA parcel 3642, and responds as follows.

4.2. The Selection Report reviews 25 sites and confirms that 19 are taken forward for further assessment including SHELA parcel 3642. The summary table entries are reproduced below for ease of reference. 4.3. It is particularly noted that the concluding paragraph states that the site passes the initial assessment and should be taken to the next stage of assessment, which is agreed. The statement that it is 'appropriate to combine with 487, 1104A, 1104B and 1104C to consider one logical extension to the town and this may allow local aspirations for an eastern relief road to the town to be considered further' is also noted, and the above sections of these representations have outlined how this could be achieved utilising initially only the western land parcels, but ultimately with the potential to include all land parcels.

4.4. Whilst Viridor agrees that the site should pass through to the next stage of assessment it has the following detailed comments on the appraisal set out in the consultation document.

- Accessibility – As set out above, Viridor is collaborating with the adjoining landowners to facilitate a wider access strategy.
- Heritage – the assessment states that mitigation to the listed building of Sands Farmhouse may be difficult but potentially achievable. It also states that the remaining farmland is a 'more important' aspect of 'setting' due to the impacts of landfill operations to the east. Viridor's response is that mitigation can be straightforward as demonstrated in the attached vision document which confirms a sensitive approach to incorporating these listed buildings. In addition it is relevant that the landfill site to the east is actively being restored to agriculture by Viridor and thus this aspect of the setting also has potential to be improved.
- Landscape –the assessment identifies potential impacts on views from North Wessex Downs AONB at Cherhill that could be mitigated through planting to the east. Viridor's response is that mitigation can be straightforward as demonstrated in the attached vision document which confirms a sensitive approach with boundary landscaping. In addition it is relevant that the landfill site to the east is actively being restored to agriculture and further off-site landscape improvements are also possible providing that they are compatible with the overall restoration objectives.
- Traffic –As set out above, Viridor is collaborating with the adjoining landowners to facilitate a wider access strategy.

4.5. As set out above, the enclosed vision document at appendix 1 demonstrates how the Viridor land parcel SHELA parcel 3642 could be developed to deliver around 140 homes, plus employment development without resulting in unacceptable impacts.

4.6. In addition an indicative link road route which demonstrates how the wider Site 4 could be delivered and connect to the A4 at Quemerford is provided at appendix 2.

Further comments

These representations are submitted on behalf of Viridor who have land interests at Sands Farm, located to the south of Low Lane, Calne. This land parcel has been identified in the 'Planning for Calne' consultation document as a key component of 'Site

4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c); which is part one of the largest 'potential development sites for assessment' at figure 1 of the consultation document. The relevant SHELAA site reference is 3642. Summary and structure of these representations

The representations set out in the enclosed report can be summarised as follows:

- Representations to the overarching 'Emerging Spatial Strategy' paper, specifically the following:

- o concern that the current plan period does not accord with NPPF guidance, and seeking that it is extended to at least 2038 in accordance with NPPF guidance (i.e. a 15 year period based upon an anticipated adoption year of 2023), and consequently that the level of new homes is commensurately increased.

- o concern at the assumptions used to calculate and apply housing completions to produce a residual housing requirement for the plan period, more specifically those at Chippenham. This artificially depresses the residual requirements and results in the Council's spatial strategy being unsound as it is not positively prepared.

- o concern at the proposed distribution of housing and employment to the main settlements and market towns over the plan period within the Chippenham Housing Market Area. In particular there is a current clear overreliance placed on housing delivery at Chippenham which is not sound owing to the long lead-in times for delivery of such large strategic sites. In our view there is a need to distribute more housing to market towns and reduce the reliance placed on Chippenham. In particular an increased housing allocation to Calne is justified given its ability to accommodate a greater scale of growth due to an acknowledged 'lower level of constraint' and because it would also enable the delivery of important transport and air quality improvements to the wider benefit of the town.

- Representations to the 'Planning for Calne' paper, specifically in relation to:

- o Question CA1 – drawing on the objections set out above, we believe 'the scale of growth' allocated to Calne must be increased beyond the 1,610 homes currently set out (residual requirement 360 additional homes), not only to ensure that the overall spatial strategy is justified, sound and positively prepared, but also to deliver key sustainability and other benefits. This can best be achieved by focussing a greater scale of growth to the south east of the town on site 4 which is a suitable, available and sustainable location for housing where important road infrastructure to the wider benefit of the town can also be delivered.

- o Question CA2 – responding to the stated 'place shaping priorities and their achievement', and setting out the necessity of distributing a greater volume of new housing to the south east of the town in order to achieve the stated objectives, most significantly that of 'ensuring infrastructure improvements to the local road network, reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality'. Only through the development of site 4 can a significant component of a new road link be realised to the east of Calne, potentially continuing the link being constructed north of Low Lane.

- o Questions CA3 – CA5 – responding to comments on the most appropriate location, type and form of development, highlighting the attributes and advantages of parcel 4, and specifically our clients land at SHELAA parcel 364. It also highlights that Viridor controls adjoining land to the east that is currently being restored to agricultural from the previous former landfill use.

o Question CA6 - responding that a specific policy should be composed to clearly define aspirations for a road link from Low Lane to Quemerford.

Representations to the 'Site Selection Report for Calne' Paper, specifically in relation to:

o Supporting the conclusions relating to our clients land, SHELA parcel 3642, whilst also referring to the enclosed vision document which demonstrates how the Viridor land parcel SHELA parcel 3642 could be developed to deliver around 140 homes, plus employment development without resulting in any unacceptable environmental or other impacts.

o Referring to the submitted indicative link road options alignment which demonstrates how the adjoining land ownerships at 'Site 4' could be delivered and connect to the A4 at Quemerford. 1.1. These representations are submitted on behalf of Viridor who have land interests at land south of Low Lane, Calne at Sands Farm as identified in figure 1 below.

1.2. This land parcel has been identified in the 'Planning for Calne' consultation document as a key component of 'Site 4: Land to the north of Quemerford (SHELAA sites 3642, 487, 1104a/b/c)'; which is the largest of the 'potential development sites for assessment' shown in the consultation document. The relevant SHELAA site reference for the Viridor land is 3642.

1.3. There is close collaboration with the owners and developers of adjoining land parcels, together with other relevant landowners, with the objective to facilitate a strategic access from the A4 at Quemerford to the south of the Viridor land which would support a larger and more comprehensive development across the various land parcels which make up 'Site 4' (as shown in Wiltshire Council Planning for Calne Consultation Paper). This also has the potential to align with the 'Main Street' currently being constructed to the north of Low Lane which links through to Spitfire Way / Sand Pit Road, and ultimately Oxford Road. Possible access points and road alignments for this wider parcel are shown in the figure below. A context plan of the relevant landholdings are identified below.

1.4. The remainder of these representations are structured as follows: • Section two sets out representations to the overarching 'Emerging Spatial Strategy' consultation paper, including in relation to: the Local Plan period/duration; the calculation of the residual housing requirement and the proposed distribution of housing and employment within the Chippenham HMA. • Section three sets out representations to the 'Planning for Calne' consultation paper, including responses to questions CA1-CA6, setting out the important role that the Viridor land and adjoining parcels can play in meeting the stated objectives. • Section four sets out representations to the 'Site Selection Report for Calne' and other relevant parts of the evidence base

Rep ID: Calne145	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Origin3 Ltd
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne145
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Strategy for Calne The emerging Local Plan directs 1,610 dwellings to Calne and identifies a residual of 360 dwellings that will need to be met on greenfield sites. Potential development sites As part of the Local Plan consultation, the Council has prepared a 'Site Selection Report for Calne' which has examined all suitable greenfield SHELAA sites around the town and distilled them down to 8 potentially suitable greenfield extensions which it describes as a 'pool of potential development sites'. In arriving at the pool of sites, the Council has carried out a high level assessment of how each suitable SHELAA site performs against accessibility, heritage, flood risk, landscape and traffic criteria. The Council's findings in respect of Land at Rookery Farm are copied below – note that red = high impact; amber = medium impact; green = low impact. This shows that the Council's assessment finds Rookery Farm site to perform exceedingly well</p>	

against environmental criteria including heritage, landscape and flood risk factors (ie low risk) and scores moderately well against accessibility and traffic impacts (medium risk).

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

These representations are submitted on behalf of [NAME REDACTED] in respect of their land interests at Rookery Farm, Calne – see site plan below. The Rookery Farm site lies immediately to the west of the Calne Marden Farm development (125 homes) that has been built by Redrow Homes.

The site comprises Rookery Farm house, outbuildings and surrounding grassed areas and is accessed via Redrow's Marden Farm development. The site area measures circa 1.2 ha and has potential for up to 30 dwellings at 25dph, reflecting the slightly reduced density due to the presence of mature trees on the site.

The Council's interactive constraints map (copied for Calne below) shows the site is free of environmental designations and is located in flood zone 1 (low risk). The area highlighted in cream adjacent denotes sites with planning permission (in this case, Marden Farm). The Rookery Farm site is well screened from surrounding land due to dense vegetation around the site boundary. SHELAA The Wiltshire SHELAA examined the Rookery Farm site (reference 3254) and identified it as a previously developed site, suitable and available for up to 45 dwellings - and developable in the medium term.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

Accessibility wise, contrary to the Council's findings, we consider that the site performs very well and should score low risk (ie green) not medium risk (amber). The site will have excellent links with the town centre, accessible on foot via the public right of way that exits the Rookery Farm site to the north (see dotted green lines on the constraints plan above), or alternatively via the Redrow development to the east and then along the public path off The Rise, that connects with the main road into Calne. The site is also within walking distance of a regular bus service providing connections with various parts of the town, including the town centre. Traffic wise, there is no explanation as to why the Rookery Farm site does not score low impact. Land at Rookery Farm can connect into the existing Redrow development which achieved suitable provision in terms of impact on the road network, access and highway safety via the relatively recently approved development there.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

The Council has identified the Rookery Farm site as 'Site 6' which is to be taken forward for further assessment. The Council states the following in their conclusions for Site 6: Site 6: Rookery Farm (SHELAA site 3254)

- Access could be achieved onto Cherhill Way
- Site is adjacent to new housing at Marden Farm
- Site is well screened by existing trees and hedgerows – these features would need to be retained on site where possible.

Conclusion
We support the need for greenfield extensions to Calne as well as the identification of Land at Rookery Farm (Site 6) as a potential development site for further consideration. We can confirm that land at Rookery Farm is suitable, available and achievable and should be allocated for up to 30 dwellings in the Draft Wiltshire Local Plan.

Rep ID: Calne147	
Consultee code: Other Advisory Bodies	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Cheltenham and Gloucester Omnibus Company Ltd dba Stagecoach West
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The level of growth identified in paragraph 9 is based on the local housing needs assessment of Wiltshire for the period 2016-2036. This indicates a higher level of growth than the standard method for the Chippenham HMA and within that HMA figure, the quantum for the Chippenham area is higher than for the other HMAs.</p> <p>The existing adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, identifies a requirement for 1,440 homes in Calne. The Emerging Strategy for Calne only proposes a requirement of 1,610 homes for the plan period 2016-2036, only 170 more dwellings than in the adopted Core Strategy. This figure is only marginally higher than the Core Strategy and assuming that the current quantum is delivered, as it should be, by 2026, this strongly implies that only 17 homes additional per year are needed.</p> <p>This is tantamount to a near-complete development moratorium, and entirely undermines the need to significantly boost housing supply.</p> <p>The requirement proposed is entirely unevenced to justify such a moratorium. From first principles, it does not reflect the role of Calne as a market town and as such a relatively very sustainable location to meet pressing housing and employment needs.</p>	

Nor does this plan show any regard for the clear evidence that the town has substantial potential to accommodate growth. The high level assessment in the Alternative Development Strategies demonstrates that - after Chippenham and Melksham - Calne is by far the least constrained in the HMA. A range of development opportunities exist at Calne that are quite unconstrained and would demonstrably support the place-shaping priorities.

Of these opportunities, from our perspective, the best one is represented by development to the east. This would represent a compact form of development that better yet, would be exceptionally well-connected to the town centre by sustainable travel modes, including walking and cycling, but also public transport. If the Council had considered thoroughly our previous representations and written input to this plan review, it would have already become aware that Stagecoach is highly minded to seek to develop a new bus route variant that would directly serve existing established and recent residential development to the east of the town along Sandpit Road and Spitfire Avenue. The opening of the final link to facilitate this link is due later in 2021. Options for higher growth should be considered to support the delivery of long-identified infrastructure to relieve congestion in the town centre and Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) within the town. This would potentially be transformative in delivering the place shaping priorities. The achievement of a full eastern relief road has long been an aspiration of the Town Council. It would link the existing southern end of Spitfire Avenue to the A4 at or East of Quemerford. This would open up substantially more relatively unconstrained development opportunities. At least as important it would go a good way to deal with serious congestion in and around the town centre, which significantly and adversely affects the operation of our key inter-urban service 55, and our town service 44 which latter we now run under contract to Wiltshire Council. This would be likely to address a serious shortage of employment land, a deficiency highlighted in the Employment Land Review (2018) but which quite inexplicably, the overall plan strategy and the proposed Plan Strategy approach to Calne makes no attempt to address.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Generic place-shaping priorities are not appropriate and need to directly address the opportunities and challenges that are presented by the locality. They should relate to the development and use of land, which is the primary purpose of the planning system and plan-making.

It is stated in the settlement profile for Calne that significant additional growth could potentially deliver an eastern bypass which has been a long-standing local aspiration. We are very surprised that this is not included in the strategic priorities, especially when similar aspirations for Melksham, for example, have clearly influenced both those place-shaping principles and the much

wider strategic approach the plan is looking to take. The failure to even consider this major opportunity – which could have wide-ranging benefits for the sustainability of the settlement and greatly more attractive relevant and reliable public transport - is unevidenced, and impossible to understand. The Council’s position therefore could legitimately be characterised as arbitrary and capricious.

Therefore while Stagecoach broadly supports the place shaping priorities for Calne are supported, consideration must be given to the longer term, and in so doing properly reflect the strategic opportunities available at Calne.

Achieving these priorities through the development strategy for Calne, is discussed in the context of the specific development sites being consulted upon. Without an appropriate amount of new development that addresses a place-specific vision and clearly informed by the opportunities it would be impossible to effectively meet these priorities.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Stagecoach observes that that the Council is focussing its assessment on a smaller pool of potential sites. In order to satisfy the tests of soundness in NPPF, the Council needs to demonstrate that it has considered a sufficient range of reasonable alternatives. At this stage, in the absence of a transparent Sustainability Appraisal of the sites the intention appears to pre-screen potential sites even before they are subjected to a sustainability appraisal process. We are concerned that this approach may fail to properly evaluate sites that potentially had strong credentials.

As a consequence of the non-NPPF-compliant plan period to 2036 (paragraph 28) there is a relatively small non-strategic site requirement to meet the alleged strategic housing requirement. Paragraph 28 then states that:

“this will be identified by the neighbourhood plan. The review of the neighbourhood plan can also consider whether further land is needed for development to meet the community’s need.” Subsequently paragraph 28 states that:

“ One or more sites will be selected for housing in the Local Plan and the rest of the pool of potential development sites will remain as they are.”

Stagecoach cannot fathom the Council’s intention. Is it the intention to include sites in the Local Plan or will this is to be left entirely to the Neighbourhood Plan? We believe that the appropriate strategy is clearly to properly plan for Calne with strategic policies looking forward over a longer period, and fully reflect the opportunities available. NPPF is explicit that it expects that strategic policies should address the strategic priorities for the area and provide a clear starting point for any non-strategic policies, including for Neighbourhood Plans:

“...Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area...”

Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area. Without this strategic steer it is far from clear that a future Calne Neighbourhood Plan could be effective, as it cannot retroactively address any higher-level policy lacuna. Simply put, in the context of the aspirations and potential to more positively meet housing and employment development needs in the Calne NP area it needs the Wiltshire Plan to lead, rather than attempt to inappropriately devolve powers to the Neighbourhood Planning Body to do a job that only the Local Planning Authority can undertake.

Eight potential sites have been identified at Calne for further assessment of their development potential. “Planning for Calne” states at paragraph 30 that “given the relatively small amount of land that needs to be planned for Calne, not all of any particular site may be required at this time,” Stagecoach considers that this is challengeable and that a realistic and positive approach needs to be taken that doesn’t start from first principles to use any number of arithmetic foils to argue down the case for any significant development in Calne, and avoid the need to evaluate development strategies that could lead to the conclusion that Calne could and should deliver a greater proportion of needs in the HMA.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

As we have previously stated to the Council, Calne benefits from being on the frequent premium service 55 providing direct and frequent links to both Swindon and Chippenham. The service takes the driving route and is competitive with driving for many journeys. However, it does not directly reach all parts of the town and many residential areas are a quite long way from the core route. Stagecoach is seeking to evolve the service to present a more relevant offer to more existing residents, as well as support sustainable growth.

The imminent connection of a link between Sandpit Road and Prince Charles Drive as part of an initial section of a possible eastern relief road, known as Spitfire Avenue, allows us to look to provide a service that directly serves much more of the eastern side of the town. It would run through a significant amount of the recent development in the town. Because relatively little use crosses the town the extra time this would take would not negatively affect too many existing users, which would ordinarily be a significant concern especially on an inter-urban service. There is a significant amount of undeveloped land lying “outboard” of the town and directly accessed off this route.

There is therefore an immediate opportunity presented by Land to the north-east of Calne (north and south of Spitfire Road) which takes advantage of this new bus route. Planning for Calne report refers to as : “Site 2: Land to the west of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 495, 3610)” and “Site 3: Land to the east of Spitfire Rd (SHELAA sites 488, 489, 451, 3168)”.

These two sites evidently represents an otherwise unconstrained and sustainable direction for future growth. In addition to the adjacency to a potential high quality bus service, we would emphasise its obvious further credentials as a relatively compact extension to the built up area. This means that walking and cycling distances to the centre and key facilities such as schools and the main employment area of the town at Porte Marsh, are quite realistic and present highly credible choices. The opportunities for sustainable modes do not end there, either. When this proximity is set alongside the fact there is an almost traffic-free “quietway” down Abberd Lane, that is relatively level and is also much more direct than driving for more local destinations, we would say that these sites presents outstanding credentials in terms of its ability to support development that minimises the transport impacts of development.

We are aware that these sites are under active promotion by an established and clearly accomplished developer with a strong regional and local track record. They can be considered suitable, available, achievable, deliverable and developable.

Together these sites can provide for residential development of up to about 600 dwellings. When this is combined with the recent adjacent development in the area, which totals about 750 dwellings within 500m it is clear that this would also support the provision of a new local centre, which we understand the promoter is looking to bring forward on the corner of Spitfire Way and Spitfire Road, to serve the immediate needs of existing and new residents on this side of the town as well as providing employment generating opportunities. This is an important contribution to maximising local self-containment. We believe that this also offers an excellent opportunity to take advantage of the intersection of the cycle provision on Abberd Lane and the bus route to maximise inter-modality, especially for trips out of town. The centre could conceivably even develop to accommodate a richer range of uses, supporting facilities such as an early years setting, a coffee shop and potentially even a home working hub as services offices and meeting rooms, and other sustainable transport facilities such as a cycle shop and cycle doctors. These would enhance the scope to provide inter-modality with the premium bus service.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we’ve missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

As we state elsewhere, we consider that there is a clear case to identify sufficient and suitable employment land. At this stage in the process e are perplexed and concerned that the Council considers that there is no need to consider employment allocations for Calne. Stagecoach has been looking for a site for an operating centre in Calne for a considerable amount of time, so far

without success. This is necessary to operate more efficiently but it would also allow us to offer more journeys at the start and end of the day benefiting Calne residents and businesses. There would be clear opportunities to create local skilled jobs that we are currently frustrated from providing.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

We also reiterate our wider major concern is that as the plan period commences at 2016 and the end point is only 2036 the plan is fundamentally hampered in achieving all it needs to. A longer term view and a clearly strategic approach are essential to arrive at a sound and positively-planned approach to the future of the market town offering hugely greater scope to maximise the opportunities to address the strategic priorities for Calne.

Further comments

Rep ID: Calne149	
Consultee code: Statutory Body	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Natural England
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne149. This response also includes comments on Emerging Spatial Strategy, HRA, SA, Empowering Rural Communities, Climate Change and Biodiversity Net Gain, Market Towns and Principal Settlements and G&T Local Plan.
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Planning for Calne

Site 2 (SHELAA reference 495 & 3610)

Individually this site may not demonstrate harm however cumulative impacts with site 3 and 4 may have potential to significantly impact on the setting of North Wessex downs AONB.

Site 3 (SHELAA reference 488, 489, 451 & 3168)

Individually this site may not demonstrate harm however cumulative impacts with site 2 and 4 may have potential to significantly impact on the setting of North Wessex downs AONB.

Site 4 (SHELAA reference 3642, 487, 1104 ((a, b, and c))

These sites represent a large increase in the overall settlement boundary to Calne. This represents a major encroachment on the boundary of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Natural England concurs with the SHELAA conclusion that development at this site is unlikely to be mitigated and would pose significant harm to the characteristics of the AONB.

The gravel pits to the North of these combines sites provide evidence that land in this area is of particular value in terms of soils. Natural England holds specific survey data to demonstrate that soil at the gravel pit north are Grade 1 and 2 on the ALC. Please use the provided link for respective soil report and maps.

This would suggest that neighbouring land is of similar quality and should be safeguarded according to NPPF 170/171 and 118.

Please see detail provided below on soils

All of the site above should be assessed individually and cumulatively for impacts on the North Wessex Downs AONB.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

General comments on final proposed sites for assessment

During the site appraisal stage and before selecting which sites to take forward as allocations in the plan, the following may be useful to ensure opportunities for biodiversity net gain are secured:

- Does the site present significant risks to biodiversity? If so, have alternative sites with lesser impacts been explored?
- What site specific recommendations can help delivery biodiversity net gain, for example what further survey work may be required at the planning application stage?

• Whether the site can accommodate on-site biodiversity net gain provision or whether there is a need for off-site contributions?
What types of habitat creation or enhancement are most appropriate?

• Does there need to be any restrictions on the type of development that will be acceptable or particular parts of the site that should be not be developed?

During the site selection process, potential sites should be judged in accordance with all policies in the NPPF, including selecting land with the least environmental value, where consistent with other policies. The Biodiversity Metric can be useful during this process to understand the opportunities on a site, test indicative biodiversity net gains and to ensure sites of high biodiversity value are not selected.

Natural England encourages developers, promoting sites for inclusion in the plan to use its Discretionary Advice Service, to discuss opportunities for biodiversity net gains on individual sites. This helps to ensure evidence is provided and appropriate ways to deliver biodiversity net gain can be included in site allocations if they progress. This can also help speed up the planning application stage. Further details on Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service is provided here.

Protected Landscapes – general comments

All development allocations, including those within settlements, should carefully consider impacts on the landscape and scenic beauty of the Protected Landscape (PL), including cumulative impacts and impacts on the settings of PL to ensure the highest status of protection is given to the PL, in line with NPPF para 172. We request that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is carried out for allocations, particularly those outside of existing settlement boundaries, to assess the impacts on the character of the landscape and the visual impacts. Whilst such a LVIA would not be as detailed as one for a planning application, sufficient information e.g. on visual baseline, number of dwellings and key viewpoints are required to inform our advice.

Allocations within the existing built up area may also benefit from a LVIA e.g. where extensive green spaces contribute to the character of the settlement, particularly when viewed from high points in an AONB and such views are recognised as one of the special qualities of the PL.

All development within PLs or their settings should:

- respect and enhance local landscape character;
- be of the highest design quality;
- include appropriate green infrastructure;
- incorporate appropriate enhancement measures e.g. landscape enhancement or access improvements, in line with the relevant NP/AONB Management Plan or local landscape character assessment. Biodiversity net gain should also be delivered (in line with a local plan policy/other local strategy).

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered

generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further advice

Green Roofs

Natural England is supportive of the inclusion of living roofs in all appropriate development. Research indicates that the benefits of green roofs include reducing run-off and thereby the risk of surface water flooding; reducing the requirement for heating and air-conditioning; and providing habitat for wildlife.

We would advise your council that some living roofs, such as sedum matting, can have limited biodiversity value in terms of the range of species that grow on them and habitats they provide. Natural England would encourage you to consider the use of bespoke solutions based on the needs of the wildlife specific to the site and adjacent area. I would refer you to <http://livingroofs.org/> for a range of innovative solutions.

Access and Rights of Way

Natural England advises that the Plan should include policies to ensure protection and enhancement of public rights of way and National Trails, as outlined in paragraph 98 of the NPPF. Recognition should be given to the value of rights of way and access to the natural environment in relation to health and wellbeing and links to the wider green infrastructure network. The plan should seek to link existing rights of way where possible, and provides for new access opportunities. The plan should avoid building on open space of public value as outlined in paragraph 97 of the NPPF.

The plan should make provision for appropriate quantity and quality of green space to meet identified local needs as outlined in paragraph 96 of the NPPF. Natural England's work on Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) may be of use in assessing current level of accessible natural greenspace and planning improved provision.

Soils

Soil and Agricultural Land Quality

The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpin our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver, for example:

1. Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society; for instance as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. The Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) 'The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature' (Defra, June 2011), emphasises the importance of natural resource protection, including the conservation and sustainable management of soils, for example:

- A Vision for Nature: 'We must protect the essentials of life: our air, biodiversity, soils and water, so that they can continue to provide us with the services on which we rely' (paragraph 2.5).
- Safeguarding our Soils: 'Soil is essential for achieving a range of important ecosystem services and functions, including food production, carbon storage and climate regulation, water filtration, flood management and support for biodiversity and wildlife' (paragraph 2.60).
- 'Protect 'best and most versatile' agricultural land' (paragraph 2.35).

2. The conservation and sustainable management of soils also is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in paragraphs 170 and 171. When planning authorities are considering land use change, the permanency of the impact on soils is an important consideration. Particular care over planned changes to the most potentially productive soil is needed, for the ecosystem services it supports including its role in agriculture and food production. Plan policies should therefore take account of the impact on land and soil resources and the wide range of vital functions (ecosystem services) they provide in line with paragraph 118 of the NPPF, for example to:

- Safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future.
- To avoid development that would disturb or damage other soils of high environmental value (e.g. wetland and other specific soils contributing to ecological connectivity, carbon stores such as peatlands etc) (See comments below on biodiversity and geodiversity), and, where development is proposed.
- Ensure soil resources are conserved and managed in a sustainable way.

3. To assist in understanding agricultural land quality within the plan area and to safeguard 'best and most versatile' agricultural land in line with paragraphs 170 and 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework, strategic scale Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Maps are available. Natural England also has an archive of more detailed ALC surveys for selected locations. Both these types of data can be supplied digitally free of charge by contacting Natural England. Some of this data is also available on the www.magic.gov.uk website. The planning authority should ensure that sufficient site specific ALC survey data is available to inform decision making. For example, where no reliable information was available, it would be reasonable to expect that developers should commission a new ALC survey, for any sites they wished to put forward for consideration in the Local Plan

4. General mapped information on soil types is available as 'Soilscapes' on the www.magic.gov.uk and also from the LandIS website <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm> which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

5. Further guidance for protecting soils (irrespective of their ALC grading) both during and following development is available in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, to assist the construction sector in the better protection of the soil resources with which they work, and in doing so minimise the risk of environmental harm such as excessive run-off and flooding. The aim is to achieve positive outcomes such as cost savings, successful landscaping and enhanced amenity whilst maintaining a healthy natural environment, and we would advise that the Code be referred to where relevant in the development plan.

Tranquillity

The Local Plan should identify relevant areas of tranquillity and provide appropriate policy protection to such areas as identified in paragraph 100 and 180 of the NPPF. Tranquillity is an important landscape attribute in certain areas e.g. within National Parks/AONBs, particularly where this is identified as a special quality. The CPRE have mapped areas of tranquillity which are available here and are a helpful source of evidence for the Local Plan and SEA/SA.

Further comments

We welcome Wiltshire Council's engagement with Natural England from an early stage in the process, we note there are currently no changes to specific policy, therefore we provide broad advice on the plans strategy and what should be considered when developing policy. In addition we will provide advice on each principal settlement and market town where the council has determined allocations moving into the final pool of sites to be assessed in the plan period 2016-2036. We wish to acknowledge that this response is considered as part of an iterative approach to plan design with Wiltshire council and look for to further discussion.

Natural England's main concern at this stage is that the new local plan ensures development is directed to the most sustainable places and provides high quality green/ open space for new and existing communities. We would expect to see suitable policies that address the impacts of increased recreation on local green spaces, and for designated sites and landscapes, by ensuring its effects are properly managed.

Natural England is concerned about the effects of recreation on international and national designated sites within and beyond the local plan area. The impacts of recreational use is widely recognised as a significant issue impacting on designated sites. Recreational impacts can include soil compaction/loss and eutrophication from dog fouling.

Rep ID: Calne150	
Consultee code: Parish/Town Council	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Compton Bassett Parish Clerk
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne150
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

New Wiltshire Core Strategy 2016–2036 proposes 1,610 new dwellings in Calne. As 627 have been built, and 625 homes in the pipeline, another 358 remain to be built by 2036. Therefore, a total of 983 homes are still to be built between now and 2036, equating to a population increase of c.2,400. The scale of growth in Calne's population means it is likely to reach c.21,000 by 2036, roughly double the 1991 number. The report rightly identifies transport issues, such as congestion on A4/A342 through Calne. However, despite many years of intention there is even now only a vague reference to an eastern bypass aspiration but no apparent plan for it. There will be an estimated additional 1,100 motor vehicles in Calne when the housing development reaches its conclusion. Missing are coherent plans to deal with traffic congestion in Calne which can only worsen and still no eastern bypass specified. Most new housing is designated to go into eastern flank of town, which will require a distributor road; why not also plan for a simultaneous eastern relief road? With the growth in population, the impact of enhanced traffic flow through some of the small villages which border Calne, such as Compton Bassett, is severe. We see drivers seeking to avoid the centre of town, and use roads only designed to serve rural communities, as unofficial by-passes. The village lanes here are unfit for the volume and speed at which vehicles use them. Any new strategy needs to foresee the inevitable effects of increased vehicle movements on rural lanes and plan for it.

Rep ID: Calne151	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Brownfield Target.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
These are the right priorities	
CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?	

This is the right pool of potential sites

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Brownfield site - low level housing.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

I think you have covered everything.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

I think you have covered everything

Further comments

No further comments

Rep ID: Calne152	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable):
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below:
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
Far too high. There is enough development already.	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?	
The County Council must take heed and act upon the submitted local plan. This was the wish of the local population and should not be dictated to by the developers.	

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

No

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

Any development should be kept to the minimum and must not be detrimental to this town centre which is the hub of the community.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Site 7 on no account should be used. Access to the A3102 should be forbidden. Traffic in that area already used by heavy lorries already filters into the town centre which is a main through route. Stationary traffic already adds to pollution.

Further comments

N/a

Rep ID: Calne153	
Consultee code: Parish/Town Council	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Calne Town Council
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation?	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne153, Calne153a
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>Getting a balance of growth for the town has to be considered carefully. Insufficient growth during the plan period may impact on the supply of new housing for residents, affordable housing provision, employment land and infrastructure improvements. Larger housing only growth may make getting around and accessing services more difficult. The lack of a county wide five-year land supply may result in additional development that the town does not want being approved. Wiltshire Council may also need to allocate further housing allocations to Calne if other parts of Wiltshire are unable to accommodate their projected allocation. Any CIL and precept income would not come to the Town Council as the majority of sites for growth are outside of the Town Boundary.</p> <p>Housing Growth: Members are asked to consider and approve one of the following recommendations: Recommendation A: – Members recommend that the allocation of 360 homes be approved for Calne in the plan period up to 2036 subject to the concerns about employment and infrastructure being addressed. or</p>	

Recommendation B: Members recommend that a higher allocation of homes be considered for Calne in the plan period up to 2036 subject to the provision of employment land and infrastructure being addressed.

Employment land:

The local plan consultation suggested 4ha of employment land is required.

High Penn Trade Park <https://propertylink.estatesgazette.com/propertydetails/6630625?INTCMP=target-property-card-experience-a> Spitfire Way <https://www.ejhales.co.uk/property/spitfire-way-calne-sn11-8ga---4576> has the potential to provide 1.6 hectares.

That these sites are brought forward for development before any new housing is allocated.

Members are asked to consider and approve the following recommendation:

Recommendation C: That employment land is allocated and protected during the plan period up to 2036 and that employment provision comes in advance of future new housing. Land to be allocated include land off Oxford Road roundabout and off Spitfire Way.

CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be achieved?

Members are asked to consider and approve the following recommendation:

Recommendation D: These are key priorities for Calne in shaping the local plan:

1. Protect and provide sites for employment - early provision 2. The subject of infrastructure was a key concern. 3. Provision of open space and allotment land 4. Provision of land suitable for cemetery space 5. Improvements to existing and new pedestrian and cycle routes 6. A Town Centre levy 7. Provision of Primary School places (parent choice schools) and NHS services.

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

Members are asked to consider and approve the following recommendations in relation to possible future site selection report.
Recommendation E: site selections

South of High Penn - subject to suitable access this could be a natural progression for development in this area. Smaller site on the edge of the town. Furthest site from Town Centre but close proximity to employment and supermarkets. Good road access to A3102. May increase traffic through Town Centre to the south (KGA and villages beyond). 50% of the site is within the Calne Town boundary

West of Spitfire Road – the land is raised and therefore could be prominent and visible. Improvements to pedestrian and cycle cross site routes to allow access to Porte Marsh and retail units at end of Oxford Road would be required from Sandpit Road so that the site is connected to the town. A larger site which would see additional traffic on Oxford Road/Sandpit Road. May increase traffic through town to the south (KGA and villages beyond). Loss of employment units unless land is allocated for employment use. Would increase traffic through High Penn Park estate if retained access is used. Development to east is further from Town Centre. None of the site is within the Calne Town boundary.

East of Spitfire Road – closer to industrial use at Sands Farm and HGV traffic which would need significant mitigation. Part of this site is being marketed for commercial use. The site could offer some infrastructure and mixed employment uses. Need to protect flood plain/Abberd Brook and improvements to pedestrian and cycle access so that the site is connected to the town. Site may be suitable for some development closest to Spitfire Road. Development to east along Abberd Lane is further from Town Centre. None of the site is within the Calne Town Boundary.

North of Quemerford - would need to come with significant infrastructure gain to include new road access, community facilities, primary school and space for NHS services along with employment land. This is the largest site and any development would increase traffic along the A4 and potentially AQMA. Could offer potential north south road extension route but significant housing would need to be built to fund a distributor road. Heritage and environmental assets would need to be protected and mitigation for proximity to the Hills Waste site. Has opportunity for well designed development with excellent green credentials and space for community and employment and open spaces. This would depend on numbers of houses allocated in the new plan. The majority of this land is not within the Calne Town boundary.

Stockley Lane (The Knowle) - a small site on the further edge of the town, rural road and adjacent to open countryside. Not supported. This is not within the Calne Town boundary.

Rookery Farm – not supported by residents due to the impact on Rookery Farm potential loss of trees. This is not within the Calne Town Boundary Not supported.

Land off Wenhill Land (adjacent to proposed new surgery) impact on listed building and adjacent residents due to raised site. Increased extra traffic using A3102 / Silver Street and AQMA, access to primary school places. Access via Marden Way would increase traffic on Station Road/New Road roundabout. This is within the Town Council boundary. Not supported.

Chilvester Hill - application recently refused due to impact on heritage assets and as gateway site to the Town. This is not within the Town Council boundary Not supported.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

Financial Implications

The impact on the Town Council and wider Town is not yet clear as to what low or no housing growth during the plan period would mean. However, this may include;

- No new Community Infrastructure Levy funds (not all land is within the Town Boundary)
- No increase in new Band D properties being occupied (new homes in Calne has seen the figure used to calculate Precept increase)
- Need for direct investment in any infrastructure projects
- Lack of possible future investment/regeneration as no housing growth.
- Lack of housing availability in Calne forcing people to move away
- No new affordable housing provision.

Staffing Implications

There are no new staffing implications as a result of this report

Community and Environmental Implications

The Town Council approved a Strategic Plan for 2021-2026

EMPLOYMENT & JOBS

ENVIRONMENT & SUSTAINABILITY

ECONOMIC VIABILITY

GETTING AROUND

Biodiversity Implications

Calne Town Council has a duty to consider biodiversity implications in every decision that it makes.

Crime and Disorder Implications

There are no direct crime and disorder implications to this report.

Risk Assessment

Providing a consultation response is an opportunity to shape the future Wiltshire Local Plan. There has to be a balance between consolidation and enabling future

managed growth for the Town. Not responding would be a lost opportunity for the town. In providing a response Members need to consider the future needs and aspirations of the town and use this opportunity to enable the objectives in the Strategic Plan.

Rep ID: Calne154	
Consultee code: Statutory Body	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Historic England
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? No	
Organisation being represented (if applicable):	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Calne154
CA1. What do you think to the scale of growth? Should there be a brownfield target?	
<p>The form and character of the town, within its wider landscape setting, and the availability of suitable sites should inform the proposed scale of growth.</p> <p>We would support Wiltshire Council's efforts to identify, allocate and prioritise all potential brownfield opportunities, big and small, including repurposing existing vacant sites, or underused buildings of historic interest to help reinforce and enhance the character of the town and in turn limit sprawl. An ambitious brownfield first target is encouraged although the related future capacity (numbers/amount of brownfield development) must relate to the context of the site(s) and the future form ensuring a good fit with the townscape. An accurate capacity can be informed by a Conservation Area Appraisal, currently absent.</p>	
CA2. Are these the right priorities? What priorities may be missing? How might these place shaping priorities be	

achieved?

A Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and or Heritage Topic Paper can help to inform such priorities and in doing so demonstrate a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats (NPPF para 185).

CA3. Is this the right pool of potential development sites?

The Council should consider whether a Conservation Appraisal and setting assessment is required to inform the promotion of suitable development sites within the town.

Disclaimer – Historic England has not undertaken a detailed assessment of the suggested sites at Calne due to Wiltshire Council's intention to provide further evidence. We therefore reserve judgement until then. We note several proposed sites adjoin or effect the setting of designated heritage assets. Their significance needs to be determined and applied to inform site suitability and if the principle is acceptable, the form that development should take to avoid or minimise harm and deliver potential enhancement.

CA4. What land do you think is the most appropriate upon which to build?

An understanding of the history, character, identity, appearance and landscape setting should inform the level of growth and site suitability in accordance with national policy. Historic England's published advice on site allocations may be useful.
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/>

An up to date Conservation Appraisal and setting assessment, where appropriate, can help inform the Plan.

It would be helpful to appreciate the judgements of the Council's in-house heritage and landscape expertise, and any germane planning history.

It will be important to be mindful of legislation, national policy, guidance and advice for the historic environment.

CA5. Are there important social, economic or environmental factors you think we've missed that need to be considered generally or in respect of individual sites?

A strategic understanding of the history, character and landscape setting should inform the spatial distribution, capacity and specific allocations proposed. To do so a heritage topic paper for Calne is recommended including a strategic landscape setting assessment and up to date Conservation Area Appraisal to inform brownfield capacity and place shaping opportunities. Any further site assessment should be independent and robust, undertaken or commissioned by the local planning authority rather than relying solely on evidence provided by the promoter of a site.

CA6. Are there any issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified?

Further comments

It will be important to demonstrate how proposals have considered and responded to the historic environment, the town's history, character and landscape setting. Calne doesn't appear to have a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan but more importantly perhaps is the absence of a setting assessment to inform considerable proposed edge of town expansion.