

Rep ID: Trowb_CP001

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No employment options - not enough open space.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Solar can be build into houses

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No - this will put a huge traffic burden on the road which is already highly polluted and at a standstill on most mornings. The traffic going over the bridge is already severe due to increased traffic from changes in bradford on avon and the elizabeth way bypass. The road is flooded nearly every year - this will just become a commuter traffic jam and remove all character from Staverton village.

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

More green space should be provided closer to the road - there is already a tunnel effect whereby traffic fumes are contained and intensified on the new terrace road. This could be mitigated by further planting instead of more houses.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Further comments

In a time when we have all recognised what a wonderful boon an open green space can provide to everyones mental and physical well being you are planning to flatten all of the green space in the local area. On top of the fact that this area has been flooded with groundwater for the last three months - something which most modern developments simply push to be someone else's problem, the traffic over the single bridge in Staverton will be horrendous causing more light, noise and air pollution along the New Terrace road.

The scope of this development will completely nullify the current village and community feel Staverton enjoys - making it just another soulless development like the recent one near the Moulton Estate. Despite the fact that Staverton is located in close proximity to Trowbridge, it has until now maintained a more distinct village environment and atmosphere. This development will completely submerge Staverton - made all the more apparent that this entire area is labelled as Trowwbridge North - rather than considering what is actually a distinct area in its own right.

The scope of this development is just too large to be supported by the local area - although the report highlights potenital fluvial flood risk - there is regularly standing ground water on the fields alongside the road to the west of the canal and for the last few months it has more resembled a wetland habitat than a crop field.

I have no faith that peoples objections will sway the decision and as soon as planning permission is granted I will be looking to move out of the area. Perhaps that is one less house you will need to build.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP002

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No. Para 32: the design does not respect the villages. Design Principles. The suggestion of a 'tree-lined main street' or spine road 'designed initially as a 40-50mph road', is insane. According to the concept plans the roads are simply to access the development, disgorging all traffic back onto the existing roads. Roads in residential areas should have design speeds appropriate to residential areas. The statement (para 42) about a 'spine road' directing traffic away from Hilperton conflicts with the concept plans.
The plans are poorly presented, remaining illegible even when expanded. This is unfortunate as it's not difficult to provide legible plans.
Cycle roads and footpaths should be separate in line with government guidance.
Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be a flexible approach allowing for technological advances. Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No. Para 32: the design does not respect the villages. Design Principles. The suggestion of a 'tree-lined main street' or spine road 'designed initially as a 40-50mph road', is insane. According to the concept plans the roads are simply to access the development, disgorging all traffic back onto the existing roads. Roads in residential areas should have design speeds appropriate to residential areas. The statement (para 42) about a 'spine road' directing traffic away from Hilperton conflicts with

the concept plans. The plans are poorly presented, remaining illegible even when expanded. This is unfortunate as it's not difficult to provide legible plans. Cycle roads and footpaths should be separate in line with government guidance. Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be a flexible approach allowing for technological advances. Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP003

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No I don't agree. Having built the hilperton relief road these developments will simply clog up the one road through the area and the one bridge over the river Avon
You have also overlooked that the "marsh" road and farm area is marshy and boggy the row of houses have soakaway run offs illustrating the problems
Don't think you've thought enough about all that.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Insufficient nature break between existing housing and new development, the plans to nothing to maintain the village of hilperton it will become a v busy rat run in and out of the new development

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No see my other points. You've taken no account of access road restrictions for the area

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There is already substantial solar power, I'd focus on this and consider wind as is a flat open space - well until built on

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Further comments

This is ill thought out, what happened to building either side of the hilperton relief road?? which has better access roads than the one road through hilperton and along marsh road.
The land is prime farm land and green belt.and you are destroying the open nature of the area.
There is no consideration of those of us who already live there.
Shameful proposal

Rep ID: Trowb_CP004

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No building should even be considered in these areas. This land is necessary for food production.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Any necessary properties should only be sited on brownfield sites e.g. the unsightly factory on Stallard Street which has been decaying for years.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

These should be built on brownfield sites. Land at Hilperton is necessary for food production.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar panels and wind turbines on brownfield sites.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Range of uses is adequate, but not on this site. Development brownfield sites first.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

All properties should be on brownfield sites which are available in Trowbridge e.g. factory site on Stallard Street.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Brownfield sites only should be used for all new properties.

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Solar panels and wind turbines on brownfield sites.

Further comments

Centre of Trowbridge needs to be completely refurbished and new shops encouraged to move to the area before any more houses are even considered.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP005

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No we don't agree this is greenfield sites which should be left for local people to enjoy ,for wildlife to survive and for tourism on the canal. This is countryside not urban sprawl vital for the wellbeing of all who enjoy it More houses will contribute to more cars and traffic and greenhouse gases. More hedges and trees destroyed and potential mass flooding. Names of places such as Marsh Road and Marsh farm should indicate the

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

Why are greenfield sites being used. There is opportunity for the development of the Bowyers site which would bring life to Trowbridge. It is on links for rail and bus . The town needs regeneration and there are empty shops etc which could be turned into affordable housing for local young people . Partial use of the Hilperton gap would also be better placed for through traffic and utilise the road which has already destroyed countryside

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

We do not need this amount of houses and roads to contribute to global warming

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No greenfield sites which flood extensively

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

As for North east plans

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Hilperton is a village and people chose to live here because of that. People come to enjoy the surrounding countryside and there has been a massive amount of new houses in the area already with Paxcroft Mead and Green lane . There are very limited work opportunities in the local area and this will create a huge need for cars to add to already busy roads. Trowbridge offers huge potential with brownfield sites these should always be used instead of precious green land

Rep ID: Trowb_CP006

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

There must be large green spaces next to the existing houses adjacent to the development.

The wildlife and woodland must be protected.

The development is far to big.

There should be self build eco homes, many allotment areas more than one orchard not some tiny peace meal area.

I think the whole area could be a model for sustainable housing, generating of power. I would like windmills, solar power, many plots for small holders to use to supply Trowbridge with the food it needs. An area for some wholesale shops, a local dairy, a poly tunnel development. A recycling plant and everything that would help for the future to preserve this planet. More cheap brick built homes and peacemeal bits of green space are not enough.
Also working spaces for small buisness ie like the coffee importers. An area of small low impact buildings for studios and small manufacture.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Some low impact sustainable self builds but they must be screened by trees.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Yes

Windmills solar and underground.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

It could be made into a tourist attraction like centre CENTRE PARKS which would attract many visitors to Trowbridge and keep the area green. It would also bring many long term jobs to Trowbridge.
It could be a complete green Park with sustainable energy recycling A whole green Park.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I would need to see a bigger map but There should be larger areas of green space and no building around Whaddon Lane or old Hilperton Villag

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

There are just too many houses proposed.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar, windmills and underground heating

Further comments

The housing needs to be in one part where it will not impact and not spread out all over the land. Please leave this area to nature. It has been designated an area of wildlife conservation around Whaddon lane.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP007

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

The only local shop Hilperton has is the garage on Marsh Road. Will there be a convenience store on the new site? Doctor's surgery? Dentist?

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I would like to see a green buffer between the new development and Hilperton/Marsh Road/Hill St. I can't see the detail on the maps very well, but it seems as if the new development will be built directly behind Greenhill Gardens, thus merging the old and new and making just one big development.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No opinion

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

A large solar farm is already near the proposed site. New homes could have solar panels fitted? Charging point for EVs?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan]. Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?
Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP008

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Leave it as it is ruin the habitat for local wildlife removes popular walking area access to canal and surrounding fields are essential spaces for the mental health and wellbeing of local residents will cause huge traffic congestion - in an area where there are already problems and Elizabeth way was intended to alleviate them This is a flood risk area that will probably get worse - and would likely affect existing properties

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No - leave it as it is

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No - leave it as it is

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

100% renewable - of any form

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No - leave it as it is. ruin the habitat for local wildlife removes popular walking area access to canal and surrounding fields are essential spaces for the mental health and wellbeing of local residents will cause huge traffic congestion - in an area where there are already problems and Elizabeth way was intended to alleviate them This is a flood risk area that will probably get worse - and would likely affect existing properties

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No - leave it as it is

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No - leave it as it is

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

100% renewable - of whatever form

Further comments

Building more new houses is simply NOT the solution to society's problems. There are many, many commercial properties becoming available that could be used for housing. In particular the Bowyers site is still empty after many years. There are a lot of town centre properties that could and should be converted to residential housing. The impact of Covid has not yet been fully realised. I strongly feel that major planning decisions such as this should be postponed until these impacts are more fully understood. Sadly there will be many businesses that will go bust, releasing property that can be converted to residential use. The growth of on-line purchasing is having a huge impact on the need for physical retail outlets. There is no point fighting this. Technology is also enabling workers to be much less dependant on physical locations. I do not believe we yet fully comprehend the impact of this trend in society, but it will be big. We must also tackle properly the issues of climate change - this is not simply limited to renewable energy. Removing wildlife areas should be a very last resort - once it is gone, it is unrecoverable. I think it is scandalous, inexcusable and very short-sighted to be considering such a proposal. Clearly if this proceeds the decision maker is not taking our future seriously or has not understood the world, or simply wants to ignore it.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP009

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No – sites should not be progressed

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. I don't believe these options should be allocated.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Already a large solar farm adjacent to site 4 – do you really need additional renewable in either of these sites? Wind turbines would be inappropriate, but maybe something could be harnessed from the flow of the River Avon? However this does not mean I support the development!

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

The plans are difficult to examine and comment on, as the resolution seems very poor and impossible for proper and careful appraisal (both onscreen or in printed format)!

Plans for both sites 4 and 5 seem of poor conception and out of keeping with the local village area.

Site 4 and 5 should not be developed but if they were it should comprise high quality housing with wide roads and adequate off street parking for 2 cars per household. Site 4, one concept access road seems to be adjacent to the canal bridge? and would be a blind dangerous access to the main road!! The canal bridge built in early 1800's is already damaged and unsuited for current traffic heavy traffic, let alone any additional vehicles. Speed limits through any development and along the B3105 should be reduced, restricted and enforced to 20 mph!

Rep ID: Trowb_CP010

Consultee code: Parish/Town Council

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Steeple Ashton Parish Council

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Examine potential for district heating systems. Otherwise use solar energy or wind power.

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Consider water source heat pumps utilising the canal as a heat source.

Further comments

Preferrable for all these houses to remain within the existing Trowbridge settlement boundary.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP011

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

There seems to be very limited recognition in these plans that they would cause immense traffic congestion at Staverton Bridge (which is already frequently clogged up) and at the Kings Arms roundabout. Traffic would also greatly increase in Hilperton village, nullifying the effect that Elizabeth Way was intended to have. Flooding would also be of concern, both in some areas of the development itself, and also in adjacent areas, especially but not solely on the causeway to Bradford and Holt.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP012

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No comment

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No Comment

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No comment

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

No comment

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No comment

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No comment

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

No comment

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

No comment

Further comments

The major problem I have with this concept for Trowbridge is that the development is the far side of the villages of Staverton and Hilperton and none of the land allocated abuts Trowbridge for which the houses are intended. In reality, Trowbridge is overwhelming both villages which will simply lose their separate identity.

Access roads are also a concern both to get into Trowbridge itself, not everyone will be able to walk or cycle, and more particularly for those commuting to more distant locations. These houses are not being built for residents currently living in Trowbridge nor is there any grand plan to significantly improve employment prospects within walking/cycling distance on the scale needed for 2600 houses.

Though home working will mitigate this to some extent there is still going to be a significant level of commuter traffic emanating from these developments and I see no evidence that adequate provision is being made for this to minimise traffic on Hill Street, Church Street and Marsh Road, effectively negating the value of Elizabeth Way. Access to Waddon is also unclear and providing that could well make Waddon Lane a Rat run. To be viable this proposed development must be provided with adequate and no doubt eye watering expensive road links.

Frankly the other potential development site on the Paxcroft side of the A361 would have made far more sense as would some of the other open land surrounding Trowbridge.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP013

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

3 schools and 2 nurseries along with 2600 houses is vast. Increased traffic congestion and air pollution should be considered as priorities. So should a medical centre.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Same answer as for North East Trowbridge concept plan

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Extra traffic congestion and air pollution will increase with these developments and have a damaging affect on all the surrounding area. Additionally the rural aspect of this area will be decimated. There is no provision for medical and health infrastructure in these plans and the system is already struggling to cope with the shortage of provision currently.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP014

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Nil

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

The plan should include protected green space on both sides of the canal to stop future development.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

Yes.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I agree with the provision of self build sites but these should be adjacent to the canal or adjacent to the eastern green space. If individuals are going to commit to a self build, they should be afforded a better location.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

An electricity network should be installed to allow every property to charge electric vehicles. Solar panels and/or air sourced heat pumps should be mandated for EVERY property.

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

Yes, but a green corridor must be provided adjacent to the canal as Site 5.

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

Yes, with the addition of a canal side green space.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

there should be more allocated.

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Yes, every house should be mandated to have solar and/or air sourced heat pumps.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP015

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): NA

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

I do not agree with the uses proposed. The number of houses proposed exceeds the Wiltshire requirement and will destroy a much needed green space and wild life habitat.
The proposal to build schools for the wider Trowbridge community will attach additional traffic onto the B3105 bottleneck.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

The maps in the draft plan are poorly presented and impossible to read online. My lack of comment should not be taken as agreement.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Same response as TB7.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

All new buildings should be fitted with ground source heat pumps.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No, the provision of a primary school will draw traffic into the Staverton bottleneck.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Unable to comment in detail, the map is illegible. However, the cycle and footpath network for this site should be extended to Holt to improve recreational activity and reduce commuter traffic.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No comment.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Yes, ground source heat pumps.

Further comments

Sites 4 and 5 are both havens for wildlife providing safe spaces for bats, badgers, slow worms, water voles, and breeding birds such as the kingfisher, grey heron, cetti's warbler and many other migrating species - which can be spotted daily throughout the year.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP016

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No, the whole area selected to the North of Hilperton , this is not Trowbridge, is totally unsuitable fo development. This a area has already see extensive historical and proposed building around Paxcroft mead and Elizabeth Way.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No, the whole area selected to the North of Hilperton , this is not Trowbridge, is totally unsuitable for development. This a area has already see extensive historical and proposed building around Paxcroft mead and Elizabeth Way.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

There should be no further building to the northern end of Trowbridge \ Hilperton

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be no development

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No, the whole area selected to the North of Hilperton , this is not Trowbridge, is totally unsuitable fo development. This a area has already see extensive historical and proposed building around Paxcroft mead and Elizabeth Way.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No, the whole area selected to the North of Hilperton , this is not Trowbridge, is totally unsuitable fo development. This a area has already see extensive historical and proposed building around Paxcroft mead and Elizabeth Way.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

There should be no further building to the northern end of Trowbridge \ Hilperton

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be no development

Further comments

The whole of the proposed development is on open farmland and outside of the previously agreed Village Settlement boundary. This proposal will inevitably lead to further flooding in an area which is already subject road closures during periods of heavy rain. The area has already seen extensive building with the Paxcroft Mead area and approval for housing on Elizabeth way. This will also lead to massive increase to traffic through Hilperton village and around the Staverton lights.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP017

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

This whole area is totally unsuitable for development, the key reasons being as follows:

1. The whole suggested development is on farmland outside the village settlement boundary (which has been set by Wiltshire Council in recent weeks)
2. The additional traffic will add to existing congestion at the Staverton bridge traffic lights.
3. This traffic congestion will be further compounded by the schools and nurseries suggested in the plan.
4. Roads adjacent to the Kings Arms roundabout will also become more congested and traffic is likely to be pushed back though Hilperton village - the very thing that Elizabeth Way was built to ease.
5. The area is already prone to waterlogging and flooding and the development would likely lead to more such incidences of this nature and cause the road at the causeway in Staverton to be closed more often, leading to even more traffic congestion in the area.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP018

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

Yes, but the scale proposed is excessive.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

Yes

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

Yes, but the scale of development proposed is excessive.

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

1. Consultation undertaken is insufficient.

Whilst I have no doubt that the statutory consultation has been undertaken, as the exercise has taken place during the Covid pandemic lockdown, when, for example, school gate gossip has not been taking place, it has been obvious from my contacts how few people are aware of the proposals.

2. The target for Brownfield redevelopment is considered unambitious.

3. Concentrating new housing in the Hilperton/Staverton area risks overwhelming the existing settlements. Numbers should be reduced and landscaped cordons increased.

4. The existing pinch point on the B3105 at Staverton (CP UK) must be improved to cope with additional traffic generated by this proposal.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP019

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

I disagree with the proposed uses, the land should be left as agricultural and as footpath amenities.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I disagree with all proposed uses. The land is agricultural land and should remain as such.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I disagree with the proposed locations, as the land is agricultural and should remain as such.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

The site shouldn't be used for building of any sort, therefore it does not require any energy.

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

I disagree with the proposed uses, this land regularly floods severely during the winter and building here would cause more flooding at Staverton causeway.

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

I disagree with the proposed uses, this land regularly floods severely during the winter and building here would cause more flooding at Staverton causeway.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I disagree with the proposed uses, this land regularly floods severely during the winter and building here would cause more flooding at Staverton causeway.

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

None would be required as this development should not go ahead.

Further comments

I wish to object most strongly to both developments on the following grounds.

1. The developments are on valuable open farm land and are outside the village settlement boundary.
2. Road at Staverton bridge is not suitable for vast increases of traffic from new developments and climate change will increase frequency and duration of closure of the Staverton causeway due to flooding.
3. Large amount of wildlife will be displaced and disrupted by this development.
4. The villages of Hilperton and Staverton will be subsumed into Trowbridge. This specifically goes against previous commitments made to residents when the western bypass was agreed and built through the Hilperton Gap.
5. These proposed developments with two Primary schools and a secondary school with access onto Hill st/ Marsh road will cause a huge amount of traffic to come through the villages. This exactly what the Hilperton Gap bypass was built to avoid and which is working successfully to date.
6. Whaddon lane must be cut off from any further development because of its narrow entrance at Hill st, which renders it totally unsuitable for any increase in domestic or commercial building access. As it is, two cars cannot pass safely at the entrance to Whaddon lane, and an increase in traffic could lead to accidents or fatalities on the adjoining footpath. The narrowness of the footpath at this entrance is already an accident waiting to happen.

If this development was to go ahead I would consider Wiltshire Council to be guilty of environmental vandalism as the proposed site is all greenfield land.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP020

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Existing use, this land sits outside the boundary and should continue to do so.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

.This site should not be repurposed, developing this site takes away my and my families whole point in moving here. You are removing the view out over the fields, the ability to go walking through the fields and at the same time de-valuing my house. To say I'll be gutted if this is approved is an understatement! Other concerns are the impact on traffic levels through Hilperton

Village, at the Staverton Bridge Traffic lights and all the roads connected to the Kings Arm's Roundabout. The impact on flooding also needs to be considered, it is already an issue in the area.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. This all seems to have been placed in areas that do not have views out over the fields or areas that are under threat of further development that will take their views once they are built!

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar. Clearly a good area for this as existing fields full of solar panels further out + opportunity to fit to existing houses outside this area.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Existing use

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar

Further comments

This site should not be repurposed, developing this site takes away my and my families whole point in moving here. You are removing the view out over the fields, the ability to go walking through the fields and at the same time de-valuing my house. To say I'll be gutted if this is approved is an understatement!

Rep ID: Trowb_CP021	
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
No. There is no need for this in the village of Hilperton. We the residents were led to believe that the construction of the Hilperton Gap road was to reduce the traffic through the village. This proposal will increase this to higher levels than before.	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	
I strongly disagree with the proposed location. The majority of the proposal is located on green farm land which is home to countless wildlife species. Red Kites have been seen in strong numbers, Hares, Deer, Owls can be heard and with the Kennet &	

Avon canal running adjacent to the planned area, Water voles habitat will be disturbed. AN area with less impact on the local wildlife should be considered.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I disagree. See answer above.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

We already have a solar farm on the opposite side of the Canal.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

I strongly disagree. The proposed location is on a flood plain that floods regularly. The road already get highly congested at the traffic lights by cereal partners that causes considerable delays most times during rush hour.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I disagree with the location. On a flood plain is a ridiculous location. On an area where there is little to no risk of flooding and where the impact of addition traffic won't be felt as much

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I disagree. See answers 12 & 13

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There is already a solar farm nearby.

Further comments

there seems to be very limited recognition in these plans that they would cause immense traffic congestion at Staverton Bridge (which is already frequently clogged up) and at the Kings Arms roundabout. Traffic would also greatly increase in Hilperton vil

Rep ID: Trowb_CP022	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): NA
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<p>I disagree with the overall scale of the development. I have to applaud the inclusion of allotted space for self build housing, green spaces, community orchards and new allotments, but disagree with the use of these to shield the visual impact of this proposed town from the recreational users of the canal at the expense of shielding the existing residents from the visual impact of this development.</p>	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	

The location of access to the 50MPH spine road is perfectly placed to drive traffic through Hilperton - the exact problem Elizabeth Way way built to alleviate - and cause massive congestion on all roads adjacent to the Kings Arms roundabout. If you live on the Staverton Marina and needed to get to the A350, this would be the route you'd choose.

The location of the schools will also cause traffic congestion on the road through Hilperton at pick up and drop off times as well causing chaos with parents abandoning cars on all adjoining roads.

The location of higher density housing on plot 3541 - an area of poorly drained land whilst undeveloped - is asking for problems with flooding. Perhaps a community orchard or other green area would be better placed here?

Overall, there needs to be more of a buffer between Hilperton (all the way along the currently rural edge of site 5 and not simply around the village centre) and the new development. All of the proposed buffering is between the development and the outside view of Trowbridge. Suggesting that protecting the view of a few occasional users is a higher priority than those who are having this imposed on them and have to look at it every day, all day.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I have no objections to their proposed location, either end of site 5 would seem suitable. Should more of the development be given over to self build and have them dispersed across the site. All the development estates built in and around Trowbridge in the last 25 years+ are full of dull identical houses with no architectural merit.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

As much renewable energy provision should be made as possible.

Any new builds should be held to high energy standards with minimal heat loss/drafts as a minimum and renewables at the heart of the plan.

Each house could be mandated to have sufficient solar panels fitted to cover its typical consumption with battery back storage to spread the supply to meet consumption.

Water preservation is going to be key in the future (ironic given that it is on marsh and has sever risks of flooding) along with the reduction and capture of water run off.

The proposal of a communal heat pump to provide heating and hot water is an exceptionally good idea.

Consideration needs to be given to how the use of electric cars becoming the norm and to be able to charge overnight at home. There must be sufficient off street parking at each of the dwellings to accommodate the number of cars assumed per household, with sufficient grid capacity to handle the surge in demand planned in from the outset.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

I disagree with the overall scale of the development. I have to applaud the inclusion of allotted space for self build housing, green spaces, community orchards and new allotments, but disagree with the use of these to shield the visual impact of this proposed town from the recreational users of the canal at the expense of shielding the existing residents from the visual impact of this development.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

The location of the school will also cause traffic congestion on the road that the development will join (which is already at a standstill for many hours a day) at pick up and drop off times as well causing chaos with parents abandoning cars on all adjoining roads. There is also currently a primary school opposite this development.

Overall, there needs to be more of a buffer between Staverton and Hilperton and the new development. All of the proposed buffering is between the development and their view over the factory. Suggesting that protecting the view of a the new residents is a higher priority than those who are having this imposed on them and have to look at it every day, all day.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I have no objections to their proposed location, either end of site 5 would seem suitable. Should more of the development be given over to self build and have them dispersed across the site. All the development estates built in and around Trowbridge in the last 25 years+ are full of dull identical houses with no architectural merit.

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

As much renewable energy provision should be made as possible.
Any new builds should be held to high energy standards with minimal heat loss/drafts as a minimum and renewables at the heart of the plan.
Each house could be mandated to have sufficient solar panels fitted to cover its typical consumption with battery back storage to spread the supply to meet consumption.
Water preservation is going to be key in the future (ironic given that it is on marsh and has sever risks of flooding) along with the reduction and capture of water run off.
The proposal of a communal heat pump to provide heating and hot water is an exceptionally good idea.
Consideration needs to be given to how the use of electric cars becoming the norm and to be able to charge overnight at home.
There must be sufficient off street parking at each of the dwellings to accommodate the number of cars assumed per household, with sufficient grid capacity to handle the surge in demand planned in from the outset.

Further comments

This proposed development is the size of new town and is unbalanced in the demands it places on the existing infrastructure and facilities in Trowbridge. There is no details of what local employment growth there will be with in walking/cycling distance of the development and little generated on the development. This proposed development does nothing to alleviate the problem of

affordable housing in the surrounding villages. All the mitigation of the impact on the landscape is focused on the views from outside the town looking in, not on mitigating the impact on the views of the current residents. Those that have to look at the development imposed on them 24hrs a day, 7 days a week should be a higher priority than the view for leisure users of the canal or people commuting past.

Hilperton currently has a green, strongly rural character to it with pasture land and trees defining the setting of the village. A character that the development priorities set out to preserve. Building the equivalent of a small town on the pastureland setting - especially with little to no buffer between old and new - doesn't seem in keeping with this priority. Hilperton is also bigger than just the old part of the village, it extends all along zone 5 and at the far edge of zone 5 are cottages built in the 1800's that the view from the rear has remained largely unchanged in this time.

I would argue that this development would have impacts upon its surroundings that would be difficult to make acceptable:

- The visual impact that is unlikely to be successfully mitigated especially from the properties with gardens backing onto the development
- Increased flood risk to the existing properties as well as those built in the development
- increased traffic generated as a direct result of the development of circa 3000 dwellings, 3 schools and a link road through that causes an unacceptable degree of harm in terms of worsening congestion
- It represent an unacceptable urban development in a rural environment.

Sites 4&5 have been put forward as the councils preferred options, despite their many flaws and issues being raised, being outside the village settlement boundary set by the council only 12 months ago. They appear to have had their ranking adjusted to take in to promote them due to the fact that they are potentially massive site.

These sites are opposed by our parish council and by the town council, yet the county council still looks to impose them on us with what appears to be a drive to meet targets with the minimum effort required on their behalf.

I would like to have on record that this consultation was launched without any notification to the residents that its outcome will affect. In total, only a 6 week window for consultation was granted and we only found out about it by chance 2 weeks ago. No effort was made by the Wiltshire Council to highlight this to the local community and to allow proper consideration and time for questions to be answered and clarifications to be sought. When we did find the papers under consultation, the images where of such a poor quality that it was nearly impossible to make out what the proposed development actually was (aside from the shock of how big it was). We have struggled to get decent images of the plans (this took over a week and several emails chasing including escalating it up through the department and involving our MP) and information regarding the way and the data/assumptions used for the sites assessment (which wasn't forthcoming and is still unsatisfactory). It was as if they were hoping that no one would notice it and they could move straight through to the next round unchallenged.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP023	
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
Strongly object to the loss of farmland to the North/East of Hilperton Village. The use should remain as existing.	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	
Strongly object to any development.	
TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].	

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Strongly object to any development.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

I am a Hilperton Village Resident who cares about the area in which I live, particularly the farmland to the North East of the village where the preferred development site for housing is located.

I was made aware of this proposal just last week (w/c 1st March 2021) by a parish Council leaflet and have received no correspondence from Wiltshire Council regarding the site allocations list. I have since found out that many more Hilperton residents have found themselves in the same position. How can the council expect to gather a response to their Local Plan Review without adequately informing the public?!

I am saddened by the proposal to allocate the open farmland to the North East of Hilperton Village for the purposes of a new housing development for the following reasons:

- The proposed site will destroy the green boundary to Hilperton Village. The fields safeguard the countryside and provide an important green rural setting for the local community to follow leisure pursuits; local rambling groups, childcare settings, horse riders, runners, cyclists, and dog walkers all use the area. In today's society, in which physical and mental wellbeing are being advocated, the need for natural spaces is more important than ever. We should, therefore, be doing everything we can to protect precious greenfield land for the local community to enjoy.
- The site is of significant size, probably larger than the adjacent village of Hilperton itself that it will dwarf, and there will be a significant loss of greenfield and agricultural land. The whole development is on open farmland outside the village settlement boundary (set by the council themselves in Feb 2020 in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan).
- At Whaddon Lane, there will be major impact on the setting of the conservation area due to backland development. This will harm the character of the historic settlement pattern of Hilperton.
- There will be a loss of habitat and biodiversity. The hedgerows that run alongside the fields provide precious wildlife corridors and support a diverse flora and fauna which would be eradicated if used to provide additional housing in the area.
- I have seen many bats on the proposed sites in the past, specifically near the canal. It is inevitable that their habitat will be lost.
- A development of this size will significantly increase levels of environmental pollution, including air quality, noise, light and vibration.

- There will be a significant impact on the local highway network from the extra traffic, that will add to the already existing congestion at the Staverton Bridge traffic lights, where there is regular traffic build up.
 - The plans include 1 secondary School, 2 primary Schools and 2 nurseries each of which will add even more traffic. It will lead to severe congestion on all roads adjacent to the King's Arms roundabout (where the access to the proposed site is planned).
 - It will put traffic back through Hilperton Village that has both narrow and in some places no pavements, increasing the risk of harm to pedestrians.
 - The Hilperton Gap road was built to divert traffic away from the village and any new development on the proposed site will significantly increase this.
 - The development will inevitably lead to increased incidents of flooding across the causeway which closes the road completely at times. The northern part of the site is at risk of flooding due to a nearby watercourse (River Avon) and this occurs regularly. There is also ground water flooding. Any new development will be susceptible to both these issues.
- I have written to convey the great concerns that our household (and I know many others in the local area) have about any proposed development on the open farmland. I hope that this land can be preserved with the highest priority, and that all brownfield sites would be developed before any consideration would be given to encroaching on these precious areas of protected land.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP024	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Unitary Candidate for Holt Staverton & Atworth
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
No, what is proposed exacerbates the problems in areas of site 4. The plans are difficult to decipher as to where the actual schools are proposed. A completely different colour would have been useful.	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	
No I don't agree.	

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I like stand alone, self build & custom build housing options of a very high quality. By their very nature the self build will not be finished in sequence so neighbours will be subjected to noise & deliveries over a period of years if you've ever watched Grand Designs! Its not clear where access is.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Insulation above government guidelines should be used. Technology is changing quickly so whatever is appropriate at the time. If houses are well insulated hardly any energy would be used. Triple glazing is the way forward.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No, what is proposed exacerbates the problems in areas of site 4. Not clear about the railway crossing or the canal crossing? The map isn't legible enough.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I just don't agree that this site should be used.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Can't see any on site 4.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Insulation above government guidelines should be used. Technology is changing quickly so whatever is appropriate at the time.

Further comments

Site 4 will negatively impact Staverton by its loss of crucial open space. It will become a disparate Parish with a busy road running through it. Residents unable to reach each part safely.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP025	
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:
<p>TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?</p>	
Have no specific comment on the range of uses - they appear comprehensive	
<p>TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?</p>	
<p>The location of schools (particularly the secondary school) must provide for significant vehicle access both near to the school and for access from the Trowbridge area. It is unrealistic to expect the majority of access to be walking or cycling. There will need to additional vehicle access over the canal and in particular over the river. This development could not proceed without a new river crossing and relief road on stilts over the flood plain to the west of Staverton.</p>	

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No comment

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Electric Charging points for cars at every house. This is the normal specification in other countries eg Netherlands

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No comment

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

As commented re site 5 there would need to be an additional river crossing at Staverton. Also access between Sites 4 and 5 over the canal

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No comment

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Electric charging points at every house

Further comments

Development of the proposed areas in Hilperton/Staverton have never been previously considered. The focus of the previous plan was in the West Ashton to Yarnbrook area with good access to the A350. The present plan shows an area described as North Ashton marked in Dark Grey as a Development Area. Also an area nearer to the A350 marked in Light Grey having Planning Permission completed. When will the Ashton Park development proceed? Is it now prevented by the Bats Special Area of Conservation?

The additional housing required is stated as 1,805- why should a development of 2,600 houses be considered at all? It is dismissed in the assessment document as a good idea to increase the number without any justification.

There has been insufficient consideration given to Brownfield potential developments particularly towards the centre of Trowbridge.

Sites 4 and 5 only have access from the east corner (by the Rugby Club roundabout). Without a new River Crossing this proposal would be a disaster due to the build up of traffic at the western end where there is no adequate vehicle routing. This concern is expressed in the assessment document but then ignored in the conclusion.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP026

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

I wish to object most strongly to both developments on the following grounds.

1. The developments are on valuable open farm land and are outside the village settlement boundary.
2. Road at Staverton bridge is not suitable for vast increases of traffic from new developments and climate change will increase frequency and duration of closure of the Staverton causeway due to flooding.
3. Large amount of wildlife will be displaced and disrupted by this development.
4. The villages of Hilperton and Staverton will be subsumed into Trowbridge. This specifically goes against previous commitments made to residents when the western bypass was agreed and built through the Hilperton Gap.
5. These proposed developments with two Primary schools and a secondary school with access onto Hill st/ Marsh road will cause a huge amount of traffic to come through the villages. This exactly what the Hilperton Gap bypass was built to avoid and which is working successfully to date.
6. Whaddon lane must be cut off from any further development because of its narrow entrance at Hill st, which renders it totally unsuitable for any increase in domestic or commercial building access. As it is, two cars cannot pass safely at the entrance to Whaddon lane, and an increase in traffic could lead to accidents or fatalities on the adjoining footpath. The narrowness of the footpath at this entrance is already an accident waiting to happen.

If this development was to go ahead I would consider Wiltshire Council to be guilty of environmental vandalism as the proposed site is all greenfield land.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP027

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident of Hilperton

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Strongly disagree with the use of this greenfield site at all. The proposed development is vast and will dwarf Hilperton Village. The proportion of housing to other uses is totally unbalanced and will not benefit the residents of this area in any way.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Strongly disagree with the location, this whole area is important for the local community for a plethora of reasons.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Although I agree with the inclusion of self build and custom build housing, I strongly disagree with the whole site.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

I do not have enough info to answer this

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Strongly disagree

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Strongly disagree

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Strongly disagree

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

I do not have enough information to answer this question.

Further comments

As a local resident, I care greatly about the area in which I live, especially the proposed site, which we use as a family on a daily basis. We received zero correspondence from Wiltshire Council about a proposal that will have a huge impact on the local area and residents, which in itself I find unethical and seemingly underhand. It seems no local residents were made aware of the proposal and once alerted by the parish council we had only a few days to respond and inevitably many people will not have had enough notice to voice their opinions.

I strongly disagree with the proposal for the following reasons:

- Destruction of an important greenfield site and rural area. Not only for the residents but for existing wildlife. There will obviously be a huge loss of natural habitat and biodiversity including habitat for colonies of bats.
- The Hilperton village settlement boundary was set by the council themselves in Feb 2020 in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan. This proposal completely ignores this and I understand there is no requirement for a site of this size. The sheer size will completely dwarf and ruin what is a lovely village.
- There will be a significant increase in levels of pollution, including air quality, noise, light and vibration.
- Extra traffic in an already congested area in Staverton. The Hilperton bypass was built to move traffic away from the village. As a mother I am already very aware of the amount of speeding vehicles through the village and lack of any traffic control through most areas leading to dangerous sections for all the villagers, especially children. This will only be made worse by the proposal.

- Nearby areas are already prone to flooding. Using existing flood plains will surely cause serious issues for existing housing and roads.
- Hilperton is an attractive village with many older properties. What consideration will be give to the overall appearance of the village and integration of this proposal? If local estates are anything to go by, I can only assume none. The preservation of this rural village and surrounding green land should be of upmost importance.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP028	
Consultee code: General Public	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Resident of Hilperton
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
I do not agree with anything, I live in the village of Hilperton and will be very sad to see all the farmers and farmland gone.	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	
I do not agree with the location, I do not want to see any more houses built around Hilperton.	
TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].	

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No I do not agree. Yes please.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No i do not agree.

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

I do not agree with any of it.

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

No and yes.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Paxcroft Mead is a massive housing estate which is still expanding, why do we need another large estate on the other side of Hilperton.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP029

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

NO.
A NEW TOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK,
SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

NO.

A NEW TOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE PUT IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK, SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

NO.

A NEW TEOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK, SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

ALL NEW BUILD, RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL, IN THE COUNTY SHOULD HAVE SOLAR/WIND POWER

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

NO.

A NEW TOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK, SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

NO.

A NEW TOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE PUT IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK, SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

NO.

A NEW TEOWN IS REQUIRED WHERE ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE IN PLACE LIKE NEW ROAD NETWORK, SCHOOLS, MEDICAL FACILTITES, HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY & SUPERMARKET

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

ALL NEW BUILD, RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL, IN THE COUNTY SHOULD HAVE SOLAR/WIND POWER

Further comments

THIS CONSULTATION SHOULD NEVER HAD TAKEN PLACE IN THE MIDDLE OF A PANDEMIC WHEN THE MAJORITY OF RESIDENTS DO NOT KNOW ABOUT IT THROUGH LACK OF PUBLICITYBY WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

Rep ID: Trowb_CP030

Consultee code: General Public

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Na

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No the infrastructure is not available to support this level of development. The addition of schools will add to the burden of traffic.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

I oppose the use of the site for 2600 dwellings due to the lack of infrastructure principally traffic and congestion through staverton.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Yes not on this location

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

No

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

I am struggling to understand the rationale for this development based on the limitations caused by the current infrastructure. The roads are too busy already, especially by the cereal factory I. The morning I cannot understand how the planning team think it is appropriate to build a development of this size. You have already overbuilt in this area and now are seeking to take away a place where many people enjoy walking and taking their dogs out, never more important than now in these times. We are fundamentally opposed to this development.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP031

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

I disagree with this plan in its entirety. However if it were to go ahead I disagree with the density of the housing planned for the site. Given its location as an extension to an existing village there should be fewer houses and more open and recreational space to maintain a village feel and aesthetic.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I disagree with this plan in its entirety. However, if there is going to be a main entrance to the development of the roundabout at the junction of the bypass road and Devizes Road, then Devizes Road should definitely be closed off. It is already a rat run on

which drivers do not obey the speed limit, additional traffic will make it even worse. The eastern boundary of the site is where a new planned cycleway is proposed going through to Semington and on to Melksham. It would make sense for the site to have direct access to this route.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

The plan does not give enough information about what is meant by self and custom build housing to answer this question.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

I disagree with this plan in its entirety. However if it is going to be built it would be a good idea to explore the use of heat pumps (both air and ground source) for buildings on the site.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

I disagree with this plan in its entirety

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

I disagree with this plan in its entirety

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

I disagree with this plan in its entirety

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

I disagree with this plan in its entirety

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP032	
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TROWBRIDGE Options 4 and 5. - This Review has decided to select sites and publish detailed plans of those sites before any consultation with the public. It feels as though decisions have already been made. The report notes that land is promoted by developers. This feels very much the case here. Who prepared, paid for and owns the site plans? - It is impossible to compare the Options fairly as there are no detailed plans for the other sites. In particular this makes the methodology around Accessibility unclear. For instance, was the impact of a secondary school at Option 6 even considered? <p>A: No. The current high value of the land for arable, wildlife and amenity purposes should be considered relative to other Options.</p>	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].	

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. The plans are not clear enough about what is being proposed.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

A huge swathe of land adjoining the proposed sites has already been allocated for solar energy. This makes this question seem irrelevant as decisions have already been made before any public consultation has taken place.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP033

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Development of either of these areas would not be appropriate with the existing conservation area.
Access to the sites would not be easy to achieve.
The fields are an extension of the Hilperton Gap and provide foraging areas for wildlife including bats.
The fields have a system of well-established hedgerows which are beneficial to all wildlife.
According to a WCC map, over 75% of these fields are grade 1 / 2 agricultural land and so should not be built on in any case.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP034

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

5 and 4.
Too much housing. Make the houses bigger with more land footage around them so that residents can enjoy a more private and comfortable life.

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No. There is no need to develop the whole site. A smaller within the areas would be more acceptable.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Self build should be allowed near water resources and on the outer edge of the areas to allow for privacy.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar panels.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

5 and 4.

Too much housing. Make the houses bigger with more land footage around them so that residents can enjoy a more private and comfortable life.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. There is no need to develop the whole site. A smaller within the areas would be more acceptable.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Self build should be allowed near water resources and on the outer edge of the areas to allow for privacy

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar panels.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP035

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

Site 4 North Trowbridge
Site 5 North East Trowbridge
Both sites are in essence one large site!

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

The sites (4 & 5) are not suitable for any significant development, certainly not of this massive scale.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

The sites (4 & 5) are not suitable for any significant development, certainly not of this massive scale.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Prime agricultural land should be used for food production. Renewable energy generation, whilst important, should not compromise important green spaces and land for food production, that makes little sense. Whilst contentious energy generating incinerators

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Site 4 North Trowbridge

Site 5 North East Trowbridge

Both sites are in essence one large site!

The sites (4 & 5) are not suitable for any significant development, certainly not of this massive scale.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

The sites (4 & 5) are not suitable for any significant development, certainly not of this massive scale.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

The sites (4 & 5) are not suitable for any significant development, certainly not of this massive scale.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Prime agricultural land should be used for food production. Renewable energy generation, whilst important, should not compromise important green spaces and land for food production, that makes little sense. Whilst contentious energy generating incinerators

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP036

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Staverton and Hilperon Marsh plan

No ...

Is green field food crops area – don't build !!

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

How There is no land for renewable energies .. you are building on everything !

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

I write in objection to plans for adding another 2600 dwellings – designated for Staverton and Hilperton marshes area.

I object in terms of –

Environment – this area is designated green fields

Environment – this area is food producing land.. where will we get our food from, let alone where will all these new people get food from !

Environment – Where we cannot even put paving on our driveways as will affect water drain off, to put this many houses over an area called Staverton Marsh and Hilperton Marsh will mean significant flooding will then take place MORE OFTEN !

Environment – 2600 houses with on average dwelling for 4.5 people .. Where is their sewerage and waste going to go ??

Environment – on average house have 2+ cars .. even if a number are electric, this will bring major air pollution to this rural area
Resources – 2600 houses, electric cars + all the 1000's of existing development already sanctioned will mean a major stress on electrical supplies

Resources – 2600 houses + all the existing development already sanctioned will mean a major stress on drinking water supply and sewerage disposal

Traffic – This area already suffers bad traffic flow - !

Crime – This is a rural community. We have already seen where housing density is increasing in Paxcroft and other areas nearby, there is more and more major crime being committed !

Rep ID: Trowb_CP037

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Wiltshire Core Strategy (Jan 2015)

Core policy 1

4.15. Development outside the settlement boundary will be strictly controlled. Relaxation of the boundaries will only be supported where it has been formally reviewed through a subsequent DPD or a community-led neighbourhood plan, which includes a review of the settlement boundary to identify new developable land to help meet the housing and employment needs of that community. In turn this could bring forward benefits to the local community such as improvements to the economy through the identification of land for employment purposes.

4.16 there is a general presumption against development outside the defined limits of development of the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages

5.150 It is recognised that the villages surrounding Trowbridge, particularly Hilperton, Southwick North Bradley and West Ashton, have separate and distinct identities as villages. Open countryside should be maintained to protect the character and identity of

these villages as separate communities. The local communities may wish to consider this matter in more detail in any future community-led neighbourhood planning

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Core policy 29 Spatial Strategy

Trowbridge Community Area Development in the Trowbridge Community Area should be in accordance with the Settlement Strategy set out in Core Policy 1. Principal Settlements: Trowbridge Large Villages: Hilperton, North Bradley and Southwick

Appendix E List of settlement Boundaries to be retained - Large Villages

Hilperton settlement boundary has been clearly agreed in this document (and indeed re-confirmed a in Feb 2020 by Wiltshire Council)

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Wiltshire Site Allocation Plan adopted Feb. 20 makes no mention of Hilperton

2.8 Settlement boundaries have been used in development plans for the County for a number of years. The WCS retains them. Except for small villages each category of settlement h

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Appendix A:

North and West HMA Part 2 Amended Settlement Boundaries Adopted February 2020

A.62 The following settlement boundaries in the Trowbridge Community Area have been reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan: Trowbridge, Hilperton, N

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Hilperton Village Design Statement Part 2 Planning Guidance

The open countryside setting is an essential part of Hilperton's rural character.

Recommendations:

- The natural beauty of the landscape including flora, fauna features should be respected and where appropriate enhanced and protected.
- New development in open countryside should be avoided.

Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan Topic Paper 1: APPENDIX 2 Settlement Boundary Review Methodology June 2017

Neighbourhood plans will be considered to have reviewed their settlement boundaries where this issue has been explicitly addressed through the neighbourhood plan process, even if the eventual outcome is to retain the existing settlement boundary. Generally, when a neighbourhood plan submitted to the Council has reviewed a settlement boundary and proposes amendments, this Plan does not carry out a second review of the boundaries 10. The community area topic papers will highlight those settlements where the settlement boundary is considered to have been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan.

Wiltshire Council Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment

Methodology August 2017

2.5 It is important to note that whilst the SHELAA identifies potential sites, it does not allocate them for development or add weight to the site for the purpose of decision making on a planning application. The allocation of future sites for development will only take place through statutory plan processes (e.g. Local Plan, neighbourhood plans) which undergo public consultation and examination

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

Road Infrastructure

Site 5 is poorly serviced by existing road networks and the river bridge traffic lights already cause severe congestion at times which back up into Hilperton Marsh. Any development in this area would not be sustainable and create increased and severe congestion on all surrounding roads

The closure of the road across the floodplain is only forecast to increase in occurrence due to climate change and storm water run-off from any development in the vicinity will end up in the river only exacerbating this issue.

Any development in the location of site 5 would result in increased traffic through Hilperton Village, the very thing the Gap road was built to remove.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

The proposal to build on the land outside the Settlement Boundary of Hilperton has failed to follow central and local government policy and guidelines. In addition every working document preceding The Wiltshire Local Plan has categorically stated that the existing settlement boundary of Hilperton is to be maintained.

The proposal to allocate land outside the settlement boundary has only become public in the Wiltshire Local Plan which has been out for consultation from Wednesday 13 January to Tuesday 9 March 2021, during the latest Covid 19 Lock down which has severely hindered public awareness and engagement.

This proposal is seriously flawed and should not be allowed to progress. Unless it is stopped it will set a precedent for any developer or landowner to secure approval for development, ignoring well established and tested National and Local Planning Guidance.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP038

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Land outside Hilperton Village Settlement boundary referred to as Site 5

No development whatsoever should be proposed for Site 5 all of which is outside the Village Settlement Boundary

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

See answer above TB6

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

See answer above TB6

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

See answer above TB6

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Land outside Hilperton Village Settlement boundary referred to as Site 5

No development whatsoever should be proposed for Site 5 all of which is outside the Village Settlement Boundary

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

See answer above TB6

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

See answer above TB6

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

See answer above TB6

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP039

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Site 5 North East Trowbridge

No I do not agree. I think it's a ridiculously high number of houses. There is no need to join up Hilperton and Staverton. The green space should be kept as is. Given the circumstances of the last year (Mar 20- Mar 21) open space has never been more important for health and well being. One of the factors that makes Hilperton a desirable village location is its current size and access to the countryside. This proposal destroys this

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No I do not agree. I believe that there should be extra education facilities- specifically a secondary school this side of town as this was previously talked about following the build at Southview Park and Castlemead and nothing has happened, the sensible option would be to build a secondary school off Leapgate opposite / the same side as the CoOp – leading to the West Ashton Road.

**TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

No I do not agree. There is a self build site allocated in the field directly behind our house. The implications of a build site for several years, noise pollution not to mention dust and a visual eyesore.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Unsure but a good idea if possible. More detail required to form a full answer.

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

Site 5 North East Trowbridge
No I do not agree. I think it's a ridiculously high number of houses. There is no need to join up Hilperton and Staverton. The green space should be kept as is. Given the circumstances of the last year (Mar 20- Mar 21) open space has never been more important for health and well being. One of the factors that makes Hilperton a desirable village location is its current size and access to the countryside. This proposal destroys this.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No I do not agree. I believe that there should be extra education facilities- specifically a secondary school this side of town as this was previously talked about following the build at Southview Park and Castlemead and nothing has happened, the sensible option would be to build a secondary school off Leapgate opposite / the same side as the CoOp – leading to the West Ashton Road.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No I do not agree. There is a self build site allocated in the field directly behind our house. The implications of a build site for several years, noise pollution not to mention dust and a visual eyesore.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Unsure but a good idea if possible. More detail required to form a full answer.

Further comments

You are trying to encourage people to walk and cycle more and keep their cars at home yet by building more houses, means more roads and more congestion and pollution. Further negative impacts to consider would include noise pollution for the

increased proportion of the population who are now working from home, both during the extensive construction phase and beyond. General reduction in the quality of life for the existing residents.

This proposal is incredibly upsetting, even our children (those who are old enough to understand 10 & 7 years old – the future of Trowbridge and are those who will be affected longer term by this excessive development) simply asked why? And were very sad when we told them about the impacts on the wildlife and the view from their bedroom windows especially.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP040

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Site 5 North East Trowbridge

No I do not agree. I think it's a ridiculously high number of houses. There is no need to join up Hilperton and Staverton. The green space should be kept as is. Given the circumstances of the last year (Mar 20- Mar 21) open space has never been more important for health and well being. One of the factors that makes Hilperton a desirable village location is its current size and access to the countryside. This proposal destroys this.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No I do not agree. I believe that there should be extra education facilities- specifically a secondary school this side of town as this was previously talked about following the build at Southview Park and Castlemead and nothing has happened, the sensible option would be to build a secondary school off Leapgate opposite / the same side as the CoOp – leading to the West Ashton Road.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No I do not agree. There is a self build site allocated in the field directly behind our house. The implications of a build site for several years, noise pollution not to mention dust and a visual eyesore.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Unsure but a good idea if possible. More detail required to form a full answer.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

You are trying to encourage people to walk and cycle more and keep their cars at home yet by building more houses, means more roads and more congestion and pollution. Further negative impacts to consider would include noise pollution for the increased proportion of the population who are now working from home, both during the extensive construction phase and beyond. General reduction in the quality of life for the existing residents. This proposal is incredibly upsetting and is already having an impact on my mental health and quality of life.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP041

Consultee code: Parish/Town Council

Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Hilperton Parish Council

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

No. The various sites shown should not be allocated. You are taking the easy option; less thought required, less effort required, less money required. The plan is unsound.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

**TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Your proposal for Hilperton will be adjacent to two solar farms.

**TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

**TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

**TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?**

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP042	
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:
<p>TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?</p> <p>I disagree with the overall scale of the development, however I have to applaud the inclusion of allotted space for self build housing, green spaces, community orchards and new allotments. I'd like to see inclusion of a native wildflower meadow to encourage biodiversity, especially among essential pollinators. Perhaps this could form the 'landmark design' required to define the development? (Far nicer than the stone markers at Paxcroft Mead.)</p>	
<p>TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?</p>	

- a. The location of access to the spine road worries me: it looks perfectly placed to drive traffic through Hilperton - the exact problem Elizabeth Way way built to alleviate - and cause massive congestion on all roads adjacent to the Kings Arms roundabout.
- b. The location of the schools will also cause traffic congestion on the road through Hilperton at pick up and drop off times.
- c. The location of higher density housing on plot 3541 - an area of poorly drained land whilst undeveloped - is asking for problems with flooding. Perhaps a community orchard or other green area would be better placed here?
- d. Overall, there needs to be more of a buffer between Hilperton (all the way along the currently rural edge of site 5 and not simply around the village centre) and the new development.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

I have no objections to their proposed location, either end of site 5 would seem suitable. Should more of the development be given over to self build?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

As much renewable energy provision should be made as possible. Any new builds should be held to high energy standards with renewables at the heart of the plan.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP043

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:

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No, not until a concept plan for Trowbridge Town Centre is available

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

There needs to be a more realistic approach to housing numbers for a town and surrounding area that is inundated with vehicle commuters. A thorough reappraisal of employment and economic growth is also required before volume housing is considered

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

More incentive and encouragement to include self-build as part of Neighbourhood Planning

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

More incentive and encouragement to include as part of Neighbourhood Planning. To include PV panels on roofs, highest levels of thermal insulation, triple glazing, heat pumps and bio mass boilers. Also needed is a greater number and better accessibility t

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No, not until a concept plan for Trowbridge Town Centre is available.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

There needs to be a more realistic approach to housing numbers for a town and surrounding area that is inundated with vehicle commuters. A thorough reappraisal of employment and economic growth is also required before volume housing is considered.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

More incentive and encouragement to include self-build as part of Neighbourhood Planning.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

More incentive and encouragement to include as part of Neighbourhood Planning. To include PV panels on roofs, highest levels of thermal insulation, triple glazing, heat pumps and bio mass boilers. Also needed is a greater number and better accessibility to EV Charging Points.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP044

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): no

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

**TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?**

No until a concept plan for the town centre is prepared

**TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?**

There has to be a reappraisal of employment and economic growth, and a realistic approach to housing numbers for a town which is swamped with commuters.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

It should be determined through a refresh of the Neighbourhood Plan.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

PV panels on roofs of all new buildings and retrofitted on old buildings where possible. All new construction must meet the highest standards of insulation, triple glazing, solar panels, Biomass boiler, heat pumps etc.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No until a concept plan for the town centre is prepared

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

There has to be a reappraisal of employment and economic growth, and a realistic approach to housing numbers for a town which is swamped with commuters.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

It should be determined through a refresh of the Neighbourhood Plan.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

PV panels on roofs of all new buildings and retrofitted on old buildings where possible. All new construction must meet the highest standards of insulation, triple glazing, solar panels, Biomass boiler, heat pumps etc.

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP045

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No. Para 32: the design does not respect the villages. Design Principles. The suggestion of a 'tree-lined main street' or spine road 'designed initially as a 40-50mph road', is insane. According to the concept plans the roads are simply to access the development, disgorging all traffic back onto the existing roads. Roads in residential areas should have design speeds appropriate to residential areas. The statement (para 42) about a 'spine road' directing traffic away from Hilperton conflicts with the concept plans.

The plans are poorly presented, remaining illegible even when expanded. This is unfortunate as it's not difficult to provide legible plans.

Cycle roads and footpaths should be separate in line with government guidance.

Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be a flexible approach allowing for technological advances.
Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

No. Para 32: the design does not respect the villages. Design Principles. The suggestion of a 'tree-lined main street' or spine road 'designed initially as a 40-50mph road', is insane. According to the concept plans the roads are simply to access the development, disgorging all traffic back onto the existing roads. Roads in residential areas should have design speeds

appropriate to residential areas. The statement (para 42) about a 'spine road' directing traffic away from Hilperon conflicts with the concept plans.

The plans are poorly presented, remaining illegible even when expanded. This is unfortunate as it's not difficult to provide legible plans.

Cycle roads and footpaths should be separate in line with government guidance.

Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

No. Sites should not be allocated.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

There should be a flexible approach allowing for technological advances.

Statements in this response about mitigation must not be taken to indicate support for the proposals

Further comments

Comments on the proposed Staverton allocation

The site, along with the proposed Hilperton allocation, should not be taken forward at this stage. Other previously allocated sites, including town centre brownfield sites, should be built out first. The justification for allocating sites 4 and 5 is weak and should be re-assessed.

Infrastructure.

The B3105 through Staverton is not able to cope even with existing traffic levels. The canal bridge is listed and was built in 1820. The stone parapet is regularly damaged by vehicles. The railway bridge causes visibility problems for the School Lane junction. The historic river bridge, also listed, has a light-controlled shuttle system which can cause long traffic queues at peak times. The section of road between the railway and river bridges is narrow and winding and causes problems for HGV drivers.

The allocations would seriously increase traffic levels in Staverton and would overload the B3105.

The introduction of a Clean Air Zone in Bath has the potential to increase HGV traffic on the route.

Developments within the Hilperton Gap will increase traffic on the route.

Air pollution levels are likely to exceed legal limits.

A snapshot air quality measurement undertaken in 2017 on the B3105 near Staverton Church gave a measurement of 32.6 µg/m³ of Nitrogen Dioxide, below but approaching the EU legal limit of 40 µg/m³ (annual mean).

The cycle paths and footpaths shown on the concept map are inadequate. The canal towpath is not a suitable cycle track as it is narrow and heavily used by pedestrians. Viable and efficient cycle tracks, in line with the latest government guidance, would need to connect to Holt and Trowbridge.

Station

The possibility of re-opening Staverton station has been considered in the past and should be re-investigated. (SWLEP / Swindon and Wiltshire Rail Study / Rail Strategy Report / 12/7/2019 / p39)

Bus

Apart from the 'Zigzag', Staverton has poor bus provision. If development goes ahead the opportunity should be taken to start a regular service from Trowbridge to Bradford on Avon via Staverton

Constraints

The site is adjacent to the Green Belt. The elevated position above the river means it will impact on views from the north.

Drainage. The farmland currently is poorly drained, with large areas of standing water during wet weather.

Staverton triangle

The proposal not to include the Staverton Triangle site as an allocation is supported.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP046

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Unable to answer this question in any detail because the good quality map does have the references that are present in the poor quality maps in the appropriate report concept maps.
This will apply to questions TB6ff8 7 ff BB and all sites

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Unable to answer this question in any detail because the good quality map does have the references that are present in the poor quality maps in the appropriate report concept maps.
This will apply to questions TB6ff8 7 ff BB and all sites

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

**TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].
Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?**

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP047

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

Public access and recreation space should be much more central to the design of the site – maximising the canal space, the green credentials the site should have and the opportunity to build on the businesses and community activities already taking place on site.

Start up units for businesses or spaces for coffee shop/ shared office space type working should be a core part of the community space. Similar to the Glove Factory in Holt in both the business and community cafe spaces – maximising the creative growth opportunities, building a place for people who will be working at home to mix and access large spaces to work

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

The schools are in a really good location

The public recreation space needs to be thought through really thoroughly and link much more to the local centre.

Definitely no through traffic on Waddon Lane!

The school frontage assumes car access from Marsh Road area which is wrong. If the spine is pulling traffic through the site, that should be where school traffic is funnelled, away from the existing residential areas of Hilperton and Hilperton village. The links between the schools/nursery and the hub space, and the public recreation space all need to be significantly strengthened with walking and other access routes

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Whatever is most sustainable and able to develop as technology changes. The schools, industrial units, local centre and community hub spaces are all key to accessing and using the renewable energy and the renewable energy provision should be a USP and a

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP048	
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:
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
I like the allotments, cooperative/self-build housing. You also need high levels of mandatory provision of social housing – Trowbridge is an area of high deprivation. (higher levels of disability & poverty than elsewhere in Wiltshire). Developer-housing for private purchase should NOT be prioritised.	
TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?	
No – the locations should be in town & on existing brownfield sites – of which there are plenty.	

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

The self-build dwellings could be incorporated onto brownfield sites – as is done elsewhere in cities in the UK (St Werburghs in Bristol is a good example). Also, a high proportion of new housing in Trowbridge should be social rental, or alternative tenure such as cooperative housing. Supported housing is also in very high demand and should be provided for older people in particular.

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Renewable energy – microgeneration on apartment blocks would be a good start. It would be less costly to fit and maintain, and provide tenants with a sense of connection to where their energy comes from.

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP049	
Consultee code: Landowner	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Lightwood Strategic
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: Trowb_CP49
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<p>a) These representations have been prepared by Lightwood Strategic who are working in a promotional capacity with the Oatley family of Hilperton Marsh Farm and Paxcroft Farm, and [NAME REDACTED] of New Barn Farm Hilperton, Trowbridge.</p> <p>b) The Oatley's own 58% of Site 5 (North East Trowbridge). With the addition of [NAME REDACTED] ownership this increases the coverage to 75%.</p> <p>c) Within Site 4, the Oatley's own a small area of around 0.6ha, but to the east of Site 4 their land hosts a 10MW solar farm. This generates enough electricity to power 2,700 homes based on the usage of an average home.</p> <p>d) It is highly material to these representations that the Oatley's also own Site 6, between the A361 and the A350 (and land beyond the A350). Consequential to the publication of the emerging Local Plan, Site 6 is now being promoted as a Country Park and Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space of up to 63ha (155acres).</p> <p>e) Appendix 1 [TROW_CP49] sets out a land ownership plan in the context of the emerging site allocation boundaries</p>	

f) These representations focus on:

- The emerging spatial strategy to the extent that most directly affects Trowbridge
- the justification for the selection of Site 4 and Site 5, in-principle, and the emerging policy criteria and concept plan that the Council has published.

g) As an opening statement, noting that this is not a full draft plan consultation, we think that the Council has got it 'about right' in terms of what it is presenting at this stage. The documentation is trying to funnel down options (to be able undertake meaningful consultation) whilst remaining open to changes prior to the preparation of the pre-submission Local Plan. Nonetheless, and as invited to do so, we comment on issues that could ultimately affect the soundness of the Local Plan, so that these can be considered and addressed. We recommended no-going engagement with critical parties during 2021.

2.23 The Concept Plan for Sites 4 and 5 is expressed through eight separate plans:

- A Draft Framework Plan (Figures 2 and 6)
- A Draft Green and Blue Infrastructure Plan (Figures 3 and 7)
- A Draft Movement Plan (Figure 4 and 8)
- A Draft Urban Design Principles Plan (Figures 5 and 9)

2.24 Paragraphs 35 and 36 identify that the Concept Plans are a way and one way that Site 4 and Site 5 could be developed, and that there are different ways. Consultees are invited to give their observations.

2.25 The Council's intention is that 'further development' of the Concept Plan(s) will culminate in design codes, developed alongside masterplans to which applications would have to adhere.

2.26 At the outset, we expressed support for a specific master planning and design code process, with both pillars being subject to specific locally focused public consultation, with input from other relevant bodies, including statutory consultees. At this stage it is unknown whether Site 4 or Site 5 will come forward as a single joint outline planning application or two or more applications. A coordinated framework plan, phasing plan, and infrastructure delivery plan is the ideal way to proceed if delivery is to follow a Local Plan allocation. Landowners must however reserve the right to submit a planning application at any time, and in light of the Council's 5-year supply problems. It is for the Council to determine how to deal with such an application. Clearly, the presentation of an application within a technically justified masterplan would still be needed.

2.27 The wording of paragraph 36 in respect of 'further development' is a little ambiguous but it is our expectation that a 'master planning and design coding process' is viewed by the Council as a separate body of placemaking and design work to be prepared outside the Local Plan itself. Clarity is sought here.

2.28 Clarity is also requested in respect of whether the Council intends to undertake this 'further development' within an SPD process or not (whether Council-led and funded, developer-led and funded, or collaboratively-led funded).

2.29 If an SPD process is not envisaged then a landowner/developer led and funded process will be required (to include public consultation), with the Council acting an 'overseer' and ultimately endorsing an end product. Again, we should like to establish

clarity over the intended process. Based on sites in the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan, our expectation is that it will be for the developers to progress a co-ordinating masterplan that the Council endorses, with regular engagement on the way.

2.30 Any landowner/developer masterplanning and design coding process could take place in parallel with the later stages of the Local Plan process rather than waiting to begin until after the Local Plan is adopted. This would enable planning applications to be submitted closer to the date of Local Plan adoption, thus assisting with the timeliness of delivery. No housing trajectory has been provided, but it is clear that the Council is assuming that 1,600 homes of the 2,100-unit Site 5 are delivered by 2036. Assuming 150 per annum, with first completion in 2025 is not unreasonable at this stage, but would require an efficient master planning and application process that began during rather than after the adoption of the Local Plan itself.

2.31 Whilst we understand the consultation value in the Council 'painting an early picture' of how the land could be developed, we caution against the inclusion of the current suite of plans (even once adjusted after this consultation) in the Pre-submission Plan itself. A Local Plan examination (on the basis of the current planning system at least) is not the forum to be able to assess the technical

justification for a masterplan, and thus, the inclusion of such plans would have to be so heavily caveated as being too susceptible to a high degree of change, that inclusion is unwarranted.

2.32 However, we do see merit in a first stage framework plan, (or framework 'options' plans) appearing in the Council's evidence base. The purpose of this evidence base would be to justify the assumed housing capacity of the site and to demonstrate that the site is capable of being delivered, including the SANG strategy. The evidence base would be LPA 'owned' but landowners and developers would contribute to it.

2.33 At this time and for the benefit of other consultees, we must express that the Concept Plan within the consultation document has been unilaterally prepared by the Council without any engagement or input from the Oatley's and Cradock's. Consequently, there is a failure to understand critical landowner perspectives at first principles stage. These perspectives need to be understood.

2.34 The Council has published no technical evidence as part of this consultation to justify the concept plans, nor any evidence of an optioneering process. The Council would not be expected to evaluate a concept plan without this background. Consultees, including landowners should have been presented with this information in order to comment more effectively, assuming it exists. No doubt there has been some professional assessment, and some of the ideas may ultimately be perfectly valid and indeed translate into a final masterplan, but that is not the point; the technical documentation justification is missing. It is acknowledged that the landowners have not, to this point, offered any vision for the development of their land within a wider strategic context but the emerging Local Plan now generates a basis upon which to do so.

2.35 We present our headline observations as follows, and present at Appendix 2 a series of alternative Concept Plans that serve to illustrate the points that we make. Bullets a-kk need to be read

alongside Appendix 2.

2.36 The key message is that there is still quite a lot of optioneering to be done, whether the red line for the allocations remains fixed or is extended. This optioneering does not affect the basic principle that a strategic expansion in this area is justified and achievable but it does require the Council to think about the extent of the allocation and the dispositor of uses. It also calls into question what the draft Local Plan itself shows in terms of plans versus policy requirements, and what is hosted within the evidence base.

Appendix 2 : Concept Plan Optioneering

- a) The landowners only plan to make part of their land at Hilperton Marsh Farm available for built development.
- b) The landowners run a valued suite of commercial premises of various sizes at Hilperton March Farm. Some long-term tenants have moved into larger units as their businesses have grown. The commercial units will remain in situ and the landowners needs to retain some flexibility to enable further growth during the plan period. Suitable buffers will be needed between the existing premises, any new premises and housing. Given the Council's in principle endorsement of North East Trowbridge land for strategic development, the landowner will accelerate its future business planning so that a first phase (evidence-based) framework masterplan can be developed to justify housing capacity assumptions for consultation on the pre-submission Local Plan.
- c) The landowners live on the site and will continue to do so, even if most of the land is developed for housing. The orientation and outlook of the two residential dwellings in their ownership means that they wish to keep their two eastern fields free of built development, including a primary school. Ideally, the landowners do not want a spine road bisecting the business park and their properties from the canal. We calculate that around 4ha of housing land (up to 150-160 plots) would be lost from the net residential area, but that is the landowners choice. Consequently, further optioneering is needed to assess alternative primary school locations and the vehicular access and movement strategy.
- d) The proposed 2FE primary school is in any case probably too close to the school in Site 4. We recognise that the relationship of a new school primary site to the existing Hilperton C of E Primary school is also a consideration. There are other options that must be considered, either side of Whaddon Lane, including on other Oatley land.
- e) The concept plan is rather ill conceived in respect of the assumption that a secondary access road could be driven from Marsh Road, through existing residential curtilages to the Oatley's North Eastern field. Existing use values need to be considered for the affected properties, some of which have no wider stake in the allocation. Strategically, this issue is rather superseded by the 'no build' strategy to the north.
- f) There is no published evidence base to justify the performance of the primary access strategy along Marsh Road/Hill Road versus alternatives. Nonetheless we see the logic in presenting the proposed alignment and access points for discussion. The key features of the access strategy, for this Hilperton Marsh part of Site 5 are that the spine road connects to the Texaco roundabout and that there is a 'branch' that emerges to the east of Hillside Gardens.

g) This access strategy means that the main landowner is not afforded its own primary (or secondary) access point despite a 475m frontage on to Marsh Road/Hill Street. The Concept Plan is therefore somewhat naive in respect of its understanding of the interplay between design and delivery. It will be necessary for the Oatley's to achieve a primary access point if anything is to be delivered on Site 5. Consequently, the Hillside Gardens access would be changed to a secondary junction and the internal highway network rearranged.

h) The landowners consider that a primary point of access is achievable at the confluence of Horse Road and their current access to the business park. Land for new junction arrangement and realigned spine road alignment is available between the main farmhouse and Marsh Road. This alternative strategy will of course need to be assessed to determine its performance.

i) Whatever the alignment of the spine road, the emerging policy requires that it be designed for speeds 40-50m, yet capable of adaption for 20-30 mph speed limits.j) Firstly, we do not see how 'design speeds' can be justified in terms of soundness within Local Plan policy. The emerging policy should instead be focusing on the objectives of the spine road, and what it should and should not be designed to do, i.e it should be not become an equally quick route of choice between the A361 and Canal Road (as Elizabeth Way has been developed for that purpose). Nor should it be so tight, e.g. Cottles Barton in Staverton, so that it feels too pinched. We are more than happy to work with the LPA and highway authority to make sure that the highway design strategy is 'right' within an overall design vision for North East Trowbridge. We observe that the same basic spine road speed design requirement is applied to the strategic allocations at Chippenham, but the spine road here will have a more strategic function.

k) On the 20m tree lined principle for the spine road, this clearly reflects emerging government guidance, but there are also some that say (rightly) that some of the best streets have no trees (Bath for instance). It may be the case that the road should have sections that are, and sections that are not, tree lined to vary the character. This is a detailed design matter and policy wording should reflect this. It may be the case that, for instance, 66% coverage is an agreed approach. Typical section drawings usually show shared cycle/pedestrian lanes within 20m main streets, but given the scope for off-road cycle routes, on desire lines which are preferable, there may be some flexibility in the width of the main spine road.

l) The design principle also seems to be premised on the road being built in one phase with subsequent redesigns. This is perverse and has the potential to result in not the best placemaking (it is also cost inefficient). It could equally be the case that the spine is delivered phases alongside housing development. Phasing thresholds will of course need to be established in such a scenario.

m) Clearly there are knock on consequences of moving primary access points, in conjunction with the land available constraints referred to under bullet (c). The alignment of the primary road network itself is affected and the placement of large land uses, such as secondary schools can also be affected. Equally, the development parcel (Yates/Barratt) off the Texaco roundabout could come forward as a stand-alone development, at least in term of vehicular movements (perhaps not re SANG and secondary school places) if there is a strategic shift in respect of the alignment main spine road. These matters require further investigation.

n) The necessity of making adjustments to the primary access strategy, and the wider spatial effect on the alignment of the primary road network would likely affect the proposed secondary school site and the size of the school that could be accommodated. A relocated primary access point is only of use if it enables the Oatley's to run a spine road from Marsh Road into the field immediately adjoining and to the NW of the business park to them to gain control of the delivery of housing on their land. Of course, consideration needs to be had to the urban design of the spaces alongside that road as an entrance into the community. A secondary access may still be needed to the NE of Greenhill Gardens (where a primary access is currently shown).

o) The secondary school site is around 6.4ha, but is wrapped in 2.4ha of residential land. Conceivably this location, as currently drawn, could accommodate a 5/6FE secondary school (minimum size) or an 8FE secondary school (referred to in the emerging policy wording) in lieu of the housing land. The proposed secondary location currently straddles two landowners (Oatley and Singer) which has the potential to hinder rather than assist delivery. Further testing is needed but it is possible that the alternative, yet necessary, access strategy for the primary access point and spine road alignment has the potential to constrain the option for a larger secondary school in this location (or even a smaller one). The Oatley's also have concerns about the relationship between a secondary school site (large or small) and the security of its generally open access business park. Our overall conclusion, at this stage, is that the secondary school site can and should be moved to a more flexible location off the A361. Such a more flexible location is enjoyed by Abbeyfield (Chippenham) and Melksham Oak.

p) As a consequence of (n) the primary school could move to part of the secondary school site (or elsewhere if optioneering suggests other options are available), and for this area to also deliver housing. The relocation of a/the local centre to this location is also an option. Equally it could be located a little deeper into the site. Off the spine road itself. The function of a main local centre needs to be considered, and there may be scope for a second smaller parade of shops. All this needs testing from a variety of perspectives (walkable neighbourhoods versus the size of the market to support different levels of commercial space, including form within the existing built-up area).

q) On the issue of the actual in-principle size of the secondary school, we subscribe to the need for a new school at Trowbridge to serve a future phase of development. However, we reject a policy stipulation, at this stage, that the school must be 8fe in size, despite understanding why the Council, corporately, is looking at something bigger (i.e. how to best spend £.8.5m in S106 contributions for secondary provision from the Ashton Park allocation and other allocations from the Aston Park site, where a 5Fe is planned). Ongoing engagement with the Council is requested on this matter.

r) A 5fe school and the requisite contributions to its construction would allow Sites 4 and Site 5 to come forward in full, whilst still generating around 230 surplus places that could be taken up by other children in the area. It would be unsound to stipulate the need for more than a 5FE school at this time. Any additional land for a larger than necessary school, would surely have to be acquired, reflecting the opportunity cost to the landowner(s). This may narrow the cost efficiency gap between two 5fe schools and one 8fe school.

- s) Further testing is needed, but the larger the secondary school (where presently located), and in light of the land ownership and access considerations presented above, the more likely the overall delivery consequences for North East Trowbridge. Moving the location of the secondary school needs to be considered.
- t) Ultimately, Lightwood consider that the secondary school should be located off the A361, utilising Oatley and/or other land ownership outside Site 5 or washing Site 5 over a wider area.
- u) Co-locating a new secondary school with the Rugby Club and the planned Trowbridge Town Council 3G pitch makes a lot of sense, of itself, and in respect of the wider master planning of the core of the current Site 5 site (in light of comments above). This general location, bearing in mind one is talking about secondary school aged children, not primary school children, is still walkable and cyclable from Site 5 and the existing urban area, and indeed Semington. Off-road connections through Site 4 and Site 5 will be plentiful and we are aware of the tranche 2 Emergency transport fund that has been secured to connect Hilperton to Semington (and on to Melksham). This optimizes the use of the existing byway network to the east of the site. It also follows/links to the A361 cycling project to the south west of the Elizabeth Way/A361 roundabout.
- v) Moving the secondary school brings into play the logic of extending the allocation to include some or all of the land north of the Rugby Club, that wraps around to the A361, for a mixture of built development, open space and another strategic access option into the main body of Site 5. This would reduce/remove any reliance on the single southern primary access point off the Devises Road roundabout as currently shown on the Council's plan. This land, if available, is a valid consideration even if the secondary school does not move. The landowner concerned also has land within the allocation itself. We are aware of some archaeological potential in this area, but not the precise constraint (record or preserve). Even in a preserve context the interest would only form a partial constraint given the size of this area.
- w) The observations in bullet (v) should be linked by the reader to our spatial strategy observation in respect to of the role of Trowbridge in its HMA. Here we said that housing supply was erroneously being exported to other parts of the HMA. Linked to this, paragraph 29 of the Trowbridge Settlement Statement refers to Site 5, as currently defined, as forming a new long term boundary for the town (along the Whaddon Lane byway east of the Rugby Club).
- x) We disagree. Once Trowbridge reclaims its reasonable share of HMA growth during the plan period and/or once the then the land to the east of the byway comes into play for this and/or other reasons, the town will grow toward the Hilperton parish boundary (but probably never cross it, with transmission lines forming a significant constraint). That will close the Semington gap, but not the extent that the gap between Trowbridge Southwick/North Bradley has been closed by planned development. In short Semington still retains its separate identity. The risk for the Council is that if it is not to expand the allocation then it is quite likely that this land will be developed (off-plan) between phases of plan review, i.e through 5 year land supply failure. Thus, there is merit in the Council maintaining control by allocating and controlling, through policy, a wider area. The additional homes will generate contributions value to infrastructure that is said to be needed anyway (Staverton bridge).

y) Based on the Council's logic, if the Whaddon Lane byway was to be the long-term boundary then it would be the Green Belt at Trowbridge 'to go next'. Quite simply we say that the land east of Whaddon Lane still trumps the Green Belt when seen 'attached to Site 5'.

z) Another key transport theme relates to the Whaddon Lane - Church Street/Hill Street Junction. For several parts of the Site 5 Allocation this is the natural desire line to Trowbridge but the junction is clearly limited and development has the potential to introduce traffic back into 'old' Hilperton, albeit not to the level of traffic that will have been removed by the implementation of Elizabeth Way. Nonetheless, we support vehicular traffic controls along Whaddon Lane. Existing properties served from it, including those in Whaddon will of course need to achieve access and a detailed design phase required to ascertain a long term strategy and how to achieve this.

aa) The interface of Site 5 either side of Whaddon Lane is around 400m giving a lot of scope for the alignment of a 20m wide spine road, with consequential effects for the argument of development blocks and the central GI spine. In short there are quite a few ways to cut this.

Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)

bb) Around 38ha of SANG is needed for 2,100 homes within Site 5 (assuming that the Texaco roundabout site is captured by SANG too). At present the emerging Local Plan does not require SANG for Site 4, but the small print of the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation SPD implicitly suggests that there is a high risk SANG being required following survey. If so, then a further 500 homes would generate an overall need for 47.2ha.

cc) Within Site 5, the 100m canal buffer, with 3.5km circular walk, is purported to represent part of the SANG provision for Site 5. We estimate that this strip is around 18ha. However, based on our experience in the Thames Basin, this format of provision is unlikely to be regarded as 'suitable' provision that would be endorsed by Natural England. It is likely to be too narrow /linear as part provision. Although it links to other strategic open spaces within Site 5 (central corridor) and Site 4, these are not SANG areas but other strategic open spaces.

dd) However, during the course of this consultation the SANG strategy has come increasingly into focus. Site 6 was one of the shortlisted locations for built development and actually performed well in the Sustainability Appraisal, save for a lack of placemaking connectivity. That would change if the land around the Rugby Club was brought into play, but its proposed role is somewhat different.

ee) The land between the A361 and A350 (Hag Hill), once landscaped, presents itself as the optimal SANG solution and can at the same time achieve major, landscape scale, ecological enhancement of benefit to the SAC. A new Country Park of around 63ha (functioning as SANG) could be provided.

ff) Consequentially the canal side buffer can be reduced to that which is needed to mitigate for bats. We understand that a minimum buffer of 45m has been determined but seek to have this confirmed, as the 'riverside' guidance for development and

lighting in Bath regarding bats is less onerous. The canal side still offers the scope, with buffer of 45m to form a major part of the GI strategy for the site.

Renewable Energy Provision

gg) The Oatley's accommodate 10MW solar farm on 23ha to the east of Site 4. Had the farm not been developed then this land could conceivably have been part of an expanded Site 4 allocation.

hh) The solar farm generates enough electricity to power 2700 homes based on average consumption rates. We calculate that the Oatley's could accommodate around 1300 homes within Site 5 and are therefore off-setting the consumption of these homes, whilst also putting a net 1400 units worth of power back into the grid. Whilst there is not 'cable' connecting the facility to the land, this is unnecessary in the grand scheme of things as the credits for offsetting is the same as for direct power. For example, who's to say that the power that the Oatley's land generates does not find its way back to the site from the grid!

ii) As far as the Oatley's are concerned they have more than met their renewable energy obligations that are generated by their share of Site 5. Rather like advanced structural planting mitigation in anticipation of site promotion/development, the Oatley's have done the same for power. We trust the Council will credit the landowner for being ahead of the game in terms of achieving carbon neutrality.

Other Issues

jj) Some smaller peripheral landowners within the allocation (e.g. Robinson and Horgan) have their land are identified for only open space. This is unrealistic, given existing development and use values.

kk) Where, in Appendix 2 our indicative secondary internal road network connects to branches of the spine road, a modal filter/point closure would stop motorists taking a short cut through a lower tier street. The principle is to connect them by walking and cycling but minimise 'through routes' for car the car.

2.37 In commenting on the Concept Plan, our critique/narrative results in the headline conclusion that the Site 5 allocation should be extended to encapsulate land either side of the A361. To the east of the A361 a new county park/SANG be created. To the west, development should wrap around the Rugby Club to link the County Park into the rest of allocation. The prevalence of current and planned cycling routes means that this location will be very well connected internally and to the wider area. We have set out the key landowner perspectives that need to be accounted for when master planning this area. The Council is advised to engage with landowners and developers throughout 2021 to work up master planning options within the evidence base alone. These would inform the Draft Local Plan but not feature with it.

2.38 The Draft Local Plan itself should perhaps revert back to the approach seen for the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan so as not to generate additional levels of detail that is best set out as background evidence informing the Local Plan rather than being presented within it.

[For Appendix 1 and 2 see attachment Trowb_CP49A, Trowb_CP49B]

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

Rep ID: Trowb_CP050	
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): L&Q Estates Ltd	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Trowb_CP50
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<p>The Site 4 Plan currently states requirements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 500 dwellings to include self and custom build plots, as well as specialist housing. • Land for one Two Form Entry Primary School • Land for one 40 place nursery with space to increase to 60 spaces after 2036 • Land for community orchards and allotments • Open space provision to include an area alongside the Kennet and Avon Canal • Walking and cycling links to and from the town centre, nearby settlements including Hilperton, Staverton and Semington and footbridges over the Canal • Land for a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and a Multi-use Games Area (MUGA) 	

We understand the Council does not intend to fix a masterplan or concept plan for the proposed allocation in the LPR, but that the LPR will fix the above allocation requirements.

To the above end, it is important that that the allocation requirements are feasible, viable and deliverable given the site's constraints.

The true capacity of the site, taking into account the site constraints, is also a critical issue which relates to the soundness of the LPR, as the true number of deliverable homes on each of the allocations will presumably contribute to a housing trajectory for the County which shows that the full housing needs can be met.

As the promoters of a large proportion of Site 4, L&Q have produced a body of technical work which informs our understanding of the sites constraints and opportunities. This includes:

- Masterplan – Define (Appendix 1);
- Ecology Technical Note – Tyler Grange (Appendix 2);
- Access and Movement Technical Note – Neil Brant Consulting (Appendix 3);
- Sustainability Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 4);
- Drainage Technical Note including Drainage Strategy – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 5);
- Air Quality Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 6);
- Ground Conditions Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 7);
- Noise Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 8).

We have set out the key findings of the above work below, and then go on to state our findings in relation to the specific consultation questions.

The Site Assessments

Ecology

The ecological note produced by Tyler Grange focuses on the L&Q Estates land control and is informed by extensive survey work. The work states the ecological opportunities to enhance the site include:

- Enhancement of the area adjacent to the river into a wildlife area, accessible by the new residents. New planting should create a mosaic of tussocky grassland and scrub which will encourage new species to colonise, particularly invertebrates. This in turn will improve the site habitats for other species, such as birds and bats;
- The area along the ditch should be integrated into the wildlife area as part of the multi-functional blue/green infrastructure, with wetland planting creating new habitats on site and encouraging aquatic and riparian invertebrates to colonise;

The wildlife area should improve access to nature for the new residents, with informal mown paths, interactive nature trails and interpretation boards guiding them through;

- Hedgerows could be enhanced with native, ecologically beneficial stock, improving foraging opportunities for birds and bats;

- In addition, the 15m buffer zones for bats described above could be enhanced through transitional planting, allowing wildlife corridors to be maintained through the site for a wide variety of species;
- Provision of bat and bird boxes on retained trees and integrated into new buildings will enhance nesting and roosting opportunities within the site;
- Provision of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which could be controlled by planning condition, will be fundamental to the delivery of habitat creation and enhancements to mitigate for the losses required and delivery net gains for biodiversity;
- An appropriate lighting strategy (which could be controlled by way of a condition on any future consent) would ensure new lighting is designed sensitively to avoid impacts to light intolerant bat species and will allow the retention of dark corridors throughout the site; and
- Building with Nature, the UK's first green infrastructure benchmark providing "a framework of quality standards, an assessment and accreditation service and national awards recognising the design and delivery of high-quality green infrastructure", could be considered for this site.

It concludes there are no overriding ecological constraints to the development of this scheme, providing that the measures described are adhered to and incorporated into the green infrastructure. As such, any future development can be in conformity with relevant policy and legislation.

Access and Movement

The Access and Movement Technical Note produced by Neil Brant Consulting considers the various aspects of access to the site, accessibility and mobility. The note concludes with the following of relevant points:

- Site 4 is located within cycling distance of Trowbridge station, on the Westbury to Bristol main line. Bus services that pass close to the site (within easy walking distance) also route via the town centre and the station via the Canal Road Industrial Estate (local area of employment). The level of bus provision locally is conveniently close but lacks peak time services.
- Footway provision locally is good and at most would only potentially require localised minor improvements, such as a creating consistent widths and with dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points. The B3105 Marsh Road corridor width along the site frontage could potentially accommodate a shared pedestrian/cycleway and this could be continued into the site.

Road safety in the vicinity of Site 4 is limited to forward visibility across the canal overbridge, and which highlights the need for consideration when considering the location of potential access to Site 4 at the eastern end. Otherwise, there does not appear to be any existing road safety issues that would preclude the suitability of development at Site 4 or the principal of taking access from Marsh Road.

- Site 4 is accessible to local amenities and facilities including employment, the town centre and education, within either/or walking and cycling distance. Its proximity and accessibility to these key trip destinations, we believe, places it above an 'Average' score and into 'Good', an improvement on the Council's suggested score.

- With regards to traffic, the Staverton bridge signals, in conjunction with other constraints on the network, currently act to self-regulate the volume of traffic that can physically pass through that route. The major road network infrastructure works to the A350 will materially reduce demand on Staverton bridge but with Sites 4 & 5 traffic generation replacing that demand and keeping a level of status quo. The relief road around Staverton bridge removes its throttling effect and traffic re-assigns from elsewhere to use it, as would be expected.
- In terms of traffic impacts, without any infrastructure intervention, whilst the Staverton bridge signals remain as operating at and around their capacity, there is only a small deterioration in overall performance. With the inclusion of the A350 works and Staverton relief road, there is a significant net reduction in congestion resulting in material betterment, even with the inclusion of traffic generation from Sites 4 & 5.
- Previously, the Trowbridge Transport Strategy Refresh included for improvements to the Staverton Bridge traffic signals. These improvements to the Staverton Bridge signals could be considered as an interim arrangement pending the delivery of the relief road and in so doing, this adds confidence to the strategy that development at Site 4, can be accommodated in the short, medium and long term by the implementation of incremental improvements and that it is not fully reliant upon the relief road coming forward.
- The Council's transport strategy for Trowbridge, including cycleway improvements, is supported and are considered to be viable and deliverable with significant levels of cost benefit likely to be achieved.
- Through development at Site 4, there is an opportunity to extend and increase existing bus services, not only to serve the development itself, but to introduce increased service frequency and capacity. This would not only meet the needs of the development but provide for an improved bus service for the wider town. Whilst the Marsh Road and Cottles Barton bus routes are within reasonable walking distance of the site, if feasible, it may be beneficial to re-route the service(s) through the site, but whichever approach is adopted, all of the site area would nonetheless be within walking distance of a bus service.
- The principles of vehicular access, including a range of options, have been established and shown to be viable and deliverable. There is likely to be a need to form two points of access to Site 4 on to the B3105 Marsh Road, which offers a substantial length of highway from which access can be taken. The western access could be formed as an extension of the existing Cottles Barton junction, either as a fourth arm on the roundabout or re-forming it as a signal-controlled junction. The eastern access could be integrated with that to Smallbrook Gardens, as either a back-to-back priority junction or a new mini-roundabout.
- Site 4 would need to incorporate a comprehensive network of streets, footways and cycle routes meeting the needs of users, not only in terms of travel but also as places to live. The majority of streets should be 20mph zones and designed to even more stringent 15mph design speeds with priority given to pedestrians and cyclists. In addition to the estate roads and streets, a new access loop road will provide for the main route and potential bus route and have a mix of 20 and 30mph speed limits, depending on its location.

Sustainability

The Sustainability Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong provides a high level desk appraisal of the sustainability features that could be incorporated into any proposed development at the site. These presented and considered under the following key themes:

- Energy and Carbon Emissions
- Sustainable Material Use
- Sustainable Transport
- Waste and Recycling
- Water and Flooding
- Contamination and Environmental Pollution
- Sustainable Building Design and Layout
- Adapting to Climate Change
- Health and Wellbeing
- Biodiversity

The Note makes clear that sustainability is a key element of the Developer's vision for this site, and it is a common theme running through many of the different environmental aspects, from climate change and carbon emissions to health and wellbeing and biodiversity. Flexibility is important at this stage but key strands of the sustainable agenda for the Development will include:

- A forward-thinking energy strategy, based on the energy hierarchy of using less, using more efficiently, and using renewables;
- Enhanced green/blue infrastructure and biodiversity net gain;
- Using sustainable design and construction measures;
- Promoting sustainable transport and active travel; and
- A precautionary approach to flood risk and water use.

This strategy supports the Council's objectives set out in relation to Carbon Neutrality by 2030

Drainage

The Drainage Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong and accompanying Drainage Strategy states and concludes the following:

- The Drainage Strategy shows the overall quantum of drainage attenuation required, and the optimal location for these features has been identified located on the lower lying land adjacent to the River Avon and outside of the flood zones.
- EA mapping indicates that the majority of the site is located in Flood Zone 1, the area in the north of the site bounding the River Avon will be designated as green openspaces. Therefore, this site is suitable for development in terms of fluvial flood risk. The site is at low risk of flooding from surface water. It is anticipated that ground reprofiling and the addition of SuDS features will manage the localised risk in low laying areas.

- Infiltration testing has not been carried out to date. Although the River Terrace Deposits to the north of the study area are expected to be permeable, they are close to a major watercourse and the depth to groundwater may be unsuitable for infiltration SUDS. Infiltration testing should be undertaken to confirm the discharge hierarchy and further investigation should be undertaken to confirm groundwater levels. It is proposed that surface water will discharge to the River Avon at QBAR greenfield runoff rates and therefore groundwater levels will not impact the proposed drainage strategy.
- To replicate pre-development conditions, the use of two attenuation basins. The basins have been designed to accommodate runoff from all storm events up to and including a 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change storm event.
- The preferred points of connection for foul flows is manhole 7401 located in Marsh Road. Foul flows from the development will need to pump to the preferred connection point. A developer enquiry has been submitted to Wessex Water to confirm capacity within the existing foul network to accommodate flows from the site.

In summary the site is deliverable in flood risk and drainage terms and an appropriate strategy has been identified.

Ground Conditions

The Ground Conditions Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong concludes:

- That it is not anticipated that there will be any significant pollutant linkages and sources of contamination at the site;
- The likelihood of significant geotechnical hazards is considered to be low, there is potential for made ground across the site associated with infilled ponds. A moderate hazard for compressibility exists associated with Alluvium deposits and any infilled ponds;
- Based on the available information reviewed the site is considered to present an overall low risk from past use, adjacent operations and ground instability;

By carrying out some targeted ground investigation and formulating an appropriate foundation design, the site can be considered suitable for future development.

Air Quality and Noise

The Air Quality and Noise Technical Notes have been produced by Wardell Armstrong and support the production of a masterplan for the site.

In relation to Air Quality, for the operational phase of development Wardell Armstrong conclude that:

- Based on the low predicted background concentrations at the site, and the fact that no main roads are in close proximity, it is not considered that on-site pollutant concentrations are likely to be a constraint on potential development at the site.
- Any potential development would generate additional traffic and cause a redistribution of existing traffic on the local road network resulting in the potential for adverse effects on local air quality to occur at properties located close to roads where traffic flows are predicted to increase. Given that the existing background air quality (according to the Defra Background Maps) in this area is well below the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives this is unlikely to be a constraint.

- Notwithstanding this, locating a primary school away from Marsh Road and further into the development site is likely to have air quality benefits, as this has the potential to encourage car-free travel to the schools and might also reduce potential congestion from school traffic on Marsh Road at the start and end of the school day.

In relation to noise, the technical note considers the Site 4 concept masterplan:

- Wiltshire Council's concept masterplan shows the residential area to be up to the southern boundary closest to Marsh Road, and to be up to the western and north western boundaries closest to the Trowbridge to Melksham Railway Line, Cereal Partners World and the Staverton Mill textile factory. With the development area up to the southern, western and north western boundaries, this may require mitigation measures to reduce the potential noise impact from road traffic, rail and industry. It is noted that Figure 9 of the Local Plan document shows potential for Employment Land along the railway line which would provide useful in screening noise to the benefit of residential uses further into the site. Locating the Primary School on the main road of Marsh Road is not ideal for achieving desirable internal sound levels although appropriate mitigation is likely to be possible through appropriate siting of the school buildings within the zone, glazing and ventilation.

- The masterplan shows a road to be located along most of the western boundary between the rail line and the residential area. This would allow dwellings to face the western boundary and have gardens located on the screened side of the properties to provide attenuation from potential rail noise and industrial noise.

- It is also noted that drainage swales and basins are proposed along the north western site boundary. This may limit the potential for physical noise mitigation, such as noise bunds or barriers, if noise monitoring was to show that it is required for proposed properties along the north western boundary.

- To the north east, the boundary will be located adjacent to a solar farm, which has the potential to have a small noise impact on the proposed development. However, the masterplan shows an areas of green space between the proposed properties and the boundary with the solar farm, therefore, it is likely that with careful site design, noise could be made to be acceptable in this area.

- The eastern part of the site is unlikely to be significantly impacted by any noise sources, and therefore unlikely to require any specific noise mitigation.

Conclusion on Questions TB6 and TB7.

In response to the consultation questions TB6 and TB7, we do generally agree with the range of uses proposed for Site 4, but we do not agree with the location of the proposed uses. Our review of the concept plan, and utilising our understanding of the site informed by the technical assessments above we propose the following amendments to the concept masterplan assumptions:

- The potential LEAP should be located more centrally to the site;

- A minimum 15m buffer should be applied to all existing hedgerows (to be compliant with the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy);

- There is further opportunity to create east-west links for ecological purposes and reduce loss of trees;

- Amendment to the drainage strategy, removing the number of basins on the higher ground, moving drainage away from veteran trees and adopting the Wardell Armstrong drainage strategy, locating the drainage basins on the lowest part of the site;
 - The Primary School should be located away from Marsh Road as the current location is not ideal in respect of the noise and air quality environment, in addition, the existing location would result in the loss of a hedgerow;
 - The most eastern access to the site will need to be moved north-westwards due to the reduced visibility at the listed bridge;
 - There is further opportunity to increase width of green link out towards canal corridor and open space;
 - Opportunity for inclusion of small residential blocks to offset loss of areas for drainage and positively overlook any open space;
 - There is further opportunity for new pedestrian and cycle links to existing Public Rights of Way;
 - Opportunity to create wildlife area and also an increased accessibility to nature;
- With taking the above amendments into account, we conclude the Site 4 concept masterplan provides an example of a suitable and feasible masterplan which can deliver the proposed number of homes and uses.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

There appears to be no self or custom build areas demonstrated on the proposed concept Plan for 'Site 4', however the proposed uses listed for the site does refer to 500 dwellings 'to include self and custom build plots'. We cannot therefore agree or disa

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

The Sustainability Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong considers in detail renewable energy and the closely connected objective of carbon emissions reduction.

The Note states that:

- A detailed energy strategy will be developed for the site base

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

The Site 4 Plan currently states requirements for:

- Approximately 500 dwellings to include self and custom build plots, as well as specialist housing.
- Land for one Two Form Entry Primary School
- Land for one 40 place nursery with space to increase to 60 spaces after 2036
- Land for community orchards and allotments
- Open space provision to include an area alongside the Kennet and Avon Canal
- Walking and cycling links to and from the town centre, nearby settlements including Hilperton, Staverton and Semington and footbridges over the Canal
- Land for a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and a Multi-use Games Area (MUGA)

3.16 We understand the Council does not intend to fix a masterplan or concept plan for the proposed allocation in the LPR, but that the LPR will fix the above allocation requirements. To the above end, it is important that that the allocation requirements are feasible, viable and deliverable given the site's constraints.

3.18 The true capacity of the site, taking into account the site constraints, is also a critical issue which relates to the soundness of the LPR, as the true number of deliverable homes on each of the allocations will presumably contribute to a housing trajectory for the County which shows that the full housing needs can be met.

3.19 As the promoters of a large proportion of Site 4, L&Q have produced a body of technical work which informs our understanding of the sites constraints and opportunities. This includes:

- Masterplan – Define (Appendix 1);
- Ecology Technical Note – Tyler Grange (Appendix 2);
- Access and Movement Technical Note – Neil Brant Consulting (Appendix 3);
- Sustainability Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 4);
- Drainage Technical Note including Drainage Strategy – Wardell Armstrong

(Appendix 5);

- Air Quality Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 6);
- Ground Conditions Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 7);
- Noise Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong (Appendix 8).

3.20 We have set out the key findings of the above work below, and then go on to state our findings in relation to the specific consultation questions. The Site Assessments

Ecology

3.21 The ecological note produced by Tyler Grange focuses on the L&Q Estates land control and is informed by extensive survey work. The work states the ecological opportunities to enhance the site include:

- Enhancement of the area adjacent to the river into a wildlife area, accessible by the new residents. New planting should create a mosaic of tussocky grassland and scrub which will encourage new species to colonise, particularly invertebrates. This in turn will improve the site habitats for other species, such as birds and bats;
- The area along the ditch should be integrated into the wildlife area as part of the multi-functional blue/green infrastructure, with wetland planting creating new habitats on site and encouraging aquatic and riparian invertebrates to colonise;
- The wildlife area should improve access to nature for the new residents, with informal mown paths, interactive nature trails and interpretation boards guiding them through;
- Hedgerows could be enhanced with native, ecologically beneficial stock, improving foraging opportunities for birds and bats;
- In addition, the 15m buffer zones for bats described above could be enhanced through transitional planting, allowing wildlife corridors to be maintained through the site for a wide variety of species;
- Provision of bat and bird boxes on retained trees and integrated into new buildings will enhance nesting and roosting opportunities within the site;
- Provision of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which could be controlled by planning condition, will be fundamental to the delivery of habitat creation and enhancements to mitigate for the losses required and delivery net gains for biodiversity;
- An appropriate lighting strategy (which could be controlled by way of a condition on any future consent) would ensure new lighting is designed sensitively to avoid impacts to light intolerant bat species and will allow the retention of dark corridors throughout the site; and
- Building with Nature, the UK's first green infrastructure benchmark providing "a framework of quality standards, an assessment and accreditation service and national awards recognising the design and delivery of high-quality green infrastructure", could be considered for this site.

3.22 It concludes there are no overriding ecological constraints to the development of this scheme, providing that the measures described are adhered to and incorporated into the green infrastructure. As such, any future development can be in conformity with relevant policy and legislation.

Access and Movement

3.23 The Access and Movement Technical Note produced by Neil Brant Consulting considers the various aspects of access to the site, accessibility and mobility. The note concludes with the following of relevant points:

- Site 4 is located within cycling distance of Trowbridge station, on the Westbury to Bristol main line. Bus services that pass close to the site (within easy walking distance) also route via the town centre and the station via the Canal Road Industrial Estate (local area of employment). The level of bus provision locally is conveniently close but lacks peak time services.
- Footway provision locally is good and at most would only potentially require localised minor improvements, such as a creating consistent widths and with dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossing points. The B3105 Marsh Road corridor width along the site frontage could potentially accommodate a shared pedestrian/cycleway and this could be continued into the site.
- Road safety in the vicinity of Site 4 is limited to forward visibility across the canal overbridge, and which highlights the need for consideration when considering the location of potential access to Site 4 at the eastern end. Otherwise, there does not appear to be any existing road safety issues that would preclude the suitability of development at Site 4 or the principal of taking access from Marsh Road.
- Site 4 is accessible to local amenities and facilities including employment, the town centre and education, within either/or walking and cycling distance. Its proximity and accessibility to these key trip destinations, we believe, places it above an 'Average' score and into 'Good', an improvement on the Council's suggested score.
- With regards to traffic, the Staverton bridge signals, in conjunction with other constraints on the network, currently act to self-regulate the volume of traffic that can physically pass through that route. The major road network infrastructure works to the A350 will materially reduce demand on Staverton bridge but with Sites 4 & 5 traffic generation replacing that demand and keeping a level of status quo. The relief road around Staverton bridge removes its throttling effect and traffic re-assigns from elsewhere to use it, as would be expected.
- In terms of traffic impacts, without any infrastructure intervention, whilst the Staverton bridge signals remain as operating at and around their capacity, there is only a small deterioration in overall performance. With the inclusion of the A350 works and Staverton relief road, there is a significant net reduction in congestion resulting in material betterment, even with the inclusion of traffic generation from Sites 4 & 5.
- Previously, the Trowbridge Transport Strategy Refresh included for improvements to the Staverton Bridge traffic signals. These improvements to the Staverton Bridge signals could be considered as an interim arrangement pending the delivery of the relief road and in so doing, this adds confidence to the strategy that development at Site 4, can be accommodated in the short,

medium and long term by the implementation of incremental improvements and that it is not fully reliant upon the relief road coming forward.

- The Council's transport strategy for Trowbridge, including cycleway improvements, is supported and are considered to be viable and deliverable with significant levels of cost benefit likely to be achieved.
- Through development at Site 4, there is an opportunity to extend and increase existing bus services, not only to serve the development itself, but to introduce increased service frequency and capacity. This would not only meet the needs of the development but provide for an improved bus service for the wider town. Whilst the Marsh Road and Cottles Barton bus routes are within reasonable walking distance of the site, if feasible, it may be beneficial to re-route the service(s) through the site, but whichever approach is adopted, all of the site area would nonetheless be within walking distance of a bus service.
- The principles of vehicular access, including a range of options, have been established and shown to be viable and deliverable. There is likely to be a need to form two points of access to Site 4 on to the B3105 Marsh Road, which offers a substantial length of highway from which access can be taken. The western access could be formed as an extension of the existing Cottles Barton junction, either as a fourth arm on the roundabout or re-forming it as a signal-controlled junction. The eastern access could be integrated with that to Smallbrook Gardens, as either a back-to-back priority junction or a new mini-roundabout.
- Site 4 would need to incorporate a comprehensive network of streets, footways and cycle routes meeting the needs of users, not only in terms of travel but also as places to live. The majority of streets should be 20mph zones and designed to even more stringent 15mph design speeds with priority given to pedestrians and cyclists. In addition to the estate roads and streets, a new access loop road will provide for the main route and potential bus route and have a mix of 20 and 30mph speed limits, depending on its location.

Sustainability

3.24 The Sustainability Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong provides a high level desk appraisal of the sustainability features that could be incorporated into any proposed development at the site. These presented and considered under the following key themes:

- Energy and Carbon Emissions
- Sustainable Material Use
- Sustainable Transport
- Waste and Recycling
- Water and Flooding
- Contamination and Environmental Pollution
- Sustainable Building Design and Layout
- Adapting to Climate Change
- Health and Wellbeing

- Biodiversity

3.25 The Note makes clear that sustainability is a key element of the Developer's vision for this site, and it is a common theme running through many of the different environmental aspects, from climate change and carbon emissions to health and wellbeing and biodiversity. Flexibility is important at this stage but key strands of the sustainable agenda for the Development will include:

- A forward-thinking energy strategy, based on the energy hierarchy of using less, using more efficiently, and using renewables;
- Enhanced green/blue infrastructure and biodiversity net gain;
- Using sustainable design and construction measures;
- Promoting sustainable transport and active travel; and
- A precautionary approach to flood risk and water use.

3.26 This strategy supports the Council's objectives set out in relation to Carbon Neutrality by 2030

Drainage

3.27 The Drainage Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong and accompanying Drainage Strategy states and concludes the following:

- The Drainage Strategy shows the overall quantum of drainage attenuation required, and the optimal location for these features has been identified located on the lower lying land adjacent to the River Avon and outside of the flood zones.
- EA mapping indicates that the majority of the site is located in Flood Zone 1, the area in the north of the site bounding the River Avon will be designated as green openspaces. Therefore, this site is suitable for development in terms of fluvial flood risk. The site is at low risk of flooding from surface water. It is anticipated that ground reprofiling and the addition of SuDS features will manage the localised risk in low laying areas.
- Infiltration testing has not been carried out to date. Although the River Terrace Deposits to the north of the study area are expected to be permeable, they are close to a major watercourse and the depth to groundwater may be unsuitable for infiltration SUDS. Infiltration testing should be undertaken to confirm the discharge hierarchy and further investigation should be undertaken to confirm groundwater levels. It is proposed that surface water will discharge to the River Avon at QBAR greenfield runoff rates and therefore groundwater levels will not impact the proposed drainage strategy.
- To replicate pre-development conditions, the use of two attenuation basins. The basins have been designed to accommodate runoff from all storm events up to and including a 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change storm event.
- The preferred points of connection for foul flows is manhole 7401 located in Marsh Road. Foul flows from the development will need to pump to the preferred connection point. A developer enquiry has been submitted to Wessex Water to confirm capacity within the existing foul network to accommodate flows from the site.

3.28 In summary the site is deliverable in flood risk and drainage terms and an appropriate strategy has been identified.

Ground Conditions

3.29 The Ground Conditions Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong concludes:

- That it is not anticipated that there will be any significant pollutant linkages and sources of contamination at the site;
- The likelihood of significant geotechnical hazards is considered to be low, there is potential for made ground across the site associated with infilled ponds. A moderate hazard for compressibility exists associated with Alluvium deposits and any infilled ponds;
- Based on the available information reviewed the site is considered to present an overall low risk from past use, adjacent operations and ground instability;

3.30 By carrying out some targeted ground investigation and formulating an appropriate foundation design, the site can be considered suitable for future development.

Air Quality and Noise

3.31 The Air Quality and Noise Technical Notes have been produced by Wardell Armstrong and support the production of a masterplan for the site.

3.32 In relation to Air Quality, for the operational phase of development Wardell Armstrong conclude that:

- Based on the low predicted background concentrations at the site, and the fact that no main roads are in close proximity, it is not considered that on-site pollutant concentrations are likely to be a constraint on potential development at the site.
- Any potential development would generate additional traffic and cause a redistribution of existing traffic on the local road network resulting in the potential for adverse effects on local air quality to occur at properties located close to roads where traffic flows are predicted to increase. Given that the existing background air quality (according to the Defra Background Maps) in this area is well below the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives this is unlikely to be a constraint.
- Notwithstanding this, locating a primary school away from Marsh Road and further into the development site is likely to have air quality benefits, as this has the potential to encourage car-free travel to the schools and might also reduce potential congestion from school traffic on Marsh Road at the start and end of the school day.

3.33 In relation to noise, the technical note considers the Site 4 concept masterplan:

- Wiltshire Council's concept masterplan shows the residential area to be up to the southern boundary closest to Marsh Road, and to be up to the western and north western boundaries closest to the Trowbridge to Melksham Railway Line, Cereal Partners World and the Staverton Mill textile factory. With the development area up to the southern, western and north western boundaries, this may require mitigation measures to reduce the potential noise impact from road traffic, rail and industry. It is noted that Figure 9 of the Local Plan document shows potential for Employment Land along the railway line which would provide useful in screening noise to the benefit of residential uses further into the site. Locating the Primary School on the main road of Marsh Road is not ideal for achieving desirable internal sound levels although appropriate mitigation is likely to be possible through appropriate siting of the school buildings within the zone, glazing and ventilation.

- The masterplan shows a road to be located along most of the western boundary between the rail line and the residential area. This would allow dwellings to face the western boundary and have gardens located on the screened side of the properties to provide attenuation from potential rail noise and industrial noise.
- It is also noted that drainage swales and basins are proposed along the north western site boundary. This may limit the potential for physical noise mitigation, such as noise bunds or barriers, if noise monitoring was to show that it is required for proposed properties along the north western boundary.
- To the north east, the boundary will be located adjacent to a solar farm, which has the potential to have a small noise impact on the proposed development. However, the masterplan shows an areas of green space between the proposed properties and the boundary with the solar farm, therefore, it is likely that with careful site design, noise could be made to be acceptable in this area.
- The eastern part of the site is unlikely to be significantly impacted by any noise sources, and therefore unlikely to require any specific noise mitigation.

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

Conclusion on Questions TB6 and TB7.

3.34 In response to the consultation questions TB6 and TB7, we do generally agree with the range of uses proposed for Site 4, but we do not agree with the location of the proposed uses. Our review of the concept plan, and utilising our understanding of the site informed by the technical assessments above we propose the following amendments to the concept masterplan assumptions:

- The potential LEAP should be located more centrally to the site;
- A minimum 15m buffer should be applied to all existing hedgerows (to be compliant with the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy);
- There is further opportunity to create east-west links for ecological purposes and reduce loss of trees;
- Amendment to the drainage strategy, removing the number of basins on the higher ground, moving drainage away from veteran trees and adopting the Wardell Armstrong drainage strategy, locating the drainage basins on the lowest part of the site;
- The Primary School should be located away from Marsh Road as the current location is not ideal in respect of the noise and air quality environment, in addition, the existing location would result in the loss of a hedgerow;
- The most eastern access to the site will need to be moved north-westwards due to the reduced visibility at the listed bridge;
- There is further opportunity to increase width of green link out towards canal corridor and open space;

- Opportunity for inclusion of small residential blocks to offset loss of areas for drainage and positively overlook any open space;
 - There is further opportunity for new pedestrian and cycle links to existing Public Rights of Way;
 - Opportunity to create wildlife area and also an increased accessibility to nature;
- 3.35 With taking the above amendments into account, we conclude the Site 4 concept masterplan provides an example of a suitable and feasible masterplan which can deliver the proposed number of homes and uses.

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

There appears to be no self or custom build areas demonstrated on the proposed concept Plan for 'Site 4', however the proposed uses listed for the site does refer to 500 dwellings 'to include self and custom build plots'. We cannot therefore agree or disagree with the proposed locations as they are not specified for Site 4.

3.37 However, if self and custom build plots are sought to be included on Site 4, our experience suggests that they can/may frustrate the ability for sites to come forward as planned and can result in issues associated to incohesive overall design, impacting the marketability of adjoining market plots, custom/self build plots being empty or unfinished for a long time, and critically viability issues with regards to contributions to site infrastructure.

3.38 To this end we do not agree with the suggestion of self and custom build housing provision on Site 4. We reserve the right to comment further in future on the Council's evidence base and approach for inclusion of self/custom build plots on sites of this scale.

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

The Sustainability Technical Note produced by Wardell Armstrong considers in detail renewable energy and the closely connected objective of carbon emissions reduction.

The Note states that:

- A detailed energy strategy will be developed for the site based on the energy hierarchy, firstly prioritising energy reduction (being lean), then using energy efficiently (being clean), and finally implementing renewable technologies (being green).
- The Government is in the process of introducing its Future Homes and Future Buildings Standards (FHS and FBS), which are the proposed mechanisms to reduce and decarbonise energy use within residential and commercial development respectively.
- At the start of this year the Government issued its response to the 2019 FHS consultation, at the same time as launching the FBS consultation. It confirmed that, for the FHS, the interim reduction will be a 31% reduction in carbon emissions relative to Part L 2013 requirements. For the FBS, the Government is consulting on a preferred 27% reduction in carbon emissions for non-residential buildings during the interim period, to facilitate the eventual realisation of zerocarbon buildings.
- This set out a clear timeline for the introduction of the FHS and the interim arrangements. It is intended (subject to the FBS consultation) that a new Part L 2021 (and Part F 2021) will be introduced towards the end of this year and come into effect during 2022. This will formally instigate the interim arrangements for both residential and non-residential developments. Buildings approved prior to June 2022 and commenced prior to June 2023 will remain eligible to be built out under Part L 2013, but this will only apply to individual units and not a site in its entirety.
- Post 2025 residential developments are expected to meet a minimum 75% emission reduction, allowing zero carbon homes to be developed as the electricity grid continues to decarbonise to bring about the zero-carbon target. Final confirmation on zero carbon targets for commercial buildings is still pending.
- Wiltshire's Local Plan consultation document, "Addressing Climate Change and Biodiversity", suggests that all new development should be designed to achieve net zero carbon standards. It is important at this point to note the distinction between regulated and unregulated energy. Regulated energy is energy associated with the operation of the building itself. It includes space heating, domestic hot water, lighting, pumps and fans. Unregulated energy includes cooking and appliance use which is more reliant on the behaviour of the residents. Building Regulations focus on controlling regulated energy as this is the element that can be most influenced by the design and construction of the building rather than the actions of the occupants. Ofgem regulations require electricity users to have full access to the electricity market and to be able to choose their own suppliers, which limits how much control the Developer can have over unregulated energy use.
- The developer will therefore focus on reducing regulated emissions so that the project will be zero carbon in regulated terms in line with local and central government aspirations. Where influence can be exerted, the developer will encourage occupants to seek green and low-carbon electricity supplies to reduce carbon from their unregulated energy use. It is recognised that over time unregulated energy will be eventually be decarbonised in line with the wider electricity grid but this is outside of the Developer's immediate control.

- All proposed buildings will adopt a fabric-led approach to emissions reduction to ensure that the 75% to 80% reduction target, likely to be in force at the time, is met or exceeded. This will ensure that any emissions that result from the development are minimised while grid decarbonisation takes place
- All buildings will be constructed with significantly higher levels of insulation, will employ materials that have lower thermal transmissivity, will have reduced thermal bridging and higher airtightness than is specified under current building regulations.
- Provision will be made within the development to supply properties with renewable energy. Given the local preference for district heat networks (DHN) both large and micro scale renewable energy based DHN will be assessed for feasibility and implemented where possible. Opportunities to collaborate with local industry (i.e. Cereal Partners/Nestle) will be explored to identify whether synergies exist, especially in relation to the production of waste heat. Other renewable energy technologies deployed at the site could take the form of PV panels, air-source/ground-source heat pumps, or an alternative renewable technology. Depending on the construction timescales, different parts of the development may be subject to different building regulation regimes, so a flexible approach is required at this stage which will be crystallised as time goes on. However, regardless of the building regulations in force energy efficiency and low carbon emissions will be a priority.
- Electricity based heating systems will be utilised to ensure that as the national grid decarbonises the site will become zero carbon from an operational energy standpoint.
- Other energy/carbon reduction measures such as Waste Water Heat Recovery (WWHR) and Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (MVHR) will be considered and implemented where viable and appropriate.
- As required by Building Regulations, the developer will undertake an energy assessment for each property upon completion of its build. This will form part of the sales documentation to new buyers and provide confidence in the energy performance of the build. It will also highlight areas of strength and weakness, which will help residents prioritise further actions they may wish to take to reinforce energy saving initiatives. All homes will also be fitted with smart meters and be wired for electric vehicle (EV) charging where appropriate parking is available.

Further comments

We are not aware of any other issues or infrastructure requirements that should be identified with specific regard to the proposed allocation of 'Site 4' for development.

Taking all of the above together, the summary and conclusions of our Representation are as follows:

- We are supportive of the level of housing growth proposed at Trowbridge, however encourage the Council to consider further growth at the settlement given the conclusions of the SA, role and status of the Town. We accept the choice of the Council to adopt the TR- B Westbury Growth Point of the alternative scenarios, in that it still directs a significant proportion of growth towards Trowbridge however caution the justification of this strategy based on perceived impact on the SAC;
- We advocate extending the LPR Plan Period to be in accordance with the NPPF, adjusting one of the delivery principles and considering further how the spatial options have been arrived at against truly realistic alternatives to maximise chances of success/compliance with the tests of soundness;
- The land east of New Terrace/Marsh Road, Staverton, controlled by L&Q, is able to deliver the proposed quantum of housing development suggested and meet the key priorities identified for the settlement by the LPR;
- As set out we do generally agree with the range of uses proposed for Site 4, but do not agree with the location of the proposed uses based on our understanding of the sites constraints and opportunities. With the amendments identified to the assumptions used to inform the sites capacity we promote the land east of New Terrace/Marsh Road as suitable, available and achievable for the housing development proposed at 'Site 4' and as a sustainable choice for meeting the needs of Trowbridge and wider County.

See attached [TROW_CP50] for the following technical reports:

Appendix 1: Masterplan – Define

Appendix 2: Ecology Technical Note – Tyler Grange

Appendix 3: Access and Movement Technical Note – Neil Brant Consulting

Appendix 4: Sustainability Technical Note – Wardell Armstrong

Appendix 5: Drainage Technical Note including Drainage Strategy – Wardell Armstrong

Rep ID: Trowb_CP051	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Barton Willmore
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Gallagher Developments	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): yes	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Trowb_CP51
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<p>First and foremost, we query the rationale of provisionally allocating green space on the majority of this site. The site is in a sustainable location on the urban edge as demonstrated in the Council's Site Selection Report. We consider this site would be better allocated for residential development given the proximity to existing services and facilities in Hilperton and Trowbridge, and the proposed vehicular access. There is a large existing open space a short distance to the south of Site 5 North East Trowbridge in the form of Hilperton Gap. This concept plan as currently shown would lead to two large areas of green open space less than 0.5km apart . A series of smaller open spaces throughout the new allocation may be more appropriate.</p> <p>We agree that green and blue infrastructure will be fundamental to the success of sustainable growth in Trowbridge. Whilst we do not oppose providing green space as part of the development, we are of the opinion that a more sustainable development could be achieved with the same benefits of accessibility to high quality open space. We appreciate this is an early concept of the potential layout and we would welcome discussing the opportunity of the site with you as this evolves.</p>	

We trust these representations are helpful to inform the next stage of the draft Local Plan. Should you require any clarifications of the points raised please do not hesitate to contact me.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments

We write on behalf of our Client, Gallagher Developments, in respect of their land interests at Land off Hill Street, Trowbridge ('the site' hereafter). We welcome the opportunity to respond to the consultation to inform the preparation of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review.

We append a Site Boundary Plan (Appendix 1) illustrating our Client's land interests, which form part of the Preferred Development Site – Site 5 North East Trowbridge. We support the Plan's strategy and the Site 5 allocation as an appropriate location for growth to help meet the needs of Trowbridge and the wider District in a sustainable manner. However, we query the approach set out in the Council's current concept plan, which undervalues the contribution our Client's site can have in delivering sustainable development as part of this wider allocation. We will submit more detail around a potential masterplan and the site's relationship with the wider draft allocation in due course.

As shown on Appendix 1, the site adjoins the existing urban area and is immediately northeast of Hill Street with a potential vehicular access point into the site. The site is identified as Reference 644 'Land off Hill Street' in the Site Selection Report for Trowbridge (January 2021). It performs very well in the Stage 2A and 2B Overall Judgement, with no significant development constraints. It is recommended for development, with the conclusion:

'The site sits to the north of the historic core of the village of Hilperton and could provide a logical extension of built form northward towards the canal'.

We note that surface water flood risk and landscaping values have been identified, however any impact is said to be capable of mitigation. We also note the appropriateness of ensuring the site is amalgamated into a single allocation with the surrounding sites and support a joined approach to support place shaping objectives.

In terms of the Emerging Spatial Strategy, we support the hierarchy of settlements and welcome the primary focus on development to the Principal Settlements of Chippenham, Salisbury, and Trowbridge. In addition, we welcome the Council's growth ambitions and the acknowledgement that the minimum target is 40,840 dwellings in the Plan period. The ESS also acknowledges that the housing requirement figure may change once the Government has reviewed the Standard Method. We would support the Council's higher growth target of a minimum of 45,630 dwellings to provide flexibility of supply and to encourage economic growth.

We have also reviewed the other consultation material, including Figure 2 (Concept Map) in the Planning for Trowbridge document, which shows the proposed layout and land uses for Site 5 North East Trowbridge. This illustrative plan shows our Client's site as predominantly comprising green space, some residential development around the parcel boundary, and a vehicular access off Hill Street. For ease of reference, we respond to questions TB6 and TB7 in the Planning for Trowbridge document collectively. We will provide more detailed comments around the allocation as part of our forthcoming design work.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP052

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:

TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

For both sites 4 and 5, the concept plans are clear and well thought through. The major concern is the increase in traffic that has to use the bridge over the river Avon. The increase in traffic would be unsustainable. The main access to both sites should be directed to the A361, with new bridges being built over the canal. I don't see any playing fields suitable for team sports.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

No comment, except that I would propose having a green belt on either side of the canal, not just one sided

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Solar and Wind

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments
The number of houses across the 2 sites would account for the majority of new-builds planned for Trowbridge. Alternative sites to the south of Trowbridge should share the burden.

The number of houses across the 2 sites would account for the majority of new-builds planned for Trowbridge. Alternative sites to the south of Trowbridge should share the burden.

Rep ID: Trowb_CP053	
Consultee code: Developer/Agent	Consultee Organisation (if applicable): Pegasus
Is this response on behalf of someone else/another organisation? Yes	
Organisation being represented (if applicable): Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	
Does this representation refer to attachment(s): no	If this representation refers to attachment(s), these are listed below: Trowb_CP53
TB6 [North East Trowbridge concept plan]. Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?	
<p>Concept Plans</p> <p>6.5 The Concept Plans provided in this section are acknowledged as being conceptual and are not reflective of the final proposals that will ultimately be delivered. It will be important for the Council to engage with the relevant landowners early, including Barratt and David Wilson Homes, to facilitate the preparation of a masterplan and agreement with regard to infrastructure delivery to ensure that an equitable return is secured for all landowners/developers.</p> <p>6.6 The current concept plans show a significant amount of green space running along the Kennett and Avon Canal. This would reduce the development capacity of Barratt Homes' interest at Maxcroft Farm significantly as a result. Previous work has indicated that the site could comfortably accommodate around 150 dwellings; however, this would be reduced significantly under the concept plans presented.</p>	

6.7 Given that this 'gateway' to the site will be well related to existing and proposed pedestrian, cycle and public transport connections, it makes sense to deliver a higher quantum of development around this key node. Significant levels of open space do not make sense in this location, albeit high-quality pedestrian and cycle connectivity to areas of open space will be provided.

6.8 If the intention is to provide a suitable transitional green buffer between, then our technical landscape work has identified that a 25m offset from the canal will be sufficient to deliver this.

6.9 Again, we note that the concept plans are indicative at this stage; however, we would have to object to them in their current form. We look forward to working with the Council to progress a potential masterplan for the allocation.

TB7 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North East Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

TB6 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the range of uses proposed? What other uses should be considered?

TB7 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the location of the proposed uses? What should be located where and why?

TB8 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Do you agree with the proposed locations for self-build and custom build housing? Would you prefer alternative locations?

TB9 [North Trowbridge concept plan].

Is there a particular type of renewable energy that should be provided on site?

Further comments