

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
1	Middle Lane development off Corsham Road	None of the properties west of the train line on Westlands lane have fast broadband. Seeing as this new housing development is so close and will require fast broadband, can we please request that the broadband be extended to Westlands Lane? We're the only part of Whitley who don't have fibre.		Telecoms and Broadband provision is not covered in the NP. You can find out more about plans in your area by using the postcode checker on <a href="http://www.wiltshireonline.org">www.wiltshireonline.org</a>
2	Page 47, Para 4.4.1, Draft policy 9  Page 84 and 85. 5. Priority Statements, Draft Priority Statement 4 and Figure 19	<p>Please consider sustainability and viability of town centre businesses. We want local people to use Melksham Town Centre shops and businesses.</p> <p>The Melksham By-Pass options shown at Figure 19 are concerning. Much has been achieved so far to ease congestion and we risk going too far at the expense of green space. We live in Bowerhill and do not want to see a By-Pass to the South as this would destroy Giles Wood and much of the open space between Bowerhill and Seend. We understand the emphasis on keeping away from the new developments where possible but what about those of us who have lived here for many years? We have done our bit already with the expansion of Bowerhill to the North and East. Please leave us alone. Additionally much has already been spent on the Semington By Pass and the new road from Snowberry Lane to Sandridge. The more expensive and extreme options at Fig 19 seem to by-pass the by-pass. Please discount Option 10c.</p>	<p>Please re-consider allowing one hour free parking in Town centre Car parks to attract customers. This policy used to be in place but was discontinued a few years ago. We understand the green issues but people will use their cars anyway so let us do all we can to ensure they shop locally. Please rule out Option 10c. Options 8a and 9a seem the most sensible as they incorporate the existing Semington By-Pass and its expensive aquaduct.</p>	<p>Parking fees are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Town Council have reconsidered the parking redemption scheme recently, and is committed to supporting that scheme. However, it considers that the provision of one hours free parking is currently cost prohibitive. The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
3	Draft Policy 4	<p>The policy is fine as far as it goes, but it needs to be bolstered by further measures. Melksham Town currently has only one charging point, supplying two bays, (in King Street carpark). It needs many more to support the growing number of electric cars and to encourage visitors, shoppers and tourists. Electric car drivers who need charging on the A350 will be drawn to the town and, because electric cars take typically 30-45 minutes to charge, the drivers will inevitably take refreshment or go shopping to fill in the time. Charging points are a business generator.</p>	<p>1. Fit charging bays at Melksham Station. 2. Strongly urge and encourage supermarkets to have charging bays installed, perhaps with the aid of grants. 3. Strongly encourage hotels/ Travel Lodge/ Premier Inn (as appropriate) to include charging bays. 4. Businesses with carparks to include charging bays.</p>	<p>As part of the commitment to enabling more Ultra Low Emission vehicles, the Town and Parish Council will be working with partners to deliver locations for charging at various sites across the Plan area.</p> <p>Improvements to the Melksham railway station will also introduce rapid electric car charging points as part of an overall masterplan to improve the station.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
4		<p>Has the checklist from Transport for new homes been used and if so what rating has the draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan attained? <a href="https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/the-project/checklist-for-new-homes-development/">https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/the-project/checklist-for-new-homes-development/</a> This is a very easy to complete and understand for the layman.</p>	<p>I think it would be very beneficial for you to complete and publish the results before the end of the public consultation period so that the public will have a better understanding of the issues we face with the sustainable transportation being a priority and not just becoming another car dependent commuter estate.</p>	<p>The draft allocation has not been subjected to the TfNH checklist.</p> <p>However, the proposed allocation is closely associated with an existing settlement and was considered on the basis of assessment of its connections and proximity to local facilities, existing footways and public transport. The draft allocation can provide for the conservation and enhancement of an existing PROW footpath provides affordable housing associated with new community open space and access to the countryside.</p> <p>In many respects it therefore addresses most criteria relevant to a small non-strategic site allocation. Matters relating to the potential future development of the site through development management may address other site design matters included on the checklist.</p> <p>As it is a draft allocation, there is an opportunity to consider refinements and amendments to the proposal including in response to transport issues.</p> <p>The checklist can form a helpful additional reference to assist in assessing any future proposals</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
				for the allocation site (and potentially others for strategic and large-scale sites beyond the scope of the NP).

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 84	The Town and parish councils will support efforts by Wiltshire Council to progress the delivery of a by-pass. Reading through this I notice you use the words climate 53 times and green 63 times, all the good intentions in the plan are made pointless by the endorsement of the bypass. All research and experts agree that road expansion is not only bad in respect to climate change, it fails to fix the issues with traffic and congestion increasing. I'm shocked that the councils who have declared a climate emergency are still supporting this road expansion. There has been no climate change assessment of the bypass and it has not considered the Government's, councils or the Parish agreement commitments to tackle the climate crisis. Not only is it the wrong thing to be doing, it may also be illegal and all road expansion is being challenged in court, the support should be taken out the Draft Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>Work from home, better public transport links, better active traffic links, smart road technology, change in times that create a rush hour, congestion charging.</p> <p>Building a bypass and pushing traffic a mile down the road is no solution.</p>	<p>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p> <p><a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>
	Page 31-page 22	Future Homes Standard (FHS) this has been widely criticised by experts with too many loop holes for builders, houses could be built with even lower insulation than houses built today. The only answer to this is for local councils to require better standards than the FHS.	Engage with the relevant standard bodies to close all loop holes that builders will use.	Reference to the FSH has been removed in acknowledgement of the wide criticism of the Standard and text updated to reflect support and guidance from CSE in preparation of the Plan.
	Page 53 and 86	New cycle and walking routes with co-operation with neighbouring bodies to be extended and upgraded to Chippenham, Trowbridge and Devizes.		<p>Wiltshire Council have submitted 2 recent bids to the Department for Transport for the reallocation of road space to prioritise cycling and walking in the county, which includes a proposal for Hilperton to Melksham via Semington.</p> <p><a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking</a></p>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 69	Need for the planting of new woods to help the fight against climate change and for recreation.		The Plan supports the retention and planting of trees and woodland
	General comment	It seems that there has been no specific climate change expert consulted on this plan, if so it needs to be done ASAP.		The Steering Group engaged with the Centre for Sustainable Energy (CSE) as part of the preparation process and the Steering Group have also had members who have focused on this area.
5	Page 30 - Draft Policy 1	On behalf of Shaw Village committee, we support sustainable design and construction on the basis that we feel any new developments should minimize their detrimental effect on the environment and be as energy efficient as possible.	Ensure that all future developments include some sort of provision for solar or geo-thermal energy production.	The NP policy strongly encourages the use of renewable energy in line with Wiltshire wide aims for Carbon Neutrality
	Page 34 - Draft Policy 3	On behalf of Shaw Village committee we support the localized generation of energy in order to protect the precious environment and natural assets of the area.	Look into feasibility of solar power generation using the roof of Shaw Village Hall.	Noted - Action / Project for Melksham Without Parish Council
	Page 43	Draft Policy 7. On behalf of Shaw Village Committee we support the allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley on the basis that it provides for managed provision of existing housing (including affordable housing) whilst retaining the hedgerows and natural landscape of the area.		Noted. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision
	Page 84 - Draft Priority Statement 4	On behalf of Shaw Village Committee we support bypass options 10a, 10b or 10c (preferred) on the basis that they provide a viable route for commercial and public road users to bypass Melksham to access the industrial areas to the south east of the town and beyond without travelling through already heavily developed residential areas to the west of Melksham or routing traffic via already congested junctions to the west of the town.		The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
6		<p>I have made comments on the Figure 10 Key Routes for Walking and Cycling on the draft plan which is on Page 55 but before doing anything more than comment I wanted to do some investigating myself. A lot of the footpaths that you have indicated on the Fig 10 map, are made virtually impassable for various reasons (animals, crops, stiles in disrepair etc.), and I wanted to find out if the local councils had any jurisdiction over this. You have announced in this statement that money is available to create cycle and walking paths – perhaps a bit of this money should be spent on current problems. I have complained on a couple of occasions to the Wiltshire Council Footpath warden about the farmers planting maize (for which I think they get a substantial grant), as this crop provides an impenetrable barrier to walking several of the footpaths round Melksham and Melksham Without. I know that there has recently been a dispute regarding the paths around the back of Melksham Forest and along the Avon river, and I believe that there has been a resolution, although the barriers that the tenant farmer put in place are still there. He has also planted a maize crop over the legitimate footpath from Forest through to Lacock. Because locals have been tramping this down, you can still access this but soon there will be a barrier.</p>	<p>Can you please, advise in light of your statement below, if you have any jurisdiction over these farmers to ensure legitimate footpaths are left clear and that stiles are maintained and footpath boards are put in place. I walk a daily average of 5 or 6 miles on Melksham footpaths winter and summer and can advise the Councils on where there are significant problems preventing this, but if you do not have jurisdiction over this, please advise, and I will direct my comments to Wiltshire Council. I have done this before, but to be honest, they have no real enthusiasm for contacting the farmers and sorting it out in a timely manner. This is especially true with regard to the maize crop which is often cut down before the Warden addresses the problem. You have also mentioned cycling – but not the matter of cyclist using the pavements throughout the town – how about some support for pedestrians who are often being harassed by cyclists if they should dare to complain (I personally have been sworn at on a number of occasions). If you are to encourage cycling – part of the voucher scheme should be that they adhere to the Highway Code which prevents cycling on pavements</p>	<p>Out of the scope of the NP. MWPC Clerk has emailed respondent separately regarding the maintenance issues on Rights of Way.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>unless indications to the contrary or the voucher should be withdrawn. Also where there are dual pedestrian/cycle routes – there should be pointers (perhaps white lines) on these that cyclist should keep to the righthand side and pedestrians to the left. I am surprised that a serious accident has not happened before. I know Melksham Oak is not currently operating, but you take your life in your hands if you walk down Spa Road at 3.00 p.m.</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>I understand the £2m referred to goes directly to Wiltshire Council and I presume both Councils have to put in proposals to get any of this grant money. As Wiltshire Council have allegedly already spent £235,000 they received on schemes in Salisbury, Bradford on Avon, Purton and Trowbridge - I am presuming that there is no money available for bicycle paths or to reinstate proper footpaths locally.</p>		<p>The £2m funding was written into the NP before the figure was known for Wiltshire, which has been confirmed as £235K for the first bid. Wiltshire Council have submitted a 2nd bid to the Department for Transport, which includes a proposal for Hilperton to Melksham via Semington. <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking</a>. The Govt funding was for changing the priority of road allocation for pedestrians and cyclists in the aim of providing an alternative to public transport under COVID-19 restrictions. Most of the improvement schemes put forward within the Plan area did not fall into this category, however they are currently being assessed by the Melksham Community Area Transport Group (CATG) with the town and parish councils to see if there is still merit in taking these projects forward.</p>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
7	page 42-43 Section 4.3.3 Allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley	If a future need for housing in Whitley should be identified, I fully support the proposed site at Middle Farm, Corsham Road. The northern end of the village is not prone to flooding in the way that the southern end is, making this site a good choice in accordance with the stated aims of the Neighbourhood Plan to provide development that is sympathetic to sustainability and climate change issues. The site is large enough to provide for the proposed number of houses with a density appropriate to the rural setting and also to allow for a generous recreational space and wildlife habitat. The properties on the opposite side of the road are single storey and facing away from the site onto Whites Corner, so only a very small number of existing properties are likely to be impacted by the development and the thick and mature existing hedgerow around the site will help to preserve the current village scene with minimal disturbance. The site is positioned within the village boundary and allows for the retention of an agricultural field between the site and Westlands Lane, preserving the network of green spaces around the settlement and the green buffer between Whitley and the settlement at the western end of Westlands Lane. This is in accordance with section 17.3 of the plan, responding sensitively to the transition between settlement edge and countryside.		Noted. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
8	Page 42 - 4.3.3 Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley	Having read the neighbourhood plan, if there is a future need for more housing in Whitley, I would support a development at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley. This is preferable to any other proposed development in the village of Whitley as this area of the village is not known to flood, unlike the other end of the village. Only a small number of current properties on the opposite side of the road would be impacted and the existing hedgerow and suggested landscape buffer around the site would create minimal disturbance to this rural village. I would also recommend traffic calming measures on the Corsham Road be considered if this development should go ahead as many drivers do not obey the 30 mph speed limit and this would therefore help with safe access and egress from the development. A zebra crossing should also be considered for those crossing to access the amenities of the village and the bus stops.		Noted. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document. Refer to appendix 3 of the Statement of Community Involvement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
9	4.3.3 Allocation of Land at Middle Lane Whitley	Having read the neighbourhood plan I think the proposed development of Middle Farm, Corsham Road is very good and I fully support the proposal. It satisfies the potential need for new housing in Whitley without ruining the rural setting and with minimal impact on the single storey properties on the opposite side of the road. The village is in a beautiful agricultural area which provides a green buffer separating the village from outlying settlements. I believe this is an important consideration as we must preserve wildlife habitat and green spaces in accordance with the plan. Another very important factor is that this northern end of the village is not subject to flooding in the way that the southern end has been of which I have first hand experience.		Noted. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
10	Page 42, para 4.3.3	We have lived in Whitley (along Top Lane) over the past 20 years and object to expanding Whitley with further housing development. The spacing between Melksham and the villages of Shaw and Whitley have declined over the past few decades, meaning that we are at risk of becoming one large conurbation of Melksham with the impact of villages like Whitley and Shaw losing their unique setting and identity. We therefore object to the plan of developing 18 new dwellings along the Corsham road as this will not only increase the sense that Whitley is turning into a larger conurbation resembling a small town but it will also suffer from a continued increase of traffic on our roads. The development of 18 dwellings will see a further jump of at least 40 more cars (assuming 2 cars per house) along the Corsham road and through Whitley, notwithstanding the large number of lorries that are likely to add to the road traffic chaos whilst development is in progress. Similar poor experience of increasing traffic has been the result of the extensive housing development built on the old George Ward School site. Since this site was redeveloped we have seen hundreds more cars on the roads causing frustrating delays, noise, safety concerns for cyclists and pollution.	Normally we would say that "brown field sites" should be considered for further housing development, however, we are not convinced that there is actual evidence that we need more housing that is intended to supplement the already expansive programme of housing developments across Melksham, Corsham and Chippenham.	Noted. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
11	P42 para 4.3.3	I am happy for this to go ahead because the proposal does not adversely impact Whitley's identity as a rural village in its own right. I do acknowledge and understand that there is a need for more housing in the area. However, I am deeply concerned about an apparent attempt to build on the fields that make up the primary southern boundary. That would cause Shaw and Whitley to lose their individual identities.	To add a proposal to the effect that: "Any development that would result in the loss of or damage to the distinct nature or identity of any village shall not be permitted."	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
12	P42-43. 4.3.3 Allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Rd, Whitley	This site is suitable for additional development in Whitley. The northern edge of the village is not prone to flooding (unlike the southern edge), there is generous space for the site and associated amenities and there are minimal directly facing adjacent properties.		This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
13	P32 Draft Policy 2	Unless not reasonably practical'. As it stands these words are a way of avoiding the re-use of water - the debate about 'reasonably practical' will be endless	The clause should be deleted and the sentence should read - include water re-use measures.	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	P42 Draft Policy 7	This development is supported. 'The development is expected to include 5 affordable homes'	Replace expected by must	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	P53 Draft Policy 11	An opportunity to make the developer of George Ward Gardens provide/contribute towards a pathway through Shurnhold Fields and on to Shaw School was missed. This is an example of a safe route to school which have alleviated some of the unnecessary car journeys to school.		The land between the development at George Ward Gardens and Shaw School is in a variety of private ownership and so therefore is not considered a viable project moving forward by Melksham Without Parish Council.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	P84	By-pass fully supported		<p>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p> <p><a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p> <p>Noted.</p>
	P86	<p>Fully support need to expand medical facilities and clearly an urgent need to strengthen the overstretched facilities.</p> <p>Finally a policy on schools would be beneficial. School catchment areas should be restricted to those who reside near a school. Private cars should not be allowed, say within 500 metres of a school to drop off and collect children. Current parking around schools leads to many problems. Many cars park at least 30 minutes before school closing times, parking along the road causes a hazard to traffic, pedestrians and cyclists. In winter some cars leave the engines running to keep the heater on. This subject has been discussed ad nauseum and more radical action needs to be taken. Perhaps a community school bus.</p>		<p>Out of the scope of the Plan. School catchment areas are a Government policy area and outside of the scope of the NP, school admission policies are down to the individual schools/academies.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
14*	P53 Draft Policy 11- Sustainable Transport and Active Travel	<p>Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. <b>Station Improvements – Policy 1: Sustainable Transport and Active Travel</b></p> <p>As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail or station improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements. <b>Level Crossings:</b></p> <p>Any development of land which would result in a material increase or significant change in the character of traffic using a rail crossings should be refused unless, in consultation with Network Rail, it can either be demonstrated that the safety will not be compromised, or where safety is compromised serious mitigation measures would be incorporated to prevent any increased safety risk as a requirement of any permission. Network Rail has a strong policy to guide and improve its management of level crossings, which aims to; reduce risk at level crossings, reduce the number and types of level crossings, ensure level crossings are fit for purpose, ensure Network Rail works with users / stakeholders and supports enforcement initiatives. Without significant consultation with Network Rail and if proved as required, approved mitigation measures, Network Rail would be extremely concerned if any future development impacts on the safety and operation of any of the level crossings listed above. The safety of the operational railway and of those crossing it is of the highest importance to Network Rail. Level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals <b>(Full Comments - see Consultation Statement - Appendix 5)</b></p>		Noted

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
15	43	<p>The proposed building of 22 new houses on the Corsham Rd opposite Top Lane , Whitley, will increase traffic and enlarge a village which now has no facilities with the closing of the post office and shop. This is at present a very attractive rural village - you are proposing to change its nature to become more urban. NB It has been brought to our notice that Ashford homes are proposing to build 9 houses on First Lane where it already floods and the parking is dangerous during school collection hours and traffic heavy for a single track (in parts) lane. We would strongly oppose this application as it would cause more traffic problems and change the nature of the village.</p>		<p>Opposition of Allocation (Policy 7) noted. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document</p>
16	42 4.3.3	<p>I support the allocation of land within the plan at Middle Farm, Corsham Road Whitley. However this is on the proviso that the development in Whitley is limited to no more than 18 dwellings. The stated requirement for the development of land in Whitley that it must "be of an appropriate layout, form, appearance and materials that protects the amenity of existing neighbouring residents, reinforces and enhances the historic form and character of Whitley and conserves the rural setting of the site;" This is really important to me as a resident of Whitley.</p>		<p>Support of Allocation (Policy 7) noted. This comment together with others has informed the revision of this policy. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement of to see policy revision.</p>
17*		<p>At the outset the considerable time and energy spent to date by the local community in preparing the Regulation 14 version of the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) is acknowledged. It is also appreciated that further time and energy will be required to consider the Reg 14 consultation responses and to submit the Neighbourhood Plan to Wiltshire Council for a Regulation 16 public consultation.</p>		<p>Noted with thanks</p>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	p.13 Wiltshire Core Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) identifies Melksham as a Market Town at Policy CP1 , this is not explicitly clear in the text of MNP.</li> <li>• Policy CP1 states that Market Towns; "...have the ability to support sustainable patterns of living in Wiltshire through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities. Market Towns have the potential for significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance their services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable sustainable communities." • Core Policy 2 of the Core Strategy states that growth levels across the housing market areas are minimum not maximum levels. By implication therefore the levels of growth at each community area identified in the Core Strategy are also minimum not maximum figures.</li> <li>• Core Policy 2 also states that within the limits of development defined on the policies map there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at Market Towns and that the limits of development can be altered; "through the identification of sites for development through subsequent Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and neighbourhood plans."</li> <li>• Not all allocated sites in the Core Strategy (2015) or adopted Housing Sites Allocation Plan (Feb 2020) have come forward owing to delivery problems, therefore in order to maintain a 5 year housing land supply it is necessary for the authority to continue to grant planning permission in accordance with the spatial strategy of the adopted Core Strategy regardless of whether the quantitative 'needs' of a community area have already been met for the plan period.</li> <li>• It should be noted that at the time of responding (July 2020) Wiltshire are unable to evidence a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) applies.</li> <li>• National Planning Practice Guidance states that where a neighbourhood plan precedes a reviewed Local Plan that the Neighbourhood Plan; "...should consider providing indicative delivery timetables, and allocating reserve sites to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed." 1</li> <li>• The Wiltshire Council Cabinet report of April 2019 indicated that between 890 and 2,600 dwellings will be afforded to Melksham in the Local Plan Review dependent on the eventual development strategy. It</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicitly state that Melksham is defined as a Market Town by the Core Strategy. • In the light of the lack of a 5 year housing land supply in Wiltshire, and in accordance with the national Planning Practice Guidance that neighbourhood plans should allocate 'reserve sites to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed', in advance of the Local Plan Review, (which is unlikely to be adopted until mid/late 2022 at the earliest), it is recommended that the MNP, in consultation with Wiltshire Council on the indicative levels of emerging housing need, make further allocations for residential development over and above the single site identified at Middle Farm. This will ensure that new residential development at the town is plan led and comes forward at sustainable locations.</li> </ul>	<p>The definition of Melksham as a Market Town in the Core Strategy to be clearly stated on page 13.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a current lack of 5-year housing land supply across Wiltshire this status could change. Housing needs for Melksham town are firstly to be addressed and delivered through the plan led system with site allocation and infrastructure plans within the Wiltshire Local Plan review to 2036.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>is clear therefore that the MNP should be considering development sites of sufficient capacity to accommodate the future growth needs of the Town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Failure to allocate a suitable site in the MNP leaves the Market Town vulnerable to speculative development, until the Local Plan review is adopted (which may take 24 plus months).</li><li>• It should be noted that the revised Local Development Scheme as reported to Wiltshire members at Cabinet in March 2020 indicated that Covid 19 may well have a detrimental impact on the timescale for the preparation of the Local Plan Review owing to Council officers being deployed to COVID related responsibilities.</li></ul>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>p.16 Development Sites Evidence Base</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comprehensive Site Assessment evidence base prepared by AECOM in 2017 and 2018 is acknowledged.</li> <li>• Our client is promoting land identified as sites 6, 7, 8 and 9 to the north east of Melksham.</li> <li>• That Sites 6, 7 are in the 10 'most suitable' sites for development and Site 9 is 'potentially suitable' according to the findings of the AECOM 2018 report is drawn to the attention of those preparing the MNP.</li> <li>• It should be noted that the sites have been promoted by our client to Wiltshire Council as a combined single site further to the Autumn 2019 Local Plan Review developer consultation which considered alternative growth options across each of the community areas. See Appendix 1 for site area promoted.</li> <li>• Currently the AECOM 2018 report states that site 8 could be unsuitable for development unless developed with site 9 as it would be separate from the town. It is confirmed that Site 8 can now be combined with Site 9 as our client is in control of both.</li> <li>• It is the case that the site can come forward in part without prejudice to the delivery of a larger scale urban extension to the north east of Melksham. • It should also be noted that since the completion of the AECOM evidence base that further decisions have been taken by Wiltshire Council with regard to the location of an eastern by-pass for the town (this matter is considered further below).</li> <li>• The land our client is promoting is situated immediately adjacent to the existing Settlement Boundary to the north east of Melksham, ensuring that new growth would be directed to a highly sustainable and accessible location.</li> <li>• It is not subject to any statutory or non statutory landscape, heritage or ecological designations. Despite part being marginally within the outermost layer of the Spye Park (SSSI) impact risk buffer zone, it is confirmed that residential development will not pose any risk to the SSSI.</li> <li>• Multiple points of existing agricultural access are in place from Woodrow Road, New Road and Sandridge Common.</li> <li>• 1,100 dwellings can be achieved on the Site, alongside a primary school (2 ha), formal recreation and open space, and a local centre (1.6 ha). In addition to this, an area could be reserved for future development (to the east of the Site), which could accommodate a further circa 450 dwellings (13.5 ha) if required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AECOM evidence base should be updated to reflect the fact that our client has control over sites 8 and 9 and that they are suitable and available for development.</li> <li>• The AECOM evidence base should also be updated to reflect the latest decisions of Wiltshire Council with regard to the two possible routes for an eastern bypass for Melksham on which there was a presentation to Melksham Area Board on 4th March 2020.</li> <li>• Once the AECOM evidence base has been updated the land our client is promoting (comprising AECOM sites 6, 7 , 8 and 9) should be re-evaluated for consideration for allocation in the MNP, including its ability to provide land for a new primary school for the Town.</li> </ul>	<p>Site Assessment will be reviewed once the Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>• A local centre would be proposed in the south-eastern corner, adjacent to Sandridge Common and New Road. The location of the local centre would help to ensure that current residents of Melksham can access the services and amenities provided, alongside future residents of the Site.</p> <p>• An existing Public Right of Way crosses the centre of the Site, from east to west, connecting to Savernake Avenue. Development would seek to preserve and enhance the Public Right of Way and the potential location of the primary school adjacent to the footpath would help enhance accessibility to the school for existing residents living to the west of the Site. • Development would seek opportunities to retain and enhance existing trees and hedgerows, whilst also seeking opportunities for enhancements of green infrastructure, in order to maximise landscape and other ecological benefits. The design of the development would be informed to ensure that it respects the wider landscape setting. Overall, it is considered that development could be accommodated with an appropriate design that responds to, and aids, integration with the existing landscape context.</p> <p>Opportunities for ecological enhancements within the proposed development would be identified and used to promote a net gain in biodiversity across the development. The majority of the site is situated in Flood Zone 1 with an area of Flood Zones 2 and 3 present from the eastern part of Woodrow Road, towards the centre of the site which follows the route of a ditch crossing the site from north to south.</p> <p>Development would be directed to those parts which are at the lowest risk of flooding with open space and sustainable drainage features proposed in the areas at risk of flooding. The site does not contain any designated or nationally important heritage assets, not does the site fall within (or within close proximity to) a Conservation Area.</p>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>p. 30 Draft Policy 1 – Sustainable Design and Construction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policies of the MNP should be drafted so that they are able to be effectively used by a decision maker. Draft Policy 1 as currently worded does not provide clarity for a decision maker and would require significant technical knowledge to do so.</li> <li>• It is not clear what scale of development proposal the policy will apply to or how it will be monitored.</li> <li>• There is currently no mandatory requirement for developers to demonstrate that their proposals comply with the Energy Hierarchy principle it is therefore unreasonable for the MNP to request this in planning policy.</li> <li>• Matters of design are already taken into consideration in Design and Access Statements which are a requirement of major planning applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Draft Policy 1 in light of comments made.</li> </ul>	<p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	p.32 Draft Policy 4 - Low emission vehicle charging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the sentiment behind this policy is understood it should be noted that the technology around low emission and electric vehicles is rapidly developing.</li> <li>• Not all households own a vehicle as a result of economic circumstance or personal choice.</li> <li>• While the Government's 'Road Map to Zero' (2018) may have outlined a series of ambitious measures it has not yet made it a mandatory requirement for housebuilders to make provision for low emission vehicle charging to be installed in all new homes.</li> <li>• The Department for Transport recently held (ended on 7th October 2019) a consultation on Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential &amp; Non-Residential Buildings.</li> <li>• A requirement for large numbers of EVCPs will require a larger connection to the development and will introduce a higher power supply requirement to any development.</li> <li>• In certain cases, the need to install charge points could necessitate significant grid upgrades which will be costly for the developer. Some costs would also fall on the distribution network operator.</li> <li>• Any potential negative impact on housing supply should be mitigated with an appropriate exemption from the charge point installation requirement based on the grid connection cost. The consultation proposes that the threshold for the exemption is set at £3,600.</li> <li>• When this cost is exceptionally high and may make developments unviable it is the Governments view that EVCP requirements should not apply and only the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive requirements should be applied.</li> <li>• Draft Policy 4 does not recognise the technical feasibility and viability impacts of EVCP identified by the Government and the MNP should not be running ahead of Government proposals for Building Regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delete Draft Policy 4 as this matter is best addressed by a national standardised approach implemented through Building Regulations to ensure a consistent approach to future proofing the housing stock.</li> </ul>	Policy retained

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	p.38 Draft Policy 5 Pre-application Community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy as currently worded is contrary to the NPPF – development proposals that have entered into pre-application engagement should not be 'looked on more favourably than applications that have not' as this would result in bias in the planning system which is predicated on determining planning applications in accordance with the development plan (NPPF para 11).</li> <li>Paragraph 40 of the NPPF is clear that a local authority 'cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application' moreover it is clear that they can only 'encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community...before submitting their applications'.</li> <li>The first limb of draft Policy 5 is a direct quote from NPPF paragraph 128 which falls under Section 12 of the NPPF, 'Achieving well-designed places', and refers to consultation with local communities in respect of the design and style of emerging schemes – it is read and interpreted in the context of the preceding sentences of the paragraph and does not stand alone.</li> <li>The requirement at Appendix 1 for Melksham Town Council to be consulted on all S.106 agreements between Wiltshire Council and developers is challenged. These are legal agreements negotiated between the Council and a landowner (or their successor in title) that are required to ensure the grant of a planning permission. The involvement of a third party on a consultation basis is not required once a resolution to permit has been granted by Planning Committee – the correct stage for Town Council involvement is at the statutory planning consultation stage. The Town Council should only be involved as a party to a S106 legal agreement if they happen to be signatory to it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reword Policy 5 to correctly reflect the NPPF.</li> </ul>	<p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p> <p>The Pre-application Community Engagement Protocol has been reviewed &amp; text amended.</p>
	Draft Policy 6 – Housing in Defined Settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy states that development will not be permitted outside the settlement boundary in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 2.</li> <li>The MNP may wish to consider an amendment to the existing settlement boundary of Melksham in the MNP to ensure sufficient land is allocated to meet the emerging policy requirements of the Local Plan Review as Wiltshire are currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Albeit this boundary could be subsequently altered should the Local Plan review require even higher numbers at Melksham.</li> <li>Not do so will potentially require a decision taker to breach MNP Policy 6 should Wiltshire Council find themselves in an untenable housing land supply position.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequately amend the settlement boundary, as allowed for by Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy 2, to allow for substantial new housing development at a sustainable location in advance of the Local Plan review.</li> </ul>	<p>Housing needs for Melksham town are firstly to be addressed through site allocation and infrastructure plans within the Wiltshire Local Plan review to 2036, and in future reviews of the NP. This NP will therefore be restricted to addressing local housing provision at Whitley and Shaw.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 8 - Infrastructure Phasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing developers do not provide or control the delivery plans of community and social infrastructure providers ; the NHS or education providers. It is not appropriate therefore to expect housing developers to address these matters.</li> <li>• Developers enter into legal agreements with regard to on or off site open space, play, sports facilities, education and library provision etc.. that directly relates to a development proposal.</li> <li>• They also pay community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to contribute to the provision of wider infrastructure but have no control over the spending of such monies by a local authority.</li> <li>• It is for the Town Council and the Melksham Area Board, through their locally elected representatives to lobby appropriate agencies to ensure timely delivery of local infrastructure.</li> <li>• In terms of provision of local community infrastructure, our client's site at land north east Melksham could accommodate a 2 form entry primary school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reword Draft Policy 8 to remove the obligation for phased delivery of infrastructure from housing development.</li> </ul>	Policy 8 reviewed. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Draft Policy 9 - Town Centre	This Policy is supported in as far as it seeks to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of Melksham Town centre.		Noted
	Draft Policy 10 - Employment Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is supported in so far as it seeks to retain and create jobs within Melksham and to improve the level of self-containment of the settlement.</li> </ul>		Noted

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Drat Policy 11 - Sustainable Transport and Active Travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to Figure 10 'Key Routes for Walking and Cycling' demonstrates how well our client's site at northeast Melksham (shown at Appendix 1) is related to; a national cycle trail to the north; a cycleway to the south, a priority walking route to the north and other key walking routes to the south.</li> <li>• Our client's site is therefore well placed to deliver effective additional cycle and walking linkage to enhance the existing sustainable transport infrastructure of Melksham.</li> <li>• Delivery of the site would facilitate further cycle and walking connectivity to the north east of the town as well as enhanced connectivity with existing residential areas immediately to the west of the site.</li> <li>• The ability of local residents to use Melksham train station for sustainable travel enhances the sustainability credentials of the Market Town as a location for new development, this point is enhanced by proposals to improve bus services in the local area.</li> <li>• The delivery of the Melksham Eastern By-Pass will also improve connectivity for our client's site in relation to public transport. The Government have confirmed its support for the provision of funding for a Melksham bypass (with Wiltshire Council now needing to develop a business case for the scheme to enable it to progress to the next stage of development under the government's Major Road Network (MRN) and Large Local Majors (LLM) programme).</li> <li>• The bypass seeks to ease traffic flows on the A350, in the centre of Melksham. Three Options to the east of Melksham will be explored.</li> <li>• A presentation to the Melksham Area Board on 4th March 2020 discussed the proposals, including timescales, for delivery of the new road. A plan showing options to the east of Melksham is attached at. Option A would commence at the southern part of the Site, through the addition of a fourth arm to the Sandridge Common and Eastern Way roundabout, and would pass through the Site, connecting with New Road, following the route of New Road, to connect with Beanacre.</li> <li>• Accordingly, our client's Site presents an important opportunity to facilitate the provision of route Option A, whilst ensuring that the Site and bypass come forward as a comprehensive and well-planned sustainable urban extension. <b>(Full response including appendices within the Consultation Statement - Appendix 5)</b></li> </ul>	That the sustainable transport and active travel opportunities presented by allocating our client's site for development in conjunction with the delivery of Option A for the new eastern by-pass for Melksham by incorporated into the MNP.	This site is not being allocated with this NP. Allocation may be considered as part of the NP review (see page 14 of the NP document).

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	p.71 Bristol Tree Replacement Standard Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While not included in draft MNP policy the text of the MNP refers to the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard as a methodology to inform replacement trees in the Neighbourhood Area.</li> <li>• Objection is raised to the use of the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard owing to the findings of the Cam Parish Neighbourhood Plan Examiner who stated in his report (February 2020) at paragraph 57 ' In my experience, in arriving at good landscaping schemes, much depends on the characteristics of the site, the nature of the development and the expectations regarding the replacement trees .... Equally, the nature of the development will be very relevant.'</li> <li>• He continues 'On a major residential greenfield development, it is not always appropriate to replace the trees in the position where they were felled, but rather greater benefit could derive perhaps by more structural planting' and at paragraph 58 the need to 'avoid reliance on a too rigid/formulaic approach so as to allow flexibility at the development management stage ' is stated.</li> <li>• While the Bristol Standard may be appropriate in a predominantly urban area Melksham is located in rural Wiltshire where detailed proposals for development schemes may require an alternative approach negotiated through bespoke detailed landscape schemes that accompany development proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That reference to the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard be removed from the MNP and that tree replacement be negotiated on a case by case basis.</li> </ul>	The Bristol Tree Replacement Standard is intended only as a robust and proven reference point to inform tree replacement negotiation, which is acknowledged should be on a case by case basis. Supporting text amended to reflect this point.
	p.85 Melksham By-Pass Route Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Melksham Area Board considered a presentation in March 2020 on routes for the Melksham by-pass, including more detailed routes to the east of Melksham which are shown at Appendix 2.</li> <li>• It is considered that inclusion of Fig 19 is misleading to include in the Reg 14 consultation as while no decision has yet been made the routes at Appendix 2 will be considered by Wiltshire Council for business case preparation. <b>(Full Comment, including appendices within the Consultation Statement - Appendix 5)</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove Fig 19 from future iterations of the MNP and replace with Appendix 2 attached.</li> </ul>	Figure 19 removed

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
18	Page 84	I do not believe the Neighbourhood Plan should support the bypass without further qualification. Currently the only stipulation for this support states “This will need to improve the efficiency of the A350 as well as improve the local economy and meet other economic objectives for the town.”	Other areas of concern to be referenced as needing to be satisfactorily addressed as part of any new by-pass:  - Protection of existing community facilities - Protection for existing open green spaces - Protection/Enhancement for biodiversity - Impact assessment on any existing or planned Green Infrastructure (e.g. Wilts & Berks Canal, K&A Canal, Cycle Routes)	<u>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</u> <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
	Page 65 2nd Paragraph	Public Houses are vital to our communities and although these are highlighted elsewhere in Community Facilities Evidence Base Report, they are not noted in the extensive list of other important facilities on this page.	Add in “Public Houses” to the list in this paragraph.	Update to included proposed words
	Table 1, Community Facilities Evidence Base Report	The Pear Tree, Whitley, ought to be added to the table. This public house has regular community activities such as craft-days, comedy nights and charity events.	Add in Pear Tree, Whitley to the table.	Map and Evidence Base Report updated

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 64, Draft Policy 15 – Community Facilities	<p>My concern is that a stronger test should be required than is currently listed in the plan for when proposals are put forward to lose community facilities.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant in the Melksham Without areas where the loss of a community facility could give no reasonable alternative, despite the plan having many alternatives available, entirely due to the size of the area covered by the plan.</p>	<p>Specify a distance for the alternative and add wording to ensure non-viability is proven. For example, below is taken from another neighbourhood plan (Pluckley) and I struggle to improve on it:                      Proposals that will result in the loss of an existing community facility will only be supported where:                      a) adequate alternative provision exists or will be provided in an equally accessible or more accessible location within the reasonable walking distance of 800metres or                      b) all reasonable efforts have been made to preserve the facility but it has been demonstrated that it would not be economically viable, feasible or practicable to retain the building or site for its existing use; in such cases evidence must be provided to confirm that the property or site has been marketed for a meaningful period and that there is no realistic interest in its retention for the current use or for an alternative community use.                      Proposals for development which involve the unavoidable loss of community facilities for which there is a proven demand will be required to consider the scope for relocating or re-</p>	<p>Thank you for providing an example. This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>providing the facility either within the new development or on an alternative site within the locality and to make such provision where feasible and practicable.</p>	
	<p>Page 47, Draft Policy 9, Town Centre</p>	<p>I believe the town centre in Melksham offers the opportunity to enhance it's night-time economy and would like us to support these efforts. Anecdotal evidence from people I know in neighbouring towns point to the relative feeling of safety in the town at night, and I would personally say this is an improvement from past times.</p>	<p>Indicate in the neighbourhood plan that developments that positively enhance the night-time economy would be supported.</p>	<p>Supporting text for the policy updated in line with proposal</p>
	<p>General</p>	<p>This is really a wider point and really would need a strategy of it's own, but a reference to supporting it would be a start. There is no reference in the plan to the post office(s). I feel at the very least this ought to be referenced as a community facility. It is also one that the community feels strongly about, so if there is the chance to outline some level of support in this document for this facility we should do so.</p>	<p>Add the post office to the list of community assets.</p>	<p>Map and Evidence Base Report updated</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	General	The production plan is a considerable piece of work that has clearly been a big effort, and I applaud those involved. I wonder given this effort why the plan is only covering the period to 2026. In comparison to other neighbourhood plans I've seen this appears very short. I'm guessing the date somehow ties to the councils overall 2026 plan, but does it have to? I think the points covered in the neighbourhood plan are valid beyond 2026.	Extend the plan beyond 2026.	The Plan period has been extended to 2030.
19	Page 42 Para4.3.3	I am opposed to the plan to build these homes at middle farm. Melksham is already committed to 17% more homes than we are required to build. The village has fewer facilities than in the past plus an over subscribed First school. I am also against any further development in the Villages of Shaw and Whitley. As this will prove to reduce the Flora and Fauna and add to the continual erosion of wildlife habitat in and around the villages		Opposition to allocation noted. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.
20	Page 30, Sustainable Design & Construction Draft Policy 1	I find this part of the proposal quite vague: there is reference to the BREEAM standards etc, but examples of "what good looks like" may help. I assume there's also appetite to fulfil self-build quotas (not mentioned?), so examples there might resemble e.g. passivhaus design and sustainable tinyhomes ? (as supported in Frome)	Add examples Address self-build	This comment, together with other comments, has informed revisions to the supporting text

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Page / Clause / Para</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Proposal (where relevant)</b>	<b>Proposed Resolution/ Comment</b>
	Page 30, Draft Policy 1 Part (ii)	"...all new development should be...located where the proximity to services and facilities, or the mix of uses in the development, minimises the need to travel by private vehicle". Whilst a good sentiment, an unintended consequence of this is increased density of housing (query validity given covid19?), as every new home tries to be as close as possible to the railway station or to the Campus hub. Given that Melksham's new housing has already outpaced infrastructure, shouldn't we be prioritising new infrastructure (i.e. Draft Policy 8 and Objective 10 - new walkways / cycleways) rather than just developing near existing infrastructure, thereby alleviating density?	Consider wording & intent / consequence	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Page 47, Draft Policy 9</p> <p>and</p> <p>Page 66/67 Draft Policy 15, Figure 14a/b/c</p>	<p>'sustain or enhance the range or quality of shopping provision' (Draft Policy 9) and 'facilities for people of all ages are made available to support a diverse and healthy local population' (Draft Policy 15)</p> <p>A cohesive 'directory' of currently available facilities would be very helpful here, both for council &amp; developers assessing whether a proposal is complementary and well-situated, and for informing new residents on what's available. It should be holistic and cover retail, small business offerings, plus community facilities / leisure / green spaces / EV charging points / events / clubs. I know there was a Melksham Town initiative to do this, but has not materialised / is very sparse. The maps throughout the Neighbourhood Plan are useful and highlight 'blackspots' where facilities are missing, but could be more user-friendly and widely-available. Web-scraping Sham Shoutouts might be a good place to start for events &amp; local offerings! Is this addressed by the 'Masterplan' mentioned - or is that just for planning use?</p>	<p>Plan to create directory for wider use</p>	<p>See associated evidence base document - Community Facilities which lists all currently available facilities. A local directory is outside the scope of the NP.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 51	'Proposals for start-up and small businesses are particularly encouraged to enable the growth of a range of new employment opportunities.' Again examples might help - does this mean 'incubators' (e.g. Holt Glove Factory), coworking sites (e.g. Corsham Digital Mansion)?	Add examples	Thank you for your comments. Examples are not going to be listed as the range is so broad, and ever changing at present due to the Covid pandemic restrictions.
	Page 55, Figure 10	It's not clear if the routes marked are existing, for improvement, or planned? There are several 'Priority' walking routes in Melksham Without that are not very well serviced if they are existing. I'd also like to	Clarify legend Comment on connectedness	The SG have reviewed the Connections Map

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 76, Figure 16, Character Areas	<p>see comment on the lack of connectedness of the routes as demonstrated by the map.</p> <p>Looking at the 'Character' yellow shaded area for Beanacre, there are two separate zones. It's not clear to me why the area in between them is not also included as 'Character', given that that contains houses at least as old as those in the area further up. In the associated Melksham Without Listed Buildings map there are several Listed buildings in the intervening area between the two shaded 'Character' zones. It's important to preserve the character of an area as a connected whole, not just selected spots.</p>	Mark as 'Character' a larger area in Beanacre, or explain why an area that contains Listed buildings has been omitted	The character map has been updated to accurately reflect the area of Beanacre
21		Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan.		
22	pg35 P4.2.4  pg42 P4.3.3	<p>Provision for charging points seems eminently sensible and will, if anything, contribute to the marketability of new homes in the area. The proposed development fits with the area and meets the needs of the local community, and is therefore wholly appropriate. I've had feedback from a few locals around the plan being too long/complex and not understanding how best to respond.</p> <p>Two thoughts occur to me:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could a summary be produced or publicised?</li> <li>2. Is there merit in an informal referendum e.g. a consultation question as follows: "Having read the NP do you support it in principle?"</li> </ol>		Suggestion noted for future communication / consultation.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
23	43	<p>I wish to raise my strong objection to the plans on page 43 of your Neighbourhood Plan document. I have recently lost the sale of my property due to search results raising the matter of the Neighbourhood Plan. I can forward you the email I received from prospective buyers (received). The plan to build 18 properties at the end of my garden has come as a complete shock to me and would considerably reduce the value of my property which is currently on the market. It will significantly affect the future sale of my property. The rural aspect of my property will be affected by the increase in noise levels and traffic on the Corsham Road and the reduced rural aspect from our garden. I was not until now aware of plans to build here and would have expected a letter outlining the plans.</p>		<p>Opposition to allocation noted. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.</p> <p>Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
24	<p>Plan page 42 Paragraph 4.3.3 Draft policy 7</p>	<p>I fully support the proposed allocation of land for development on the Middle Farm site on Corsham Road. This area is not known for flooding, as opposed to the southern side of Whitley. If it was proposed for the southern side, it would be disastrous for the village. I therefore feel that by building here it would fulfil the quota of new homes in the area and keep the village safe from becoming the next Atlantis. The plan also incorporates natural habitat sustainability, which is excellent.</p>		<p>Support Noted. The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
25	<p>Page 43 Draft Policy 7</p>	<p>Development at Middle Farm Corsham Road, Whitley - We support this application as long as affordable housing included retain the hedgerow and the natural landscape of the area. Suitable visual vehicular assess.</p>		<p>Support Noted. The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
26	Page 42 Para 4.3.3	I do not agree with the proposed plan to build houses at Middle Farm, Whitley. I understand that the proposed land is outside of the settlement boundary for Whitley. There is no need for any further house building in the village since the housing already committed is actually 17% over the housing requirements in the Core Strategy. There are not enough facilities in the village to cope with a higher population. The Primary school is at full capacity since the George Ward development was built. There is no longer a shop in the village. The amount of traffic using Corsham Road has increased substantially in the last 10 years and a development of 18 houses would increase the number of cars using the road to the detriment of the residents.		<p>Opposition to allocation noted. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.</p> <p>The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
27	<p>Draft plan - Page 43, para 2</p> <p>Site as identified in the 'draft rural site assessments 2020' &amp; 'site assessment report' docs</p>	<p>As owner of the site 'no.13 Land East of Corsham Road (opposite first lane)' that has been considered in the supporting documents ('draft rural site assessments 2020' &amp; 'site assessment report') we would like to offer up the site at a reduced size due to the proximity to our existing business - Whitley Golf Club. This smaller portion of the site could provide multiple new home plots within the village. Whilst we are aware this site is not selected within the draft plan currently, we wanted to follow up on the highlighted suitability of this site for development for your consideration. In the case of any further consideration of the site we would like to make sure that a green buffer to the golf club is created which can also benefit the wider community with public open space/community orchard. We would like the potential for homes on this site to be offered up to the community as plots that could be developed subject to an approved masterplan, so that there would be consistency in layout, design, materials etc. but to allow the wider public to benefit including potential self-builders. Our desire is to allow the existing and growing community within Whitley to benefit from the land</p>		<p>Comment considered as part of Policy 7 review. No further sites will be allocated in the Submission Plan.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>which is currently under-utilized but occupies a prime development spot given the proximity to the existing local amenities. The pub, golf club, primary school, village shop, reading rooms and church are all within easy walkable distance from the site whilst there is also a bus route and stop on the Corsham road that connects the site to the wider context. We are also aware of the problems with the need for adequate car parking for the primary school next door to our golf club and could offer as part of this, some extra parking provision on our land. Currently, the cars have to park on the Corsham road and this would relieve the traffic issues that cause disruption to the local community. Please do let us know if you have any questions or would like to contact us to discuss the potentials further. Thank you. <b>(Map of Site included within Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
28	Key Routes for Walking and Cycling	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to consider the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (MNPC) - Lacock Parish Council (LPC) has asked me to respond regarding the outdoor/walking/cycling proposals contained in the plan.</p> <p>Walking and cycling east of river (between Avon and Forest Lane, including Forest Lane)</p> <p>There is nothing contentious here and these proposals recognise and enhance existing routes. The priority walking route follows existing rights of way (RoWs) from Forest to Bezzels &amp; Queenfield and into Lacock Parish fields west of Mead Farm and south of Abbey Bridge. Some of these RoWs are ploughed and blocked most years (on the Melksham side of the Roman Road), so any enhancement is to be encouraged. Lacock Parish Council wish to endorse such recognition and enhancement and suggest that consideration be given to further enhancing the RoW line east of the Avon to provide a safe off-road cycleway as an alternative to Forest Lane &amp; Lacock.</p>	<p>Opening up the line of the Wilts and Berks Canal (the stretch south of Lacock Abbey Bridge to Melksham) is a long-term aspiration for Melksham Community (mentioned more than once in main plan), but the walking and cycling map does not show this. Lacock Parish Council looks forward to any developments enabling the canal line to be re-opened along its whole length.</p> <p>Walking and cycling west of river towards Lacock</p> <p>I think MNPC misses an opportunity west of A350. MNPC's map shows prominent walking priorities from Melksham to Beanacre and Whitley, but nothing from those places to the north. There are already excellent RoW/bridleway routes from Beanacre and Whitley towards Catridge and Wick Farm (in the SW of Lacock Parish) which are not mentioned. Given the Wick solar application, we might expect these routes to be better maintained in future and I comment that MPNC should promote them and encourage enhancement of their sections in their patch. Bridleways can be accommodated for cycling without legal change, so it is only the surface and any gates to improve. The relevant path</p>	<p>Thank you for the detailed comments. MWPC have reviewed as part of connections mapping review</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>number are MELW99 - bridleway &amp; LACO1A (designated RoW, but possibly unclaimed bridleway) from Beanacre to Catridge - and MELW87 &amp; LOCO7 (both bridleways) from Westlands Lane (Whitley) to Catridge. Just south of Westlands these routes are E-W linked by MELW95 which is adjacent to a greenfield 43 house development the MNPC acknowledge for Whitley, so I would expect MNPC to look at linking that development into the footpath/cycleway network. The routes mentioned above would allow folk to walk/cycle from Melksham, Whitely and Beanacre without having to cross the A350 until Folly Lane. My strong encouragement for enhancing MELW87 and LACO7 in particular is that these two already provide a legal bridleway (so would be cyclable with surface improvements) between existing highways at Westlands and Folly Lane - thus enabling safe cycling N-S and off A350.</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
29	Draft Policy 14 (page 62)	Draft Policy 14 (page 62) proposes several sites as designated Local Green Spaces. Wessex Water maintains a number of assets which pass through these spaces. This policy must not constrain maintenance or improvement programmes, which are critical for the efficient and safe operation of Wessex Water services		Policy 14 seeks to protect Open Space but does not designate. The policy aims to protect access to open space and will not constrain operation of Wessex Water
30	Site 27 - Land North of Berryfield	I have been reading through the Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting documentation and I would like to comment on the above site that has been selected as one to bring forward as suitable for development. I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the NP list of sites as it's clearly unsuitable because it extends the size of Berryfield by potentially 180 houses. I thought the NP and Wiltshire Council were treating Berryfield as a small village? In which case further development should be limited to restricted size in fill only. Btw I tried to comment on the NP but the word document won't work on my iPad and it's too late for me to comment using my PC now. Interested to hear the thought processes that lead to the belief that this site was suitable and what the chances of using some of the Cooper site that has also been ear marked came from (I am an employee of Cooper) I don't know if you can submit these comments on my behalf.		A range of sites were considered as part of a process to consider allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan. One site in Whitley has been allocated. The plan does not propose the allocation of a site in Berryfield
31	Page 41. Para 1	Bearing in mind the statement on this page, that the building requirements up to 2026 have not only been met but have been exceeded by 17% already, with 6 years to go, we feel that there is no need to consider any further development.		Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.  The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
				of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Page 43 Para 1 Figure B	Examining the proposed site on Middle Farm field, this site breaches settlement boundary and as such contravenes Core Policy 2 and also the policy limit DP14 of the Wiltshire structure plan. It must also be noted that the proposed area includes a play area. This is madness, considering that it would be necessary for the village children to cross the busy Corsham Road to play. This illustrates that the authors appear to be incompetent to draw up plans for any village extension. However, that said we still consider the settlement boundary to be sacrosanct.		Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.
	Page 45 para 2	Any future consideration regarding housing in Whitley, it should be opposed on the grounds that the village itself currently has very limited		The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision. These points have been taken into account when considering the allocation.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		amenities i.e. no Post Office, no shop, no playing area, no medical facilities, reduced bus service and an over subscribed primary school.		
32		<p>For developers to bear in mind the principles contained in the Building for Life 12 document in their developments</p> <p>Solar Farms - There needs to be a policy with regard to the impact glare will have on nearby dwellings and what mitigation measures will be put in place to reduce glare.</p> <p>nb: both these points have been raised at parish council planning meetings during the Reg 14 consultation period, not specific to the plan but to current planning applications and to a public consultation Melksham Without Parish Council supports the CIL policy proposed with amendments</p>		<p>Reference will be included. Note that Building for a Healthy Life is the latest edition of - and new name for - Building for Life 12. Published this summer....<a href="https://www.udg.org.uk/publications/othermanuals/building-healthy-life">https://www.udg.org.uk/publications/othermanuals/building-healthy-life</a></p> <p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p> <p>Noted</p>
	CIL Policy		<p>...Civic Infrastructure, 'for the benefit of the Joint Neighbourhood Plan area, focusing on the facilities/infrastructure and communities most impacted by the new development', Melksham Without Parish Council feel the following paragraph was better suited as supporting text for the reason for the policy, rather than as part of the policy: A Memorandum of Agreement will be put in place between Melksham Without Parish Council and Melksham Town Council, defining the process by which local priorities for</p>	<p>Noted. Policy to be reviewed and updated as agreed with the Steering Group. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p> <p>Noted. Supporting text reviewed in submission version of the NP</p>
	CIL Policy			

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>infrastructure needs are identified and agreed across the Joint Plan Area. The Memorandum of agreement will include a Statement of Infrastructure Priorities for infrastructure needs and improvement projects which will be reviewed annually and agreed jointly between the Town and Parish councils.</p>	
33	Page 43	<p>Housing &amp; Infrastructure - Middle Farm, Corsham Road - This seems a very strange proposal for a few houses on what is a green field. I cannot see any justification for this. If the development were to proceed, it would be very easy to see infill happen on the North side of Corsham Road and in Westlands Lane. There are many more appropriate sites where development could take place. I fail to see any logic in this proposal.</p>		<p>The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p> <p>Available sites in area were assessed. Unsuitable ones were dismissed. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	pages 84 & 85	Transport Infrastructure - By-pass - The plans shows 3 potential routes to the West of Melksham. Any of these would involve much greater loss of green land than the routes to the East of Melksham. They would also be of less use to intersection roads than the routes to the East.		The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
34	Page 22 2.7  Page 30 4.2.1 Draft Policy 1	<p><b>Sustainable Development and Climate Change - We are pleased the plan aims to address the increasing pressures of climate change and meet national sustainability goals</b></p> <p><b>Sustainable Design and Construction Within this section we would like to see the plan make ambitious recommendations/requirements for water efficiency. Increased water efficiency for all new developments potentially enables more growth with the same water resources. Developers can highlight positive corporate social responsibility messages and the use of technology to help sell their homes. For the homeowner, lower water usage also reduces water and energy bills. We endorse the use of water efficiency measures, especially in new developments. Use of technology that ensures efficient use of natural resources could support the environmental benefits of future proposals and could help attract investment to the area. Therefore, water efficient technology, fixtures and fittings should be included in new developments.</b></p>	<p>In addition to the existing policy mentioned, we recommend the plan include and reference the aims of the government’s 25 Year Environment Plan.</p> <p>We recommend a standard of water usage of no more than 110 litres per person per day is included for new residential development and all new non-residential development of 1000 square metres gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.</p>	<p>25 Year Environment Plan referenced in the revised Plan</p> <p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Page 32 4.2.2 - Draft Policy 2</p>	<p><b>Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management</b>  <b>This policy currently only aims to address surface water (pluvial) flooding and makes no mention of other sources of flood risk including from rivers (fluvial). The subsequent reasons section suggest flood risk can be managed through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies and Wiltshire Core Strategy: Policy 67. Given the nature of flood risk within the area, especially within Melksham Town centre itself and the proposed town centre regeneration plans, we believe this is a missed opportunity for the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan to strengthen local flood risk policy, build on the existing guidance and help steer development away from areas at risk of fluvial flooding.</b></p> <p><b>We are pleased to see the inclusion of surface weather management policies to help mitigate flood risk and the impact of climate change.</b></p>	<p>We note that in the 'reasons for the policy' section it has not been specified that Core Policy 67 will be used to address fluvial flood risk, but rather this is left for the reader to assume. We recommend further clarification is included, to help advise readers who may not be familiar with different sources of flooding, on how flood risk from rivers and from surface water sources is differentiated and addressed within the policy</p> <p>The Wiltshire Core Strategy states that any development proposed in flood zones 2 or 3 will need to be accompanied by 'clear evidence that no lower risk alternative sites are available'. We recommend the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan uses this opportunity to help guide developers on what suitable evidence might be and what development types would/would not be considered suitable in these areas, such as promoting green/open space whilst avoiding vulnerability uses as laid out in Table 2: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification of the Planning Practice Guidance: Flood Risk and Coastal Change. This is particularly pertinent as the current Wiltshire Core Policy on flood risk relies heavily on</p>	<p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			national flood risk policy and the Sequential Test rather than providing a local approach and we strongly believe the plan should provide more targeted guidance beyond the existing national level.	
	Page 40 - 4.3.2	<b>Housing in Defined Settlements Draft Policy 6</b> The policy states ' <i>We will support proposals for small 'windfall' housing development within the settlements of the plan area, where they conform with the policies of the Development Plan and where they.'</i> It is not clear from this what is meant by the 'development plan' in this context.	If there is a specific document that is being used as the criteria to support windfall development this should be referenced by name.	Supporting text reviewed in response to comment
	Page 42 - 4.3.3	<b>Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley Draft Policy 7</b> We agree that the allocated site at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley does not raise any significant environmental concerns within our remit.		Noted

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>4.5.1 Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Draft Policy 12: Green Infrastructure (page 57-58)</p>	<p><b>Green Infrastructure</b> - We are pleased to see that green infrastructure is being considered as part of the plan.</p> <p>We note that Policy 12 makes reference directly to Figure 11: Green Infrastructure Key Assets and Priorities: Strategy Diagram as the existing and future priorities of the plan which will be supported. This is a significant part of the plan and we feel this requires considerable expansion, including sections detailing in writing what the key assets and priorities are along with a description of any proposals.</p>	<p>This is a significant part of the plan and we feel this requires considerable expansion, including sections detailing in writing what the key assets and priorities are along with a description of any proposals. We suggest this is expanded to include blue infrastructure, as rivers and watercourses also provide considerable corridors for wildlife and recreation.</p> <p>In addition to the above, Figure 11 requires updating as the version contained in the draft document is illegible. We cannot determine from the version provided what the existing key assets and priorities are. At a minimum this will need to be updated before we are able to provide full comments on the key assets and proposed priorities.</p> <p>In addition we are not able to determine from this section which infrastructure is existing and which is being proposed as future priorities. This will also need to be clarified.</p>	<p>The River Avon and Clackers Brook is included as blue infrastructure and identified as strategic GI assets. The supporting text will be revised to make this clearer. Figures in the Submission version will be legible. Further more detailed information is available in the Green Infrastructure Report which is part of the Plan evidence base.</p>
Page 59	4.5.2	<p><b>Biodiversity Draft Policy 13</b> We are pleased to see Biodiversity Net Gain is being incorporated into the plan and area in full support of this section.</p>		Noted

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 60 - Melksham Canal Link	This information sections states 'In 2012 a planning application for the Melksham Link was submitted, but this has not yet been determined, due to continued objections by the Environment Agency'. We believe this is misleading in that here is no justification provided for our objections and implies we are simply resisting the project. It should be noted that since 2012 there has been considerable correspondence between the applicants, the LPA and the Environment Agency regarding the proposal and ongoing efforts by the EA to review further information in attempts to overcome our concerns.	We appreciate that the supporting statements for the project within the plan may not wish to mention environmental issues and so a pragmatic approach might be to remove this sentence from this section. However, if the authors wish to keep some background information of the planning proposal we request this section be amended to state something like .... 'In 2012, a planning application for the Melksham Link was submitted, but this has not yet been determined, due to outstanding environmental concerns raised by the Environment Agency.' In addition to the above there is a duplicate of 'has' in this sentence.	Updated text in line with proposal
35		Thank you for your consultation on the revised SEA Screening Opinion for the emerging Melksham Neighbourhood Plan. I do not have access to previous documents due to remote working and having looked on the Plan's website the previous version which detailed policy 7 does not appear to be there. However, from what I can deduce the original Whitley farm site (site 17) has been replaced by the Middle Farm site (site 12). I also note on the website a report on the Whitley Farm site prepared by a heritage consultant in February 2020. The timing of this suggests that it was not produced as a response to our previous advice but is nonetheless useful evidence and may have provided the basis for the change in site allocation. There appears to be no corresponding heritage consultant report for the Middle Farm site now promoted. Admittedly the proximity of relevant heritage assets might preclude the need for such an exercise and as indicated previously we are certainly happy to accept the judgement of your authority's Conservation Officer as to the in-principle suitability of the site as an allocation and its potential for the nature and scale of any development which might be	Happy to accept the judgement of your authority's Conservation Officer as to the in-principle suitability of the site as an allocation and its potential for the nature and scale of any development which might be proposed. Their written advice can be deemed legitimate evidence with which to substantiate the policy. No report of this nature has been provided and I can find no copy on the Plan's website. It would therefore be useful to address this.	Noted Advice of Wiltshire Conservation Officer is for the written advice of the Conservation Officer to be submitted alongside the SEA screening decision as part of the overall NP submission.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>proposed. Their written advice can be deemed legitimate evidence with which to substantiate the policy. No report of this nature has been provided and I can find no copy on the Plan's website. It would therefore be useful to address this. But reference to such advice is made within the revised Screening Report which quotes the Conservation Officer as stating that no significant effects (upon heritage assets) are likely and that they see no reason why 18 units shouldn't be achievable. On the basis of the change in proposed site allocation and the Conservation Officer's comments I can confirm that we have no objection to the view that a full SEA is not required. I can also re-affirm that on this basis there are also now no residual issues associated with the Plan upon which we are likely to wish to comment in the future.</p>		
36*		<p>The Neighbourhood plan looks like it is the ideal plan for the town/parish's to be in control of their destiny and have what we want in our community, rather than what is either forced on us due to having no plan's or by deep pocketed housing companies!! Below are some of my areas of concern / development which I think will be good for our town / parish's: -</p> <p><b>Leisure</b> The obvious question on a lot of the Melksham Sports and Leisure community minds is - will the Campus now happen – have the council got the money to finish this? If it has, great let's get it finished. If it hasn't, we need to know how long we're going to be without a Leisure Centre? If the council cannot do this, maybe it can be done with a mix of council / 'local' private enterprise!! 2500 new homes coming to the area and we now have less leisure facilities than we had before the houses started being built !</p> <p><b>Leisure facilities</b> i. The Campus Project is a great project for the town that brings under its roof a number of community activities e.g. Leisure Centre &amp; Pool / Library / Council Offices. However, we need more facilities than before – not smaller and less facilities ! We've now lost the following provision in the town / parish's - Indoor bowls / Squash courts / 9 Golf course / Ten Pin Bowling. Additionally the sports hall is smaller than the CMSC so, the sports centre will not be able to host as it did previously.</p> <p>ii. Work with private companies to help provide these – the benefits will be in community engagement / spending in the community</p> <p>We need to have an alternative plan!</p>		<p>Noted. Detailed project delivery suggestions beyond scope of NP. For the latest update and plans for the Melksham Community Campus please visit the dedicated page on Wiltshire Council's website <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p><b>Housing:</b> Its great that Melksham in expanding however this mass expansion of houses has not added the facilities the community needs. 2500 house at average cost of £225k each (that's just an estimate) will bring over £500 million (1/2 a billion pounds) to the building company coffers. Yes, the building companies they have some huge costs, but these also come with huge profits !! Where are our new facilities that we actually need – Doctors / Dentists / Schools/ leisure facilities (1 new school added – 1 in the planning stage) – 2500 houses should on average bring 10,000 new residents to the town – 5000 children, and only 1 new school!! <b>(Full comment with Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>		<p>Noted. These issues are addressed through CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) regs and formula to determine reasonable investment of community infrastructure proportionate to additional demand.</p>
		<p><b>Employment Land (Business / Trading Estate's) The town needs new business in the town and in trading estates that bring jobs to the people who move to the town. They can then spend the money they earn in our community – again if we have the facilities to do this (Shops / Leisure / Tourists facilities )</b>  <b>What options do we have for more employment land? What about these: -</b>                      i. Land South of Portal way down the A365 south of Portal Road towards the Canal (south of the Great Bear Cereal Distribution Centre)                      ii. Wrapping the land around the Wiltshire Air Ambulance site south towards Semington                      iii. North and West of Bowerhill Trading centre (CMSC Site and Golf Course)                      iv. Fields on A350 south of town and North of the Bowerhill Trading estate – completing the link between Bowerhill and Melksham (Its better for the community if Jobs can be created here instead of earmarking the land for more houses which we have 100 plus alternative sites for                      v. Avon Rubber company Land (Only the Racing division now are on this site and for how long?) Do we want to end up with another 'Usher's brewery site' like Trowbridge when they relocate to a smaller factory. This will happen – it's just when.</p>		<p>Employment policy for this first NP does not allocate land for employment uses</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p><b>Retail / Leisure / Hospitality</b>                      Melksham needs more business's for its existing and present residents to spend its money in. At the moment most will shop outside Melksham for most items except groceries (where we have an abundant choice of supermarkets!!) Having different business gives consumers different reason to visit us. Hundreds and hundreds of jobs could be created i. Again more Jobs will come if we have a more appealing variety of business – not just Takeaways / Pubs / Betting shops / Funeral parlour's / Charity Shops – Business's selling things people need and not prime retail spaces being changed into the afore mentioned!!                      Lastly, I know this will be hard to do as the town residents want shops and business's that other larger towns get. Other towns get these because they have a bigger catchment area of customers and a more 'defined' shopping centre's like 'The Shire's &amp; Castle Place in Trowbridge / Emery Gate in Chippenham / Devizes shopping (300 shops) – The Avon Site Could be our Expanded shopping attraction in the future!! The alternative the town / parish needs other reasons why visitors / residents will come to the area, which could be the Canal Project / A leisure Park or any other major / minor attraction(s) , as the town is on a major A road route to the coast and M4!!</p> <p><b>Community Services</b>                      The following should all be a priority with 2500 new houses and up to 10,000 new residents !!                      i. Another large Doctors surgery – with Full time doctors                      ii. More schools – both Primary &amp; Secondary                      iii. More Town Centre business's (Already discussed above) and shops                      iv. More unknowns – something new ????? <b>(Full comment with Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>		<p>Comments noted</p> <p>The pressure on community facilities is acknowledged and addressed with the agreed scope of the current plan. Potential for CIL funding. Potential link with town centre vision</p>
37	53 - 4.4.3	Need bus route from East Melksham to Melksham Train Station.	Requirement for cycle lane on new bypass when built.	Beyond scope of NP. There is a new Masterplan for the Melksham Railway Station which MRUG (Melksham Rail User Group) are working on with TransWilts. There are current physical restrictions at the station for buses due to the

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
				lack of turning circle, to be resolved by new development.
34		Solar Panels on housing	No just on affordable housing. Should become more standard on new housing.	Agreed. The NP strongly encourages this
35 - 4.2.4		On plot parking – electric car charging point	Good idea. More charging points needed in Town Centre and villages. As technology moves on, new considerations may need to be made.	Potential town/parish council project
57		Community well-being and nature	Require better walking maps off road/ across fields to be produced. Rights of way across fields protected when new housing developments established. Primrose Drive Nature Reserve is a good example of local residents working with councils. Need more areas encouraged like this.	Potential town/parish council project
38		Having tried to work my way through the plan . I didn't see plans for more surgeries. With the expanding housing I believe this is essential. I would like to see an improved rail service . I would also like to see improved leisure facilities, yes we have the blue pool but it's in desperate need of a revamp. Can we not have a cinema etc or buses to Trowbridge that get us home after 17.30		Beyond direct scope of NP. Potential for CIL funding. Potential link with town centre vision. For the latest update and plans for the Melksham Community Campus please visit the dedicated page on Wiltshire Council's website <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus</a>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
39	Page 83 - Draft Priority Statement 3	We welcome the publication of the draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan and would like to thank the steering group for their hard work on this over the last couple of years. It is clear from reading through the plan that the Melksham Community is very much at the heart of the plan, from objectives around sustainability and the environment, through to community engagement and development policies. We note with thanks Draft Priority Statement 3: Employment. As a local employer based on the Bowerhill Industrial Estate employing over 70 people, the support for expansion is very much appreciated.	Due to the nature of our business, unlike many companies, the pandemic has opened up new opportunities and growth for us, meaning that we are rapidly outgrowing our current buildings. Over the last few months, it has become clear to us that we have only two options, expansion of the existing site, or moving to a new site which is likely to be outside of Melksham, or even Wiltshire due to the limited amount of suitable industrial land available. The knowledge that the Melksham Neighbourhood plan would support our growth and expansion and in turn further employment opportunities on Bowerhill is very reassuring and welcome as we start to assess our options moving into the future.	Comments of support noted. Both the qualifying bodies (parish and town council) support the location and expansion of major local employers in the Plan area
40	Page 32 Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management	Both Whitley and Shaw villages are subject to flash surface water flooding during heavy rain. This has resulted in habitation flooding in several properties in recent years.	Further flood alleviation work is required in the villages, both by natural means and hard construction. Any development within the villages must provide flood alleviation works both for the development itself and the villages as a whole.	Noted and addressed by Policy 2
	Page 42 Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley	My preference would be for the development of Whitley Farm as this is within the current settlement boundary. If this is not possible then the Middle Farm development is a good second choice.	Once the settlement boundary is changed for the Middle Farm development it should then be locked for the duration of this Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 55 Figure 10: Key Routes for Walking and Cycling	I note that the footpath from the northern boundary of Shaw playing field to First Lane, Whitley (just west of Laggard Farm) is not included in the Priority or Key walking routes. In my experience this is one of the busiest paths between Whitley and Shaw. The use of this path will also increase if the Priority/Key path from Shaw Hill to the Asda car park (passing west of Shaw House) is improved, as it will be a good alternative to the A365 footpath.	Add this footpath to the Priority walking routes.	The map has been amended accordingly.
41		We are particularly interested when you will replace 30+ years septic tanks in Beanacre for main sewerage? We understand that for some reason all the houses along the main road & Westlands Lane have septic tanks. Surely in this day & age having to share this archaic system with 3 other families in an Urban area so close to Melksham is no longer acceptable? We would like to know when we will be connected to main sewerage?		This is beyond the scope of the NP. MWPC have undertaken a survey of all Beanacre residents and fed results to Wessex Water who are currently reviewing first time drainage for Beanacre under their Business Plan for the next 5 years.
42*	Paragraph 4.4.2 on page 51	Draft Policy 10: Employment sites The former Christie Miller Sports Centre and golf course at Lancaster Road, Bowerhill, Melksham have been closed for some time. The site <b>(Map included within Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b> , which extends to approximately 6.3 hectares (15.5 acres) would be a suitable extension to the Bowerhill Industrial Estate. Accordingly, it should be identified for B Use Class development, potentially including the land between the golf course and the Semington Bypass. Accordingly, it should be identified for B Use Class development, potentially including the land between the golf course and the Semington Bypass. The above would accord with Core Strategy 34: Additional Employment Land	The Principle Employment sites plan at Figure 9 on page 48 could be amended to include the former Christie Miller Sports Centre and golf course. Alternatively, or in addition, the site could be specifically identified for B Use Class development. (NOTE: Map of area provided and saved by MWPC	There is no evidence to support the extended allocation of Employment Sites in the NP

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
43		<p>I have waded through quite a bit of the green infrastructure section of the neighbourhood plan and feel a little drained by the ‘greenspeak’. I’m sure it is written by committed and experienced environmentalists. However, I cannot but feel some simplification would have been useful as to how its planning is to improve our environment. I would like the Council to: Commit to a firm strategy by taking inspiration from the Hippocratic Oath, thus leaving nature to itself by not over managing it. Stop Hedgerow being removed. <b>(photos provided and available on request)</b> These photos were taken a couple of weeks ago at Spa Road, a few days after the contractor removed this hedgerow, a classic example of lack of awareness of critical timing. I realise they need space for a new roundabout but did they have to do it during the nesting season? This careless behaviour should be punished but, if it has been sanctioned by the Council, what hope is there for the rest of our green infrastructure?</p> <p>Hedgerows are not only vital breeding and feeding areas for wildlife but also highways between ever more isolated areas where flora and fauna have not been swept away by development.</p>	<p>Stop excessive roadside mowing. These pictures were taken a few days apart. (MWPC have copied these separately) Stop hedgerows being removed.</p> <p>I have provided a report to Wiltshire Council Highway's about more enlightened councils' (Dorset and Lincolnshire) success in developing wildflower verges, maintaining safety and saving money but did not seem to take my concerns seriously, citing safety as paramount. There may be other important concerns at the moment for the Council but surely saving money and helping the planet should have sparked a little interest.</p> <p>Stop using glyphosate weed killer which is a carcinogenic product and should have no role in any Council activity. Wherever possible, let the landscape look after itself; nature knows best.</p> <p>Encourage and support the farming industry to reduce its impact by using less pesticides and herbicides and allowing more and wider hedgerows / field margins I’m hopeful that post brexit update of farm subsidies will include commitments to this simple benefit. Maintain all public</p>	<p>Review GI supporting text for excessive "greenspeak". Maintenance matters beyond scope of NP.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>footpaths to a passable condition; they should not be ploughed up or fenced off.</p>	
		<p>Stop building more houses on greenfield sites. I think the Council is aware that we have reached the targets for housing in the town. Alas, any bypass will only put more greenfield sites under pressure. Encourage development of dwellings in the town centre by utilising redundant spaces and buildings. Populating the town centre will help towards maintaining its economic viability.</p> <p>Finally, I'm not sure how much power the town council has over roads but I offer this as a suggestion. It can't have escaped people's attention how wonderful the lockdown has been with regard to reduced traffic. Most significant is the reduction in noise levels. There is no doubt that the higher speed of traffic, the noisier the environment becomes. I would like to see all roads in residential areas have a 20mph speed limit. More traffic calming methods introduced will not only reduce noise</p>		<p>Noted. Bypass beyond scope of NP but significant local issue. Strategic housing through Wiltshire Local Plan beyond scope of plan. A greenfield site has been allocated because it is appropriate to meet the locally identified housing need. Beyond direct scope / power of NP, but may be link project with sustainable transport policies. Wiltshire Council have 20mph policies in place and the Town Council are looking at areas where it can be achieved.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		levels but improve road safety. It will give the drivers a little more time to see the flowers at the roadside!		
44		Whilst Seend Parish Council does not wish to make any formal comments on the plan, we would like to pass on our congratulations to all involved in producing such a thorough and comprehensive document for Melksham area. Our own Neighbourhood Plan's Steering Group knows full well the amount of work required to get to this stage. We wish you well with the remainder of the work needed to complete your Neighbourhood Plan and hope that you have in due course a successful referendum.		Noted with thanks
45	Page 14, para 2  Page 16, para 1	I note the comment that Wiltshire Council is likely to allocate some development to Melksham. As Melksham is already over its planned numbers by 17% with another 6 years still left to go is there not an opportunity through the plan to persuade Wiltshire Council that Melksham does not need to contribute further? There is significant development already underway on the area and I am concerned about exacerbating the impact of that.  It would be a useful point of reference, based on the principle of transparency, to have the full 60 sites assessed listed in the plan. This would help residents understand those sites that were not shortlisted. This could be helpful for residents in commenting on any subsequent planning applications made for those sites.	Add drafting proposing that Melksham should not contribute further.  Add an Annex to the Site Assessment Portfolio document listing the 60 sites.	Beyond scope of NP. Ref to Wiltshire Local Plan review process communication  A full index of all 32 assessed sites is available in the Site Assessment Report V3 which contains detailed information on each considered site.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 20, para 2	Whitley has a very special character and distinctiveness and I would like to see this section elaborated a little to bring that out.	Suggested words: Whitley is an ancient centre of population - Historic England, as part of West Wiltshire National Archaeological Identification Survey, has set out clear evidence of historic occupation and settlement. A roman road borders the village. Whitley is mentioned in the Domesday Book. At its heart, the village is an agricultural centre with a number of working farms, and farms that have been converted to residential use but the agricultural land associated with them dispersed to other local farms. The village is rich with listed buildings. The agricultural heritage, the listed buildings along with some other significant 20th century residential development, give Whitley its unique character, charm, and local distinctiveness. All these factors are connected to the importance of the Whitley Settlement Boundary, which serves, in part, to support and protect this special and important identity.	Thank you for the suggested words. Rapid Character and Distinctiveness Statement Updated. Supporting text in the Plan also updated
	Page 31, blue callout box	Farmland is part of our green infrastructure and I think this should be mentioned.	After "woodland", insert "farmland".	Public rights of way across farmland and valued rural views are already considered as GI. Reference to farmland inserted in supporting text

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 33, para 3	The First Lane area in Whitley is particularly prone to flooding (despite recent remediation work) and I would therefore recommend referencing that specifically as that would reinforce the importance of that issue if there were to be any future planning applications in that area, or other areas with similar risks.	Perhaps add a callout box specifically on this, with wording along the lines, reusing some of the existing draft text to serve as a case study: "Whitley as characterised in as an area of "Limescale Lowland". South Brook runs through a floodplain in the south of the village which has experienced serious flooding events over the years around South Brook, Shaw Primary School, First Lane, and local properties and land. Significant Flood events are on record (e.g. January 1925, May 1932, the winter floods of 2013-2014) and there were also two additional incidents of 1 in 150 year storms in August 2012 and September 2014, and further incidents in the early months of 2020. The UK Met Office has predicted a further 35% increase in precipitation in winter. This flood risk is exacerbated by the many drainage streams from the north of the village that outfeed in the First Lane area, and the heavy preponderance of near surface clay in the vicinity."	Noted. Supporting text reviewed
	Page 41, blue callout box	The current Settlement Boundaries are published on the Wiltshire Council webpages. As these boundaries are so important (as described in the draft plan), why not either include the maps in the plan as an Annex or provide the link to them in a footnote. This would be a good point of reference for residents.	Either include the maps in the plan as an Annex or provide the link to them in a footnote.	Overall Strategy map now included in the submission version of the Plan and this includes the boundaries

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Pages 42 and 43, general comments	I note that the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan identifies an allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley, which is also outside the Whitley Settlement Boundary. Whilst I am concerned as a matter of principle regarding any breach of the Settlement Boundary, I am persuaded that this particular development may reflect a "circumstance as permitted by other policies" and because that site does not contain any key planning impediments that may exist on other current or future proposed sites. I am therefore minded to support this proposed Middle Farm development exceptionally on condition that it is the only such development permitted outside the Whitley Settlement Boundary.	Depending on response and comments from others, add a section that states that this policy has local community support subject to some conditions. I also suggest adding some text to show that this is an exceptional case and that whilst outside the settlement boundary there are overriding matters of policy that lead to it being put forward as a policy in the plan.	Suggestions for addressing the allocation of land in Policy 7 noted with thanks and will be used together with other comments to review the policy. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Page 59,	Certainly from a Whitley perspective, and likely for the whole area, I think it would be helpful to give some examples of the wildlife network and sites. For example in First Lane/South Brook area, deer, newts, otters and bats are very common.	Maybe add a callout box to give examples of wildlife and their habitat, perhaps based on South Brook.	Supporting text updated with information about Conigre Mead
	Page 60 Page 61	I support the Canal Link Project. It would be great to have something in the plan about reviewing/supporting additional BAP Habitats (see previous comments).	Either consider another draft policy on this point or add that aspiration in "The reason for the policy" text.	Noted. Supporting text updated with information about Conigre Mead
	Pages 62 and 63	This area is characterised by agricultural land. Whilst this may not always be 100% accessible, the area is crisscrossed with footpaths which are a significant contributor to wellbeing. I would therefore recommend a reference to farmland and footpaths and bridleways in the context of green open space. Even if there are no footpaths etc., such areas are part of the landscape, support carbon reduction, and should be protected as far as possible.	Add text regarding farmland etc. in "The reason for the policy" section.	Supporting text updated
	Page 78	There are many listed building in Whitley and other villages in the area. I suggest some of these villages are mentioned in addition to Melksham Town.	Add a listed building count for Whitley in the first para of "The reason for the policy".	Supporting text updated
	Pages 84 and 85.	I support the plan for a bypass on condition that it is to the east of the area – however please note my comments in the next column about the clarity of the map.	The map in the plan is not easy to read and I recommend the insertion of a sharper image.	Bypass map not included in Submission version of the NP.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 91	I suggest adding a definition of Settlement Boundary.	Suggested text: "A 'settlement boundary' is the dividing line, or boundary between areas of built/urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development – the open countryside. For example a Settlement Boundary provides a transition between individual villages and the countryside and, importantly, supports and protects the separate identity and character of those settlements and beyond."	Settlement Boundary is defined in a call out box on page 40 of the Submission Plan
	Local Landscape Character report, Area 1	As there are two specific sites mentioned in the bullet points (Daniels Wood and South Brook), I suggest including pictures are these sites, with titles, instead of the existing picture.	Delete picture on page 5 and replace with pictures of Daniels Wood and South Brook.	The Landscape Character Report will not be updated at this point.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
46	Page 85 9b, 9c	<p>The low resolution map on page 85 offers a number of Melksham Bypass route options. Although the map is not clear and there are no details included, there are a number of concerns/objections concerning some of the routes in particular routes 9B and 9C. The routes 9b and 9c will end barely northwest of the town centre, offering no advantage to the main bulk of incoming traffic entering from the north along the A350. The routes are also so close to the existing A350 that they deem themselves as irrelevant.</p> <p>Community Facilities- Although the map shows extraordinarily little detail, it is possible to distinguish the parallel "S" formation of Southbrook Road and Addison Road to the left of the point that 9b and 9c run parallel to each other. This would indicate that the route would mean the removal of Southbrook Road allotments. This would therefore fail the intention of the plan to protect community facilities.</p> <p>Flooding- The green alley provided by the field east of Northbrook Road, The allotments, and the adjoining fields at Roundponds are very well established as flood impact areas. Historically, houses were actually removed from the field at Roundponds due to flooding. At the other end (the field adjacent/east of Northbrook Road, the flooding is less obvious to the non informed. Water has reached and surrounded many of the houses over the years. Most homes survived the worst case scenario only because the field is gravel based and therefore allowed the water levels to lower quickly. The brook does not cope on its own as photographic evidence will show. Natural Habitat- The same field is home to very established hedgerows, very tall established trees, and with its vicinity to the brook has become a haven for a vast assortment of wildlife, including otters, hedgehogs (rehabilitated locally), most varieties of British birds including owls, woodpeckers, and even an Egret. The combined area is very special towards the efforts of climate challenge, natural habitat etc.</p>		<p><u>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</u>  <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p> <p>Southbrook Road Allotments shown on the Open Spaces Map Figure 11</p>
47	<p>Page 14, Para 2</p> <p>Page 16, para 1</p>	<p>I am concerned about exacerbating the impact of the significant development already underway in the area. As Melksham is already over its planned numbers by 17% with another 6 years still left to go is there not an opportunity to persuade Wiltshire Council that Melksham does not need to contribute further?</p> <p>It would be helpful for residents to be provided with the 60 sites assessed but that were not shortlisted as it assists our ability to comment fully on any subsequent planning applications made for those sites.</p>	<p>Add a proposal that Melksham should not have to contribute further.</p> <p>Add an Annex listing the 60 sites to the Site Assessment Portfolio document</p>	<p>Wiltshire Local Plan Review issue beyond scope of NP</p> <p>All proposed sites available within background evidence</p>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 33, para 3	The First Lane area in Whitley is prone to flooding (despite recent work) and I would therefore recommend referencing that specifically	Mention the effects of the historic flood events reflected in official records and the fact that even now following the work the school and the vicarage still flood as an example	Supporting text has been reviewed and any appropriate changes made
	Page 41, blue callout box	The current Settlement Boundaries are published on the Wiltshire Council webpages including them in the document would be a good point of reference for residents.	Add the maps to the plan as an Annex	Map with settlement boundaries added
	Pages 42 and 43, general comments	I am supportive of the allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley, for development but note that it sits outside the Whitley Settlement Boundary so my support is given with the clear caveat that it is the only development permitted outside the Whitley Settlement Boundary and the remainder of the boundary will remain protected.	Add a section that states that this policy has local community support subject to conditions that it will be the only alteration to the Settlement Boundary for the village and that this is an exceptional case.	Referendum will convey support
	Page 60	I support the Canal Link Project.		Noted
	Pages 84 and 85.	I support the plan for a bypass on condition that it is to the east of the area		<u>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</u> <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
48	page 54/ 4.4.3	<p>Note error in text. Trains from the station run approximately every hour each way between Westbury and Swindon. should read Trains from the station run approximately every TWO HOURS each way between Westbury and Swindon. The plan is for a doubling of this service to every hour in the future, with this being in the TransWilts and LEP plans. The DA3 operation award to GWR specifies an extra 2 trains in the contract, though this is suspended until 20th September under Coronavirus emergency measures, as is the additional Saturday evening service that was due to start in May. With ongoing plans to increase the service, the current lower service which has already brought a 25 fold passenger increase in 6 years (3000 to 75000 journeys per annum) becomes a more powerful pointer towards just how much we have to grow - estimates vary between 250,000 and 600,000 journeys per annum in around a decade with an hourly service each way.</p>	<p>Amend proposal document to correct to "Every 2 hours". Include aspiration for a service increase to a minimum of hourly each way during most of the day.</p>	Text amended
	page 53/ 4.4.3/ draft policy 11	<p>We fully support the sustainable transport model, with people encouraged to move as high up this list as practical, and for Melksham to move forward to make that movement up much easier. (1. Walking, 2. Cycling, 3. Public Transport, 4. Freight and taxi, Private powered vehicle). This should be coupled with suitable arrangements to support those with mobility disabilities. Although not directly within the scope of the NHP, the current Covid situation has necessitated working from home for many people. How this will continue in the future is not clear, but it has many merits from a sustainability perspective, and we would encourage new housing and infrastructure to ensure this will always be possible. Cycling and walking are distance-limited (severely for many), and buses and trains do not call at every house. For this reason, the plan should (and does) provide where practical, for good access to public transport hubs by walking and cycling routes to facilitate the overall journey, especially where modes from the upper half of the sustainability tree are used for the longer sections of those journeys. Many residents of Melksham do not have access to private cars. A strong integrated public transport provision will improve their quality of life and reduce their economic call on social and individual support services</p>	<p>Ensure the needs of disabled travellers are included.</p>	Supporting text amended

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>page 55/ 4.4.3/ Fig 10 Key walking &amp; cycling routes</p>	<p>(a) We suggest that the map should show the old Bath Road from the corner of Old Broughton Road to the A350 underpass as a key walking and cycling route, in the same way that extensions off both ends are shown. This corridor is already cycle and pedestrian friendly but should be included in the plan to ensure its maintenance as a vital route. Unverified estimates (based on survey data now 3 years old) are that 70% of rail passengers at Melksham station get to the station on foot/cycle, with two thirds of those arriving from the town. It is possible that this percentage may drop if better town bus integration with the station is implemented.</p> <p>(b) We suggest that the plan/map should also highlight the advantages for a cycle and pedestrian routes from the A365 / A350 junction and underpass down Station Approach to the Station and beyond to Foundry Close (the so-called 'Northern' access to the station). This route, which requires a short obstruction section to be modified, would save up to 600 metres of walking / cycling distance to some residences, and over 400m saved to a much wider area including links to other paths and cycleways already highlighted in the plan. For example, it would reduce the distance to Forest Road (across the river via the Murray Walk bridge) such that a large part of Melksham Forest will be brought within 'normal walking distance' of the station.</p> <p>(c) We would encourage the development of a new walking route (approximately 300m) from the end of the current path on the South East corner of the Farmer's Roundabout to the existing walking route at Conigre Mead Nature reserve. This short section of path is alongside the current A350 and would provide an extra pedestrian crossing over the river, and a shortened walking route from the Station, ASDA and north Melksham to the Hazelwood Road area, south Melksham and Bowerhill. The bridge has a wide pedestrian parapet which may make such a route straightforward to implement there. About 100m of new pathway would also be required beside the A350 to the north and south of the bridge.</p> <p>(d) The Town Bridge is something of a "pinch point" for walkers and cyclists at present, and the plan should note that it is a key walking and cycling route to minimize any further reduction in the width of the route. Multiple walking and cycling routes filter down to this bridge which only has provision for walking and trunk road traffic, with recently installed barriers constraining pedestrians to a passageway as narrow as 1.2 metres, and giving cyclists the choice of walking their cycles (a problem</p>	<p>We suggest that the map should show the old Bath Road from the corner of Old Broughton Road to the A350 underpass as a key walking and cycling route, in the same way that extensions off both ends are shown. We suggest that the plan/map should also highlight the advantages for a cycle and pedestrian routes from the A365 /A350 junction and underpass down Station Approach to the Station and beyond to Foundry Close (the so-called 'Northern' access to the station). Include development of a new walking route (approximately 300m) from the end of the current path on the South East corner of the Farmer's Roundabout to the existing walking route at Conigre Mead Nature reserve The plan should note that the town bridge is a key walking and cycling route to minimize any further reduction in the width of the route.</p>	<p>The map has been reviewed and amended as appropriate.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		when two meet in the middle) or cycling on the narrow roadway without the option to step off their cycles onto the pathway.		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
49	Page 42 4.3.3 Policy 7	<p>The AECOM survey states “The site may be appropriate for taking forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. However there are a number of constraints which would need to be overcome to enable development, including potential impacts on the road network”. This is not a convincing recommendation, particularly when “there is no remaining housing requirement for the Melksham Area Neighbourhood Plan in the Plan period to 2026”.</p> <p>There is also plans to develop an area on First Lane, Whitley, which is a more suitable site as it does not extend the village boundary and has less impact on agricultural land, so this development on Corsham Road is unnecessary.</p> <p>As identified by AECOM survey, the road network is likely to be impacted. This is already a busy road, and an additional junction at the end of the village (where vehicles often exceed speed limit due to straight road and change in speed limits), will create an additional hazard. There will be more traffic because of additional housing which the already busy road will struggle to cope with.</p> <p>A question in the site survey asks, “Could the site be home to protected species such as bats, great crested newts, badgers etc?” There are bats present in and around this field and can often be seen in our garden at dusk. The loss of such wildlife will be a huge loss.</p> <p>As identified, the site is “Gently sloping from the north-west to the south-east of the site”. This leads to significant water run-off, causing flooding to nearby gardens. Building on the site would negatively impact the drainage, increasing the problem. This is particularly concerning for our property on Corsham Road as the house sits approximately 1 metre below the level of the field.</p> <p>As mentioned previously, our house sits approximately 1 metre below the level of the field. Therefore, any building will have a greater impact on the light entering the north face of our property. This will also greatly affect our privacy; the housing will be at a higher level than our property and the houses will be able to look down into our home</p>		The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
50	1. 1.2 What area does this Neighbourhood Plan cover	<p>The Neighbourhood plan needs to capture what has been done for the local community successes so far – how they have been received and welcomed. Also consider where there have been failures:</p> <p>The plan should be a vision for the future ‘our intention’ seeking support and offering consultation if required on aspects for the future.</p>		Noted. Section 5 contains priority statements (Page 82 onwards) which detail priorities for the qualifying bodies (town and parish council) that are outside of the scope of the Plan.

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 15: Community Facilities	<p>Sports provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is happening in regard to Campus?. Melksham / Bowerhill have lost an abundance of community facilities in respect of the Christie Miller centre – this was on the premise that a Campus would be built – this has not yet happened. The plan should explain what has happened here. Why has this initiative so far failed and what is being done to resolve the situation? Can any interim provisions be identified and utilised such as local schools for badminton in the evenings for instance?</li> <li>• Can assurance be given that the sports field provisions in the community will remain – such as the football field in Bowerhill?</li> <li>• Rugby and Football provision has been made – focus on this – does this provision fulfil community need?. Are there any pro's / con's – aspects to praise or area's to be considered.</li> <li>• New ideas arising from Covid? – a hard floored canopy covered sheltered area could be built in George V park that can be booked by community groups to allow activities such as line dancing / pilates – any group based activity currently restricted by Covid 19 provisions.</li> </ul>		<p><u>Protection of facilities covered by policy. Covid ideas potentially to be taken up by Parish/Town Councils. For the latest update and plans for the Melksham Community Campus please visit the dedicated page on Wiltshire Council's website</u>  <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus</a></p>
	Draft Policy 14: Open Spaces 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is being done to maintain and develop local nature provision?. Especially in the time of Covid – when access to the countryside has been so vital. Focus of areas of community benefit – how these can be assured and supported for the future. Giles Wood for instance in Bowerhill should be maintained and supported at all costs.</li> <li>• Other areas available to the Council that could be championed as Wildlife preserves such as the old Christie Miller golf course</li> </ul>		<p><u>Policies 12 (Green Infrastructure), 13 (Biodiversity) and 16 (Trees and Hedgerows) address the question of local nature provision.</u>  <u>Town and Parish Council also to address through practical projects. Please note that Giles Wood is in Seend and therefore out of the scope of this NP, but please refer to Seend NP</u>  <a href="https://www.seendparishplan.org/neighbourhood-plan-information.html">https://www.seendparishplan.org/neighbourhood-plan-information.html</a></p>
	Draft Policy 16: Trees and Hedgerows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect local green spaces – such as the common area in Bowerhill near Bowerhill school. There is a central green area surrounded by housing and hedgerow – used on a daily basis by the community. Houses surrounding this area keep trying to land grab – cut trees down and remove habitat for wildlife. Put a stop to this.</li> </ul>		<p>This space is identified for protection in the open spaces map and policy (14).</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Draft Policy 6: Housing in Defined Settlements 40 Draft Policy 8: Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities</p>	<p>Housing &amp; Infrastructure :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The total of 2,773 shows that the housing actually delivered/committed was 17% over the indicative housing requirements set out by the Core Strategy.</li> <li>• There is therefore no specific requirement for this Plan to allocate sites for housing</li> </ul> <p>Previous feedback to the plan illustrates that new housing development must be supported by the necessary infrastructure services, facilities, transport and healthcare. Recent build and expansion has already put a strain on Melksham and the surrounding area and the Infrastructure support has not kept in line with the development. Housing development is already in excess of 17% of the commitment required in the core plan and that is without any future provision being considered. Why does housing provision keep increasing without the necessary support provision? Maybe a pause is needed so aspects can align. Expansion has been too rapid. If roads are struggling it is because of the excess houses being built and action being taken by neighbouring councils to divert traffics to our roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly state in the plan – how local infrastructure has grown with new development is it meeting the levels required for the housing introduced?.</li> <li>• Ensure infrastructure preceeds new housing builds and is not an add on that may or may not be met by developers – if they have sufficient funding left.</li> </ul> <p>When approving new developments consider if brown field sites can be utilised in the first instance.</p> <p>Consider the existing use of the current business / use of land in the vicinity. Existing businesses in Bowerhill industrial estate for example should not have to adapt their working practices as housing is being built adjacent to them. If a change to business practice was required planning permission should not have been given to the housing.</p>		<p>Noted. Policy 8 details Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 11: Sustainable Transport and Active Travel	<p>• Figure 19: Melksham By-pass Route Options (There are 8 potential routes for the bypass) – however the routes affecting Bowerhill have been put forward as preferred choices in local media                      Note no route option has been decided. The highway corridors are illustrative only and do not imply any specific alignment of new roads</p> <p>New housing developments have been built without consideration of how the land or surrounding area could be used for the provision of a bypass.                      Existing countryside and community area is threatened.                      Though no route has been decided the proposals for the bypass as highlighted by the media focus on the options close to or around Bowerhill. There are 8 to be consider and ‘the favoured’ proposal should not be a forgone conclusion. As lockdown illustrated the area from Bowerhill to the canal – is essential to the community. In use continually and a haven for residents. Giles wood should certainly be protected and there should be NO housing developments encroaching on the canal removing the beauty for all.                      Champion your green spaces and areas of interest. Take them away and all Melksham / Bowerhill will be is one extended housing estate.</p>		<p>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.  <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>
51*	Draft Policy 10	No provision made for new employment land	Make an allowance for employment land using the submitted site adjoining the A350 (refer to submitted statement)	There is no evidence to support the extended allocation of Employment Areas in the NP
	Draft Priority Statement 3 ‘Employment’	This statement proposes the allocation of additional employment land to extend the Bowerhill Industrial Estate. <b>(Fuller response in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b>	Amend the draft plan to include positive policy on the extension of Bowerhill Industrial Estate (rather than a statement of intent) please refer to submission statement.	There is no evidence to support the extended allocation of Employment Areas in the NP
52	4.2.3 Local Energy Generation p.34	4.2.3 Local Energy Generation p.34	Possible more use of wind turbines and solar panels	Renewable sources of energy generation are supported in the NP

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	4.4.3 Sustainable Transport and Active Travel p.53 5. Priority Statements p.81	<p>Improved use of public transport. Very nice to see the new railway station plans</p> <p>My primary concern is that by becoming a larger town, Melksham will lose the community and 'homely' feel it has. It may then have a city feel and for a lot of people who enjoy the simple life and quieter town.</p> <p>I think priority should be given to developing greener/natural spaces and more eco-friendly infrastructures. Such as more footpaths, encouraging less use of the car and more public ecological transport. The construction of the new by-pass route is controversial, because we are reducing traffic in one area, increasing it in another, degrading the countryside and natural surroundings of Melksham. A lot of people cycle and enjoy long walks to, from town, and along the canal. Reducing traffic all together would be more sustainable as we do not have enough cycle and bike lanes. I support the plans to become more self-sufficient.</p> <p>I do feel we strive hard and put in place wonderful infrastructures, plans and community projects. And I do support the majority of the new proposals put forwards in the Neighbourhood Plans by our local council. I do also support obtaining more investments.</p>	<p>More cycle lanes and walk ways.</p> <p>Less car use.</p> <p>More public transport.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Thank you for your detailed comments</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
53*	Planning Policy Background and the general approach taken in draft JMNP	<p>...Charterhouse Strategic Land welcomes the draft JMNP's approach to future housing development in the town. It recognises that Wiltshire Council is likely to allocate land for development through the Local Plan Review process and given that no final decision has yet been made on the precise scale or location of any allocation, it is noted that the Town Council has agreed with Wiltshire Council that the draft JMNP should not reach decisions on, or move to allocate, any sites in or on the edge of Melksham. Furthermore, the draft JMNP outlines a joint approach with Wiltshire Council which reflects paragraph 009 of the Guidance. Charterhouse Strategic Land supports this approach, though is clear that the JMNP, if adopted as currently drafted, would not trigger the provisions of paragraph 14 of the Framework as it does not identify a housing requirement for Melksham and criterion b) of that paragraph requires that "the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement".</p>		Noted

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 38, para. 4.3.1	<p>Draft Policy 5: Pre-application Community Engagement begins by stating that “Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community will be looked on more favourably than applications that have not.”. Whilst the wording in support of the policy clearly outlines the benefits of early and meaningful community engagement and the advice contained within the Framework, Charterhouse Strategic Land is concerned at a potentially prejudicial implication within this current policy wording that community engagement will automatically engender a proposal with a level of support irrespective of its merits and compliance with planning policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is noted that paragraph 004 of the Guidance states that “A neighbourhood plan should ... contain policies for the development and use of land...Wider community aspirations than those relating to the development and use of land, if set out as part of the plan, would need to be clearly identifiable (for example, set out in a companion document or annex), and it should be made clear in the document that they will not form part of the statutory development plan.”.</p> <p>Charterhouse Strategic Land is concerned that as currently drafted, Policy 5 is not a policy for the development and use of land. Paragraph 041 of the Guidance states that “A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications”. In this case, a decision maker would not be able to use draft policy 5 when determining planning applications; for example, it is not a policy that a decision-maker could include in a list of refusal reasons. Rather it is an advisory procedural statement, expressing an (understandable) aspiration for applicants to engage in proactive and effective engagement on development proposals. The process for this is already outlined within the Pre-Application Community Engagement Protocol and the wording supporting the draft policy hints at this, stating that “Although applicants</p>	<p>Charterhouse Strategic Land therefore recommends that draft policy 5 is removed as it fails to meet the basic conditions. Charterhouse Strategic Land supports the draft JMNP’s aspiration to strongly encourage applicants to undertake pre-application engagement and suggests that applicants should be directed to the Protocol, which should be included as an annex to the plan.</p>	<p>Policy retained, but revised. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		cannot be required, only encouraged, to undertake early stage community involvement, putting in place a coherent and consistent approach, in the form of the Protocol (rather than the policy) is a key way to deliver this mutual benefit” (emphasis added).		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Site Assessment report and accompanying proformas, AECOM</p>	<p>Charterhouse Strategic Land wishes to make a number of comments regarding the draft JMNP's Site Assessment report and accompanying proformas. These documents have been prepared for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group by AECOM and are dated September 2018. The land west of the A350 which Charterhouse Strategic Land is currently promoting is referred to as 'Site 10: Land between the Railway Line and Beanacre Road' in these documents. Our comments relate not only to the assessment of this site, but also to the general methodology used in making the site assessments and a number of errors and inconsistencies across the site assessments. <b>(Fuller Response in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>	<p>.....Bearing in mind all of the above, Charterhouse Strategic Land believes that the conclusion that site 10 is 'unsuitable for development' is clearly erroneous and should be amended to 'this site has minor constraints'. Furthermore, as outlined within these representations, these minor constraints are not insurmountable and Charterhouse Strategic Land supports the conclusion of Wiltshire Council's SHELAA assessment that the site is 'developable' and 'deliverable' in line with the Framework's definition; it is available now, offers a suitable location for development now, and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing could be delivered on the site within five years.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the draft JMNP only allocates one site in the Neighbourhood Area and specifically avoids allocations in or adjoining Melksham to avoid prejudging potential allocations of the forthcoming Local Plan Review, the site assessment documents remain important given the stated intention in the draft JMNP that these documents and the rest of the</p>	<p>The evidence base used in this NP will be reviewed again for suitability of use for any subsequent allocation process.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>draft JMNP's evidence base will in time be made available to Wiltshire Council to supplement the Local Plan Review's evidence base.</p>	
54		<p><b>Whitley Farm</b>                      In conjunction with the new housing proposal could an area be set aside for village parking? This would assist in providing a parking area should we retain our Post Office/Shop. It could also provide parking for visitors and ramblers who wish to walk to the Roman Road and Quarry area. This area is used for dog walkers and horseriders and can be accessed via the footpath and Littleworth Lane.                      As Whitley Farm is a listed building of some considerable importance any new housing should be aesthetically designed to suit the location. High density building should not be allowed.</p>		Site not allocated

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Fig 8 Site 12	<p><b>Draft Policy 4 Middle Farm</b>                      Access although a single road access is indicated onto Corsham Road this is potentially dangerous. Despite traffic speed restrictions, vehicles are generally far exceeding the speed limits - reasons being it is a straight road following a fast bend. In order to make this access safe, traffic calming measures should be installed, in addition, there are no pavements on the East side of Corsham Road at this point. With reference to the community area, there are high voltage cables crossing the North side of this proposal which area undesirable. This proposed area of agricultural land - green belt has been the source of flooding further down Corsham Road. There is historical proof of this from reports carried out and documented by Wiltshire Council drainage engineers. In addition, surface water drainage on the East and West of Corsham Road has proven in the past to be inadequate/non existent, any surface water from the proposed housing would have to be designed to improve the existing situation.</p> <p>As an alternative to housing why can't this area be improved by tree planting and a community area. This would screen the Beanacre Sub Station from view. There is little evidence of any planting being carried out in Whitley. To the contrary, many trees and hedgerows have disappeared in this area. This proposed development would be outside the village perimeter and would open the flood gates to other developments in the village.</p>		<p>Concerns about allocation noted. Detailed design will resolve necessary measures. Allocation does not facilitate further development beyond site.</p> <p>The policy has been revised in response to this and other comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
	Fig 19	<p>The By-pass should be on the East side of Melksham where the majority of new housing developments is being built. This would give easy access for the local traffic and avoid congestion in the town centre.</p>		<p><u>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</u>  <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Fig 2	<p>Should Melksham to Bath buses drop or stop off at Melksham Station to facilitate onward rail travel.</p> <p><b>First Lane, Whitley</b>  <b>There is speculation that Ashford Homes have put forward a proposal for a housing development on the South side of First Lane adjacent to Lagards Farm. This is NOT mentioned in the plan but if true, should be commented on. This development appears completely inappropriate, given the flooding that has occurred in this area, although remedial work has been carried out, the flooding issue has been pushed further downstream putting Corsham Road, Shaw School, The Vicarage and maybe others at risk. The green separation area between Shaw and Whitley should be mentioned. The timing of this proposal seems ill conceived. If this becomes a planning application it should be dismissed.</b></p>		<p>Outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. There are current physical restrictions at the station for buses due to the lack of turning circle, to be resolved by new development Outside of NP scope.                      Addressed through existing adopted policy framework.                      Refer to planning application for dwellings at land on First Lane 20/05766/OUT</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p><b>Amenities</b>                      The loss of the 'Toast Office' earlier this year was most unfortunate, but in particular the loss of the 'Post Office'. This is a great blow to the village, the amenity will be badly missed. The recent planning application to convert the shop into residential accommodation reduces the chances of this reopening in this location. If an alternative location could be found it could be a community project to include shop, Post Office, coffee shop run by volunteers. This could be a large asset to Whitley as I believe this type of operation is being run success in other villages in the area. There are many senior citizens who greatly miss the convenience of a local Post Office.</p>		<p>On 19/8/20 Wiltshire Council made a decision not to list Whitley Village Shop, 116 Top Lane, Whitley, Wiltshire, SN12 8QU as an Asset of Community Value. "Having considered all the information and submissions provided, following the nomination of Whitley Village Shop to be listed as an Asset of Community Value, Wiltshire Council has decided not to enter the property onto the list of Assets of Community Value. The asset has been entered into a list of unsuccessful nominations, maintained online at <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planninganddevelopment/planningcommunityrighttobid.htm#relateddocuments">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planninganddevelopment/planningcommunityrighttobid.htm#relateddocuments</a>." A community group has been set up by local residents to look at setting up and running a community shop, and the latest update can be found on their dedicated website <a href="https://whitleycommunityhub.com">https://whitleycommunityhub.com</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
55	Site Assessment Report (Sept 2018) and the draft Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>This representation is submitted in respect of land off Woodrow Road, Melksham, titled Site Number 31 in the Assessment Report.</p> <p>The assessment of the site is completely inaccurate and in conflict with the findings of the Council in refusing an application for the development of 77 units on site. That application (reference 16/05644/OUT) proposed the development of 77 units and was refused on 31.3.17 – some 18 months before the Site Assessment Report was issued.</p> <p>That application was refused at a time when Wiltshire Council concluded that they could demonstrate a five year land supply and therefore there was no requirement to permit development beyond settlement limits.</p> <p>The Delegated Report confirmed that there were no heritage or landscape reasons to refuse the scheme and neither the heritage or landscape consultees objected to the scheme. As with any new development beyond the settlement limits (that were set to meet historic housing land requirements) there would be a very limited and localised landscape impact.</p> <p>Despite this position, 18 months later the evidence base for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan has reached a completely different and unsubstantiated conclusion (pages 40-41 of the Site Assessment Report) that it was not appropriate to take the site forward.</p> <p>This approach is wholly inaccurate and out of kilter with the detailed analysis undertaken by specialist consultees and Council Officers in determining the application.</p>	<p>The approach to considering the subject site is therefore completely flawed and inaccurate.</p> <p>Based on this, it is clear that the evidence base for the emerging plan as a whole is flawed and therefore the conclusions drawn in the Site Assessment Report and carried through to the draft Plan can be given no weight.</p> <p>For example, the draft Plan allocation at Policy 7 has been clearly made on the basis of a flawed assessment as sites have not been appraised accurately.</p> <p>The subject site is in a highly accessible and sustainable location and has been dismissed on the basis of an inaccurate broad brushed assessment that ignored all detailed information provided to the emerging Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>There can therefore be no confidence in the fact that the emerging Plan is based on an accurate evidence base and these errors must be rectified before the Plan proceeds to Examination.</p> <p>We would also note that the draft Plan has sought to allocate a single site for a small residential development in order to meet the minimum requirements to qualify for</p>	<p>Concerns about the Site Assessment Report (Aecom 2018) noted. The assessment concluded "Whilst the site is within proximity to local services and facilities in Melksham town, there are significant constraints to development including relating to landscape and townscape character, the disturbance of locally significant features of archaeological interest, the suitability of the existing access into the site, and its visibility from surrounding areas. As planning application '16/05644/OUT' for 77 residential dwellings was rejected on similar grounds, it is considered that this site is not appropriate to take forward for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan."</p> <p>The decision has been made only to allocate in the rural areas of the Plan area. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham.</p> <p>The evidence base used in this NP will be reviewed again for suitability of use for any subsequent allocation process.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			enhanced protection under Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The Plan should be amended to deliver a significant growth in housing supply in line with the requirements of the NPPF.	

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
56*	Draft Policies 9, 11, 15	<p>The access to our future campus needs to be considered in a more practical way. With present plans, entrance to the campus from the Market Place for vehicles will not only create traffic problems, but incur a large expense to widen the currently proposed entrance for two-way, plus foot and cycle, traffic.</p> <p><b>(Full response in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>		<p>The reponse details practical suggestions for access to the <u>future Campus which is outside the scope of the NP</u>. For the latest update and plans for the <u>Melksham Community Campus</u> please visit the dedicated page on <u>Wiltshire Council's website</u> <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus</a></p>
57	Page 30 - Draft Policy 1	I support sustainable design and construction on the basis that I feel any new developments should minimize their detrimental effect on their environment and be as energy efficient as possible.	Ensure that all future developments include some sort of provision for solar or geo-thermal energy production	The NP policy strongly encourages the use of renewable energy
	Page 34 - Draft Policy 3	I support the localized generation of energy in order to protect the precious environment and natural assets of the area	Look into the feasibility of solar power generation using the roof of Shaw Village Hall.	Implementation community project beyond scope of NP
	Page 43 - Draft Policy 7	I support the allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley on the basis that it provides for managed provision of existing housing (including affordable housing) whilst retaining the hedgerows and natural landscape of the area.		Noted
	Page 84	<p>Draft Priority Statement 4: Transport Infrastructure - By-Pass</p> <p>I support bypass options 10a, 10b or 10c (preferred) on the basis that they provide a viable route for commercial and public road users to bypass Melksham to access the industrial areas to the south east of the town and beyond without travelling through already heavily developed residential areas to the west of Melksham or routing traffic via already congested junctions to the west of the town.</p>		<p>The Bypass is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but has been included as an important local issue that is a priority to the Town and Parish Council. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p> <p><a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
58	Page 60	<p><i>Melksham Canal Link Project</i>  <i>“The project will need to be financed largely by new housing alongside the new canal link, which does not form part of the present planning application”</i>  <i>Why is this the case? The Canal Link planning application needs to include all aspects of the project and not add in significant changes such as this in a piecemeal way.</i>  <i>What other options for funding the Canal Link have been explored and why have they been discounted?</i></p>	<p>Would not wish this statement to be included as part of the neighbourhood plan until such time as full plans for the Canal Link and how it is to be funded have been made public and there has been opportunity for comment and debate. Including this statement now is premature; inclusion may influence future and current planning debate by giving the Canal Link project leverage by being part of Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p><u>"Enabling Development" is Wiltshire Council's agreed "delivery mechanism". for the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal and this statement is therefore not considered sensitive. For latest update on the Melksham Link canal project, please go to the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal Trust website</u>  <a href="https://www.wbct.org.uk/">https://www.wbct.org.uk/</a></p>
	Page 40-41 Para 4.3.2 Settlement Boundaries	<p><i>“At the small villages, development will be limited to infill within the existing built area, or where appropriate outside the built area, but well connected to it, as a rural exception site to provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs.”</i>  <i>Draft Policy 6: Housing in Defined Settlements</i>  <i>(Berryfield is identified as a small village by Core Strategy Policies 1 and 15)</i>  <i>If the Canal Link project was to be financed by new housing alongside the canal link this will not be driven by identified local need but by the need to fund the Canal Link project – the 2 requirements appear to have contradictory priorities.</i>  <i>“Given that the Melksham Community area has already exceeded the indicative housing requirements set out for it by the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Neighbourhood Plan supports small scale, windfall development within settlements that has regard to the scale and character of the local community and helps to meet local housing need.”</i>  <i>Building outside of the small village known as Berryfield, but keeping that development connected to Berryfield, will, by its very nature, alter the scale and character of the local community that is Berryfield.</i></p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
59	Page 42	<p>Whilst we do not object to the development, we do have concerns as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the proposed site is too close to existing properties opposite side of road and would recommend access nearer Top Lane with a possible roundabout.</li> <li>2. Visibility to the site access is a major concern and would require a lengthy splay which could harm the retained hedge. It is import to us local residents to ensure existing hedge is retained.</li> <li>3. We have concerns about the increased volume of traffic onto Corsham Road and would propose traffic calming measures. Corsham Road is a very straight run and traffic invariably speeds through the village. A proposed roundabout would inevitably slow traffic down.</li> <li>4. We have concerns about the proposed recreation area as children would need to cross Corsham Road to access the development or village. We proposed pedestrian crossings by means of a zebra crossing or pedestrian lights.</li> <li>5. We request proposed houses are not located directly overlooking our properties opposite the development and set far enough back to ensure minimal effect on open space feel and noise reduction.</li> <li>6. We request the proposed properties are no greater than 1-2 storey to ensure our views across the fields are not diminished in any way.</li> </ol>		<p>Amenity issues addressed in allocation criteria. Highway safety will be assessed at application stage</p>
60*	Page 85 9b, 9c	<p>The low resolution map on page 85 offers a number of Melksham Bypass route options. Although the map is not clear and there are no details included, there are a number of concerns/objections concerning some of the routes in particular routes 9B and 9C.</p> <p><b>NOTE: Full comments can be found in Appendix 5 to the Consultation Statement.</b></p>	<p>Having been alerted to the proposals contained in the development plan, we would like to add our support to Mr. Reeves' objections and wish to add our objections to the list</p>	<p>The Bypass map will not be included in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan due to the fact that there are a number of unresolved elements to the proposal at this stage. Decisions linked to the By-pass are outside the scope of the NP, but the by-pass has been included as a key local issue that the Town and Parish Council will engage with. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
				<a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
61	Page 40 4.3.2	Housing development not suitable for this village as it is already at 17% - 20% over the agreed limit.	Seek brown field sites	Opposition to allocation noted. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 42 4.3.3	This particular proposal will bring extra pollution, vehicles, traffic problems. The Corsham road is already busy – Shaw school already provides a pinch point – there are already concerns with flooding. There is concern over plans to build an additional 9 houses on a site at the end of Middle Lane / Corsham road this will also cause traffic problems and may be prone to flooding.	Seek brown field sites.	Opposition to allocation noted. Due to a lack of supply since 2001, rural settlement affordable housing need has not been met in the neighbourhood plan area. This is distinct to that of Melksham and would not be addressed through strategic Local Plan allocations. Meeting rural affordable housing needs will be addressed by this Neighbourhood Plan though the allocation of land at Middle Farm Whitley. The Ashford Homes scheme at First Lane is outside of the scope of the NP.
62		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thank you all for the hard work. You done good</li> <li>2. Add 'bus' to the substantial transport options</li> <li>3. Charging points for all electric vehicles (not just cars)</li> <li>4. Physical infrastructure to allow for interchange between transport modes</li> <li>5. Old Bath Road to appear as a key foot and cycle route</li> <li>6. Melksham Station to Foundry Close to be added as a foot and cycle route</li> <li>7. Increase cycle and foot provision for crossing the river</li> <li>8. Public transport improvements to include rail and bus interchange at station</li> <li>9. Amend the statement on current train service level at Melksham Station</li> </ol> <p>A big thank you to everyone who has put in their thought, skill and time to getting the plan to this stage and congratulations on a job pretty well done. Comments/suggestions for change (below) are picking up on a small number of issues, some very specialist; it's the nature of such things to focus on areas of concern and result in a negative looking response, so I wanted to say "good job" at the top.</p>		Points noted and taken on board when reviewing the draft plan

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Section 3.1 Page 24	A sustainable transport network will be promoted, so that options such as walking and cycling to work, the town centre or local facilities will be a choice open to as many of our residents as possible and we will make full use of a key local asset, the Melksham Railway Station. - Good but many of our residents are unable to walk or cycle more than a very short distance and sustainable journey options multiply if you include buses and integrate the modes.	Walking and cycling to work "walking, cycling or TAKING THE BUS to work"	Public transport noted in the supporting text to policy 11.
			Melksham Railway Station - "Melksham Train and bus interchange at the Railway Station"	Text for the Railway Station updated
	Page 35 - Section 4.2.4 - Draft Policy 4	All new houses with on plot parking spaces and/or garages should provide appropriately located charging technology for charging low emission vehicles, such as an electric car charging point - Not just cars - all vehicles, be that works vans taken home and power assisted cycles and scooters.	Include "such as electric vehicle charging points".	This comment, together with other comments has informed the revision of this policy. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Page 44 - Section 4.3.4 - Draft Policy 8	"Physical infrastructure: eg sustainable transport link and town centre regeneration" should also acknowledge multiple mode journeys such as cycling into town to get the bus or taking the bus or cycling to the station - many journeys that could be made by mass transit which is greener than the private car are put off by the awkwardness of the final mile.	change "sustainable transport link" to "sustainable and integrated transport links".	Policy amended. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Page 55 - Section 4.4.3 - Fig 10	The Old Bath Road (from the corner of Old Broughton Road to the A350 cycle and pedestrian underpass) is already well used as a cycleway and footpath between the town centre and the station (and North Melksham and Roundpond too), but is not marked on the map as a walking and cycling route.	Add this section to the map as a key part of the walking and cycling route network. It's there already, but needs to be on the map to be protected.	The map has been reviewed
	Page 55 - Section 4.4.3 - Fig 10	Wiltshire Council owns 1. Land/road at Station Approach (including station access) 2. Road at Foundry Close - Both are open access to the public. They are adjoining, but passage between them is blocked by a high fence. It is a walk of some 700 metres from the station platform to residences in Foundry Close at present, including two crossings of the A350. This would reduce to 100 metres with no road crossings if the track north from the station was extended for cycles and pedestrians up to the fence, which was then removed. A footpath and road already runs up to within 1 metre of the fence on the Foundry Close side. Other improvements in walking and cycling distances via this new access would include:	Additional aspiration for cycle and footpath from Melksham Station to Foundry Close should be added.	The map has been reviewed and updated where appropriate

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>a) About 500 metres shorter walk - to Avon Road, Granville Road areas and Leekes department store                      b) About 400 metres shorter walk - To Scotland Road and via Murray Walk to Melksham Forest and the new route would bring Aldi, McDonald's and the shops on Granville Road onto the natural walk to/from the station, to the benefit of those businesses and of train passengers. The A350 bus stop (buses to Beanacre and Lacock) would also come into easy distance of the station.</p>		
	<p>Map in Section 2.6/Fig 6 refers Fig 10/Page 55/within section 4.4.3 relates - draft priority statement 4 (page 84)</p>	<p>a) Cross river capacity for walkers and cyclists is limited to the town bridge and Scotland Road bridge with railings on the town bridge making it a significant pinch point that already needs to be addressed as the sustainable transport model with modal shift to walking and cycling comes into play. Further cross river self propelled traffic is likely to be generated by redevelopment on the north west bank and housing development and town centre somewhat re-baised towards leisure and personal services from retail which continues and will continue to move out of town and online.                      b) The direct route from the Hazelwood area to The City/Asda/Railway station over the Challymead Bridge is impractical to use by all but the bravest of cyclists or walkers.</p>	<p>The plan should look to provide extra connectivity across the river for cyclists and walkers                      i) A shared cycle lane and footpath should be added from the rear (A350) entrance of Melksham Cemetery to Farmers Roundabout, joining up to existing paths (some of which are poorly used) and the proposed strategic path at the south end and to the existing path ends at the roundabout. The parapet of the Challymead Bridge is already wide enough to support this path, though obstacles would need to be moved. Safety/clear air issues on/beside the A350 would be mitigated by the Eastern bypass moving through traffic away from this road. I note that with reduced traffic on the Eastern bypass, there is also an opportunity to provide vehicular access to the campus to reduce the powered vehicle access to that facility via the Market Place and narrow listed gateway</p>	<p>The Town and Parish Council are looking at ways to address improved connectively.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>perhaps even to zero.                      ii) The town bridge should be provided with adequate capacity for walkers and cyclists in volume, as well as motor traffic to use it. Should traffic for Melksham be diverted to enter from an Eastern bypass, a traffic light single alternate powered vehicle lane, a cycle path and two footpaths could be accommodated.</p>	
Page 87 - Draft Priority Statement 7		<p>"To increase levels of railway passengers transport and help reduce traffic congestion, railway station parking facilities should be improved and extended. Improvements to public transport serving the town centre will be promoted and encouraged to make it safer, more attractive and more convenient to users" - Parking at the station - improvements already underway with a more than doubling of spaces in progress. Suggestions from TransWilts that passenger journeys will be up from 75,000 to 450,000 per annum by 2026 may prove optimistic bearing in mind the current pandemic, but 300,000 is likely - that's 4 times the current number.                      Public transport improvements should include buses to the station to make for joined up transport - help people travel the final mile or two from the station to their homes and to the business area to the south of the town, much of which are beyond normal walking distance.</p>	<p>Add "and public transport interchange at the station" to the "improvements" sentence.</p>	<p>This Priority Statement has been deleted as more detail on the Railway Station has been added in the main body of the Plan</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 54 - Section 4.3.3	<p>"Melksham railway station, located in the north west of the town, is on the TransWilts Line which runs between Swindon and Southampton Central. Trains from the station run approximately every hour each way between Westbury and Swindon" - incorrect trains call at Melksham about every hour - alternately headed for Swindon and Westbury and not hourly to each.</p> <p>The growth from 3,000 to 75,000 journeys per annum in passenger numbers in the last decade on what is still a sparse service highlights the growth potential when the service steps up to hourly, which is probable. Analysis and comparison with similar towns in Wessex such as Frome and Warminster suggests that passenger numbers will grow to around 350,000 per annum with an hourly service based on journeys per resident per annum figures. Note this is a low estimate - other towns such as Westbury, Bradford-on-Avon, Trowbridge and Chippenham already have far higher journeys per head of population even than what I would forecast for Melksham over the next decade. P.S. The 3,000 figure from 2010 is a realistic estimate. Office of Rail and Road statistics quote over 10,000 ticketed journeys sold - however, Melksham to Bristol was a cheaper fare than Trowbridge or Bradford-on-Avon to Bristol, but the Melksham ticket was valid for those journeys and this resulted in "phantom" journeys which have distorted Melksham Statistics.</p>	Change to "every two hours".	Amended

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
63*		<p>My principal reference that I used was Crown Copyright ISBN 978-1-4098-4321-4 Jan 2015 and my approval or objection of the various planning proposals is based on the words from that document that “Planning ensures that the right development happens in the right place, at the right time, benefitting communities and the economy. It identifies what development is needed &amp; where, what areas need to be protected and enhanced and in assessing whether proposed development is suitable.” Over-pinning our comments are the following 2 statements:—</p> <p>Melksham Without is already 17% over its approved housing allocation at this time of writing. We are in favour of ‘infill’ planning applications on brownfield sites but against any development outside the settlement boundaries for Shaw and Whitley Villages. We wish to comment on the following planning applications and proposed developments:—</p> <p>Whitley Toast Office: Planning permission to turn the existing shop &amp; post office into 2 dwellings.</p> <p>Middle Farm Corsham Rd Whitley: proposed development for 18 houses along the East side of Corsham Road (B3353). This proposal is outside the settlement boundary of Whitley. We know that flood alleviation work has been done in recent years behind the existing homes on the East side of Corsham Rd, but with the addition of 18 new properties’ whose surface water will run into that same water course after heavy rains, the risk of flooding is renewed further down Corsham Rd as it feeds into the Southbrook and adds to the risk of recent flooding both at the Presbytery for Shaw Church and Shaw School.</p> <p>Finally, if Middle Farm were to agree to a continuation of Single Homes along Corsham Rd and built of a high specification to withstand flooding from opposite Top Lane to where the existing homes now begin, we would not object to the reduced application to be considered.</p> <p>Ashford Homes Planning Application: <b>NOTE: Full comment in appendix 5 of Consultation Statement.</b></p>	<p>To say that development of all these sites would radically change the nature of the village would be an understatement. Still Whitley would not have a shop nor a Post Office; the risk of flooding to existing and newly proposed properties further down the Corsham Rd remains a real possibility; and the nature of approving the Middle Farm/Ashford Homes developments would open up numerous possibilities for many more further infill planning applications onto green fields along the main routes through Whitley and outside the settlement boundaries. Furthermore infill development of the 3 main roads into and out of Whitley would change the nature of our green, rural village which is now pleasantly interspersed with green fields and NOT solid with housing development on both sides of all 3 main roads that form a triangle around the perimeter of our village. The green fields that divide Shaw from Whitley villages must be preserved and at present the Southbrook provides that division as well as a flood plain for both villages. Please let this ‘natural’ water course and flood plain remain as the one physical boundary</p>	<p>Whitley Toast Office: Planning application to turn the existing shop &amp; post office into 2 dwellings was refused in July 2020</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			between Shaw and Whitley villages.	
64	Page 42 - para 4.3.2	There has obviously been a lot of thought and effort put into researching and preparing this neighbourhood plan. I understand how the draft Policies, if adopted, will be used to assess future applications for housing and employment sites in the future so I am confused as to why one particular site is featured and described as "Draft Policy 7". I can see a lot of other sites were looked at and only this one is featured in the Draft Plan but I don't see how it is a Policy. If anyone wishes to	Delete this Policy from the Plan	Objection noted. this comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		develop this site, and it appears the Council would be happy for a developer to do so, then it should be assessed against the other Policies listed in this plan and only proceed if it fits in with the plan. It is not a Policy in it's own right.		
	Page 51 - 4.4.2	I cannot agree more that the area needs greater employment opportunities. That should definitely not just be more super markets but higher tech opportunities to retain the higher skilled residents who are currently commuting out of the area for employment. However, the plan does not address what incentives could be offered to attract suitable employers into the area and in particular this would require improvements to the digital infrastructure. The Corsham Hub and MOD Corsham give that town very good connectivity and something similar needs to be offered in the Melksham area.	Suggest what could be done to incentivise employers investing in the area. For instance designating a brown field site as a possible location for a technology hub. Council would need to work with potential employers offering incentives to attract them in.	Potential local economic project. Currently beyond policy scope of plan
	Page 42	I fully support the aim to promote cycling but with so many people commuting out of the area (during normal non-lock down times) they travel too far to cycle to work. Encouraging commuters to cycle to Melksham Station is a good aim.	The Council should give more clarity on what it is doing to improve cycling routes and make them safer to use. Many current cycle routes are on very picturesque but very narrow roads on which cars approach round blind bends at high speed.	<u>Wiltshire Council have submitted 2 recent bids to the Department for Transport for the reallocation of road space to prioritise cycling and walking in the county, which includes a proposal for Hilperton to Melksham via Semington.</u> <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/bid-submitted-boost-cycling-and-walking</a>
	Para 4.3.2	Cycling, however, is generally dangerous on most roads in our area because they are not wide enough for cars to pass easily and car drivers frequently get impatient. One answer would be to widen pavements and designate more of them as combined cycle/pedestrian routes. If it was safer to do so and there were secure places to leave bikes more people would cycle particularly as many people have got into cycling during lock down.		Highway investment beyond scope of NP. Potential for town/parish joint project with Wilts

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
65		In the light that Wiltshire already has more than 17% of the number of homes required for the next 5 years it would appear there is no need for further development in Whitley. The village is already under threat of losing its heart and community hub and of becoming a dormitory in a Melksham urban spiral. A Consultation leaflet sent to only the closest residents to the flood plain in First Lane by Ashford Homes suggests their proposed development would be of benefit to all. However it would be in conflict with historic and listed buildings in the lane which help to give Whitley its special and distinctive character. The Government has recently said it will be changing its policy and will no longer allow building on flood plains which would also rule it out. There are other ways of providing off road parking for Shaw and Whitley School. The by-pass scheme at last on its way would allow access from the Corsham Rd. Building on quality agricultural or any other green site would force loss of green aspect an extremely retrograde step.		<a href="#">Ashford Homes scheme and bypass beyond scope of NP.</a> <a href="#">Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</a> <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a> The First Lane planning application is addressed through existing adopted policy framework. Refer to planning application for dwellings at land on First Lane 20/05766/OUT
66	Page 42, para 4.3.3	I hope I have understood Draft Policy 7 correctly in relation to the proposed allocation of land for development of 18 dwellings. In arriving at the number of 18, I would like to be assured that a development of that size provides for a minimum of 2 vehicle car parking spaces per dwelling, plus additional off-road parking for visitors. In addition, has sufficient footage been allowed per plot and side access to the rear of each dwelling so that amenities like refuse bins (x 4 per household) do not have to be kept at the front of the houses? I have seen in many recent developments that space for cars and bins has not been adequate, resulting in cars parked on corners, pavements, even roundabouts, and rows of unsightly bins blotting the landscape.	Reduce the number of dwellings permitted on the development site to allow for ample space for car parking, bins and visitor off-road parking. In addition, given the allocation of this land for residential development, that there be no further development permitted in Whitley in order to preserve the nature and character of the village.	Allocation review. Number of dwellings maintained at 18. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
67		The document is generally well presented, and will undoubtedly meet the requirements for a planning document. However I would question if the general public are likely to read through and understand the mass of supporting documentation covered by this Plan. I also think that much of the language is 'planning speak' which will be difficult for people to understand. detailing the key initiatives	Produce an Executive Summary and Glossary of Terms used.	Thank you for the suggestion. In the initial pages there is text to enable people to navigate the Plan. A glossary of key terms is included at the end of the Plan. An Executive Summary will be considered for the Submission Draft.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>I am concerned that production of this Plan may not be robust enough to withstand judicial challenge because there seems to non compliance of clear requirement statements included in government guidance on Neighbourhood Planning – introduced in 2014 and updated as recently as May 2020. These include:</p> <p>(a) Plans should be community led – Plan developed behind closed doors especially over the past two years;(b) Plans should be developed for forward planning over 10, 15, 20 years ;</p> <p>(c) Does not identify aspirational and deliverable priorities for land use within the Plan area;</p> <p>(d) Relationship between the existing and emerging Wiltshire core Local Plan now under consultation;</p> <p>(e) Plans can allocate sites for development;</p> <p>(f) Plans should consider infrastructure needs within the Plan area;</p> <p>(g) Plans should be prepared in an inclusive and open way – not achieved by the ‘Behind closed Doors’ approach adopted by the Steering Group over the past two years in particular;</p> <p>(h) Compliance with how this emerging plan relates to Wiltshire’s lack of five year land supply in relation to planning applications.</p> <p>What is the evidence that the Plan is meeting government guidance?</p>	<p>Carry out a risk assessment to test the Plan for compliance with current government guidance,</p>	<p>Plan prepared in accordance with government planning guidance and this will be assessed by the Plan Examiner.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken on the preparation of the draft NP, including this formal stage of Regulation 14 consultation. The comments on this draft plan will be taken into account to review the draft NP to reach a final submission version.</p> <p>As set out in the government guidance on Neighbourhood Planning, the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body and as such Neighbourhood Plans are not required to allocate development.</p> <p>Relationship between the NP, the Core Strategy and the Local Plan Review has been carefully considered and is clearly set out in the NP</p> <p>Steering Group meetings have been held monthly and open to the public, with the agendas widely publicised by the town and parish council, and the minutes published on both their website and the dedicated Neighbourhood Plan website. Included as a standard agenda</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
				item for every Steering Group meeting was an item for Public Participation.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>It has taken over five years to produce this document. During this period, many things have happened which materially affect the issues being considered for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. – For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- considerable house building / completions has caused rapid population growth in the Melksham community to a point that it already exceeds Wiltshire’s target for the year 2026;</li> <li>- Cooper Tires has closed much of its manufacturing capacity on the edge of the Melksham Town Centre – creating a brownfield site ripe to housing development unless safeguarded for other purposes;</li> <li>- the government has identified substantial funding for a by-pass round Melksham;</li> <li>- funding pressures has caused delays on redeveloping the Melksham House site for community use – to the point that recent decisions have placed the entire project ‘at risk’ , and suggesting the site needs to be safeguarded for community use;</li> <li>- closure of Christie Miller Leisure Centre and continuing delays in delivering the replacement facilities on the Melksham House site;</li> <li>- closure of maternity and most recently minor injuries unit at both Chippenham and Trowbridge Community Hospitals – and planned closure of St Damians GP surgery;</li> <li>- Wiltshire Council has commenced a review of its own Core Plan</li> </ul> <p>There impression throughout the documents is of over-riding presumption of permitting (housing) development rather than safeguarding land to meet the inter-dependent community and infrastructure needs of the existing and rapidly growing population of the Melksham community.</p>	<p>Review the Plan to test that it is up-to-date with known situations Consider revising the Plan to cover the period to date from post Referendum (2021) for one of the periods described in government guidance para 003 to match ie: 2031 or 2036</p> <p>Explain exactly why this is so</p>	<p>Plan period to be extended to 2030 in line with Wiltshire Council Feedback</p> <p>The Plan supports sustainable development and identifies priorities for environmental protection and enhancement going forward.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 6	<p>The commitment in Draft Policy 5 for Pre-Application Community Engagement of development proposals is strongly welcomed, but it is a pity that there has been no pre-application engagement in preparing the detail of this document with either the Town or Parish Councillors or with the general public before this consultation. This exposes the Plan to the accusation that it is not community led.</p> <p>My over-riding concern is therefore not about what is included in this document but rather what important issues are brushed aside or have been excluded.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5 and 6 on this page directly contradicts current government guidance on: Neighbourhood Planning Updated 13 May 2020</p>	<p>Delete Paragraphs 5 and 6 Insert Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the current government guidance – see below: What is Neighbourhood Planning Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided. (Paragraph 1) Neighbourhood planning</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken on the preparation of the draft NP, including this formal stage of Regulation 14 consultation. The comments on this draft plan will be taken into account to review the draft NP to reach a final submission version. Steering Group members include two from the Town Council and two from the Parish Council, these council representatives regularly feed back to their respective Planning/Economic Development Committees where the Minutes of the Steering Group meetings are also regular agenda items. Paragraph 5 states that NP cannot require new facilities or infrastructure to be built. This is correct. The paragraph will however be updated to reflect the recently updated guidance that sets out that communities can have their say on what infrastructure should be provided.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>provides the opportunity for communities to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years in ways that meet identified local need and make sense for local people. (Paragraph 3)</p>	
	Page 7 Para 1.2	QUESTION – source / accuracy of population figures in para 2	The 2019 figures should be now available – and probably also the 2020 population figures	Figures taken from a Local Government Association Report summarising the 2018 available information on the demographic and socio-economic make-up of the Melksham neighbourhood plan area.
	Page 8	The Consultation Statement reveals that there has been no meaningful consultation with the community since late 2017 – this document has been prepared behind closed doors over the last two years	Include an explanation of the engagement process up to late 2017 and the reasons for lack thereafter.	Consultation Statement has been reviewed and updated.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 11 Para 2.2	Section 2.2. LGA population information seems to be at variance with other data – perhaps by not including occupation of new housing.	Expand Section 2.,2 bullet points to include Melksham is: (a) the fifth largest community in Wiltshire after Swindon, Salisbury, Trowbridge, and Chippenham; (b) still facing significant pressure for new housing development; (c ) strategically located on the A350 between Chippenham and Trowbridge; (d) recent Wiltshire Council traffic analysis indicates far higher movements than expected, leading the government funding award for a by-pass; (e ) has far less facilities already in place, especially for health, than other smaller Wiltshire towns.	Para 2.2 revised
	Page 13 Section 2.3 Last para	Notes that Wiltshire is required to establish the next Local Plan for new houses and jobs for the period up to 2036, But then fails to indicate how this Neighbourhood Plan can influence this new Wiltshire Local Plan as suggested in government guidance: thereby giving the impression that this Plan is more about placating the priorities of Wiltshire planners rather than articulating the aspirations of the residents and businesses in Melksham	Extend period of this document for the fifteen years 2021 – 2036. Test how the Plan proposals address government guidance in terms of local community priorities Paragraph 003 - Plan for 10,15, 20 years. Paragraph 009 – Role of emerging Neighbourhood Plan when local Plan being updated.	Page 16 sets out a proactive and positive approach that has been taken by the Qualifying Bodies working collaboratively with Wiltshire as both the Local Plan Review is progressed and the Neighbourhood Plan (Ref Neighbourhood Planning NPPG para 009)

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 14	Community engagement activities in the period up to 2017 consistently rated access to health facilities amongst the highest priorities for Melksham residents – but this is ignored throughout this draft	Include - health facilities as a specific bullet point	Added
	Page 15	Landowner of site between Semington Road and A350 Semington by-pass South of Hampton West roundabout indicated willingness for his land to be designated for employment purposes – part of site now used by Wiltshire Air Ambulance, creating many new jobs and the rest of the site could also be used for health facilities to meet WCCG July 2017 suggestion to merge Chippenham – Melksham –Trowbridge primary care health facilities.	Designate site (SHLAA 1004) as additional employment land Extend map to south to show site as designated for employment land...	There is not sufficient evidence to support employment designation.
	Page 16	Is the sequence of stages listed actually legal?	Check against the GOV.UK Neighbourhood Plan guidance Amend the 3 stages to create / cover specific time periods to bring them in line with the next Wiltshire Review period:- ie: – 2021-25, 2026-2030 and 2031-2036 Create a proposed land use map to Indicate: - what land is safeguarded against consideration for future housing development for each time period;- what additional community facilities will be deemed necessary / expected to be developed within each of the stage / time periods – prioritising secondary education;	The strategy and approach have been carefully crafted with the aim of delivering a NP after a number of years of consultation and work by the Qualifying Bodies and the Steering Group, as well as taking on board government guidance (Ref Neighbourhood Planning NPPG para 009) about working collaboratively with the Local Authority in Plan preparation (of both NPs and Local Plans)

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>primary health; employment and retail; and community, green or recreational facilities.                      - what land will be considered or safeguarded against agreement of housing development with Plan area within each Safeguard land within each stage / time periods;</p>	
	<p>Page 24                      Para 3.1                      Para 4                      Page 25                      Para 3.2                      Para 4</p>	<p>Text is too generic in stating 'infrastructure' in both the Vision and Objectives.                      Does the phrase ' infrastructure' include community, education and health facilities? If not ...</p>	<p>Insert see ... <b>community, education and health facilities, and ...</b> before infrastructure ...</p>	<p>Term 'infrastructure' further defined in the vision</p>
	<p>Page 33</p>	<p>Why are those areas most at risk of flooding not being specifically safeguarded from development.?</p>	<p>Identify specific areas to be protected in associated documents – with reference here.                      Insert <b>Areas most at risk of flood will not normally be considered for future development</b></p>	<p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision (see appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement or submission plan for more detail).</p>
	<p>Page 40                      Para 4.3.2</p>	<p>Draft Policy 6 should include a timetable when .....</p>	<p>ADD new paragraph 1                      .... <b>consideration of future large scale housing development will have regard for the availability of land identified for each of</b></p>	<p>Policy 6 addresses Housing in Defined Settlements</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>the time periods as described on page 16</p>	
	Page 44	<p>Draft Policy 8 does not include shared infrastructure projects needed to address the additional pressures that new development put on existing community facilities needed by local Melksham as a whole. Use of CIL receipts is very welcome.</p>	<p>Insert a new bullet point - <b>Community Infrastructure</b> eg: <b>community, education and health facilities</b> (proposed new text in bold italics)</p>	<p>Policy 8 has been revised and the text noted in proposal has been removed. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
	Pages 47 / Page 48	<p>Draft Policy 9 contains no provision to link with Policy 10 for either (a) public transport or car parking, nor specifically the (b) safeguarding and potential redevelopment of the Cooper Tires / Avon enterprise sites if they either significantly contract or vacate within the Plan period. Recognise scope of these sites for mixed housing, retail and employment purposes development.</p>	<p>Insert in Town Centre <b>iii. contributes to provision of appropriately located access to public transport and car parking</b> Insert Town Centre expansion uses ... <b>in future on vacated Cooper Tires or Avon Enterprise sites or ...</b> within edge</p>	<p>This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
	Page 51 para 4.4.2 Page 52	<p>Link with Draft Policy 10: Employment Sites Surely the increase in population necessitates expansion employment opportunities within the NP area to reduce level of out-commuting.</p>	<p>Insert new para 3 Expansion of new employment opportunities within the Plan area is considered desirable to reduce the amount of outcommuting to deliver sustainable travel movements</p>	<p>Noted Supporting text amended.</p>

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 53	Draft Policy 11 should link both the Market / Town Centre and Melksham Railway Station to local residential areas.	Insert new Page 54 and renumber	Policy 11 includes reference to the need to link the Station to the rest of the Plan area
	Page 58	Car parking is not mentioned in any of the Draft Policies 9, 10 or 11 Whilst of walking, cycling and public transport is highly laudable, we should not ignore the fact that there is already high level of car ownership / operations in the rapidly growing Plan area which must also be catered for.	Insert new page 54 – <b>Car Parking</b> Needs to cover location, timing and charging strategy.	Car Parking times and charging are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan
	Page 58	Need to protect Melksham House site as GI if funding cannot be provided to develop the Campus	Include Melksham House site on Map as key green asset	Melksham House is included on the Open Spaces Map
	Page 60	Given that Wiltshire Council is reviewing its own Core Plan to 2036, shouldn't consideration be included to safeguard land from Melksham Town Centre eastwards towards Lacock, especially to avoid any potential conflict with an A350 Eastern by-pass route that government has already allocated funding for.	Insert new para at end of green b consideration be included to <b>land eastwards from Melksham Town Centre towards Lacock should be safeguarded to avoid any potential conflict with the A350 Eastern by-pass route that government has already allocated funding for.</b>	Comments about the Bypass are included in the Priority Statements section of the Plan
	Page 62/ Page 63	Need to protect Melksham House site as GI, if funding cannot be provided to develop the Campus. The site is more than just a sports facility – it should provide key community facilities	Include Melksham House site in list contained in para 3 of reason for policy. Review site designation on map	Text amended

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 64 4.5.4	Objective 13 should also include community. Draft Policy 15 needs to recognise the strategic position of Melksham along the A350; and local land use capacity to enable the development of health, education and other community / leisure facilities for the Plan and wide surrounding area, especially where these can be provided through partnership working with other agencies. (See page 15 comment)	Amend to Add ... community ... ADD new para 4 before ... New community facilities ... Proposals for partnership working with other national or local agencies to develop strategic community facilities to meet the identified needs for the Plan and wider surrounding areas will generally be supported. It is recognised that location of such facilities within the Plan area will also contribute towards achieving wider employment and traffic management policies.	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Pages 66 and 67	Needs another symbol to indicate 'health facilities'- ie: BLUE cross	Map 14a – include GP surgeries and dental practices Map 14c – include new symbol in land bordered by Old Canal / Headquarters to indicate Air Ambulance Base	Map amended
	Pages 72 to 74	The Policy 17 presumes new housing development without being clear about where, how much, and what landscape character will be expected on each site. The last bullet point statement is questionable given that most of the land has not been protected and is now being covered by a housing development on both sides of Pathfinder Way, and a planning application covering the balance of land along Western Way (SHLAA site 1045) has been lodged.	Revisit and rewrite	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision (see appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement or submission plan for more detail).

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 75	The policy lacks inclusion of any measures for safeguarding existing character or characteristics that is already in existence in the immediate area of proposed development	Add to either paragraph 3 or 5 of the Policy 18 Statement positively to the <b>safeguarding the integrity and</b> character or complement, safeguard, and extend	This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
	Page 81	The Policy Statement 1 should include a paragraph dealing with: (a) how further lack of five year land supply in Wiltshire will impact on treatment of large scale housing development applications; (b) how CIL money will be allocated to ensure adequate provision of shared community facilities ( ie secondary school, health and employment facilities are provided in the Local Plan Review.	Add paragraphs as suggested	The lack of 5 year land supply is a scenario that changes and therefore not relevant to this planning policy; the policy sets out its positive intention. Policy 8 details Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities, and that a Memorandum of Understanding will be agreed between Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council regarding the sharing of any CIL funding from their share. With regards to the Local Plan Review and health and education facilities, please see Priority Statement 4: Levels of Growth and Infrastructure (Page 85). The supporting text for Policy 8 relating to Wiltshire Council's CIL 123 list has been updated to reflect the change to annual Infrastructure Funding Statements that are now required.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 83	Policy Statement 3 fails to include the opportunities to create new employment by safeguarding the excess brownfield site land now that Cooper Tires has significantly reduced its manufacturing requirements on the site, and the need to safeguard land to meet future demands for secondary education, health and retail facilities.	Include statements on Priority Statement 3 about (a) how the Cooper Tires site might be redevelopment if it is vacated or significantly reduced (b) recognizing that provision of new secondary education and health facilities for the Melksham community creates significant new employment opportunities	Please refer to Policy 9: Town Centre
	Page 85	The map is out-of-date and does not reflect the actual routes (10a, 10b and 10c) that Wiltshire Council are working on.	Replace the Priority 5 map on to show the most up-to date Wilshire Council position of an Eastern bypass	Submission version of the Plan will not include a map of the Bypass as the information available will change over the course of consultation that is to come on the Bypass
	Page 86	The Priority Statement recognizes the problem but says nothing about how it might be addressed	Priority 6 should include safeguarding land to provide the shared secondary education and health facilities	Noted.
Consultation Statement		I would challenge the accuracy of paragraphs 2.1 and 3.13 in the Statement that the MNPSG has worked hard to engage with residents and various stakeholders and provided opportunities for settlements to be involved throughout the Plan development period. In the years since, planning and other decisions / developments have overtaken Plan preparation. Meaningful public engagement ended in late 2017 and even local Councillors have had no opportunity since to suggest priorities or comment on Plan details – as the Plan Steering Group Minutes lack any detailed information. Evidence to support my is contained in TABLE1 Summary of Events and Activities, which demonstrates no public engagement between 11th November 2017 and	Revisit national government guidance and provide evidence of up-to-date compliance with requirements identify actions to meet	The Plan has been prepared in line with guidance. There was a gap between consultation activities and the Regulation 14 consultation as highlighted but communications on plan preparation activities continued. Consultation responses to Regulation 14 consultation will be reviewed and responded to appropriately as required by the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. The Consultation Statement has been reviewed and updated with other community engagement that

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		an update provided to invited stakeholders on 6th January 2020. The draft Plan document provides no evidence about how these changes have impacted on the Melksham community, nor how they have influenced the evolving Neighbourhood Plan plans.		took place during the last few years.
	Melksham Issues Statement	This document only evidences public engagement up to 8th November 2016 – so is even more out of date. However, it does include analysis of comments received both in summary and in detail – but the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not indicate how these priorities have been addressed	Revisit the draft Plan to explain (a) how feedback from the public contained in the Issues document has been incorporated; and (b) how the proposals in the Plan have been led by the community and not by the planners and officer as required by national guidance.	The Plan draws on the results of consultation and issues document as well as a broad evidence base. The Plan will also draw on the results of the Reg 14 consultation to inform content.
68	Page29	Draft Policy 3. Decentralised Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Generation. “Decentralised” not consistent with index wording of Draft Policy 3	Change Decentralised to Local.	Updated
	Page 78	Community Character & Distinctive Statement. Policy Text Box. Should this have Rapid before?	Put Rapid before Community	Updated
	Page 96	Rapid Community Character & Heritage Statement.	Change Heritage to Distinctiveness.	Updated
	L.H. Section	On page 75 & 75 refer. Is made to the Rapid Community Statement & Distinctiveness Statement.		Updated

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
69		<p>I'm writing to give my observations to the proposed planning area outlined in the Melksham neighbourhood plan for Corsham Road, Whitley. I object to the proposed area. I do however agree that some new dwellings need to be built in Whitley. I object to the proposed area unless the following terms/proposals are adhered to.</p> <p>Firstly, is with the 'Green buffer'. I think at least 15 metres as well as retaining the existing hedging is a good amount but this buffer should be dense and contain tall growing trees to the effect that it provides privacy for all properties concerned. I would also think that it should wrap around to the existing properties adjacent on the south side of Corsham Road.</p> <p>2. The entrance to the site needs to be closer to Top Lane – ideally opposite, but further away than proposed so the properties on the west side of Corsham Road have more time to merge onto Corsham Road.</p> <p>3. The layout of the proposed site should contain bungalows as well as houses – this would be in keeping with the rest of the village, being as there are already bungalows and houses within short proximity of one another.</p> <p>4. The location of these bungalows should be on the west side, south west and southern borders of the site.</p> <p>5. The proposed play park in the plans should also be on these borders but preferably on the south western borders</p> <p>6. The road coming into Whitley from Corsham needs rework to the extent of a revised speed limit location, with 30mph coming before Westlands Lane (coming from Corsham direct – lay by being on the left) as this road is well used by local residents to get, mostly, to Chippenham.</p> <p>7. There needs to be some sort of traffic calming measure applied for the main straight of the whole of Corsham Road in Whitley. There is constant speeding along the road in both north and south directions. There is a consistent disregard to the applied 30mph limit at any time of day. I would however not agree to the proposal of a 'give priority' type of calming as it would create backlogs/queues during peak hours and cause significant disruption for residents along the whole of Corsham Road.</p> <p>8. I am concerned also about how the pedestrian access from the west side of Corsham Road to the east side (for the proposed area) would be encompassed (and vice versa). A pelican crossing is not welcome due to noise of it and I would be concerned about the use of it by 'people of</p>		<p>Many thanks for these suggestions. Together with other comments this has informed a revision of the Policy.</p> <p>Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>a disruptive nature' at inconvenient hours. Also, the flashing lights of a zebra crossing would also not be welcome due to being a 24-hour disruption.</p> <p>I would propose the idea of an 'island type' crossing – because its rural and very dark, I'm very much against anything that would produce large amounts of 'unnatural light' in the close proximity/line of sight to the dwellings on the west side of Corsham Road.</p> <p>Of course, if it is deemed safe enough to cross from the proposed area to and from the west side of Corsham Road with all preceding measures outlined in sections 2, 6 and 7 without the need for a dedicated crossing, then that would be satisfactory.</p>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
70*		<p>Since November 2016, on behalf of the Estate, Savills have been in discussions and attended a number of meetings with the NPSG regarding the potential residential allocation of Whitley Farm. The representations comment upon the suitability of the site and propose a regeneration policy to be incorporated into the draft Plan.</p> <p>we propose a regeneration policy to be incorporated into the draft Plan, to enable the heritage assets to be safeguarded and detail of the proposed development to be agreed at a later stage through a planning application. This approach has been accepted by Wiltshire Council in previous 'made' Neighbourhood Plans, with Holt Neighbourhood Plan (2016 – 2026) incorporating the Tannery site as a regeneration policy (Policy H1.1). <b>(Full comments in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>	<p>Giving consideration to Historic England's guidance 'The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans' and the Tannery site example, we propose the following site specific regeneration policy for Whitley Farm:</p> <p><b>'This Plan supports the development of the Whitley Farm site provided it meets the following criteria:</b></p> <p><b>a) The development will occupy the area outlined within the map and not exceed these boundaries unless the benefits of an enabling development that might otherwise be in conflict with planning policies would secure the future conservation of the heritage assets and the proper planning of the site as a whole;</b></p> <p><b>b) The site will be for residential development use;</b></p> <p><b>c) The development will propose an appropriate housing mix, type and tenure in line with Draft Policy 6 and Core Policy 45 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy;</b></p> <p><b>d) The development will conserve, and where possible, enhance the listed buildings on site, in line with Core Policy 58 and Draft Policy 19;</b></p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group thanks Savills' representation made on behalf of Neston Park Estate. It recognises the large amount of work undertaken to promote the site since 2017. However, due to significant heritage issues raised by Wiltshire Council, Historic England and the NP Group's heritage consultant, it has concluded the site could not be promoted for allocation for housing development within the Regulation 14 Plan.</p> <p>The Steering Group welcomes the objective of conserving and enhancing the historic fabric and setting of the site's historic assets. It recognises that this must now be resolved through the development application process and, that in doing so, will be expected to comply with adopted development plan policies. The NP Steering Group does not consider it necessary for the NP to state existing policy obligations or necessary technical procedures and contributions that would be associated with any potential consent given through a Wiltshire Planning Authority process.</p> <p>As the scope, use and amount of development is a matter to be considered</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p><b>e) Provision of an appropriate level of community benefits and affordable housing in accordance with Core Policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and based on the most up to date local housing needs information available;</b>  <b>f) The development will meet the design standards set out in Draft Policy 18 and Core Policy 57;</b>  <b>g) The developers will undertake the relevant technical surveys and ensure that associated infrastructure is delivered alongside any new housing and is in progress before the building is finished;</b>  <b>h) The development will include new planting along site boundaries, in line with Draft Policy 16;'</b></p>	<p>through a planning and listed building application it considers it inappropriate to seek to express a view or give support to a particular development area, use or amount of development within an NP policy.                      The Melksham Joint Neighbourhood Plan will therefore not contain a specific Whitley Farm regeneration policy as promoted by Savills in their NP                      Regulation 14 representation on behalf of Newton Park Estate.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
71*		<p>With regard to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan itself, Catesby does not have any specific comments with regard to the emerging policies and overall strategy. It is a well-written and cogent document. Catesby has noted the proposed approach with regard to housing allocations, in effect leaving specific designations to a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan ("Neighbourhood Plan 2") once overall housing requirements for Melksham have been determined through the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Review. At this stage, the overall numbers to be allocated to Melksham are not known, although it seems highly likely that between 890 – 2044 dwellings will be required in this location; therefore a greenfield site(s) on the edge of the town will need to be allocated. <b>(Full comment in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>	<p>Land at Snarilton Farm ('the Site')                      Catesby has prepared a detailed "Vision Framework" for the Site, which includes the Concept Masterplan mentioned above and carefully shows how an initial phase of c.300 dwellings could be delivered, either as a stand-alone development with good linkages to the existing settlement or as part of a wider strategy for development to the east of Melksham, potentially tying in with the proposed by-pass. Catesby are continuing to discuss the site with Wiltshire Council and would welcome the opportunity to work with Melksham Town Council to bring this development forward as part of the emerging Local Plan Review and subsequent Neighbourhood Plan 2.</p>	<p>The Qualifying Bodies and Steering Group would welcome the opportunity to work with local landowners at future stages at the appropriate time.</p>
72*		<p>These representations focus on land at Semington Road, Melksham (location plan, Appendix 1) which is considered to present an appropriate and sustainable location for residential development, capable of accommodating up to 144 new homes and is subject to the current planning application ref: 20/01938/OUT (Indicative Layout Plan, Appendix 2). This representation sets out our view that the evidence base, which supports the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan, should be reviewed to correct a number of errors relating to Land at Semington Road, prior to submission of the Plan for examination. <b>(Fuller response and appendices within the Consultation Statement - Appendix 5)</b></p>	<p>To support the draft Neighbourhood Plan, a Site Assessment Summary Report has been prepared by AECOM (dated September 2018). The individual assessments of each site considered are set out at Appendix A of this report. Nexus consider the Site Assessment process undertaken by AECOM, to be flawed and accordingly the evidence base should be reviewed prior to submission of</p>	<p>The Aecom Site Assessment Report has been used to inform the approach to site allocation alongside other information. This NP has taken an approach to allocation that seeks to balance the delivery of further housing with community benefit within the Plan Period of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and allocations in the Plan Area that will be delivered through the forthcoming Local Plan</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			the Neighbourhood Plan for examination.	Review and a Neighbourhood Plan Review.
Draft Policy 2		Draft Policy 2 relates to flood risk and states that all new development will be expected to include measures to reduce the rate of rainwater run-off in order to mitigate flood risk. Proposals will also need to address surface water run-off and re-use measures. The wording and aspirations of this policy is materially similar to Core Policy 67 (Flood Risk) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. It is unclear why this policy is required given the existence of a comparable policy that required development to include measures to reduce the rate of rainwater run-off.	Accordingly, we feel that draft Policy 2 should either be revised to reflect Core Policy 67 or should be removed from the Plan altogether.	Flooding in the local area is an important issue which the NP seeks to address and adds detail to Core Policy 67. The policy has been revised in response to this comment and others. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
Draft Policy 5		Draft Policy 5 as it is currently worded does not provide clear policy, rather it reads as guidance. A policy seeking early engagement with members of the local community would be advisable and welcomed,	we feel that it would be more practical if it were worded as follows: “Applications should demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community”	The policy has been revised in response to this comment and others. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
Draft Policy 18		Draft Policy 18 relates to ensuring high quality standards of design are met largely through provision of a design compliance statement.	Although this policy is supported, we feel that it would be beneficial if this policy is amended to make clear that a Design and Access Statement (already a Wiltshire Validation requirement for outline/full proposals of 10	The policy has been revised in response to this comment and others. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p> dwellings or more) is the most suitable document for this assessment to be undertaken.</p>	
73*	Foreword	<p>“When our work is completed the Neighbourhood Plan will have a place in planning law and should help to prevent unwelcome development while encouraging changes.”</p>	<p>For clarity, we suggest that this section of the Foreword is rewritten as follows:                      “Once the neighbourhood plan has been endorsed by the local community at referendum, it will help guide the growth and future development of Melksham and form part of the Wiltshire Development Plan.”</p>	Foreword amended

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	2.3 Fifth Paragraph	<p>Again, we reiterate our concerns about the Core Strategy being an out-of-date development plan which was adopted with a largely retrospective plan period and therefore does not plan for the future. Wiltshire Council has failed to progress a review of the Core Strategy despite its commitment to an early partial review being a determining factor in the Inspector’s report recommending adoption of the Core Strategy (subject to main modifications). The suggestion that a new local plan could be in place by 2022 is unfortunately unrealistic given that Wiltshire Council has not commenced consultation on the local plan review yet.</p> <p>The reference to the Core Strategy prescribing the number of homes to be built in the Melksham Community Area as 2,240 for Melksham (Town and Bowerhill) and 130 for the remainder of the Community Area is incorrect. These figures come from Table 1 (page 48) of the Core Strategy in which they are referred to as an “indicative requirement”. It is not intended to be a ceiling or a cap on new housing development and many planning appeals<sup>4</sup> have confirmed that this is the case. The NPPF encourages local authorities to significantly boost the supply of homes through the development plan process and granting planning permissions.</p>	<p>We therefore suggest that the text in section 2.3 is rewritten as follows:                      “The Core Strategy outlines an indicative requirement for the number of homes to be built in the Melksham Community Area by 2026: 2,240 for Melksham (Town and Bowerhill) and 130 for the remainder of the Community Area.”                      The following statement should be deleted:                      “Development over the plan period to date has exceeded the housing numbers set out in the Core Strategy meaning that the housing requirement in Melksham (Town) and the remainder of the Community Area is now zero. There is therefore no specific requirement for this Plan to allocate sites for housing (see Wiltshire Council Housing Land Supply Statement dated April 2018).”</p>	<p>The text referenced has been reviewed and will be updated to make clear that the numbers for housing requirements are indicative. It is acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Planning Guidance sets out that Neighbourhood Plans should be positively prepared and states that <i>‘planning bodies are encouraged to plan to meet their housing requirement, and where possible to exceed it’</i>. Paragraph: 103 However it is also clear that the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan is not required to plan for housing and the strategy for plan making in the area, given the current context and this is clearly set out in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. To further quote the Neighbourhood Planning Guidance: <i>‘The scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body. ...Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.’</i> Paragraph: 104 Noted. The approach to site allocation is clearly set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
	2.4 The approach to the Neighbourhood Plan – Page 16 paras 1 - 3	<p>It is disappointing that the neighbourhood plan steering group has chosen not to allocate any housing sites in Melksham, aside from the site in Whitley which does not relate to the town. This is a missed opportunity. Government planning guidance encourages neighbourhood plans to be proactive and plan for growth;</p>	<p>We strongly recommend that the progression of the neighbourhood plan is paused whilst further consideration is given to the allocation of housing sites around the edge of Melksham. There is a need to</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			allocate housing sites at Melksham and the neighbourhood plan should seize this opportunity.	
Draft Policy 6		<p>There is no need for draft policy 6. Core Strategy Core Policy 2 states: “Within the limits of development, as defined on the policies map, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages.” It is therefore an unnecessary policy which duplicates Core Policy 2. We are concerned that draft policy 6, together with the lack of housing allocations, portrays the message that the neighbourhood planning steering group is not supportive of new development proposals and actively encouraging Melksham to grow and thrive. Again, in response to the reason for the policy (page 41) we reiterate our comments in relation to “indicative requirement” for Melksham and the community area being 2,370 homes. This figure is not a cap or ceiling to development and should be exceeded especially as it is only planning until 2026.</p>	We recommend that the policy is deleted as it is unnecessary duplication of Core Strategy Core Policy 2.	This policy is retained, but has been updated in response to Regulation 14 comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
Draft policy 7		<p>The Core Strategy classifies Whitley, along with the adjacent settlement of Shaw, as a large village. It is fifth in the settlement hierarchy (Core Policy 1) which defines Large Villages as settlements with a limited range of employment, services and facilities. It is therefore not a sustainable location for development compared to Melksham which is one of Wiltshire’s largest market towns where there are employment opportunities, a broad range of shops, facilities and services and public transport including a main line railway station. Accordingly, sites should be allocated in Melksham in advance of rural areas such as Whitley. Moreover, the Site Assessment report (AECOM, 2018), the evidence base to the neighbourhood plan, did not include this site (site 12: Middle Farm, Corsham Road) in the shortlist of 10 sites suitable for development. It was identified as one of 12 other sites as having potential on the basis of there being “a number of constraints which would need to be overcome to enable development, including potential impacts on the road network.” It is therefore odd that the steering group has ignored the findings of its own evidence base and allocated this site for housing.</p>	Whilst we question the rationale and justification of this allocation in terms of its sustainability and evidence base, if the neighbourhood plan steering group should pursue this allocation then we strongly recommend that the site be allocated as a rural exception site.	This site allocation remains. The policy has been updated. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Draft Policy 8: Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities</p>	<p>The site would be more appropriate as a rural exception site where it could bring forward much needed affordable homes to the local community. Core Strategy Core Policy 44 encourages the provision of rural exception sites in Local Service Centres, Large and Small Villages. However, the supporting text to the policy only suggests that the site would only bring forward five homes, which is less than 30% of the 18 dwelling capacity figure and is therefore not policy compliant nor will it address the unmet housing needs of the local community. The NPPF encourages the provision of rural exception sites and entry-level exception sites to address housing needs. Further the PPG suggests that neighbourhood plans are a useful tool to ensure the delivery of affordable homes<sup>9</sup>. It is therefore a missed opportunity that no sites have been identified in the neighbourhood plan to address affordable housing needs.</p> <p>...We also note that page 45 refers to the local planning authority being required to produce a Regulation 123. This requirement was deleted when the CIL Regulations was amended in 2019.<sup>10</sup> Local authorities are now required to produce annual infrastructure funding statements which set out how much money has been raised through developer contributions (both CIL and S106 obligations) and how it has been spent. All authorities must produce their first statement by 31 December 2020.</p> <p>Notwithstanding these changes to the CIL Regulations it is welcome that the Town and Parish Councils are intending to prepare a joint plan area statement of Infrastructure Priorities which will be reviewed annually. Whilst we welcome this proactive approach, we would ask the Town and Parish Councils to be mindful of deliverability as disproportionate developer contributions can lead to unviable developments. It is in the interests of all that housing developments bring forward community benefits but infrastructure requirements need to be viability tested as is the case for the CIL charge for each local planning authority area. <b>(Fuller comment in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>	<p>We are satisfied with the principle of this policy but wish you to consider the comments we raise in further revisions to the policy. The text in the reason for the policy section needs to be updated regarding the CIL 123 list as explained above.</p>	<p>Comment noted with thanks. Supporting text updated.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
74		<p>Below are comments I commonly make on Neighbourhood Plans. I am involved with Air Quality and Contaminated Land and would like to see emphasis on these within the proposed neighbourhood plan where possible. I have also mentioned some matters related to noise and wood burners/Biomass Boilers.</p> <p><b>Air Quality</b> The latest draft of the NPPF now includes specific requirements for plug in vehicles and ULEV infrastructure consideration by LPAs'. We now ask developers to provide ultra low energy vehicle infrastructure which can take the form of EV charging points although other technologies are also out there now.</p> <p><b>Contaminated Land</b> <b>We would like to see the redevelopment of former brownfield sites encouraged in preference to greenfield ones as the amenity these area provide along with soils, vegetation and fauna are a valuable resource that warrants protection.</b></p> <p><b>Noise</b> Planning for noise control is an important part of any neighbourhood plan as the unintended consequences of development proposals often involve amenity impacts such as noise and also odour, vibration, smoke and fume....</p> <p><b>Wood burners/Biomass Boilers</b> In seeking alternative energy sources for heating and hot water many people now turn to wood burners or Biomass Boiler. There is little control over them currently and on occasion they can cause more problems than they solve. Incorrectly specified and installed systems can give rise to nuisance from smoke; consulting with a HETAS engineer and having them verify the installation as suitable can be enough to prevent future problems. Wood burners and Biomass Boilers are also a source of particulate emissions and contribute to air quality pressures.</p>	<p>We have succeeded in getting EV into various developments in Wiltshire and would like to see this and other alternatives promoted wherever possible, hence the opportunity that exists within Neighbourhood Plans. Melkshams Policy 4 is welcomed.</p> <p>Encouragement of development that is sympathetic to prevailing noise climates and receptors is something we would seek.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Appropriate redevelopment of brownfield sites is encouraged</p> <p>Points on "protection to the amenity of residents" are included</p> <p>Noted - point added in supporting text about this issue.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
75	Draft Policy 7, Page 42	<p>We are against the proposed Middle farm Corsham Road development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As stated there is no remaining housing requirement for the area of Whitley up to 2026.</li> <li>2. The proposed development lies outside the village boundary as formed in the review in 2014.</li> <li>3. More cars on the roads on a very dangerous road. People tend to speed in this area as it's a straight road and this access is just beyond a blind bend.</li> </ol>	<p>Suggest that no developments are considered outside the village boundary prior to 2026 and afterward, to consider reviewing the village boundary if further development is needed within the village.</p>	<p>Opposition to allocation noted. Allocation retained but reviewed in light of consultation feedback. Details of the allocation to be reviewed in light of consultation feedback as part of preparing the submission document. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
76	P 43. Housing & Infrastructure	<p>The plan states that there is no further requirement for additional housing until 2026. It also states "the pressure for new development in the area appears certain to continue". Where is this pressure coming from? Is it only from those people and organisations who have a financial or other vested interest? I think it is important that the Plan makes it clear where exactly the pressure is coming from. Building on a greenfield site outside of the boundary is unnecessary and not in the interest of the village residents or the biodiversity of the area. The biodiversity will be reduced. Our wildlife has been steadily declining and we have lost 40% of our key species. Building of greenfield sites exacerbates this decline as wildlife has fewer places to live and thrive. The development will contribute to the flooding issues already experienced by the village. The core strategy states " The use of appropriate surface water management will have become a pre-requisite for development to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere." And in 6.3.2 "Reducing the risk of flooding by ensuring that new development is neither vulnerable to flooding nor increases the risk of flooding elsewhere"</p> <p>It will exacerbate the flooding problems of the village as runoff will be carried into the stream that runs by the school.</p> <p>Large developments alter the character of any village and increase</p>		<p>Concerns relating to Draft Policy 7 noted. The Strategic Environmental Assessment screening determination (July 2020) of Wiltshire Council concluded that the draft NP was not likely to have significant environmental effects and that an SEA would not be required.</p>



**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		developments of poor architectural quality that can be found all over the U.K. lacking any sense of place or character.		
78	Page 14, para 2	I am concerned about the amount of new build in the area. As we have exceeded our quota, can't we minimise new build over the next 5 years and make that a plan policy?		Noted
	Page 20, para 2	Can we have a clearer policy about protecting the character and identity of the town and villages? I am in my 80s and have moved to Whitley in the last 6 months and I would not like the distinctiveness of the community I live in to change.		Consider within review of design policy/guidance
	Page 33, para 3	I am a retired Chartered Consulting Civil Engineer specialising in major water schemes around the world. With this background I understand the issues around the floodplain on First Lane, Whitley. I have seen a flood since I moved here in February. From the building works I am having done on my property I can see that there is a lot of clay and a very high water table. In my professional opinion, local water attenuation schemes will not represent value for money for the community, and are usually of dubious benefit with the regular shortening of periods between major storm events.		Noted.
	Pages 42 and 43	I support the allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley. This land has a lower flood risk (see above) than other potential sites.		Noted
	Various	Please use the plan to support and protect as many green spaces and farmland as possible. As you will see from my other comments, I am concerned about the extent of new build and therefore I want the plan to limit this as far as possible.		Noted
	Pages 84 and 85.	I support the eastern routes for the proposed bypass.		Bypass beyond scope of the NP but included as a key local issue. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
79	Page 14, para 2	As Melksham is in surplus (by 17% based on the 2026 allocation) I think this plan should, except for the Middle Farm development (see below),		Noted

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 33, para 3	make a policy to postpone any significant development (say in for more than 3 new houses) until after this date at the earliest. I object to any proposed development on a floodplain and/or otherwise at risk of flooding.		Noted
	Pages 42 and 43	I support the proposed development at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley as long as this is the only such development in the area and the flood risk is deemed to be extremely low.		Noted
	Pages 84 and 85.	I support the bypass proposal as long as it is to well to the east of Beanacre (i.e. as far away from Whitley as possible).		Bypass beyond scope of NP. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
80	84	The statement that a bypass to the town is necessary doesn't make sense as the town already has a bypass. What is being proposed is a bypass to Beanacre. Whichever way this happened it would involve enormous environmental damage and financial cost for very little benefit to the residents of Melksham. The benefits would seem to be to promote the County Council's view of Melksham as a 'corridor' between Trowbridge and the M4. Who wants to live in a corridor? If a bypass is built it shows up any expression in the plan about concern for the local environment and quality of life to be empty words.		Bypass beyond scope of NP. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
	58	Well being and Nature; relating to the above points, the diagram on this page doesn't include the path from Locking Close, Bowerhill to the Kennet and Avon Canal. This is by far the most popular route for pedestrians and cyclist to reach an important area for healthy leisure activities and the appreciation of nature. This has been especially valued during the lockdown. It is rumoured that Route C is the route preferred by Wiltshire Council for a bypass. This would degrade and effectively destroy the environment along a valuable section of the canal (including Giles Wood) as well as the flood meadows South of Lacock.		The mapping was reviewed and updated accordingly, as this is a permissive path and not a Right of Way, the map has not been amended for this route.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	The whole report	<p>It is clear from comments included in the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan that it's authors are well aware of the dissatisfaction of Melksham residents that the massive amount of housebuilding within and around the town has been accompanied by a reduction rather than an increase in local facilities. For example, loss of a community hospital, one GP surgery 'on the brink' and what seems like the careless loss of a well used sports centre with good access and facilities. It seems that Melksham has been ill used by Wiltshire Council: having had to accept massive growth in housing developments with no benefit to existing residents. The way these developments have been carried out is also concerning. Typically assurances are given; for example mature trees will be left in place or open space preserved. Time after time these assurances are shown to be worthless: For example in the George Ward Development and the construction of Asda. In one of the latest housing developments, by Spa Surgery, I notice that they've started to fell trees by the roundabout, why? If the Council (as stated in the neighbourhood plan) is committed to 'Green Infrastructure' and the environment, why does this keep happening? On a related but wider point, have the residents of Melksham been saying they want a bigger town? If not, has the Town Council done anything to oppose housing growth? It seems like Melksham is bearing more than it's fair share of housebuilding. (The loss of public facilities referred to above is salt in the wound.) Given the way that so much 'green space' has been lost to roads and houses, statements in the plan about priority for the environment look at best like empty platitudes.</p>		Noted. Comments largely relate to strategic housing growth through local plan review. Potential strengthening of GI mapping. Potential for site codes/criteria linked to potential Local Plan allocations.
81		<p><i>We were unable to download the comments from this respondent, and have contacted them several times.</i></p>		
82	p31 4.2.1	<p>Remember that although trees trap carbon they tend to get cut down before their time. Soil has the potential to sequester carbon for far longer, so enhancing soil building through rewilding and all forms of regenerative agriculture is our best way of trapping carbon and helping biodiversity to increase.</p>		Noted.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	p32 4.2.2	Need to add wetland creation as an additional means of flood mitigation and increasing wildlife habitat.		The use of natural flood mitigation is encouraged through this policy. This comment, together with other comments, has informed the policy revision. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.
83*	P58 / p60 MG14 school link	<p>Great to see the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal Restoration Plan is aware of the need to have green/wildlife spaces/corridors fully integrated throughout Melksham. Thumbs up!</p> <p><b>DRAFT POLICY 9: TOWN CENTRE</b></p> <p>The current town centre boundary, as shown in Figure 9 of the Draft Melksham NP is immediately adjacent to, but not inclusive of, the Avonside Enterprise Park site. As drawn, the site would constitute an edge of centre location.</p> <p>Draft Policy 9 of the Draft Melksham NP seeks to protect and enhance the town centre. The policy recognises the potential for town centre expansion and is supportive of redeveloping employment sites, stating: “Proposals for the redevelopment of existing employment uses within edge of centre locations must be considered on the basis of their relationship to the existing town centre and the potential to expand the town centre.”</p> <p>The Draft Policy also commits to the preparation of a Town Centre Masterplan to guide future town centre development. The draft policy wording states that proposals within 300m of the existing boundary will need to demonstrate how they contribute to delivering the vision and objectives.</p> <p>Whilst our client is supportive of the draft policy, it is considered that the site represents an important opportunity for inclusion within the town centre boundary. Including the site in the town centre boundary would represent positive and aspirational planning for the sustainable future of Melksham.</p> <p>The site represents an appropriate location for town centre expansion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It is located immediately adjacent to the existing town centre boundary. Its inclusion would be a natural and logical extension to this boundary, reinforcing the connection and relationship between the north</li> </ul>	<p>A higher level of employment cannot be generated from the site unless further investment, and of the right nature, takes place. Greater flexibility is thus needed in the site’s policy designation (i.e. as a town centre site rather than employment location) to support appropriate investment and regeneration that enhances the wider vitality of Melksham. Incorporating the site in the town centre boundary would maximise the positive potential for investment and regeneration.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The value of redeveloping this site is acknowledged, however, the Town Centre Boundary has not been reviewed as part of the Plan preparation and will not be altered in the submission version. Wording in the policy has been amended however to reflect the potential for redevelopment of edge of centre sites to contribute to the delivery of the Town Centre (and wider town) vision and objectives.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>and south of the River Avon. It would bring the river into the heart of the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Enterprise Park represents an important Gateway Site for Melksham. Over time, a mix of town centre uses have been established on the site as a result of its location. The mixed use site is a destination in the town. It has the potential for transformational regeneration as an anchor destination in an expanded town centre.</li> <li>· The role of the site as a connecting node between the train station and existing town centre makes it an integral element of achieving Draft Policy 11 (Sustainable Transport). The site will encourage investment in and improved connectivity between the station and the centre of Melksham.</li> <li>· Sustainable transport options and ease of accessibility are already established at the site. A bus stop is located along the site's northern boundary, immediately adjacent to the existing vehicular access and egress point on the A3102. The site is within easy walking and cycling distance of the town centre and Melksham train station. This presents a significant opportunity for encouraging a wider range of uses, reflective of a town centre nature.</li> </ul>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
84	Page 42 Para 4.3.3	<p>Allocation of land at Middle farm, Corsham Road, Whitley</p> <p>Upon reviewing the draft joint Melksham Neighbourhood plan I support the outline proposal to provide sustainable new housing developments in suitable surroundings (as identified at Middle Farm within the plan). Adhering to the plan and its policies is important to ensure that any future developments within Whitley and Shaw are sensitive and in keeping with natural surroundings. In direct contrast to the plan we have recently been made aware of Ashford Homes consultation (June 2020) regarding the proposed development of 9 dwellings on land at First Lane, Whitley (adjacent to Corsham Road). I am concerned of the timing of the Ashford homes proposal as it is in direct contrast and pays no attention to the detailed policies and comprehensive analysis carefully considered within the neighbourhood plan.</p>		<p>The First Lane planning application is addressed through existing adopted policy framework and outside of the scope of the NP. Refer to planning application for dwellings at land on First Lane 20/05766/OUT</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
85*	42 – 4.3.3 Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley	<p>The Shaw &amp; Whitley Community Emergency Group (CEG) was established following the flooding in Sept 2014. We are both re-active and pro-active – we respond to incidents in support of the community, and we monitor potential issues, working closely with MwPC and WC. Where we can safely undertake work ourselves, we organise volunteer working parties.</p> <p>From our own monitoring and measuring, we have found the Southbrook catchment to be very “flashy”. A heavy but brief rainfall in February 2020 quickly resulted in flooding across the B3353, and the CEG team helped prevent flooding of Shaw Vicarage and Shaw School.</p> <p>As well as the September 2014 flood, a previous flood happened in August 2012. Both these resulted in flooding of residential properties.</p> <p>We monitor rainfall, members have weather stations and; the Aug 2012 floods resulted from 32mm of rainfall, Sept 2014 from 75mm. Also, the Environment Agency make the monitoring telemetry from their measuring station on the Southbrook at the B3353 available. Image 1 (<b>Available within Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement</b>) illustrates how rapidly the Southbrook rises in response to rainfall – the February level was 0.2m higher than the previous highest recorded.</p> <p>We are extremely cautious about any development proposal in this area; we believe any change will be likely to increase the risk of flooding, either upstream in Shaw &amp; Whitley, or downstream towards Melksham. (<b>Full comments in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement</b>)</p>	<p>With reference to the Middle Farm proposal, it should be noted that the Aug 2012 event resulted in the flooding of properties on both sides of Corsham Road.</p> <p>Further, property owners in this NE corner of Whitley are known to have had to expend considerable sums to increase protection against flooding. Any proposed developments must ensure their surface water drainage is adequate for that development, without increasing risk to the rest of the community. We would want to see the outputs from surface water drainage modelling for the Middle Farm proposal; provided these demonstrate a rigorous approach, we could anticipate supporting this. In view of our experience of this catchment, this is the only proposal we would expect to approve; any others, particularly on flood plain, we would strongly recommend are rejected.</p>	<p>The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>
86	Pages 84 & 85	<p>The southern end of the proposed by-pass should be far enough away from Bowerhill so there is no adverse noise or air pollution for the residents. The fields south of Bowerhill and Giles Wood are used extensively for walking and dog walking and for access to the canal. If the by-pass joined the current A350 north of the canal then there would be some tight corners for large HGVs to negotiate.</p>	<p>It is a more expensive option, but to keep traffic away from main housing areas and have a more “flowing” road then the by-pass should cross the canal and re-join the existing A350 at the round-about where it crosses</p>	<p>The Bypass is beyond the scope of this NP. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			the A361 near the West Wilts Crematorium.	<a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>
87		<p>I support Draft Policy 1                      I support Draft Policy 2 but suggest it should be strengthened.                      I support Draft Policy 3                      I support Draft Policy 4                      I support Draft Policy 5, but suggest it should be strengthened. Recent attempts by a developer to follow the spirit of this policy have been patchy and inadequate with roughly 20% coverage of affected households.                      I support Draft Policy 6 but, again, suggest it should be strengthened to close loopholes which developers may attempt to exploit.                      I support Draft Policy 7. This is a well-balanced proposal that delivers a mix of dwellings but the requirement for a significant proportion to be affordable housing must be enforced from the start. Other new-build proposals in Whitley should be resisted whilst this scheme is available.                      I support Draft Policy 8.                      I support Draft Policy 9.                      I support Draft Policy 10.                      I support the general theme of Draft Policy 11 but wonder, given their recent proliferation, whether powered mobility vehicles should not be included somewhere in this policy statement and supporting text.                      I support Draft Policy 12.                      I support Draft Policy 13.                      I support Draft Policy 14.                      I support Draft Policy 15.                      I support Draft Policy 16.                      I support Draft Policy 17.                      I support Draft Policy 18. This is particularly important in the villages where distinctive styles and colouring should be maintained and not sacrificed to efficiency, modern supply chains and profit.                      I support Draft Policy 19.</p>	<p>Draft Policy 2: All new development will be expected to include measures ... should read                      All new development will be required to include measures ...                      Draft Policy 5: Amend the first paragraph to include the word "comprehensive".                      In line with the comments about Page 42, the 3rd paragraph should read "would be required to include ..." rather than "expected to include ...". Also change "approximately" to "at least".</p>	<p>Policies have been reviewed in response to these comments and others. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>I am in broad agreement with Draft Priority Statements 1 – 7 and have no comments to make on them.</p>		
88*		<p>Given the housing land supply position in Wiltshire, which is only likely to be exacerbated through 2020 into 2021 by the impacts of Covid 19, allocating additional sites now would result in the delivery of affordable housing in the short term, a significant benefit for the area. Indeed, this is a notion which appears to be supported by the community through consultation carried out on the draft Plan, clear from the summary outlined on page 43 which states that “whilst there is no remaining housing requirement for the Melksham Area Neighbourhood Plan in the Plan period to 2026, consultation revealed that almost half of those who responded to the consultation (47%) supported more housing growth if the quantity, location and community benefits could be locally defined through the Neighbourhood Plan, with a further 34% answering “it depends”.</p>	<p>Overall, we consider that there is a good opportunity for the draft Plan to review sites now given the current context of a lack of housing land supply in Wiltshire generally, and that the land south of Western Way represents, in our view, the most logical site on the edge of the town to accommodate future growth should the Steering Group undertake a further site</p>	<p>Approach to allocation in this Neighbourhood Plan was clearly set out in the draft Plan and the approach is maintained. Further allocations will be considered as part of future Plan preparation (Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan Review)</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			review exercise beyond the Pre-Submission stage.	
		<p>Draft Policy 8 We agree with the objectives set out in draft Policy 8 and the emphasis that required infrastructure should be delivered alongside new housing. The Land South of Western Way is capable of accommodating not only residential dwellings to meet the housing need, but also infrastructure including items listed as priorities in draft Policy 8 such as community and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Draft Policy 14 This draft policy seeks to protect open spaces around the town which we support in principle, however we object to the Land South of Western Way being identified as part of this policy, and on Figure 13, as an 'amenity green space'. The land is private with no public access, and is farmed with crops, so does not comprise an area used by local residents. Furthermore, the land is not designated for open space or amenity purposes in Wiltshire's adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>...However, there is no explanation within this document for why the land has been identified as an amenity green space. Map 1 shows each of the identified green spaces in and around Melksham, with Table 1 providing explanatory text. However, the land south of Western Way is not included in Table 1 and is therefore highlighted on the map with no explanation or evidence for the proposed amenity green space designation.</p> <p>..In addition, half of the draft 'designation' is also now permitted for development, and thus an 'amenity green space' identification cannot supersede a planning permission. <b>(Fuller response in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b></p>	<p>It is therefore unclear why the land has been designated in this way, and it is recommended that this 'amenity green space' designation across the site is removed from the supporting evidence base and main draft Plan.</p> <p>The Land South of Western Way, Melksham is suitably located to the south of the town, and will soon be surrounded by built development on all four sides. The site has already been assessed as suitable by Wiltshire Council as part of the recent Site Allocations Plan process. The land is free from any significant constraints and is capable of accommodating approximately 250 residential dwellings. If the land were to be allocated for development it</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The map has been amended to show only the north section of the identified area as amenity green space to reflect permitted development as highlighted in this comment</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			could attribute to housing supply within the Neighbourhood Plan period to 2026.	
89*		No specific mention of the Campus and the current lack of community indoor sports facilities.	This is a painful reminder of the unwillingness of the lower level councils to truly confront the power of the WC cabinet, and how it chooses to prioritise its agendas. This fact should be very much in mind when reading the following feedback comments.	The Campus is beyond scope of NP. For the latest update and plans for the Melksham Community Campus please visit the dedicated page on Wiltshire Council's website <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/community-environment-melksham-community-campus</a>
84		The reason for WC's plan for a SE Melksham A350 bypass is to support its County Housing Structure plan. Within that it was stated that it intends to create an A350 corridor between Trowbridge and the M4 junction at Chippenham. The reason for this corridor is to support the target to grow Trowbridge by @ 20,000 new homes during the period 2016-2036 in order to achieve its aim of making the town the primary settlement in Wiltshire. With an overall goal of some 75,000+ for the county as a whole. <b>(Fuller Statement in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement)</b>	A SE Melksham A350 bypass does nothing for Melksham other than destroy vast swathes of land of which large areas are used for recreation and cannot be replaced due to their location and therefore would be lost to the community for ever. There are so many things wrong with the proposal that cannot be listed here but I can provide a	Bypass beyond scope of NP. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham. <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>comprehensive list which includes WC's attempts to mislead the DfT in its funding submissions for the scheme. It also contains interesting reading as to substantial risks and negative impacts WC themselves expect the scheme to have along its route.</p>	
90		<p>Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission version of the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the M4 motorway, A36 and A303 trunk roads which pass some distance to the north, west and south respectively of the Plan area.</p> <p>The plan area is bisected by the A350 and we would therefore be particularly interested in proposals which have the potential to impact on M4 J17. However, having reviewed the Plan's proposed policies we are satisfied that these are unlikely to result in a scale of development which would adversely impact on the SRN. We therefore have no specific comments to make but in general terms we are supportive of policies which seek to reduce the need for out-commuting.</p> <p>These comments do not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.</p>		Noted

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
91	Page 42 Draft Policy 7	<p>You state that there is no remaining housing requirement for the Melksham Area Neighbourhood Plan in the Plan period to 2026. You then develop a draft policy for a housing scheme which is outwith the draft Settlement Boundary and the Wiltshire Site Housing Allocation Plans, Council Version, February 2020.</p> <p>These two statements appear to be inconsistent.</p> <p>You also run the risk that, by solving a problem you don't currently have, you will have nothing to offer when required to find housing requirement in the future. Solving any future requirement may force you into proposing further schemes outside the Settlement Boundary for Shaw and Whitley.</p>		Supporting text in the Plan amended to clarify approach and reason behind allocation of Middle Farm
92	Page 42, para 4.3.3  Page 53, para 4.4.3	<p>This paragraph recommends housing adjacent to the junction between Westlands Lane and Corsham Rd in Whitley. It makes no recommendations related to other new housing in Shaw and Whitley villages, or other areas within Melksham Without Parish. I fully support this development as the site is well placed for access, is unlikely to infringe other properties environment, is on land which appears to be almost derelict and does not suffer from surface water issues found elsewhere in Whitley. These issues, particularly that related to surface water, are relevant to other proposed sites that MWPC reviewed in recent years. Any other sites should planning permission very carefully assessed, and are likely to be to the detriment of the environment enjoyed by existing residents.</p> <p>This response is made by the secretary of the Melksham rail User Group, but in this instance, is being submitted in a personal capacity. "There has been much success in recent years in providing a viable railway service to local centres of employment (including inward travel to Melksham). This is coupled with increased usage of bus services for local journeys and for travel to urban areas such as Bath. Bus services have been subject to change of service provider recently but look set to continue to provide a good regular transport option, particularly if town services are enhanced and coupled with integration with other public modes such as rail. These services should receive continued support and encouragement, to maximise the usage and minimise reliance on private cars. Trains are currently two hourly except in the rush hours and early/late in the day. Usage is buoyant and would be more acceptable to many who don't use public transport at present, if the service was increased in</p>	<p>Proceed with the recommended housing development and reject all other developments in the Shaw/Whitley area until in-depth studies of the required infrastructure (roads etc), viability (for building approval and flood risk) and acceptability (to the existing residents) have been carried out.</p> <p>Encourage and support good train and bus services, with integrated operation at the station. Make suitable recommendations to the railway infrastructure organisations and Train Operating Companies to provide a resilient service with an hourly frequency each way at Melksham over most of the day from 6:30 through 22:00. Make bus services the transport of choice to Melksham and minimising car use within the</p>	<p>Support noted. Future planning applications are dealt with on an individual basis through the existing adopted policy framework.</p> <p>The objective to encourage journeys by rail together with improving cycle and walking routes to reduce the need to travel by car is behind Policy 11: Sustainable Transport and Active Travel. Increased parking for Blue Badge holders and the relocation of taxi services is outside the scope of the plan.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>frequency and made more reliable. Such improvements require infrastructure changes that go outside the Neighbourhood plan remit, but the resulting service improvements would help make Melksham accessible and more business friendly.</p> <p>It should be realised that many people in Melksham and the area do not have access to a vehicle, or becoming elderly and no longer able to drive. The needs of the disabled should also be considered. The town is sadly lacking in disabled parking spaces."</p>	<p>town. Typically this could be by making the centre of town 'buses only' Consider increasing parking for blue badge holders in the Market Place, possibly with a relocation of taxi services to Church Street.</p>	
93	<p>Page 30</p> <p>Page 34</p> <p>Page 43</p>	<p>Draft Policy 1 On behalf of the CAWS committee we support sustainable design and construction on the basis that we believe any new developments should minimize their detrimental effect on the environment and be as energy efficient as possible.</p> <p>Draft Policy 3 On behalf of the CAWs committee, we support the localised generation of energy in order to protect the precious environment and natural assets of the area,</p> <p>Draft Policy 7. On behalf of the CAWs committee, we support the allocation of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley with the following caveat. Our support is provided on the basis that this development will not result in the movement of the Settlement Boundary and that there will be no other approvals provided to developments that impact on the current settlement boundaries.</p>	<p>Ensure that all future developments include some sort of provision for solar or geo-thermal energy production.</p> <p>Look into the feasibility of solar power generation using the roof of Shaw Village Hall.</p> <p>Whilst not currently contained in the Neighbourhood Plan, for the avoidance of doubt, CAWs does not support any development on the field at the start of First Lane (opposite the golf course) given our years of involvement and support to the Emergency Response Group and historic flooding issues in that area. Despite what would appear to be significant investment in updating the flood mitigation infrastructure in recent months, Shaw School and the Vicarage have continued to suffer excessive flooding following</p>	<p>The NP policy cannot go beyond national standards and therefore strongly encourages the use of renewable energy</p> <p>Support Noted. The allocation has been retained and the allocation revised in response to comments. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Page 84	<p>For example we are aware that Ashford Homes are in the process of submitting planning permission for the development of a field on First Lane, Whitley, proposing to build 9 new houses on an existing flood plain. This is causing a great deal of concern and unrest amongst the villagers. The Committee further supports the Middle Farm development on the basis that it provides for managed provision of existing housing (including affordable housing) whilst retaining the hedgerows and natural landscape of the area.</p> <p>Draft Priority Statement 4: Transport Infrastructure - By-pass. On behalf of the CAWs committee we support bypass options 10a, 10b or 10c (preferred) on the basis that they provide a viable route for commercial and public road users to bypass Melksham to access the industrial areas to the south east of the town and beyond without travelling through already heavily developed residential areas to the west of Melksham or routing traffic via already congested junctions to the west of the town.</p>	<p>high rainfall. Adding further housing to this fragile part of the village will only compound the issue.</p>	<p>The First Lane planning application is addressed through existing adopted policy framework and outside of the scope of the NP. Refer to planning application for dwellings at land on First Lane 20/05766/OUT</p> <p>Bypass beyond scope of NP. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p> <p><a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
94*		<p>1. Thank you for providing Wiltshire Council with the opportunity to comment on the draft Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation Draft (June 2020), referred to hereafter as the 'draft JMNP'. We welcome the publication of this draft of the neighbourhood plan and the significant progress this represents.</p> <p>2. This consultation gives an opportunity for the Council to comment at this first formal consultation stage of the draft JMNP's preparation. Our focus at this stage is to ensure that the draft plan generally conforms to strategic policies contained in the development plan, which includes the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS), Chippenham Site Allocations Plan (CSAP) and Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP), and that the proposed policies will be effective in achieving their stated objectives through the determination of individual planning applications.</p> <p>3. At this stage it is also worth reviewing the Basic Conditions, which include making sure the draft JMNP aligns with national policies and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan, but also whether the draft plan contributes to sustainable development and conforms to any relevant EU legislation.</p> <p>4. The comments that follow identify areas that should be addressed when considering appropriate changes to be made to the draft JMNP following the consultation period. These comments also take into consideration the views of specialist officers in the Council. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the contents of this letter when you are in a position to do so.</p> <p><b>Draft JMNP Plan Period</b></p> <p>5. It is noted that the intention is to align the draft JMNP plan period with the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) plan period to 2026, with a review being undertaken as the Local Plan Review proposals emerge. On reflection, we consider that as 2026 is now only a relatively short time away, neighbourhood plans are supposed to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years, and the policies of the neighbourhood plan are capable of enduring longer, it would seem sensible to extend the plan period to 2030 and that is our recommendation. Therefore, the Plan period should be 2020-2030. An early review of the neighbourhood plan can still take place as intended.</p> <p><b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b></p> <p>6. Likely effects of proposed draft JMNP policies on European Sites</p>	<p>9. One general point is that it would be useful if the Plan contained paragraph numbers so that reference could be made to those in representations and in decisions on planning applications. 10. It is also recommended that the draft JMNP include a policies map that shows the extent of the policies and designations in one place. This map could include settlement boundaries at relevant settlements, Melksham town centre commercial area, Principal Employment Areas, any relevant heritage and environmental designations and the housing allocation at Middle Farm, Whitley. This policies map would make it clearer to see all designations in one place, for those reading the document and for those making decisions on planning applications coming forward in the neighbourhood area. 11. It is recommended that the reference to the review of the neighbourhood plan in point 3 on page 16 is amended to read 'Once the draft Local Plan Review has reached an appropriately advanced stage, this Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed.' It is considered that the plan can be reviewed earlier and should not wait until the Local Plan Review is adopted.</p>	<p>Amended in line with suggestions</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>were considered both individually and in combination with other plans and projects. It has been confirmed by ecologists at Wiltshire Council that the draft JMNP will not trigger the requirement for appropriate assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019).</p> <p><b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</b>                      7. The SEA screening determination (July 2020) of Wiltshire Council concluded that the draft JMNP was not likely to have significant environmental effects and that an SEA would not be required. The three SEA 'consultation bodies' – Natural England, Historic England and Environment Agency – were consulted on this decision and agreed with the Council's determination</p> <p><b>General Comments</b> 8. It is considered that the draft JMNP has been prepared positively with a proactive attitude to achieving the desired outcomes of the parish, and at the same time helping to address relevant issues identified in the WCS Melksham Community Area Strategy (Core Policy 15). It is considered that care has been taken to understand how the draft JMNP can support the strategic development needs set out in the WCS and plan positively to support local development.</p>	<p>12. In the interests of accuracy and clarity, the references that relate to Wiltshire Council's resolution to acknowledge a climate emergency should be reviewed to ensure they are correct and appropriately used within the neighbourhood plan. Currently there appears to be some confusion, which possibly arises from the fact that the Council itself is committed to achieving carbon neutrality by 2030, whereas for the county of Wiltshire the resolution is to seek to make the county of Wiltshire carbon neutral by 2030. All references in the neighbourhood plan to carbon neutrality in Wiltshire by 2030 should be amended to refer to the correct wording of the resolution which is for Wiltshire Council to 'seek to make the county of Wiltshire carbon neutral by 2030.' It should not refer to a 'commitment' or a 'target' or an 'aim'. Paragraphs to be amended are on pages 14, 22, 30, 31 and 34.</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Chapter 2 - Setting the Agenda	13. In the final paragraph on page 16, it is noted that the designation of Local Green Space (LGS) is being left to a future review of the neighbourhood plan. It may be worthwhile that, if there is evidence to designate LGS in this plan, then a policy is included.	It is possible that certain sites may come under increasing pressure from developers so it may be prudent to designate some of these LGS now rather than leave to a later review.	Local Green Space will not be allocated in this NP. Allocation of LGS to be explored in NP review connected with potential Melksham site allocations
	Chapter 3 - Vision and Objectives	14. It is considered that the draft JMNP sets out a clear vision and objectives for the future of the plan area and that they deal with issues that are specific and of concern to local people.	15. Objective 1 refers to 'Reducing carbon emissions with the aim of becoming carbon neutral by 2030.' This could be made clearer. Are the town and parish councils aiming to become carbon neutral by 2030? Or is there an aim for the neighbourhood area to be carbon neutral by 2030? Possibly amend to read 'Reducing carbon emissions to seek to contribute to carbon neutrality in Wiltshire by 2030.' 16. Another minor amendment that could also be made is to objective 5 which refers to supporting housing adjacent to existing settlements. Housing development outside of settlement boundaries is only allowed through certain exception policies and this could be made clearer in the wording of the objective. This objective could be amended to read 'Supporting sustainable development of new housing and associated facilities within settlements, and exceptionally, adjacent to settlements.' All references to this objective in the plan e.g. before the housing	Amended in line with suggestions

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			polices, should also be amended.	
	Draft Policy 1 – Sustainable Design and Construction	17. Where the Plan might innovatively influence the sustainability of design is in terms of gross and net housing density, transport options, and perhaps housing typologies. For example, building too low a gross density can reduce sustainability of public transport, and building large, detached “executive” houses each increase the rate of greenfield being used up to house people. It is noted in the community engagement that large homes are not seen as the priority but low net densities usually deliver larger houses. This is a difficult issue to contemplate, but as the Plan says, “Great places to live ... where housing and infrastructure needs are balanced with global and regional issues”.		Net and gross housing density is considered within Policy 7 as part of allocation criteria

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 2 - Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management		<p>18. Wiltshire Council suggest that this policy could make reference to the drainage hierarchy i.e. i) re-use ii) infiltration iii) watercourse/surface water body vi) surface water sewer v) combined sewer, and that the last paragraph of the policy makes reference to the multiple benefits of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as part of Green Infrastructure, such as improving water quality and water quantity, amenity and biodiversity.</p> <p>19. SuDs should have multiple benefits (see Ciria guidance). A policy might explicitly require SuDS to comply with CIRIA Guidance, and to demonstrate at outline that an adequate area has been reserved for storage volumes without requiring inaccessible slopes.</p> <p>20. Depending on how serious flood risk is, might a policy be useful that seeks to ensure the floor level of all new homes is raised slightly above the surrounding ground level, to ensure no water ingress during heavy rainfall?</p> <p>21. The first paragraph on page 33 refers to new development not increasing the risk of flooding. It is recommended that this also refers to new development making use of</p>	Policy reviewed and updated in line with suggestions. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding (where appropriate through the use of natural flood management techniques) as per NPPF paragraph 157.</p> <p>22. It is also recommended that the supporting text to this policy references that development should also demonstrate adherence to the new National Design Guide, that includes guidance on integrated water management that enhances the character of a place and makes it more resilient. The design guide forms part of planning practice guidance that sets out the 10 characteristics that define good design and supports paragraph 130 of the NPPF.</p>	
	<p>Draft Policy 3 – Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation</p>	<p>23. The roof designs of both traditional vernacular housing and modern volume housing only really consider cost and to a degree aesthetics. In reality, the opportunity now always exists to use roof space for solar panels, which means that roof orientation could be something to strategically design into a scheme, to predominantly increase south</p>		<p>Policy 3 revised and updated taking on board this comment. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 4 – Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Charging	<p>facing areas. Does the neighbourhood plan have any view on this? WCS Core Policy 57 design guidance for ‘keeping to local character’ usually lets developers off the hook from doing anything more bespoke, and the number of roofs facing south is effectively a random by-product of the most profitable layout of limited mix of standardised house types.</p> <p>24. The DfT consultation: <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/818810/electric-vehicle-charging-in-residential-and-non-residential-buildings.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/818810/electric-vehicle-charging-in-residential-and-non-residential-buildings.pdf</a> is closed and awaiting feedback. This is likely to be addressed in updated Building Regs and in the Local Plan Review. Wiltshire Council support this policy in principle but without government mandate this is not currently applied by Highways development control.</p>	<p>25. With regards to homes that do not have on plot parking, or group housing that use group parking, sometimes dissociating parking from the plot can actually allow for more flexible and attractive residential design as the (significant) constraint of the parking space is removed. It’s quite extreme planning intervention but it has precedent <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vauban,_Freiburg">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vauban,_Freiburg</a></p> <p>26. Less extreme might be the preservation of any opportune spaces for retro-fitting existing neighbourhoods especially in the town centre, with small EV charging hub courts. For now, it might just be a case of recognising opportune spaces and saving the space so that it is not all lost to windfall housing development. (i.e. there could be a vacant plot where the NP feels a building is not suitable but an EV parking court is).</p>	Town and Parish Council to explore locations for EV in the Plan area
	Draft Policies relating to housing (policies 5 – 8)	<p>27. In relation to draft policies 5, 6, 7 and 8 relating to Housing, it is noted that connections have been made to the NPPF and to Wiltshire Core Strategy policies and that any new development would, therefore, reflect Affordable Housing policies and procedures as required.</p>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 5 – Pre-application Community Engagement	28. Does this policy apply to outline stage only? At outline stage, so much detail on appearance and character is indicative that people may feel very disappointed with what comes back in at reserved matters stage, in terms of architecture, landscaping and generally quality. In fact, the feedback in the engagement appendix shows this to be a concern.	29. A more engaging community consultation should ideally occur at reserved matters stage too, perhaps early on making better use of social media and surveys, instead of applications just being uploaded to the planning portal as a fait accompli, often including bland or generic housing design. If a policy can enforce this could help raise the bar as builders are forced to literally face the community with their 'products'. 30. How could the Plan succeed better in engaging more people in the 15-29 age group and get their opinions on the type and character of houses and neighbourhoods? They will be the ones living with the legacy of what is delivered through the Plan. Is it possible that Mobile phone App based surveys might be more engaging to them? Could similar engagement be encouraged for applicants of major planning applications?	Policy amended to add more clarity on the stages to which it should be applied

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 6 – Housing in Defined Settlements	31. It is welcomed that the draft Plan allocates land for additional housing, but the decision to allocate just the one site at Whitley has been questioned, given the size of the neighbourhood area. It has been suggested that if other suitable sites have been assessed and identified for possible new housing growth, could those sites also be allocated in the Plan now rather than waiting for a review?	32. The reasons for allocating the one site at Whitley and not, for example, at Melksham, are understood but could be more fully explained in the plan. On page 41 under the heading ‘The reason for the policy’ it is suggested the text is amended as follows: ‘The total of 2,773 shows that the housing actually delivered/committed was 17% over the indicative housing requirements set out by the Core Strategy and this is likely to have increased since the base date of April 2018. Melksham town, in particular, has over delivered a significant amount of new housing in contrast to under delivery at the Principal Settlements, without a corresponding increase in infrastructure. Given that the Melksham Community area has already significantly exceeded the indicative housing requirements set out for it by the Wiltshire Core Strategy.....’ 33. The reference to supporting ‘small’ windfall housing developments within settlements needs to be amended. The policy refers in criteria i) to the need to accord with WCS Core Policy 2 which states that ‘within the limits of development, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the	Policy text together with supporting text reviewed and updated in response to comments

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages.’ It is recommended that Draft Policy 6 is amended to read ‘We will support proposals for sustainable housing development within...’</p> <p>34. Draft Policy 6 does not mention WCS Core Policy 43 on affordable housing provision, although Core Policy 45 is referred to. The provision of affordable housing is important, both at Melksham and Bowerhill and in the rural area and could also be referenced within this policy.</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	<p>Draft Policy 7 - Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley</p>	<p>36. The Council also makes the following comments on this policy as follows:                      i) The requirement for 30% affordable housing provision on-site should be included in the policy, not in the supporting text, and the reference to 5 affordable dwellings is incorrect – it should state 6 as we do not count downwards.                      ii) There should be a reference to securing an appropriate mix of house type and sizes on-site (WCS Core Policy 45) as referenced in draft Policy 6.                      iii) Why is there a requirement for a substantive western landscape boundary with Corsham Road but there is none proposed for the eastern field boundary? A substantive western buffer may also have forward visibility impacts.                      iv) Has enough analysis been done to reach the view that approximately 18 dwellings on the 0.9 hectares would be an efficient use of land and in turn would deliver quality urban design?                      v) A quantum of 18 units would constitute about 22dph, which is higher than the surrounding residential density to the south and on the other side of Corsham Road. That in itself may not be such an issue, but there is a disconnect where the policy seeks to ‘reinforce’ the form and character of the immediate setting.                      37. Wiltshire Council confirm that there is no river, surface water or groundwater flood risk predicted at this site and that therefore it is a good site to allocate. It is recommended that criterion vi of the policy is amended to state ‘include appropriate mitigation measures to prevent an increase in flood risk within the site or elsewhere and provide multifunctional benefits of amenity and biodiversity.’                      38. Wiltshire Council would like to ensure the JMNP group is aware of Community Led Housing whilst it is in the process of drafting the plan. Community led housing is about diversifying from the current mainstream housing delivery, it can be a way to get the views of the community better heard and better development to happen. Community Led Housing is also a way in which Affordable Housing can be developed and secured for local people in perpetuity, together with other defined community benefits.                      39. If in the future an independent incorporated community body representing the community exists in Melksham and/or Melksham Without, such as a CLT, a policy or</p>	<p>35. It is recommended that the text on page 43 is amended as follows: (1st para) ‘Whilst the indicative housing requirement for the neighbourhood area has been significantly exceeded in the Plan period to 2026…….’ (4th para) ‘Taking into account the potential large-scale housing requirement for the neighbourhood area through the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Review, which may require a strategic approach to allocation through the Local Plan itself, the decision was taken to give no further consideration in this plan to those sites adjacent to the settlement boundary of Melksham. These will be considered in a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan.’</p>	<p>Amended to reflect recommendation</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>protocol in the plan for working with such a trust would future-proof the need for a developer to work with said trust. If the neighbourhood plan group would like to discuss Community Led Housing in more detail or receive further information about how it can be included in their plan please contact <a href="mailto:communityledhousing@wiltshire.gov.uk">communityledhousing@wiltshire.gov.uk</a>.</p> <p>40. Wiltshire Council asks what specifically is meant by “reinforces and enhances the historic form and character of Whitley” as the village appears to have predominantly evolved as separate cul-de-sacs of 70s style housing, with a range of house types, landscaping and road design reflective of that era. That urban form is typically not replicated with contemporary development, and so something more specific should be described to give weight to the policy. The consistent use of sandy coloured reconstone and brown pantile roofs and landscaped frontages appears to be a strong existing theme.</p> <p>41. More fundamentally, can the Plan provide any evidence of what housing need is for this site so that the forthcoming mix is community-led and not developer-led? Is the figure based on any sketch layout? If the Plan is encouraging where it cannot enforce, then meeting National Space Standards should at least be a requirement.</p> <p>42. Does the Plan believe that the land to the east of the site might be developed in future? If so, they might want to ensure that a direct connection through is preserved so that a logical connection is not precluded forcing future access to be convoluted.</p> <p>43. What is the purpose of the 15m landscape buffer, along a street which is otherwise characterised by active frontage of homes (which reinforce the sense of the street being residential and not rural which can assist with traffic calming)? If this landscape buffer is retained, it should be removed from the developable area and the numbers recalculated. If a new landscape screen is desired along the eastern edge, then the developable area should also be pulled in a bit from that edge (this would actually align with policy 16 which asks that hedges become features within public space, not privatised).</p> <p>44. The Core Strategy requires public art as part of new developments. What this might entail is often difficult for applicants and officers to establish. The neighbourhood plan might be able to offer further direction on this.</p> <p>45. Does any of the open space on this site need to be given over to</p>		

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		<p>woodland, as part of Draft Policy 12 and Draft Policy 16? Can any more detail be added on what is desired of the open space, such as functions, equipment or seating? An example of a modern layout that attempts to be visible, distinctive, and of its time but could enhance the edge of any settlement is Lovedon Fields, Winchester, which has a compact mix of house types, including even some flats, and a large amount of communal space and shared surface streets:  <a href="https://www.habhousing.co.uk/sites/default/files/lovedonfields_compressed.pdf">https://www.habhousing.co.uk/sites/default/files/lovedonfields_compressed.pdf</a></p> <p>46. Wiltshire Council have previously commented that the development criteria stipulated for the former allocated site (Whitley Farm) did not include any requirements with respect of ecology or the provision of ecological enhancements and biodiversity net gain. Having reviewed Draft Policy 7, it is pleasing to see the inclusion of site requirement point ii. which stipulates: 'incorporate habitat creation that achieves an overall net enhancement to biodiversity on site;'. However, the policy should include the required net gain figure. Likewise, it is pleasing to see that site requirement point iii. has strengthened the requirements with regards to retention and management of existing hedgerows and planting of new hedgerow and trees; as well as requiring the inclusion of a buffer area at least 15m wide along the western boundary of the allocated site.</p>		

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 10 – Employment sites	47. The former Christie Miller Sports Centre and golf course at Lancaster Road, Bowerhill, Melksham have been closed for some time. Wiltshire Council's Property dept. has advised that the site, which extends to approximately 6.3 hectares (15.5 acres) could be a suitable extension to the Bowerhill Industrial Estate. Accordingly, it could be identified for B Use Class development, potentially including the land between the golf course and the Semington Bypass. This would accord with WCS Core Policy 34: Additional Employment Land.	48. It is suggested that Figure 9 of the Plan on page 48 could be amended to include the former Christie Miller Sports Centre and golf course and potentially including the land between the golf course and the Semington Bypass. Alternatively, or in addition, the site could be specifically identified for B use class development.	No evidence base to support change to PEA area
	Draft Policy 11 – Sustainable Transport and Active Travel	49. There is no mention in the policy of the public realm around the railway station, which is a unique asset to the town and its sustainability aspirations. The area around the station is very poor-quality urban realm, and the paths connecting it to the town centre are very poor too. A dedicated Railway Station Masterplan might seek to redress this.		Information about masterplan for railway station now included.
	Draft Policy 12 – Green Infrastructure	50. The inclusion of a dedicated GI policy and a change in the policy position within the framework of the neighbourhood plan is welcomed and accords with previous suggestions on the Plan. It is also noted that some of the policy wording has been amended and that the accompanying text provides examples of GI/GIS assets as per previous suggestions. The inclusion of Figure 11 is also welcomed and although unfortunately what is listed in the legend is not clear to see due to the resolution of the pdf, the figure appears to illustrate appropriate sites and GI assets.		Map quality to be improved in submission document

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 13 – Biodiversity	51. Similarly, the inclusion of a dedicated Biodiversity policy is welcomed. The strengthening of the policy wording and requirement for biodiversity net gain (BNG) is also good to see. It is noted that the policy itself does not stipulate what percentage BNG they wish developments to deliver but rather it is specified in the accompanying text that the policy is intended to reflect the NPPF and forthcoming Environment Bill which will mandate a BNG of 10%. It is important that any percentage requirement is set out in the policy itself in order to support planning decisions, as having the requirement set out in the policy will necessitate the quantification of BNG through calculations (using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric) which will need to be provided to the council alongside planning applications as evidence to demonstrate that developments will actually be able to deliver the BNG proposed.	52. In addition, whilst it is good to see reference to the forthcoming Environment Bill in the accompanying text to the policy, it is worth noting that the 10% BNG requirement that will be mandated by the aforementioned Bill is a minimum figure only. As such there is scope for LPAs and neighbourhood plan Steering Groups to stipulate a higher percentage requirement within biodiversity policies in local plans and neighbourhood plans respectively. Therefore, we would encourage the Steering Group to consider requiring a percentage that aligns with their own objectives for their plan area, as it is not obligatory to align exactly with what will be required by the Environment Bill; for example, a BNG requirement of 15-20% may be a reasonable percentage and would ensure a tangible benefit for biodiversity. 53. Wiltshire Council also suggest that Draft Policy 13 could be strengthened as there is currently some duplication across points i. to iv. especially in terms of reference to networks and GI. Point iii. references recreational opportunities ahead of biodiversity, however the focus of the policy is biodiversity and	This policy has been revised in response to this comment. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>as such this should be the primary consideration with reference to creation of recreational opportunities being secondary.</p> <p>54. It is also noted that the policy makes no direct reference to fauna and flora and protection thereof, or to any types of nature conservation sites, whether that be statutory or non-statutory sites; although some mention is provided in the policy rationale. In addition, Figure 12, whilst welcomed, only illustrates Melksham LBAP priority habitats and omits for example, the Bristol Avon River which is a County Wildlife Site as well as being classified as priority habitat/Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI) under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006. According to the legend, it also only illustrates grassland and floodplain and coastal grazing marsh priority habitats and omits ancient woodland and priority/HPI woodlands. Whilst it is appreciated there is a dedicated Trees and Hedgerows policy (Draft Policy 16) it would be prudent for Figure 12 to denote all key designated sites and priority habitats/HPIs.</p> <p>55. Furthermore, it appears that Figure 11 associated with the GI policy includes SSSIs whereas</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>this is omitted from Figure 12 where it is also of great relevance. The correlation between the policy itself and Figure 12 could be reinforced so that it is clear that the sites/areas/habitats illustrated on Figure 12 must be retained and protected. Some of these suggestions were detailed in our response at the pre-Regulation 14 stage and we are happy to discuss with the Steering Group if that would be useful.</p>	
Draft Policy 14 – Open Spaces		56. This policy, which identifies the need for open spaces to be protected, is a positive inclusion within the Plan and it’s very useful that the key areas are illustrated on Figure 13. Unfortunately, due to the		Map quality to be improved in submission document

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
Draft Policy 16 – Trees and Hedgerows	<p>resolution of the pdf, it is difficult to see the areas listed under the legend against the areas highlighted in the figure. It may be prudent to consider amending the title of Figure 13 as the current title may cause a little confusion and/or result in perceived overlap given the dedicated GI policy earlier in the Plan.</p> <p>57. This policy seems reasonable but could also refer to native planting replacements of suitable stock sizes and to allow for tree loss (even veteran trees) through arboriculture reports that identify prevalent health conditions that will lead to decay, disease and death.</p> <p>58. The special consideration and protection of trees and hedgerows that Draft Policy 16 affords is very positive. The policy references Figure 11, however, it would be sensible for this policy to have its own dedicated figure which could also show ancient trees; this data can be obtained from the Woodland Trust. It is noted that this policy does not stipulate the requirement for buffers alongside ancient woodland and/or priority/HPI woodland and ancient/veteran trees in the event of development being proposed adjacent or near to such areas. Given that Draft Policy 7 pertaining to the allocated site sets out a required buffer alongside the hedgerow delineating the western extent of the site, we would suggest that a similar, or stronger approach needs to be taken with regards to Draft Policy 16.</p> <p>59. At present, it is suggested that there seems to be some duplication and/or confusion between the GI, Biodiversity and Trees and Hedgerows draft policies and their associated figures, with some items perhaps not quite falling under the most appropriate policy and/or being omitted from the most appropriate policy. We would be happy to provide further steer if the Steering group wishes to discuss this further.</p>		<p>Policy revised in response to comment. Refer to appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision. Dedicated figure produced in response to comment</p>	
Draft Policy 17 – Landscape Character	<p>60. There is a heartening acknowledgement of how the parish’s landscape is an important material consideration. There is also information presented from the Landscape Character Assessment and other relevant sources which outline the present visuals and value in the local landscape. However, there may well be elements of historic landscape character (tangible elements of past land use that influence the present-day landscape) that have an influence on the sense and place of character of the present-day town and its environs. This information was also provided along with the Historic Environment Record (HER) data, and maybe could be further explored (even if with just some short statements) in ‘Section 4.6.2 –Landscape Character’.</p>	<p>61. Both heritage assets and historic landscape could be covered by the existing policies derived from the sections set out as the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. It should also be seen when looking at appropriate development and future aspirations that heritage can be seen as a positive force for change and not merely something to</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

*\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement*

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			conserve/preserve. It could influence design, the wellbeing agenda or help define local distinctiveness – what it is that makes Melksham a unique place.	

## Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement

## Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions

\* by a Ref No. denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 18 – Locally Distinctive, High Quality Design	<p>62. Please be aware that on 23 July 2020, Design for Homes announced the release of Building for a Healthy Life. This will replace Building for Life 12 (B4L12). Building for Life (B4L12) is an industry standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods which is endorsed by the Government.</p> <p>63. This policy seems to refer to all types of development in the neighbourhood area, even minor household applications. It is suggested that a requirement for a Design Compliance Statement for minor household applications is too onerous and that maybe this requirement should be limited to larger applications only.</p> <p>64. At the beginning of the Plan, it states that planning policies 'should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared'. There is concern that Policy 18 isn't very distinct from what the WCS Core Policies already say. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft policy 18: 'Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council will support development that contributes positively to the conservation, enhancement and extension of Melksham's quality of place and local distinctiveness' which is similar to WCS Core Policy 57(iii): 'responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials, streetscape and roof lines to effectively integrate the building into its setting' and (vi): 'making efficient use of land whilst taking account of the characteristics of the site and the local context to deliver an appropriate development which relates effectively to the immediate setting and to the wider character of the area'</li> <li>• Draft policy 18: 'Applicants should submit a design compliance statement to demonstrate how a proposal has responded positively to the character of the area in which it is located' and 'Proposals for major development must demonstrate through a masterplan how the proposed development layout, building designs, materials and detailing complement and extend the positive characteristics of Melksham and Melksham Without's settlements and landscape' which is similar to WCS Core Policy 57(xiii): 'the case of major developments, ensuring they are accompanied by a detailed design statement and masterplan, which is based on an analysis of the local context and assessment of constraints and opportunities of the site and is informed by a</li> </ul>	<p>65. In order to develop some design policies that fulfil the criteria of being distinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is unique/unusual about Melksham that is worth celebrating and reinforcing in a modern way?</li> </ul> <p>What is missing from or wrong with recent new development in Melksham. How could the existing Core Strategy's Policies' wording be refined or supplemented to better achieve local aspirations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In what ways might the future housing development of Melksham be distinct from current, recent and historic development and eventually be looked back upon fondly as being of its people and its time?</li> </ul> <p>66. The Melksham Design Guide is more a helpful guide to the town as it exists today – it describes the "positive and distinct characteristics" of some areas, but leaves this as a starting point for would-be architects to develop and justify their own proposals. There is a good degree of instruction within it.</p> <p>67. To try and test its effectivity in regulating a scheme, the interpretation of the guidance might be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any large development should be designed in a way to make it look and feel like it is the</li> </ul>	<p>The Policy already references National Design Guide which links to NPPG</p> <p>The addition of detail as proposed is outside the scope and evidence base of this NP. The SG will consider the development of a more detailed character statement and housing site guidance when the NP is reviewed.</p> <p>The Town centre guidance is covered in Rapid Character and Distinctiveness Statement. Policy 18 has been revised in response to comments. See appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement to see policy revision.</p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
		development concept, including clearly stated design principles, which will underpin the character of the new place’.	<p>product of different developers with varying characters of place and house types (less obviously a single volume builder using a nationally standard house type).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary streets within new developments should be designed distinctively wider and as tree lined ‘avenues’ with soft verges.</li> <li>• Areas of communal green space should be visually or physically linked to primary movement routes as opposed to private drives or obscure corners of sites.</li> <li>• Layouts need not retain a strict build line and can utilised a mix of off-street parking arrangements.</li> <li>• Generally, the character of the new place should feature houses set within a front garden that individuals can personalise.</li> <li>• Existing landscaping should be incorporated into public realm, not privatised or hidden. This means layouts should generally not back onto field hedgerows edges.</li> </ul> <p>Houses should mostly be standard 2 storey but 3 story could be used in the town centre, or on main streets and focal nodes in suburban development, if sensitively done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of roof forms can be accommodated within new</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>development. New development could (but not should) seek to choose the optimum design for the location and orientation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facing materials should consist of a mix of red brick, white/cream render and recon. stone. There is no specific guidance on the proportion of the use of each, or colour and tone/texture of these or where the stone should come from. Most roofs to reflect clay tiles, but no particular colour/style specified.</li> <li>• Elevation design ought to look to use some interesting traditional detailing found in the area, such as stone quoins, tile hanging, decorative brickwork, or perhaps some decorative timber cladding. Possibly the guide is suggesting this could be more effective if themes applied over small groups of houses rather than pepper potted across sites, but this is not 100% clear.</li> </ul> <p>There is not specific guidance on the colours and materials or styles of doors and windows etc. so a developer would be able to specify all houses in schemes to be a generic white UPVC, and generic casement windows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst most developers will prefer to not include any front boundary treatment, stone</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>walling and privet hedge type front boundaries might be expected on some streets to help create character. The developer will probably prefer to opt for cheap metal railing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plot typologies which fill the space in front of a house with 2 parking bays should be avoided, because of the lack of street/ plots enclosure and the increased amount of continuous hardstanding created. Where they are used significant amounts of tree planting should be used to break up the parking.</li> <li>• In rural settlements, layouts should generally have a less formal (rectilinear) structure with varied build lines and house orientations – this will invariably relax the density somewhat by opening up more space between buildings.</li> <li>• Accordingly, street layouts should not be all rigidly straight, and should have a less formal character where possible – maybe narrower shared surfaced streets?</li> <li>• The extra space should be used for more landscaping and trees with large canopies. Some areas of more formal housing and terracing could be created so long as the overall ‘loose’ character is not lost.</li> <li>• Boundaries treatments guidance similar to above</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building form should be authentically of its time, but with enough variety that it does not dominate or dilute the existing context.</li> <li>• Materials guidance similar to above. More expensive natural stone (as opposed to common reconstituted stone) is not explicitly requested in the guidance.</li> </ul> <p>68. In future, with allocations surrounding the town, is it the intention that all sites are treated the same in terms of the design guidance on character, or might some sites be acceptably quite different in appearance or scale in order to achieve something distinguishable from another allocation site, in ways supported by the NP?</p> <p>69. For example, Graven Hill, the Self-Build development in Bicester has permitted housing that is very mixed and diverse, because the concept there is that individuals create their own home. And in the North west of Swindon, the Tadpole Garden reflects the very formal Garden City style more than it does any traditional part of Swindon.</p> <p>70. Elsewhere in the country, like in the Lovedon Fields example, various edge of settlement sites are developed in a more contemporary style</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement****Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
			<p>which is often most distinguishable for their deliberately nonlocal styles (e. g. rows of houses with striking gable fronts) and attention to contemporary detailing, than for how it blends in with the surrounding building stock.</p> <p>71. This neighbourhood plan has the opportunity to consider and debate all the possibilities, and direct developers and planning officers early on as to what local people want or might be open to, should a more aspirational developer be looking to get involved.</p>	

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Policy 19 – Local Heritage	<p>72. This seems to be a sensible and measured policy that does not cause any concerns regarding the protection of heritage assets.</p> <p>73. It is noted that amongst the supplementary evidence, the 2006 Urban Design Study is a useful document by a well-respected consultant (Colin Davies Assoc) and its inclusion in this process gives it a measure of additional weight. The group seem to have relied upon this document to provide examples of unlisted buildings of 'local heritage importance'. However, the Urban Design Study is not really intended to be a detailed heritage assessment and, whilst it is a useful start, the identification lacks the rigour which is suggested by current guidance on identifying non designated heritage assets for local lists and so on. The group may therefore want to consider whether they wish to follow this up with a bit more detail which might give their policy more weight.</p> <p>74. It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan group approached the Archaeology Service to gather information from the county Historic Environment Record (HER) relating to principally archaeology and historic landscape character. This is very heartening and the full gazetteer seems to be included as an appendix. There was also a clear statement in the plan agenda to protect heritage and make use of the assets in the town and parish to make Melksham a pleasant place to live.</p>	<p>75. Nevertheless, the policies that relate to heritage only focus on built heritage and conservation areas – with only a small amount of archaeology (medieval era onwards) being mentioned in the historic background to the parish and town. It would be nice to see more acknowledgement that heritage comprises archaeology as well as historic buildings/ structures. Archaeology can add to the character and sense of place and people walking and accessing heritage sites can have a role in wellbeing. This could be done by expanding on the information outlined in 'Section 4.6.4 – Local Heritage'.</p> <p>76. Both heritage assets and historic landscape could be covered by the existing policies derived from the sections set out as the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. It should also be seen when looking at appropriate development and future aspirations that heritage can be seen as a positive force for change and not merely something to conserve/preserve. It could influence design, the wellbeing agenda or help define local distinctiveness – what it is that makes Melksham a unique place.</p>	Policy unchanged. Supporting text reviewed to include mention on archaeology

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
	Draft Priority Statement 4: Transport Infrastructure - By-Pass		<p>77. The second paragraph in this statement is not quite correct and should be amended. Rather than funding confirmed, DfT requested further development of the schemes through a contribution to the Outline Business Case. This is the award text from the DfT: 'I am delighted to say that the A350 Melksham Bypass and A338 Southern Salisbury Junction Improvements schemes has been approved to progress to the next stage of development under the Major Road Network (MRN) and Large Local Majors (LLM) programme. To help the scheme progress to the next stage, the Department will make a contribution of £1.33 million and £170,000 respectively towards the costs of developing the Outline Business Cases (OBC).</p> <p>78. The bypass route options map on page 85 is not the current one and should be replaced with the following: <b>(map saved separately)</b></p>	<p>Priority Statement reviewed and updated to reflect correct information. The Bypass map will not be included in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan due to the fact that there are number of unresolved elements to the proposal at this stage. Decisions linked to the Bypass are outside the scope of the NP, but the bypass has been included as a key local issue that the Town and Parish Council will engage with. Wiltshire Council approved plans on 13/10/20 for a non statutory engagement exercise into a proposed bypass around Melksham.</p> <p><a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement">www.wiltshire.gov.uk/news/melksham-bypass-engagement</a></p>

**Appendix 4 : Consultation Statement**

**Melksham Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 Inventory of Comments Received and Proposed Resolutions**

\* *by a Ref No.* denotes a summary comment. Full Comment can be found in Appendix 5 of the Consultation Statement

Ref No	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed Resolution/ Comment
95		<p>Our kids and our kid's kids will look back and wonder why we didn't have the courage to separate vehicles and pedestrians. We just put up with the unpleasant experience of walking through town just a few metres away from polluting and often noisy vehicles which always and quite wrongly took priority.</p> <p>Visible and unsightly cables still being run to new buildings as a cheap solution</p> <p>Not enough made of the Wilts &amp; Berks Canal potential..... something many towns would dearly like to have on their doorstep. <b><i>Incomplete comments received, requested resubmission several times.</i></b></p>	<p>A bold plan or at least the start of one to close the Church Street car park as it's location no longer makes sense. Relocate businesses from King Street car park to there and make it attractive. Increase King Street car park to use every bit of space now possible and you have an easily-accessible car park bordering the Market Place for non-vehicle access to the town centre which can then be pedestrianised. Re-locate betting shop and restore the house behind it and the full attractiveness of the Market Place.</p> <p>Prohibit visible cables to new builds and require developers to contribute to 'open' ducting to all properties so occupiers can choose service providers, especially broadband.</p> <p>Huge support for this was voiced back in early 2000 at the canal and river corridor enhancement meeting but nothing came of it.</p>	<p>Melksham Town Council will produce a town centre masterplan to guide and inform future town centre development.</p> <p>Outside the scope of the plan.</p> <p>Refer to the Priority Statement 6: Wilts &amp; Berks Canal restoration and the GI Evidence Base Report</p>