

Note: All comments relate to the Site Selection Report

Plan Page & Paragraph	Comment
Page 9, first row of table – Site S6	<p>The S-E corner of the field is the wettest corner of the field with complex access onto Wesley Lane. Refer to Page 13, Site S6, bullet point 3:</p> <p>“The key policy objectives for this allocation will be to... Direct development to land NOT AT RISK from surface water flooding”</p> <p>The whole southern side of the field is a poor choice, both for access and surface water reasons. The northern edge is drier, with direct access onto the A361 (Frome Road)</p>
Page 9, third row of table – Site S9	<p>The site has been very quickly written off because ‘there is also uncertainty that bat mitigation can be delivered on site in accordance with the TBMS to facilitate the scale of development that has been promoted and ensuring the development would be in-keeping with the low density of the surrounding development’</p> <p>The proposed density for this site has been to 50 dwellings per hectare, (P 43) whereas S6 has a proposed density of 10 dwellings per hectare! The obvious answer is to limit the density for S9 to 10 dwellings per hectare, which would make the new development less densely housed than both neighbouring Hollis Way and Southfield.</p> <p>Both sites (S6 & S9) are very similar. They both adjoin the Blind Lane / Wesley Lane border road. They both suffer badly from flooding and high levels of surface water and the sewer is insufficient to support further development at either site.</p> <p>If S6 is suitable to carry forward, so is S9 with modifications to the proposal.</p>

<p>Page 10, second row of table – Site S2</p>	<p>Disadvantages ‘Insufficient size to deliver affordable housing’</p> <p>This is simply untrue. This site is of a size to provide 8 flats. Flats can be affordable housing. If the site is of sufficient size to provide 8 flats, it could also provide 2 houses and 4 flats. All of which could still be affordable. Especially if it was developed in conjunction with a part of Site S5, thereby providing vehicular access to the latter.</p> <p>The barrier seems to be the assumption that in order to deliver 8 affordable homes, a developer would need to be able to build a further 20 houses that aren’t classed as affordable.</p>
<p>Page 10, third row – Site S5</p>	<p>Disadvantage 1 – no vehicular access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop in conjunction with S2 as described above <p>Disadvantage 2 – No known developer interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not a problem, if this is one of the nominated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan, it is being put forward as an option for a developer to consider. If they don’t want to build there, they can build in another village or town. <p>Disadvantage 5 – Impacts on rights of way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A search of the OS Map layer on Bing Maps shows that there are no public footpaths running through this site. It is untrue to state this as a disadvantage of the site.
<p>Page 10 & 11, first row – Site S6</p>	<p>This table contradicts the analysis on Table 6. See my first comment.</p> <p>R-H column says that the site is potentially too big. Careful attention to amount of homes due to the large size of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The answer here is to use the model of Site S9, where the field has been cut in half, thus reducing the available site are. Reduce the size of site on offer for S6 to an acreage that would limit development to a scale in keeping with the village setting. Perhaps 12 – 15 homes, sufficient to provide 4 or 5 affordable homes. The rest of the quota can be sicked up by another site. - Impacts rights of way – a public footpath cuts across the S-E corner of the site. Development would eliminate this RoW, not just impact on it!

<p>Page 11, 2nd paragraph below table</p>	<p>It's stated that despite strong villager support, the site is unable to deliver sufficient affordable housing to meet the quota.</p> <p>This site is of sufficient size to meet at least half of the quota.</p> <p>Who made the decision that all of the affordable housing allocation had to be delivered on one site and one development?</p> <p>Two smaller developments would be in better keeping with the village setting.</p>
<p>Page 11 & 12, 4th para below table on P11</p>	<p>Site S6 – 'A number of MINOR adverse effects are identified at Table 5'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From table 5, the ONLY POSITIVE is that this site is of a size with the potential to prove 8 affordable homes in one fell swoop. Otherwise, ALL OTHER criteria are noted negative. <p>I reiterate my comment that it would be more in keeping with the rural village setting to nominate a number of smaller sites to spread the development.</p> <p>P12 then goes on to suggest that these negative effects can be mitigated by limiting the scale and extend to the S-E corner – the wettest corner, where development would obliterate a public footpath!</p> <p>It also suggests direct access onto Wesley Lane. All traffic from this development will be needing access to Frome Road in order to reach Trowbridge, Frome etc. This would increase the traffic movements on Wesley Land and Blind Lane SIGNIFICANTLY.</p> <p>It would be much more sensible (as stated in my first comment) to limit the scale and extent of development at the north of the site, with direct access onto the A361, WHERE ALL OF THE NEW TRAFFIC WILL BE HEADED</p>

<p>Page 13, second bullet point (S6), first sub-BP</p>	<p>'Direct development to the eastern part of the site closest to Welsey Lane to integrate with the existing built-up area and maximise the green buffer around the listed buildings to the west</p> <p>The village contains several listed buildings (The Scout Hall, The Old House, The Farmhouse, St Thomas Church, The Baptist Church, perhaps the former chapel opposite the Scout Hall?)</p> <p>All of these buildings are within the built-up area of the village and in close proximity to newer housing developments. The Farmhouse and Chantry Gardens being a perfect example.</p> <p>Blue Barn Farm is separated by 100+m (?) of agricultural land, a tall hedgerow and mature oak trees. It is therefore NOT at any risk of compromise whatsoever from development of a scale proportionate to the village setting, situated at the northern end of the site.</p> <p>It would appear that the character of the Listed Building has been given preference over the amenity lost by the residents of Lambert's Marsh, Wesley Lane, Southfield and Wesley Close. Especially when the above point is considered.</p>
<p>Page 13, second BP, second sub-BP</p>	<p>Create a new access onto Wesley Lane</p> <p>The S-E corner of the field is one of only two vehicular access points for Agricultural vehicles. If this corner of the field is developed, where will this access now come from? The only other access is from the A361. This is a less practical and far less safe option than the S-E field gate. This gate is unsuitable for access to a new development because of the complicated junction arrangement at the confluence of Welsey Lane, Blind Lane and Lambert's Marsh.</p>
<p>Page 13, second BP, third sub-BP</p>	<p>Direct development to land not at risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>In that case, the land to the North of the site is the only suitable option</p>
<p>Page 26, first row of table</p>	<p>This has been given a negative for protection of habitats etc.</p> <p>If, as suggested in my table row 3, this site is developed in conjunction with S2 (which has broad support within the village), then only a small portion of the site need be put forward for development.</p>

<p>Page 26, second row of table</p>	<p>It is important to point out that this field is in use as pony paddocks. It is being used as amenity land, not agricultural land.</p> <p>Therefore, no productive agricultural land is lost.</p>
<p>Page 29, S6 analysis. First few rows</p>	<p>I draw your attention to the proposed housing density of 10 dwellings per hectare again.</p> <p>I question why this site is proposed for two phases of development. The village requires 8 affordable homes. If a developer needs to build 30% affordable to 70% 'normal' then the site should be proposed in order to limit development to a MAXIMUM of 27 homes.</p> <p>Increase the proposed density to 20 homes per hectare (for example) and reduce the site size put forward.</p>
<p>Page 32, S6 analysis, row '6'</p>	<p>This is completely untrue, as described at the top of the previous page. Appropriate scale development of S6 would have no impact on Blue Barn Farm whatsoever.</p>
<p>Page 43, S9 analysis – first few rows</p>	<p>Site housing density proposed at 28 dwellings per hectare! Contrast this with the very similar-in-nature site S6, and I question why the site is nominated with such high housing density.</p> <p>The answer is to limit the scale and density permitted within the NP to allow for a small development that would deliver part, but not all of the village's affordable housing quota.</p> <p>This would make S9 acceptable to carry forward and nominate as a site for development within the NP, rather than leave developers with only one viable option, where development would be of a scale disproportionate to the character of the village.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Continued on next page</p>

Conclusion	<p>The drawing up of a Neighbourhood Plan is necessary and welcome. I would like to thank those involved for their time and hard work getting this far.</p> <p>However, I am disappointed with the outcome.</p> <p>The two sites put forward are S2, which will be overlooked by larger developers, and S6, which will therefore be the target of all larger developers.</p> <p>Development of S6 by a large developer will therefore be carried out with the bare minimum 30% affordable housing and as per the pattern of all of these developments, will result in a housing estate with far greater density than that nominated and far in excess of the 27 homes required to gain the 8 affordable homes required by the village.</p> <p>Other sites suitable for development have been overlooked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- S5 because it doesn't have access onto Frome Road. It does if developed in conjunction with S2, which already has support from the village- S9 because the proposed housing density of 28 homes per hectare (compared with 11-12 for S5 and 10 for S6) make is at odds with the surrounding housing stock. This is a falsehood – look at Hollis Way and Southfield, which are built at that approximate level of density. <p>I would like to suggest that the NP be re-drafted with sites S2, S5, S6 and S9 put forward, but see the acreages of the latter 3 reduced significantly in order to provide part, but not all, of the village's housing requirement on each site. Lewis Court (off Wynsome Street) is a good example of how a smaller site can provide both affordable and standard housing on a smaller scale.</p> <p>If the above deters larger developers because they are unable to build huge housing estates, then so be it. Perhaps a smaller developer such as our own W G Dell might then get the opportunity to put up smaller, more responsible housing stock</p>
------------	--