

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		Overall, it is considered that the draft JMNP2 is clearly laid out and well written and is a credit to the efforts of the steering group to date.	Noted with thanks.
Version A			Throughout the neighbourhood plan there are references to Green Infrastructure / Blue/Green Infrastructure. It should be noted that these are not just landscape / biodiversity features and should be holistically planned in conjunction with the flood risk assessment / drainage strategy in order to manage surface water runoff across a site. Given the biodiversity drivers in the emerging Local Plan, we would be expecting to see high-quality Blue/Green SuDS solutions implemented throughout a site, and not just minimal SuDS interventions which are designed to fit limited space available.	Noted and amendments added in relevant areas
Version A			Where amendments to text are suggested, these are shown as <del>deletions</del> and <i>new text</i> .	
Version A			Natural and Built Environment Chapter	We would like to see the title of this chapter renamed to 'Natural, and Built <i>and Historic</i> Environment'
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Planning	References to NPPF paragraphs throughout the Plan	Please check consistency of NPPF referencing throughout the Plan as there are several instances where incorrect paragraph numbers are quoted.	Done.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Planning	References to emerging Wiltshire Local Plan throughout the Plan	Where referencing Wiltshire Local Plan policies, please ensure to use the term 'emerging' to make clear that these are not adopted policies. Local Plan policy content and policy numbers may change during the course of the examination and the neighbourhood plan is likely to be examined against Wiltshire Core Strategy policies (depending on when the neighbourhood plan examination takes place).	Agreed and done.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Planning	Green Infrastructure / Blue/Green Infrastructure	Throughout the draft neighbourhood plan there are references to Green Infrastructure / Blue/Green Infrastructure. It should be noted that these are not just landscape / biodiversity features and should be holistically planned in conjunction with the flood risk assessment / drainage strategy in order to manage surface water runoff across a site. Given the biodiversity drivers in the emerging Local Plan, we would be expecting to see high-quality Blue/Green SuDS solutions implemented throughout a site, and not just minimal SuDS interventions which are designed to fit limited space available.	Agreed - some text updates added in supporting text
Version A	Opac Ltd re land at Shaw and Whitley		Agree with the overall objectives of the JMNP, however consider that additional housing land allocation should be considered at Shaw, either in addition to or in place of the proposed allocation of land at Middle Farm (plots A & B), which appear as an unnatural development of Whitley into open countryside, and which have not come forward for development as a result of inclusion within the JMNP 1. Such alternative housing land could be found on land south of Shaw and to the NE of the A365 as illustrated on the submitted plan.	Noted.
Version A	Cooper Tires	7.1	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd fully supports the Vision and Objectives for the JMNP. A residential-led mixed-use redevelopment of its Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1) is consistent with the Vision and delivery of key Objectives, notably the regeneration and intensified use of previously-developed employment land.	
Version A	Semington Parish Council	19 [also included in tab 19]	This response comes from Semington Parish Council. It is informed by the consideration of your emerging plan by the Semington Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group. The parish Council supports the changes you have made to your neighbourhood plan. Specifically, we welcome the new Policy 19 on Green wedges. One of the priorities for Semington parish council, reflecting the wishes of the whole population, is to ensure that the physical separation of adjacent communities is maintained: specifically, the separation of Semington and Bowerhill and Berryfield. As such, your new policy is highly relevant to Semington as a parish and community, and is, unsurprisingly consistent with the policies within our own emerging neighbourhood plan that are focused on landscape sensitivity.	Noted.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Network Rail		<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.</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 improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements.</p>	Noted
Version A	Network Rail		<p>Level Crossings</p> <p>Any development of land which would result in a material increase or significant change in the character of traffic using rail crossings should be refused unless, in consultation with Network Rail, it can either be demonstrated that they 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.</p> <p>There are 3 level crossings within the plan area that may be affected by future development:</p> <p>Melksham Without 85 Footpath Crossing WEY 99.12  Melksham Without 92 Footpath Crossing WEY 99.41  Melksham 22 Footpath Crossing WEY 100.32</p> <p>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.</p>	Noted.
Version A	Network Rail		<p>Level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing</li> <li>• By the cumulative effect of development added over time</li> <li>• By the type of crossing involved</li> <li>• By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from site includes a level crossing</li> </ul> <p>By developments that might impede pedestrians ability to hear approaching trains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs</li> <li>• By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using a level crossing</li> <li>• By any development or enhancement of the public rights of way</li> </ul>	
Version A	Network Rail		<p>It is Network Rail's and indeed the Office of Rail Regulation's (ORR) policy to reduce risk at level crossings not to increase risk as could be the case with an increase in usage at the level crossings in question. The Office of Rail Regulators, in their policy, hold Network Rail accountable under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, and that risk control should, where practicable, be achieved through the elimination of level crossings in favour of bridges or diversions.</p> <p>The Council have a statutory responsibility under Schedule 4 (j) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order, 2015) to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the rail volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway.</p>	
Version A	Salisbury & Wilton Swifts and North Wiltshire Swifts		<p>Neighbourhood and Local Plans needs to stand the test of time as they stand for 10-15 year. It is therefore extremely important that targets are set with the future in mind rather than basing themselves on current government guidelines eg Wiltshire setting a target of 20% biodiversity net gain rather than the current government 10%. Melksham should follow the county target to be in line.</p>	The emerging Local Plan is not yet adopted and there is no evidence at the local level to support an uplift of a requirement to 20%. However, policy 13 has been updated to include a reference to the ambition to gain higher percentage than 10% with 20% being referenced.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Sustrans	11	<p>It's good to see that there is an emphasis on reducing car journeys and increasing the active travel provision within the town, improving both pedestrian and cycling options for daily journeys is key for this.</p> <p>The multiple references to secure parking for bikes and other mobility tools is also good - this must also include storage for accessible options and not just standard bikes to be inclusive.</p> <p>From looking at the overall plan for the key routes of walking and cycling, it looks like there could be more routes connecting east to west, and a lot of the residential areas have no routes running through them to help connect to key areas, such as schools or shopping centres.</p> <p>As the NCN 403 also runs through the town it could also improve general accessibility to have a clear access from this route to the train station for those that may use the route for commuting.</p>	<p>The JMNP and the town and parish council are also engaging with Wiltshire Council on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) as a way of resolving the detail of delivering increased active travel provision in the town and surrounding rural areas.</p>
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	[Also put in 'Allocations' tab]	<p>It is considered that the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan is premature. The JMNP must be in accordance with the Wiltshire Local Plan which is currently under review. There may be significant changes to the Local Plan before it is adopted which could have significant impacts on policies within this Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>For example, Stantonbury have been promoting, and have plans to develop land at Upside Melksham for a mixed-use housing/employment development (indeed a planning application is currently registered with the Council). The site is an existing Principal Employment area. However, it can be demonstrated (and has been through representations submitted to the Council) that the site should no longer be given this status and it should be considered as a viable site for redevelopment for alternative uses. Were the site to be reconsidered as a potential allocation, including employment and housing, which we believe it should be, then this would have significant positive impacts for Melksham and on policies and proposals in the JMNP.</p>	<p>An up-to-date local plan is not a pre-requisite for neighbourhood planning. Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. <b>They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan</b>" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis)</p> <p>The JMNP2 has regard to both the Core Strategy and the emerging Local Plan with the aim of staying up-to-date and having the fullest possible weight in the consideration of planning applications and the setting of the future direction of growth.</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Email of August 22 2024	The Stantonbury Building and Development Company. representing Upside, SHELAA 264		<p>Could you please take account of the comments we made in the previous consultation.</p> <p>Given the Governments announcements on the need for a substantial increase in house building, particularly affordable housing, the likely changes to the NPPF, the large increase in housebuilding numbers for Wiltshire and the reintroduction of a mandatory five-year housing land supply, it would be advisable to suspend the approval process for the JMNP (and the Wiltshire local plan) so that these changes can be taken into account.</p> <p>We support policy 7. However we do consider that the exclusion of the Upside, Bath Road site is incorrect and that it should be included as an allocated site within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>A full planning application was submitted two years ago following an extensive public consultation exercise.</p> <p>The planning application is still being considered and is yet to be determined.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the EA flood maps covering the site are incorrect. We have spent the past two years extensively modelling the flood conditions in South Brook, including the most extreme flood conditions. We are very pleased to say that the EA have completely accepted the proposals we have made (without any change to the building levels we have used in the application) and they have withdrawn the holding objection, setting out conditions to go on a planning permission.</p> <p>We are currently updating the proposal to take account of the comments made during the consultation on the planning application. The revisions will be submitted in the coming two or three weeks followed shortly after by the updated ecological surveys Information and reports. We are meeting the Town Council Planning Committee on 27th August.</p> <p>In the Wiltshire Local Plan, the site is identified as an employment site. The scheme retains the current employment on site within the development, introduces new commercial units and replaces the former scrapyard with 112 dwellings.</p> <p>With our commercial agents (Carter Jonas) we have demonstrated that the commercial redevelopment of the site cannot meet the infrastructure and remediation costs. Failure to obtain planning permission for the development proposed will simply mean the re-use of the scrapyard with extremely low levels of employment.</p> <p>The site will be redeveloped in conjunction with a Housing Association and it will provide a range of house types, sizes and in particular, a wide range of housing tenures, meeting identified needs in the JMNP needs survey.</p> <p>The development proposed meets sustainable objectives; it is a short walk from the town centre, railway station and the site is convenient for bus services. The development includes valuable, strategic foot and cycle routes.</p> <p>The buildings have been designed to achieve zero carbon in use. The design is of the highest quality with a particular objective of standing a test of "time".</p> <p>The site will create excellent community facilities with the creation of a public park, giving access to and securing the future of local green space 1 (Policy 16). As well as creating public open space and foot and cycle routes, there will be a wildlife area, community orchard, wildflower meadow, community growing space and gardens, accessible green space and attenuation ponds, all designed into the existing landscape hedgerows and trees with a very large BNG gain.</p> <p>We would ask that policy 7 is amended to include the Upside site as an allocated housing site along with the provision of the public park/open space.</p>	<p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (ref land at Bath Road)	Also put to Policy 7.1 - Cooper Tires	<p>Hannick note that the JMNP2 is intended to align with the emerging policies and lifetime of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (WLPR) for which the Reg 19 Consultation has recently ended.</p> <p>The WLPR sets the strategic policies and new housing/employment growth targets for Melksham and where the majority of new homes will be located.</p> <p>The JMNP recognises the importance that the two plans are in general conformity with each other and there is no indication that the Parish Councils do not agree with allocations proposed in the Reg 19 WLPR Draft, which forms the strategic context for the JMNP.</p> <p>Policy 17 of the WLPR covers development at Melksham where approx. 2,160 homes are to be provided over the plan period, through 3 strategic allocations and some 270 dwellings to be delivered through the allocation of small to medium sites being allocated in the JMNP.</p> <p>Policy 19 of the Draft WLPR allocates Land at Bath Road, Melksham for 135 dwellings and 2 hectares of land for the expansion of the Melksham Oak Academy, to provide the necessary secondary education facilities of the town. Hannick retain an interest in the land subject of the proposed allocation and have previously submitted the site in response to the Call for Sites as part of the preparation of the JMNP2. Hannick has submitted reps to Wiltshire Council to support the strategic allocation and confirm the availability of the site and the deliverability of a mixed use development, including the land necessary for the expansion of the adjoining Melksham Oak Academy to meet the secondary education needs of the town over the plan period.</p> <p>It is noted that the Draft JMNP2 seeks to allocate some 150 homes within a mixed use development at Cooper Tires Factory Site. Whilst the redevelopment of the factory site is an important opportunity for the town we note that the site does not reflect the WLPR perceived role of the NP to allocate “small to medium sites” and the delivery of housing through redevelopment of this site over the plan period cannot be certain. The policy could also helpfully state the number of homes and other land use objectives within the main policy, rather than supporting text, similar to Policy 7.2 Melksham Library site.</p> <p>Hannick have also submitted representations in respect of various general policies within the Draft WLPR. It is noted that the Draft JMNP2 also includes several general policies on Sustainable Design and Energy, Flood Risk, Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity, Trees/Hedgerows, Landscape Character, Design etc. It is important that these policies align with those in the WLPR, including any changes following the consideration of reps through the Examination process, to ensure a clear policy framework over the plan period.</p> <p>Finally, Hannick will submit an outline planning application in due course for the land at Bath Road, in accordance with objectives of draft Policy 19 of the WLPR. At the appropriate time Hannick will follow the approach of the Melksham Community Engagement Protocol and objectives of Draft Policy 5 of the JMNP2 in terms of community engagement.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>Noted and appreciated that the Community Engagement Protocol will be followed in pre-application engagement.</p>
Version B - Email 17 Aug 2024	Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (ref land at Bath Road) - from Glenn Goodwin		<p>We note that the changes in the revised Draft JMNP2 are restricted to allocations and Green Wedges and that there are no other changes proposed to the JMNP2 at this stage, which remains as it was in the 2023 Consultation. You have confirmed that all previous comments submitted to the 2023 Consultation are still valid and a resubmission of previous comments are not necessary.</p> <p>The proposed changes do not have any direct implications to Hannick and we will therefore rely on our previous representation, which in itself was limited as we are promoting land North of Bath Road, Melksham, through the Wiltshire Local Plan Review. The site is proposed to be allocated under Policy 19 of the WLPR for 135 dwellings and 2 hectares of land for the expansion of the Melksham Oak Academy. We will continue to consult with the Local Planning Authority on this allocation.</p>	Noted.
Version A	Historic England		<p>Our role in the Neighbourhood Planning process is not to duplicate or substitute for that advice or support which is available locally, particularly from the local planning authority. Our interest also focusses mainly on Plans which propose to allocate sites for development – especially where these are likely to lead to development proposals which attract our formal involvement at any subsequent planning application stage. Experience has shown that there is a need to pay particular attention to the evidence base upon which such allocations are based to ensure that relevant heritage assets have been given appropriate consideration and that harm to them has been avoided in accordance with overarching national and local policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>We note that the review version of the Plan includes 4 new policies or site allocations: policy 7.1 – Land at Cooper Tires; policy 7.2 – Land at the Former Melksham Library Site; policy 7.3 – Whitley Farm; and policy 7.5 – Land at Middle Farm Plot B (an addition to the existing allocation at Plot A policy 7.4). It will be important to ensure that the supporting evidence base justifies the inclusion of these site allocations as proposed.</p>	Agreed. The evidence base relating to the allocations and the historic environment is taken into account.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Email 22 August 2024	Historic England		<p>In our response to the first Regulation 14 consultation on the Reviewed Plan last year we primarily drew attention to the need to ensure that appropriate heritage evidence existed to support the proposed allocations of sites for housing development at that time. Our response is attached again here for information.</p> <p>It is that theme upon which we will again concentrate our advice.</p> <p>We note that the proposed site allocation policies have now changed, with the addition of a further proposed site allocation at Western Way, Bowerhill (policy 7.6 NEW). This follows the granting of planning consent for the site since the Plan originally proposed it as a green wedge and the new policy aims to regularise matters by allocating the site and a quantum of development in accordance with the provisions of that consent. We therefore have no comments on this new policy and site allocation.</p> <p>Elsewhere, we note that there is now a more detailed proposal for the Cooper Tires site with specific quanta of development being promoted (policy 7.1 REV). While development criteria may have been modified there seems to be little material change to proposals for the Melksham Library site (policy 7.2 REV). 15 dwellings rather than the previous 10 are now proposed for the Whitley Farm site (policy 7.3 REV). The Middle Farm site has now a single amalgamated policy which embraces the land allocated in the current Plan (site a) to which is now added around 1.5ha of site b to create a combined development site of 3 ha in total (policy 7.7 NEW).</p> <p>We do not propose to comment on the changes to these policies individually but use this opportunity to reiterate our previous advice in response to the first Regulation 14 consultation on the Reviewed Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Namely, that we would encourage liaison with the Wiltshire Council heritage team if this hasn't already happened to help inform and substantiate the proposals from a heritage point of view. We can see that there is much new and modified information in the Evidence Base file supporting the second version of the Reviewed Plan and we have not gone through this line by line to identify whether there has been active liaison with and accommodation of any advice which might have emerged from the Wiltshire heritage team.</p> <p>We note that there is occasional reference to Wiltshire Council in the supporting text to the relevant policies. However, the extent to which necessary heritage considerations have actively featured in any liaison is not clear, and making a response to this requirement explicit and available in writing as supporting evidence is helpful to an assessment of the Plan's conformity with national and local overarching policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. Such tangible availability can only help in the smooth processing of the Plan once submitted to the Council for Examination and further consultations at that stage – especially perhaps in the case of the Whitley Farm site allocation where development in principle had given rise to concerns within the Council's heritage team.</p>	<p>The JMNP2 team have met with Wiltshire Council officers and the heritage team to discuss the allocations, in particular the Whitley Farm site. The allocation policy for Whitley Farm will be amended in light of their feedback.</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Natural England	Policy 13	<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</b></p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex [Appendix 6.2.1.7 ] which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species.</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>	Noted.
Version A	Canal and River Trust	Policy 12 (p82-83) & Priority Statement 3: Wilts and Berks Canal Restoration (p115)	<p>We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals &amp; rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Canal &amp; River Trust (the Trust) is a statutory consultee in the Development Management process, and as such we welcome the opportunity to input into planning policy related matters to ensure that our waterways are protected, safeguarded and enhanced within an appropriate policy framework.</p> <p>The canal &amp; River Trust (the Trust) have reviewed the document and policies contained within the document and based on the information available we have no comment to make. although we note the continuing support for the proposed Melksham link which will join on to the Trusts' canal, the Kennet &amp; Avon, at Semington.</p>	Noted.
Version A - Email 21 Nov 2023	National Highways	Priority Statement 1 - Transport Infrastructure - Bypass (p113)	<p>Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to comment on the draft of the Reviewed Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan, reflecting the proposed modifications following a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan. National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the M4 motorway, and A36 and A303 trunk roads which pass some distance to the north, west and south respectively of the Plan area.</p> <p>It is noted that the modified Plan will align with the Wiltshire Local Plan Review document in terms of the plan period which will now be to 2038. The modified Neighbourhood Plan also proposes to allocate sites for development which will complement the three larger strategic sites which are proposed as allocations within the draft Local Plan. In combination these should provide for an identified residual requirement of around 1120 dwellings for the Melksham plan area.</p> <p>The plan area is bisected by the A350 and development has the potential to impact on M4 J17, as well as local connections to the A36, all of which experience constraints in the peak periods. Whilst we have no particular comments with regards to the proposed allocations within the Reviewed Neighbourhood Plan, it should be noted that we are continuing to work with Wiltshire Council in developing their transport evidence base to understand the impact of the proposed spatial strategy on the SRN, and any requirements for necessary mitigation at key strategic junctions to accommodate the proposed levels of growth.</p> <p>This does not however prejudice any future responses National Highways 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.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Email 15 July 2024	National Highways	Priority Statement 1 - Transport Infrastructure - Bypass ( )	Our comments below are an update to those provided on 21 November 2023, and reflect the further amendments which have now been made to the draft JMNP2. In particular, we have noted the changes to site allocations. The plan now proposes to allocate 5 housing sites totalling 480 dwellings. Of these, 210 benefit from planning consent and 50 are proposed for extra care dwellings. These sites are intended to complement larger strategic sites to be allocated through the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan.	Noted.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		The Steering Group should be praised for the speed in which the review of the Neighbourhood Plan is progressing, with the first Neighbourhood Plan having been made only just over two years ago. However, notwithstanding their general support for the Plan, they have identified a number of concerns with the content contained within it. These issues have been identified within the representation. The comments are provided in a constructive manner, to help the Steering Group progress the Plan with alacrity.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plans are most effective when kept under constant review and are modified as necessary.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House		It is noted that many of the policies in the JMNP2 are rolled forward from the made JMNP1. Pegasus make no comment on those policies that are rolled forward given they have been previously examined and already comprise part of the Development Plan.	Noted.
		1.4.3 (p10)	3.3 Given the eWLP is unlikely to be adopted until 2025, owing to the need for submission, Examination and possible Main Modification (including further public consultation) the plan period of the eWLP should be extended until at least 2040/41. 3.4 Accordingly, it is submitted that the plan period of the JMNP2 should be extended until 2040/41 if it is to be in lockstep with the eWLP. 3.5 An extension in plan period of the eWLP will have an associated uplift in housing and employment needs and therefore the housing requirements for Market Towns. Melksham is identified as a Market Town in the eWLP.	The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.
			4.2 Therefore, if the JMNP2 is to be made before the adoption of the eWLP (i.e. before 2025) then it will be necessary for it to be prepared in general conformity with the adopted development plan which comprises the Wiltshire Core Strategy, which only has a plan period until 2026. 4.3 To have a plan period until 2038 or longer the JMNP2 cannot be 'made' until after the adoption of the eWLP in order to meet Basic Conditions as currently there is no adopted development plan for Melksham that has a plan period until 2038.	Wiltshire Council's Local Plan review document, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period .  As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 https:



**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3105a/b part (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)		<p>Overarching principle</p> <p>The basic conditions, amongst other matters, require neighbourhood plans (NP) to have regard to national policies, contribute to sustainable development and generally conform to the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area. In this context, and to help guide what is meant by these basic conditions, the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms:</p> <p>'A neighbourhood plan or Order must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. The NPPF is the main document setting out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.' (ID: 41-069-20140306)</p> <p>'... A qualifying body should demonstrate how its plan or Order will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset (referred to as mitigation measures). ... Material produced as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the local plan may be relevant to a neighbourhood plan.' (ID: 41-072-20190509)</p> <p>'When considering whether a policy is in general conformity a qualifying body, independent examiner, or local planning authority, should consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy</li> <li>• whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy</li> <li>• the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or Order and the evidence to justify that approach.' (ID: 41-074-20140306)</li> </ul> <p>It is highly relevant that both the NPPF and Wiltshire Local Plan contain policies concerning sustainable development principles, including covering matters in relation to sustainable design, construction, and energy. It is further relevant paragraph 1.2.3 of the NP (Reg 14) confirms that this version of the NP seeks to align with the Reg 19 Local Plan, and that the Wiltshire Local Plan (Reg 19) confirms that:</p> <p>'All the policies in this plan are strategic.' (Para 1.6)</p> <p>The following representations are made against these clear provisions and requirements.</p>	Noted.
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for <b>Martin Grant Homes</b> and landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3645? (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		<p>1.4 The Steering Group will be aware of the draft NPPF changes, and the implications for growth across Wiltshire, with the revised Standard Methodology Local Housing Needs increasing from 1,917 dpa to 3,476 dpa. Wiltshire Council has yet to submit its plan for examination, and, if they do submit before the changes are introduced, will inevitably be asked to consider the implications of the draft in any event (as others in the same position have already). This will undoubtedly have implications for the level of growth to be accommodated at the Market Towns and Villages across the district. In this context, we would urge the Steering Group to await the response from Wiltshire (and PINS) before proceeding further, and to further review opportunities for sustainable growth around the town. At the current time, progress with the neighbourhood plan is premature. We further reference this below in response to the housing allocations policy.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council's Local Plan review document, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period .</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Tor & Co, on behalf of Gleeson Land, re Land East of Melksham', an emerging allocation in Wiltshire Local Plan Reg 19 update, under Policy 18 (Tor&Co also represent Martin Grant)		<p>1.5 The Steering Group will be aware of the draft NPPF changes which were announced in July 2024 and are currently being consulted on, and the implications for growth across Wiltshire. Notwithstanding the outcome of the consultation, and the revised Standard Methodology Local Housing Needs it is clear the government is seeking to drive housing delivery forward with these targets filtering through to local and neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>1.6 Wiltshire Council has yet to submit its plan for examination, and, if they do submit before the changes are introduced, will inevitably be asked to consider the implications of the draft NPPF (as others in the same position have already). Should Wiltshire Council submit before the proposed NPPF changes come into force (NPPF adoption date plus one month) they will be required to undertake an immediate review of the plan to take into account the additional housing need, which is greater than 200 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>1.7 This will undoubtedly have implications for the level of growth to be accommodated at the Market Towns and Villages across the district. In this context, we would urge the Steering Group to await the response and progress of the draft NPPF before proceeding further, which even in an amended form is likely to require further review of opportunities for sustainable growth around the town. At the current time, progress with the neighbourhood plan is premature.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council's Local Plan review document, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period .</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version A	National Grid, submitted by Avision Young		<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above document we have identified the following NGET assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary:</p> <p>Asset Description Electrical Substation: MELK1 Electrical Substation: MELK2 Electrical Substation: MELK4 275Kv Underground Cable route: IRON ACTON - MELKSHAM 1 275Kv Underground Cable route: IRON ACTON - MELKSHAM 1 XL ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: IRON ACTON - MELKSHAM 1 ZG ROUTE TWR (004 - 259): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: HINKLEY POINT - MELKSHAM 1 33Kv Underground Cable route: MELKSHAM - THINGLEY JUNCTION YYM ROUTE TWR (001 - 109): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: BRAMLEY - MELKSHAM 1 ZF ROUTE TWR (503 - 504): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: MELKSHAM - MINETY 2 ZF ROUTE TWR (503 - 505): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: MELKSHAM - MINETY 1 4YX ROUTE TWR (172R - 311): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: MELKSHAM - SEABANK</p> <p>A plan [Appendix 6.2.1.4 ] showing details of NGET's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape/files/">www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape/files/</a></li> </ul> </p> <p>Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to NGET infrastructure. <a href="#">[only the map attached]</a></p>	Noted.
Version A	National Gas, submitted by Avision Young		<p>Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Gas Transmission assets An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Gas Transmission provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps">https://www.nationalgas.com/land-and-assets/network-route-maps</a></li> </ul> </p>	Noted.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		<p>Gladman note the intention is for the JMNP2 to align with the proposed plan period of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review to 2038. Whilst this approach is supported in principle, in our view the 2038 end date for the Local Plan Review as proposed will undoubtedly have to be extended to ensure that the requirements of NPPF paragraph 221 are met. Given the scale and substance of the plan, in addition to unresolved objections to its content, Gladman are anticipating a protracted examination period and consider it highly unlikely that the Local Plan Review will be adopted by the end of 2024 as suggested by Wiltshire Council. Gladman consider a more likely adoption date of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review to be early 2026 which would mean the plan-period would need to be extended until at least 2041. In light of this it would be prudent for the Steering Group to consider extending the plan period of the JMNP2 in this instance.</p> <p>Given the above, the Steering Group need to also consider the eventuality that the JMNP2 may be 'made' ahead of the Local Plan Review. It is of course for the Steering Group to consider when the JMNP2 should be submitted for independent examination, however, given the likely drawn-out examination of the Local Plan Review, significant consideration should be given to delaying the progress of the JMNP2 to ensure that it can dovetail with the eventual adoption of the Local Plan Review. Such an approach would avoid the potential for abortive work and minimise the risk of the JMNP2 being overridden by the adoption of Local Plan Review.</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509</p> <p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy) in order to stay up-to-date.</p> <p>As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period .</p>
Version A	Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes, representing land west of Semington Road and South of A350		<p>Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review</p> <p>Wiltshire Council is currently reviewing its Local Plan. It consulted on the Pre-Submission Draft (Regulation 19) between 27 September and 22 November 2023. According to Wiltshire Council's latest Local Development Scheme, the Local Plan Review is due to be adopted by 'End of Qtr 4 2024', based on Submission to the Secretary of State for Examination in Q2 2024.</p> <p>Given the Wiltshire Local Plan Review is ongoing, Bellway is concerned with the timing of the production of the JMNP given the changing strategic context. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) states that neighbourhood plans should not undermine the strategic policies for the area (para. 29). Further, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that "a neighbourhood plan should support the delivery of strategic policies set out in the local plan" (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 41- 004-20190509). The current adopted Core Strategy is very dated (adopted 2015) and it's therefore imperative that the updated strategic vision for the Local Plan Review is confirmed prior to a Neighbourhood Plan being 'made', although its progression can clearly run in parallel in part. Bellway therefore objects to the draft JMNP in its current form as it does not meet the basic condition of general conformity.</p> <p>The JMNP should follow on from adoption of the Local Plan Review, once this has been fully Examined and found to be sound by Inspectors, to ensure it conforms with the strategic policies. Jumping ahead of the local plan review process and confirming strategic constraints around Melksham including Green Wedges pre-judges the outcome of the Local Plan Review and does not meet the basis conditions.</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509</p> <p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>In some respects, it is beneficial for a local plan and neighbourhood plan to be prepared in parallel, this allows coordination between the plans in terms of their policies and deciding the level at which site allocations are made.</p> <p>While the draft JMNP2 is not tested against the policies in an emerging local plan, the reasoning and evidence informing the</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	LPC for private landowner re LGS6 at Whitley	[also put in Basic Conditions tab]	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights that neighbourhood plans must meet certain ‘basic conditions’ and other legal requirements before they can come into force. The main ‘basic conditions’ (which are set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) are the need for neighbourhood plans to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ have regard to national policy.</li> <li>▪ contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</li> <li>▪ be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area.</li> <li>▪ be compatible with EU obligations.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed allocation of various sites to meet the housing need of the neighbourhood plan area is supported, however it is considered that certain elements of the new draft Local Green Spaces and Green Wedges policies do not fully meet the basic conditions as outlined within the following sections.</p>	We are aware of this.
Version B, Letter emailed on 21 August 2024	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB		<p><b>General Comments on Health Infrastructure to Support Housing Growth</b></p> <p>The delivery of new and improved healthcare infrastructure is significantly resource intensive. The NHS is facing significant constraints in terms of the funding needed to deliver healthcare services, and population growth from new housing development adds further pressure to the system. New developments should make a proportionate contribution to funding the healthcare infrastructure needs arising from new development. Health and care provision is an integral component of sustainable development – access to essential health and care services promotes good health outcomes and supports the overall social and economic wellbeing of an area. Residential developments often have very significant impacts in terms of the need for additional primary and community healthcare provision for future residents. Given health and care infrastructure’s strategic importance to supporting housing growth and sustainable development, it should be considered at the forefront of the priorities for infrastructure delivery. The ability to continually review the quality and utilisation of healthcare, and wider public estate, optimise land use, and deliver health services from modern fit for the future facilities is crucial. Infrastructure including access to digital solutions must be supported to develop, modernise, or be protected in line with integrated NHS strategies. Planning policies should enable the delivery of essential health and care infrastructure.</p>	Noted. This is a key concern from the local community also.
Version B Letter emailed on 21 August 2024	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB		<p><b>Detailed Comments on Neighbourhood Plan 2 Proposals</b></p> <p>We support the Vision of the Plan that wants to see community, health and education provision delivered alongside the necessary housing and employment growth. We welcome the Neighbourhood Plan’s recognition of the constraints on local health and care infrastructure and the need for additional, and high-quality solutions to support growth. Over recent years, we have seen increased pressure from new housing developments that are situated in Melksham which is putting further pressure on healthcare service capacity, including Primary Care (General Practice and Community Pharmacy) and Community Services. References within the allocation policies to proportionate contributions to healthcare capacity and capability to meet the needs created by new housing developments are therefore supported.</p> <p>The Council will need to continue to engage with the ICB and its partners to ensure that the healthcare infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents is delivered at a pace that matches the scale of new developments, in particular for primary healthcare services which are often more directly impacted by local population growth. It may be helpful to reference in the supporting text to Policy 8 (Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities) that for healthcare, applicants will need to engage with BSW ICB to determine the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development.</p> <p>The BSW vision is for health and care organisations to work more effectively in partnership. This will be crucial to creating communities and environments that help people to live healthier for longer. The ICB deliver joined-up support across our health and care services that better meets the needs of the population. Working more closely together will also allow NHS organisations and local authorities to ensure that needed healthcare infrastructure is delivered alongside new development.</p> <p>Where existing health facilities are surplus to requirements or will be changed as part of wider NHS estate reorganisation and service transformation programmes, policies within the Neighbourhood Plan should support the principle of alternative uses for NHS sites with no requirement for retention of a community facility use on the land. All NHS land disposals must follow a rigorous process to ensure that levels of healthcare service provision in the locality of disposals are maintained or enhanced, and proceeds from land sales are re-invested in the provision of healthcare services locally and nationally. The decision about whether a property is surplus to NHS requirements is made by local health commissioners and NHS England. Sites can only be disposed of once the operational health requirement has ceased.</p>	Noted. The JMNP2 steering group and town and parish council welcome engagement with the ICB and its partners on an NHS Estates Plan for the Melksham area.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Letter emailed on 22 August 2024	Environment Agency	General [also put in Policy 3 and 7.1]	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above Neighbourhood Plan. We offer the following advice on the plan, in addition to the comments we made on 30th November 2023. We are disappointed that our previous comments were not incorporated into this iteration of the Neighbourhood Plan. They were not based on our preference but on National Planning Policy.</p> <p><b>Policy 3: Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management</b>                      We note that this policy has not been updated as per the recommendation in our earlier letter. We strongly encourage the expansion of the wording of the policy to include all sources of flooding, including fluvial flood risk. There has been recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that requires all sources of flooding to be included.</p> <p><b>Policy 7.1 Cooper Tires Site Allocation</b>                      The majority of the site is affected by flood zones 2 and 3. The proposal includes residential use which is defined as more vulnerable. (National Planning Policy Framework - Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) There is a need for this allocation to be Sequentially Tested as part of this Neighbourhood Plan. The NPPF/ Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that this is expected within the Plan that intends to allocate the site - Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). If the site were to be allocated for 'less vulnerable' site uses only, which would then maintain the existing level of vulnerability, then the Sequential Test would not be required. A flood risk assessment (FRA) and suitable flood risk mitigation could be considered at the planning application stage.</p>	Policy 3 was not amended in the second regulation 14 version of the Plan.
Version B Email 10 July	Lacock Parish Council		Many thanks for keeping Lacock Parish Council informed. At present members have no comment to make.	Noted

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email 22 Aug 2024	Spa Medical Centre		<p>Whilst there is a lot of exciting development and change detailed in the plan, there seems to be a cavernous omission.</p> <p>Do forgive me if I am incorrect or there is a separate detailed plan relating to the development of healthcare, but nowhere in the 129 page document was a plan relating to healthcare development that will be required to support the infrastructure mentioned.</p> <p>As you are very much aware Melksham has had huge development over recent years, there has been little financial input or consideration for the services for the local community when it comes to General Practice facilities and without doubt we have been overlooked for funding.</p> <p>With ever expanding housing developments comes a larger requirement for healthcare.</p> <p>As I am sure you are aware with 2 local surgeries in Melksham and a surgery in Bradford-on - Avon within our PCN we care for a large number of patients. Your plan details the following:</p> <p>'At Melksham, the Wiltshire Draft (Regulation 19) Local Plan suggests that land for a further 1,120 homes need to be planned for up until 2038 within the JMNP area. It has set a requirement for about 200 homes to be allocated at Melksham by JMNP2. The Local Plan also identifies a separate large village housing requirement of around 73 dwellings for Whitley and Shaw, and takes account of the 18 dwellings at Middle Farm, Whitley allocated in the first JMNP'</p> <p>May I ask as to how you are assessing the impact of these developments on local health care provision? Your above plan will encourage roughly 4000-5000 new patients to move to the area - all of whom need a GP and healthcare.</p> <p>As you may well be aware both local practices are unable to expand and develop the current properties in which they reside and the practice at BOA is essentially almost derelict in parts. We do not currently have the space and facilities to offer services that we know would benefit our patients and there is no funding available presently to facilitate change.</p> <p>How do you anticipate with buildings not fit for purpose and with no ability to expand ( despite extensive work with the ICB toolkit and no funding) that we will care and provide the best service possible for this new cohort of patients?</p> <p>What seems apparent is that if you expect us to expand estates ( which is a certainty to care for more patients) to provide the care needed for these extra patients this is going to need funding via developer contributions and CIL money to utilise on healthcare estates.</p> <p>Can you provide information as to how you anticipate us to apply for and obtain this funding?</p>	<p>The JMNP is planning at the very local scale of the Town and Parish.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan and the Local Planning Authority, Wiltshire Council are setting the number of houses, jobs and associated infrastructure required.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council, working with the town and parish council have asked the NHS Estates team to provide an Estates Plan for Melksham so they have a better chance at securing s106 funding. From a recent Wiltshire Council area board meeting that Medical Centre representatives attended, the Parish Council are under the impression that the Medical Centre could cope with all the proposed new development. The JMNP2 Steering Group and the parish and town councils welcome engagement with the Melksham Primary Care Network and ICB on the emerging NHS Estates Plan.</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf of private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>3.4 Since the consultation on this submission version of the JMNP2 commenced, proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework have been announced at the end of July 2024 including changes to the planning system. A new Standard Method will set mandatory housing targets reflecting urgency in housing delivery, aiming for the delivery of 370,000 homes per year. A stronger affordability driver is also introduced to account for unaffordability and increase stock further in required areas.</p> <p>3.5 For some areas, this results in draft housing targets that significantly exceed the housing numbers currently anticipated in current and emerging Development Plan Documents. For Wiltshire Council, this means a proposed increase (as currently drafted) from 1,917 to 3,476 dwellings per annum. This is a significant increase matches the Government's plan to deliver 1.5million new homes this parliament.</p> <p>3.6 The reforms to the NPPF will make this figure mandatory to ensure that Local Plans are ambitious enough to support the required level of growth. As currently stands this will require an increase of over 81% of housing numbers from that currently forecast in the emerging WLPR.</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in response to the <a href="#">Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation</a> on 19 December 2023 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The current consultation on the NPPF is just that - consultation only at this stage. Therefore the Neighbourhood Plan, at this advanced stage continues to be prepared with regard to the current version of the revised NPPF (19th December 2023). We would also add, as set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf of private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>3.7 As a sustainable settlement, identified in the WLRP for significant growth over the plan period, Melksham will be a key focus for growth in light of these emerging new increased housing targets, and it is without a doubt, that the WLPR and development strategy for Wiltshire will need to include updates to increase the number of houses to be delivered in the settlement over the plan period to 2038.</p> <p>3.8 In this context, the emerging JMNP should not frustrate the delivery of sustainable development opportunities and should look to support the proposed increase in housing numbers through the new increased housing targets. As a Market Town which has been identified as a having strategic employment role in Wiltshire, Melksham is capable of supporting increased housing numbers as a sustainable location for growth.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis) As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		<p>Plan Period</p> <p>2.1. We note the plan period for the draft NDP remains unchanged from the previous consultation draft, proposed as 2020 - 2038. It is important that the plan period for the NDP aligns with the plan period for the Local Plan, and our recent representations to the draft Local Plan raised concerns that the start date of 2020 appears to be arbitrary and unnecessarily confusing given that four years will have passed before the Local Plan will reach the Examination stage. Equally, the end date of 2038 does not provide a sufficient duration for the plan period post adoption to address the minimum 15 year requirement of the Framework.</p> <p>2.2. We therefore continue to have concerns over the soundness of the proposed plan period which we maintain should be extended to at least 15 years, to accord with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. This will account for the fact that the Local Plan has faced further delays and is unlikely to be adopted until 2025 at the earliest.</p> <p>2.3. We therefore recommend again that the plan period for the draft NDP is amended to ensure it aligns with the plan period for the Wiltshire Local Plan which will inevitably need to change given the ongoing delays.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis) As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version B - PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)	Time Period - 1.4.3, pB10	<p>However, the publication of the recent NPPF consultation on 30th July 2024, proposes the implementation of revisions to meet the new Labour government's national housing targets, principally the requirement for local housing need within Local Plans to be based upon the revised standard method. Although there are transitional arrangements in place under paragraph 226 for those plans in progress, because the Wiltshire Local Plan is at Regulation 19 stage but currently contains a housing requirement more than 200 dwellings below the new standard method, it is required to update to the new methodology (unless it is submitted for examination before the proposed NPPF changes are adopted). In short, it is extremely likely that the Wiltshire Local Plan will need to go back to the drawing board to reflect the higher standard method figure, with knock on impacts for the housing needs within the towns and villages, and where relevant, the numbers of dwellings to be delivered in Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in response to the <a href="#">Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation</a> on 19 December 2023 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The current consultation on the NPPF is just that - consultation only at this stage. Therefore the Neighbourhood Plan, at this advanced stage continues to be prepared with regard to the current version of the revised NPPF (19th December 2023). We would also add, as set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>



**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham	Time Period - 1.4.3, pB10	<p><b>New draft National Planning Policy Framework</b></p> <p>4.5 On 30th July this year the new Labour Government launched a consultation on “Proposed reforms to the NPPF and other changes to the planning system” and the “National Planning Policy Framework: draft text for consultation”, and alongside this the Secretary of State released a written ministerial statement entitled “Building the homes we need.”</p> <p>4.6 The consultation documents, and the written ministerial statement (WMS), are a clear signal of intent by the new Government.</p> <p>4.7 Whilst we note that the consultation, and the WMS, are not yet adopted Government policy, both have material weight in plan making, and planning decisions.</p> <p>4.8 Part of the consultation includes a proposed new approach to calculating housing needs. The output of this calculation suggests that the housing needs in Wiltshire will increase from 1,917 dwellings a year, to 3,476 dwellings a year. This equates to over 62,500 new homes across an 18-year plan period (such as that presented in the Wiltshire Local Plan review) compared to 36,740 new homes which was suggested at the Regulation 19 stage of that plan.</p> <p>4.9 It is very likely then that the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan will require further revisions, and more housing development sites.</p> <p>4.10 We suggest that the Councils should think carefully about the timing of their Neighbourhood Development Plan production, and consider aligning it more closely to the drafting of the District Council's Local Plan.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis) As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and “Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version B - PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		<p>5.1 The Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Development Plan needs to include clearer reference to the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Update, and the Councils should consider the direction of the new draft National Planning Policy Framework. The Councils should be careful not to cut across any potential emerging spatial strategy for strategic growth.</p>	<p>Agreed that it is important to be clear on the inter relationship between the two Plans.</p>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)	Time Period - 1.4.3, pB10	<b>Plan period</b> The plan period has been formed to align with the emerging Local Plan Review. This is entirely sensible. However, representations were made to the Local Plan Review Regulation 19 consultation that the plan period was not long enough to satisfy the requirements of para. 22 of the NPPF. Consequently, there may be the need to extend the plan period. This could have implications for the Neighbourhood Plan.	The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR. Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis)  As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		1.4 Given their interests within Melksham, BH are pleased to see the publication of the second draft of the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Part 2. As stated in their representation to the first draft of the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan Part 2 in December 2023, BH consider that the Steering Group should be commended for bringing forward a consultation version of their second Neighbourhood Plan so soon after the first Neighbourhood Plan was made. It will ensure that Melksham benefits from an up-to-date and locally specific development plan document that will reflect local aspirations on the type, design, location and mix of new development within the area.	Noted.
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)	planning policy context, page B 16 section 2.4	2.1 The second section of BH's consultation response to the first Regulation consultation summarised national planning policy contained within the September 2023 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance that was relevant to the preparation of a neighbourhood plan. 2.2 Since the submission of the representations, a revised version of the NPPF has been published (December 2023). Other than the content of para. 66 of the September 2023 version of the NPPF now being included within para. 67 of the latest iteration, the summary remains valid.	Noted.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>	Time Period - 1.4.3, pB10	<p><input type="checkbox"/> the emerging Regulation 19 Local Plan has not provided sufficient time from its anticipated adoption to meet the requirements of para. 22 of the NPPF and may need to be extended. This may have implications for the Neighbourhood Plan's plan period, which may also need to be extended;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> whilst it is an entirely sensible proposition for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to be prepared in conformity with the emerging Local Plan Review, the emerging Local Plan Review has not been tested at examination and is therefore subject to change. The policies will only be 'fixed' on adoption of the Plan. Consequently, it may be necessary for the preparation of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan to align with the emerging Local Plan Review; and</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> if the Local Plan's local housing need and requirement figure were to increase, it is possible that given Melksham's role and function within Wiltshire (a market town) and it not being identified as being a 'constrained' settlement, Melksham's requirement could be increased. To ensure conformity with the emerging Local Plan Review, there is a need to carefully monitor the housing requirement to be accommodated within the Neighbourhood Plan, as the Local Plan Review progresses.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis)</p> <p>As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p>
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road	New NPPF framework	<p><b>(4) The Written Ministerial Statement and the New National Planning Policy Framework</b></p> <p>As such, three scenarios are considered below. The first two assume the Government's recent planning reforms will be adopted without further change in 2024. The third considers the potential for further change to the transitional arrangements:</p> <p>Scenario 1: The draft Local Plan progresses in accordance with the Local Development Scheme timetable (Current Draft 226c)</p> <p>In this scenario, paragraph 226c of the Consultation Version of the NPPF would apply, meaning the draft Local Plan will be assessed against the December 2023 NPPF. However, as the annual housing requirement would be more than 200 dwellings lower than the local housing need figure (as determined by the Standard Method), paragraph 227 of the Consultation Version of the NPPF would apply, which would require Wiltshire Council to commence plan making in the new plan-making system at the earliest opportunity to address the shortfall in housing need. This would plainly require major new allocations across Wiltshire, including in Melksham as one of the most sustainable settlements. It is impossible to see how Melksham would deliver the necessary numbers without the delivery of this Site. Indeed, the Town Council would have to explore a range of new allocations.</p>	Noted.
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road	New NPPF framework	<p>Scenario 2: The draft Local Plan does not progress in accordance with the timetable, and remains at Regulation 19 stage on the date of publication (+ one month) of the Consultation Version of the NPPF (Current Draft 226c)</p> <p>In this scenario, paragraph 226 would not apply, as the annual housing requirement would be more than 200 dwellings below the local housing need figure, meaning the policies in the Consultation Version of the NPPF would apply for the purposes of plan making. Paragraph 228 of the Consultation Version of the NPPF would apply but includes ambiguity. Fortunately, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has published further guidance: Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system (Updated 2 August 2024). Chapter 12, subsection 7 of the guidance advises that local plans with a difference of over 200 dwellings per annum between the local housing need figure and the draft/emerging local plan's housing requirement will need to be revised in accordance with the revised NPPF. The same consequences would apply that Melksham would almost certainly have to explore new allocations, including the Land West of Semington Road Site.</p>	Noted.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road	New NPPF framework	<p>Scenario 3: Change to Draft NPPF 226c</p> <p>Finally, as a qualification on Scenario 1, Government may wish to impose a more stringent approach than that currently in 226c, where an authority such as Wiltshire is not merely 200 homes short, but many hundreds or even 1000+ homes short – effectively defaulting to Scenario 2. The same consequences would follow requiring new allocations.</p>	<p>All three scenarios are noted. The JMNP2 is being prepared within an emerging, and changing wider policy context. It is however positively planning to meet housing need and as set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and “Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.”</p> <p>As part of Wiltshire Council’s Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p>
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Planning		<p>The draft JMNP2 represents a considerable amount of work, involving many interests in the local community, and deals with various issues, pulling them together in a coherent way. The plan has been prepared positively with a proactive attitude to achieving the desired outcomes for the town. It is evident that thorough community engagement has been undertaken in the lead up to this Regulation 14 consultation on the draft JMNP2. It is therefore considered that the steering group have provided sufficient opportunity for the local community to give their views on what the draft JMNP2 for Melksham should contain.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the draft JMNP2 is clearly laid out and well written and is a credit to the efforts of the steering group to date. The purpose of this consultation is to identify areas that would benefit from improvement, in the interests of clarity, to inform the preparation of the draft JMNP2 in the Regulation 15 submission. With this borne in mind, the table below sets out Wiltshire Council’s response to the draft plan. The views of specialist officers of the Council have been incorporated herewith.</p>	Noted.

Foreword / Chapter 1 & 2

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	<a href="#">Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning</a>	Para 1.2.5 1st bullet point	It is recommended that this paragraph is amended to make clear that the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR) is emerging policy and still at a relatively early stage in its preparation, as while the Regulation 19 consultation has been completed the Plan has not yet been through examination. LPR policies relied upon or referenced in the JMNP2 may change prior to the LPR being adopted and this may affect policies in the JMNP2. The JMNP2 will likely be examined against adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) policies and therefore, it is recommended that WCS policies are always referenced in the JMNP2, but it is useful to also consider how the policies comply with the emerging LPR policies recognising the stage the plan has reached. This should be consistent throughout the Plan.  In line with legislation and national policy, during the plan period the Local Plan will be reviewed (at least once every 5 years) to assess whether it needs updating, and that the neighbourhood plan may also need to be reviewed as necessary during that time.	Agreed. New text for bullet 1 drafted.
Version A		Para 2.4.5 1st sentence	It is recommended that the first sentence is re-worded as follows: ‘... <del>provides an indicative target</del> <b>makes provision</b> for future development of homes, employment space and community infrastructure for Melksham and Bowerhill and a <del>separate figure</del> <b>level of housing growth</b> for Shaw and Whitley up to 2038.	Agreed.
Version A		Para 2.4.5 and Section 2.5	These paragraphs would benefit from review for clarity to ensure they reflect the wording within the emerging Local Plan about housing requirements, which form the basis for indicative requirements for the neighbourhood plan. (See Policy 17 Melksham, Policy 2 Delivery Strategy and Table 4.4). For example, the first sentence of 2.5.1 refers to a revised housing target of 1,170 for Melksham, which does not reflect the requirement.	Agreed.
Version A		Para 2.5.1 first sentence	This refers to a ‘revised housing target figure of 1,170 for Melksham’ in the draft Local Plan. The Local Plan is actually proposing a requirement for Melksham of 2,160 with a residual of 1,120. This paragraph could therefore be amended and Section 2.5 as a whole reviewed to ensure accuracy.	Agreed.
Version A		Para 2.6.2 first sentence	It is recommended that the first sentence is re-worded as follows: ‘... because Wiltshire Council is <del>set</del> <b>proposing</b> to allocate...’.	Agreed.
Version A		Para 2.6.3 first sentence	It is recommended that the first sentence is re-worded as follows: ‘Although there is no requirement to allocate housing in <del>this a</del> Neighbourhood Plan, there is ongoing development pressure in the Neighbourhood Plan area, and as set out earlier, there is a <del>target</del> <b>neighbourhood area housing requirement</b> figure set out in the <b>emerging</b> Local Plan.’	Agreed.
Version A		Figure 4	Figure 4 would benefit from being updated to reflect the current position eg recent planning permissions.	The figure has been reviewed and has been updated to be accurate as of August 2024
Version B, August	<a href="#">Wiltshire Council Planning</a>	Paragraph 1.1.4 and throughout Plan	Please amend all references to ‘ <i>river Avon</i> ’ throughout the Plan to ‘ <b>River Avon</b> ’.	Agreed and done.
		Jargon Alert box – page 8	The link to page 122 in the box actually takes you to page 119 and this should be amended.	Done. Now page 116.
		Section 2.5 heading	We suggest the title of this section is amended as follows: ‘ <i>Draft Local Plan Housing Target <b>Requirements</b> and Site Allocations</i> ’.	Agreed and done.

## Foreword / Chapter 1 & 2

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No. heading and paragraph s	Comment	Response
		2.5.1-2.5.2	These paragraphs would benefit from review for clarity to ensure they reflect the wording within the emerging Local Plan regarding housing requirements, which form the basis for indicative requirements for the neighbourhood plan. (See Local Plan Policy 17 Melksham, Policy 2 Delivery Strategy and Tables 4.2/4.4). For example, the first sentence of 2.5.1 refers to a revised housing target of 1,170 for Melksham, which does not reflect the requirement in the emerging Local Plan. The Local Plan does not refer to 'targets'. Local Plan Table 4.2 indicates housing growth at Melksham of 2,160 dwellings with a residual requirement of 1,120.	Text updated.
Version A	<u>Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens,</u>	Chapter 1, 1.4.3 (P10)	The Plan period has been formed to align with the emerging Local Plan Review. This is entirely sensible. However, representations were made to the Local Plan Review Regulation 19 consultation that the Plan period was not long enough to satisfy the requirements of para. 22 of the NPPF. Consequently it may need to be extended by three further monitoring years, to 2041. This could have implications for the Neighbourhood Plan.	There is no statutory time-period that a plan must cover. The NDP is being prepared to align with the time period of the emerging Local Plan Review as it is currently set.
Version A	<u>SHELAA site 3310</u>	Chapter 2, 2.5.1 - 2.5.3 (p16)	Should the Local Plan Review's Plan period be extended by three monitoring years, its housing requirement would need to be increased on a proportional basis. This could have implications for the housing requirement to be met through allocations in the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan. Moreover, we are aware that representations were submitted to the Regulation 19 Local Plan Review consultation suggesting that Wiltshire's local housing need is greater than the output of the standard method. If this is accepted, then it could again result in the Neighbourhood Plan's requirement being increased. This will need to be carefully monitored up to the adoption of the Local Plan Review.	Wiltshire Council's Local Plan review document, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.  As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version A		Chapter 2, 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 (p16)	Having regard to the geographic scale of the Plan and commentary provided by Inspectors of recent planning Appeals <sup>10</sup> , it is considered that it is more realistic to assume that the Local Plan Review will not be adopted until Quarter 2 2026. To conform with the requirements of para. 22 of the NPPF, this will mean that the plan period would need to be extended until 2041.  In turn, and for the reasons set out below, this may require the Neighbourhood Plan's plan period to also be extended to 2041.	There is no statutory time-period that a plan must cover. The NDP is being prepared to align with the time period of the emerging Local Plan Review as it is currently set.
Version A	<u>Tor&amp;Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3645? (Tor&amp;Co also represent Gleeson)</u>	2.5.2 (p16)	We note the statement that: <i>'2.5.2 The Local Plan suggests that land for a further 200 dwellings at Melksham should be delivered through housing site allocations made by the review of the Neighbourhood Plan and after planning permissions and the JMNP 1 allocation is taken into account, a reduced "residual" target of about 50 dwellings in Whitley and Shaw.'</i> This statement is incorrect. The Reg 19 Plan, under Policy 17 'Melksham Market Town' identifies; <i>"The neighbourhood area designation requirement is 270 dwellings."</i> (our emphasis) We understand that this is split to 200 at Melksham and 70 at Shaw/Whitley (para 4.107), but the point is that this 'housing delivery' is not a suggestion, it is a requirement, on which the Local Plan depends, and may need to be increased, if the local plan requirements are increased through examination of the plan. Further, the residual requirements, as identified at Table 4.2 for the Chippenham Area, within which Melksham is located, confirms that residual requirements take into account permissions up to 31 May 2023.	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."

Foreword / Chapter 1 & 2

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A			<p>It should also be understood that paragraph 3.31 of the Local Plan (Reg 19) confirms that:  <i>“Since the plan period is from 2020 a number of homes have already been built (referred to as ‘completions’). A proportion of the land needed to meet housing objectively assessed housing needs, already has planning permission <b>or has been identified in allocations in existing plans, including neighbourhood plans. These are referred to as ‘commitments’ and are kept under review to check they can still be relied upon. Policies contain measures that help plan for the remaining homes that need to come forward over the Plan period; this is referred to as the ‘residual requirement’.</b> Within the Area Strategies, tables are provided that help illustrate what progress has already been made to meeting requirements by setting out ‘completions and commitments’ and the ‘residual requirement’.”</i> (again our emphasis)</p> <p>Hence, it is incorrect for the NP to seek to deduct allocations already made in the first NP, or planning permissions already granted.</p> <p>In this context, the NNP does not appear to be meeting its requirement and further opportunities for sustainable development should be taken, including that at Berryfield Lane, as follows.</p>	<p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and “Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.”</p>
Version A		2.6.3 (p17)	<p>We note the statement that:  <i>‘Although there is no requirement to allocate housing in this Neighbourhood Plan, there is ongoing development pressure in the Neighbourhood Plan area, and as set out earlier, there is a target figure set out in the Local Plan.’</i></p> <p>As above, this needs to be reconsidered and reconfirmed with Wiltshire Council, because under ‘Neighbourhood Planning’ in the Local Plan (Reg 19) (paras 3.44 &amp; 3.35) it is apparent that the NP allocations at the Main Settlements are to be counted as a relevant contribution to meeting the planned scale of growth.</p>	Noted.
Version A	Tor & Co, on behalf of Gleeson Land, majority interest in ‘Land East of Melksham’, an emerging allocation in Wiltshire Local Plan Reg 19 update, under Policy 18	Chapter 2, Fig 4	<p>We support recognition of the emerging East Melksham strategic allocation in the NP (para 2.5.1), as it provides important context. However, this position is not clearly conveyed in the NP through visualisation, and we consider that it would be appropriate for the purposes of clarity and general conformity for the NP to identify the strategic allocations at Figure 4, which could be expanded to ‘permissions and commitments’. Clearly there is no need to repeat the allocation, and policy provisions of Policy 19, but it is important to show how the NP policies site within, and relate to, the Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>Whilst this is a reasonable point, as these allocations are draft only within an emerging local plan, the JMNP2 will reference this information which may be subject to change.</p>
Version A	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management (HLM), 10.81 hectares of land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		<p><b>Plan Period</b></p> <p>2.1. Notwithstanding our comments in relation to draft policies below, we note the plan period for the draft NDP has been adjusted to be in accordance with the Wiltshire Local Plan. However, as we have highlighted in our recent representations to the Local Plan consultation, the local plan period should be extended to at least 15 years, to accord with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. This will account for the fact that the Local Plan is unlikely to be adopted until 2025 at the earliest.</p> <p>2.2. We therefore recommend that the draft NDP aligns with the plan period for the Wiltshire Local Plan, and the draft NDP plan period therefore adjusted accordingly.</p>	<p>There is no statutory time-period that a plan must cover. The NDP is being prepared to align with the time period of the emerging Local Plan Review as it is currently set. Any significant change in circumstances may be taken account of in future reviews.</p>
Version A	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL01		<p>3.2 We note the plan period for the JMNP2 has been adjusted to be in line with the Wiltshire Local Plan. However, as we have highlighted in our representations to the Local Plan consultation, the local plan period should be extended to ensure that the plan period is at least 15 years, to accord with paragraph 22 of the NPPF, by taking into account that the Local Plan is unlikely to be adopted until 2025 at the earliest.</p> <p>3.3 Therefore, we have proposed that the plan period of the Local plan should be amended to relate to the period 2020 to 2040. If the JMNP2 seeks to match the plan period for the Wiltshire Local Plan, it should be adjusted accordingly as the Local Plan progresses.</p>	<p>There is no statutory time-period that a plan must cover. The NDP is being prepared to align with the time period of the emerging Local Plan Review as it is currently set. Any significant change in circumstances may be taken account of in future reviews.</p>

### Chapter 3 - Vision and Objectives

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	Objective 5 (p25) and intros on p44 and 47	<p>5.4 In order to meet the plan period housing needs of the Market Town it is necessary for the eWLP to allocate land adjacent to the settlement boundary. The eWLP cannot meet Melksham's housing need without allocating sites adjacent to the settlement boundary. Moreover, if the greenfield and brownfield allocations proposed in the eWLP and JMNP2 to meet Melksham's housing needs to 2038 (or beyond) fail to deliver then it will be necessary for other sites to come forward to meet those needs. Such sites, including our client's site, are located immediately adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Melksham. The bringing forward of our client's site should not be an 'exception' but may well be a necessity once plan period and housing requirements numbers for the settlement are amended through the WLP.</p> <p>5.5 Therefore, Pegasus request that the word 'exceptionally' be removed from Objective 5.</p>	The objective has been updated.



### Chapter 3 - Vision and Objectives

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p><b>Vision and Objectives: Overall Housing Target</b></p> <p>2.1. We object to the Vision and Objectives of the draft JMNP2, for failing to adequately address future housing need.</p> <p>2.2. The draft JMNP2 plans for the quantum of development as targeted in the draft Wiltshire Local Plan (WLP):</p> <p>2.3. The draft WLP is currently at Regulation 19 consultation and carries weight in accordance with NPPF paragraph 48. County-Wide Housing Target</p> <p>2.4. The emerging WLP has been subject to numerous objections on the basis that the total amount of housing planned for (the housing target) is insufficient.</p> <p>2.5. In our representations to the current Regulation 19 consultation, we identify numerous issues with the Council's evidence as well as a strong case for Wiltshire to plan for more homes than the minimum requirement set by the Local Housing Need standard method. These include past rates of growth (both population and housing), worsening affordability, the need to balance the population structure of the area and economic potential. An increase in the housing requirement will meet the housing needs of the local population and ensure housing is affordable to more households within Wiltshire.</p> <p>2.6. We have therefore recommended that the housing requirement be set above the minimum standard method housing target of 2,041 dpa and should at least match and preferably exceed, rates of growth achieved since the adoption of the extant Core Strategy (2,167dpa). Any increase in the overall housing requirement should be spread proportionately between the four housing market areas (HMAs).</p> <p><b>Chippenham HMA Target</b></p> <p>2.7. Shaw &amp; Whitley is located within the Chippenham Housing Market Area. The draft WLP sets out the following distribution of new housing over the plan period to meet its target.</p> <p>2.10. Despite the location of Shaw/Whitley adjacent to the Market Town of Melksham only 73 dwellings are identified over the plan period. This is significantly lower than some of its counterparts, such as Rudloe, which sits adjacent to the Market Town of Corsham but has over 3 times the proposed dwellings. Given the location of Shaw/Whitley adjacent to the Market Town of Melksham this is considered unjustified. To rectify this situation, it is recommended that additional sites, such as our clients, are allocated within Shaw/Whitley.</p> <p>2.11. Moreover, the delivery strategy for the settlements above, in particular for Chippenham, Calne and Melksham which form the majority of the trajectory, rely very heavily on large strategic sites. These sites have been selected as appropriate for new development, with other potential sites having been excluded following assessment, leaving a residual amount of housing delivery required for the rural area.</p> <p>2.12. This means that if the WLP examination were to find the plan deficient in terms of overall housing numbers, it is highly likely that it would be the requirement for the rural area as a whole which increases first, and as a result the individual village targets would go up.</p> <p>2.13. By planning only for the minimum amount of development within Shaw &amp; Whitley as set out in the draft WLP, the JMNP2 risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needing to be revised/updated if the draft WLP housing target increases; and</li> <li>• Failing to deliver against that target.</li> </ul>	<p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>

### Chapter 3 - Vision and Objectives

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p>Vision and Objectives</p> <p>The prospective purchaser supports the JMNP Vision to make the town and parish a great place to live, to work, to play and to visit.</p> <p>The prospective purchaser support the objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Enabling and promoting the importance of early community engagement in change and development.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Supporting sustainable development of new housing and associated facilities within settlements, and adjacent to settlements.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Promoting the delivery of infrastructure to address the needs of the population.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Protecting and enhancing the vitality of Melksham town centre</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Encouraging cycling and walking and journey by rail and buss to reduce the need to travel by car</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Protecting, connective and increasing our network of green spaces</li> </ul> <p>The redevelopment of the Cooper Tires site, centrally located in Melksham, on the River Avon Corridor has real potential to make a significant contribution to these objectives.</p> <p>They also note the objective for ‘the retention, regeneration and intensified use of previously developed employment land.’ We are of course supportive of regeneration and making the best use of previously development land, however, as in the Cooper Tires site, it is important to acknowledge that some employment sites no longer suit modern industrial requirements and so retention is not always needed, feasible, viable or appropriate. This is reflected in the approach of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (Core Policy 35) on the re-use of former employment land.</p> <p>The prospective purchaser therefore requests that this objective is amended to read as follows: The retention, regeneration and intensified use or where appropriate a change of use of previously developed employment land.</p>	Noted.

#### 4. Planning Policies

Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A - Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Figure 5	<p>It is suggested that the text on Green Wedges is amended to say either '...are proposed for protecting land...' or 'are proposed to protect land...'. And suggest that it says '...from development that <b>may</b> lead to...'</p> <p>It is suggested that the text on site allocations is amended as follows: '...provide sustainable housing <b>and employment</b> to meet...'</p>	Agreed.
Version B - Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Figure 5	We suggest information box text is amended as follows: '...that may lead to separate places to merge merging together.'	Agreed.

## Policy 1 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 1 and supporting text	The policy has been updated and is in many ways reflective of the emerging sustainable construction policy in the Wiltshire Local Plan Review. Policy is therefore supported in principle.	Noted.
Version A		Policy 1	<p>It is noted that the policy has been written to ‘support’ development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. So, it is probably pitched as ambitiously as reasonably possible in light of national and local policy contexts.</p> <p>There are a number of ways where the policy might be ‘tightened-up’, as follows:            First paragraph of Policy 1, suggest amending text as follows: <b>“Through a proportionate Sustainable Energy Strategy, new development schemes (of all scales) that demonstrate how carbon emissions are minimised, with the target of zero carbon in operation (regulated and unregulated energy), and how the...”</b></p> <p>In criterion c. it could be less prescriptive and let the industry lead on how we achieve net zero because solutions will be different depending on site context and the market at that time. Orientation and design is also important for energy generation and suggest amending text as follows: “...orientation, design and landscaping, in order to minimise energy demand for heating, lighting and cooling, <b>as well as maximising renewable energy generation.</b> All proposals should consider opportunities, <b>in the transition to net zero, to electrify space heating and energy consumption by considering a range of low-carbon and renewable technologies</b> to provide solar PV and energy storage”</p> <p>Criterion d. is as per the emerging Wiltshire LPR sustainable construction policy but could be interpreted more widely and capture retrofit that will not get to these levels in all buildings. Suggest amending text as follows: <b>“New build residential buildings that, within the constraints of viability and feasibility, demonstrate how...”</b></p> <p>The last point in criterion e. does not relate to operational carbon. We suggest it is set out as a standalone point after the various criteria list with some amendments and follows on reasonably from criterion g. Suggested wording is: “All major development should set out how embodied carbon <b>associated with the development has been considered and will be minimised</b> in materials has been minimised.”</p> <p>Criterion f – we are not sure where ‘commercial’ is defined, so might be simpler to amend as follows: <b>“Commercial-Non-residential</b> development that achieves BREEAM...”</p>	Updates to the policy have been made broadly in line with these suggestions
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 1 (p31-33)	Whilst Stantonbury support and promote sustainable design and construction, this policy is considered unnecessary given the significant climate change/energy efficient related policies proposed in the Wiltshire Local Plan, which will be sufficient in meeting the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy does not add any Melksham specific requirements to Sustainable Design and Construction and so should be deleted.	<p>The current adopted policies of the Wiltshire Core policy are considered to be out of date. The policy has been updated and is in many ways reflective of the emerging sustainable construction policy in the Wiltshire Local Plan Review, bearing in mind that the Local Plan is still at an early and emerging stage.</p> <p>The policy has been written to ‘support’ development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.</p> <p>However, it will be amended to take on board comments from consultees.</p>

## Policy 1 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 1 (p31-33)	This draft policy includes additional clauses to the corresponding policy in the JMNP1 in relation to heat and power demands and the retention of existing buildings. Terra Strategic recognises the critical role developers play in ensuring that residents have safe, secure and efficient homes that are future proofed across their developments. Promoting sustainable development is the core objective of the plan-led system and it is important that all new developments continue to support this aim. However, we ask Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council (the 'Qualifying Bodies') to be wary of the way that such policies could impact development viability which may restrict the provision of much needed market and affordable housing. We would also like to remind the Qualifying Bodies that building requirements in Melksham should be reflective of Government requirements. As such the JMNP2 should not be seeking to introduce stringent building standards that are already covered by adopted and emerging national policy. Nevertheless, we are confident that the residential allocation of the site would be consistent with this draft Policy.	The Steering Group are pleased to note that the residential allocation as proposed by the consultee would be consistent with the draft policy.  The policy has been written to 'support' development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 1 (p31-33)	Catesby supports the aims and ambitions of Policy 1. New development has the opportunity to be highly sustainable and adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change. The criterion set out within the policy is realistic but ambitious to achieve sustainable development within the Melksham area.	Support noted.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	Policy 1 (p31-33)	6.6 Given the above, whilst the Steering Group's proposed approach is commendable, there is a clear disconnect between Policy 1, which sets a target for all new developments to be net zero carbon immediately, to provide an adequate quantum of renewable energy to match energy output (including solar photovoltaic cells) and battery storage, and the Government's forthcoming Building Regulation standards and policy, which require a new home to be zero carbon ready and for requirements for renewable energy to be reasonable. Accordingly, there is a danger that, as currently drafted, Policy 1 does not accord with national planning policy and guidance. 6.7 In addition, the Steering Group will need to be satisfied that an adequate level of information is available for developers to be able to undertake such assessments of embodied carbon. They will also need to carefully consider how the proposed policy will be monitored and enforced going forward. 6.8 In any event, it is considered that proposed Policy 1 is broadly consistent with emerging Policies 85 and 87 of the Local Plan Review. We therefore question whether, using the terms set out in para. 16(f) of the NPPF, it serves a clear purpose, as it broadly duplicates policies that will apply within the area. 6.9 The financial implications of these requirements will need to be costed in a viability assessment.	The policy has been written to 'support' development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	1.d (p31)	6.1 Pegasus raise objection to criteria d. of Policy 1 which sets targets for heating demand, total energy consumption and provision of renewable energy output per dwelling. 6.2 Pegasus previously raised objection to this approach at the Reg 16 consultation of JMNP1 and the Examiners report2 requested modifications to the policy accordingly.	Criteria d is based on best practice guidance.  The policy has been written to 'support' development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.
Version A		1.d (p31)	6.3 Policy 1 will become part of the adopted development plan once JMNP2 is 'made' therefore it needs to be sufficiently clear to be applied by decision makers, however it refers to matters that are the subject of building regulations (e.g.; thermal capacity and insulation; energy consumption and renewable energy generation). These matters should not be the subject of planning policy but should be applied by qualified Building Inspectors through the Building Regulations process.	Current position with regards to Building Regulations and Future Homes Standard clarified in the Neighbourhood Plan

## Policy 1 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		?	<p>6.4 To meet the specifications set out in the 2025 Future Homes Standard, the Government updated Parts F and L of the current Building Regulations at the end of 2021. These specifications must be adhered to when constructing new dwellings. Part F introduces new standards for ventilation, while Part L sets out minimum energy efficiency performance targets for buildings, airtightness requirements and improved minimum insulation standards. These more rigorous requirements have applied to new dwellings in the UK since June 2022.</p> <p>6.5 The Government have also confirmed that local planning authorities will be able to set higher targets than the revised Part L Building Regulations will require, however it this has not been suggested that this ability will be conferred to those preparing neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>The policy has been written to 'support' development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.</p>
Version A		Policy 1 (p31-33)	<p>6.6 The Reg 19 eWLP public consultation included Policy 4 – Addressing Climate Change - attached at Appendix 3 - however this policy is yet to be subject to Examination. JMNP2 Policy 1 re-iterates to a great extent strategic Policy 4 of the eWLP. There is no need for a Neighbourhood Plan to repeat the policies of an associated development plan document. To that extent JMNP2 will not be necessary once the eWLP is adopted.</p>	<p>JMNP2 will be made ahead of adoption of the Local Plan Review. The later plan will carry more weight. To avoid the risk of policies in a neighbourhood plan being superseded by a later local plan, the JMNP is working with the eWLP in a complementary way.</p> <p>It is therefore pitched as ambitious as is reasonable possible given the status of the LPR and the ambition of the quaiying bodies and steering group to address climate change and taking into account the WMS Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update Statement 13th December 2023.</p>
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3645? (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	Policy 1 (p31-33) [Also included in Policy 2 and 3]	<p>This policy is both detailed and onerous. It goes well beyond national (including Building Regulations) and local plan requirements, without any justification as to why Melksham faces particular issues in this respect that require a distinct local approach.</p> <p>Much of the policy is merely an unnecessary repeat of the Local Plan policies (e.g. Policy 85 'Sustainable and local carbon energy', Policy 86 'Renewable energy', Policy 87 'embodied carbon', Policy 93 'Green and blue infrastructure'). However, the singular NP policy is cluttered and because it is not an exact duplicate of the Local Plan policies (to be tested through examination), it creates a messy and confusing development management platform, from which to consider planning applications. There is also reference to viability within the NP policy, which is a different approach to that taken in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We consider that this policy has no justification, and does not address a distinct local approach with justification. In the context of the Local Plan it should be deleted in preference for text that cross references to the Local Plan. The same applies to a number of other policies, including Policy 2 'Local Renewable and Low Carbon energy' and Policy 3 'Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management', relating to matters clearly addressed at a strategic level through national and local plan policy, and not requiring a distinct local approach.</p>	<p>The policy has been written to 'support' development that complies. This does not necessarily mean that development that fails to comply will be refused. If it is interpreted to require compliance, it would be premature of national and local policy context and would need to provide more opportunity for justified exemptions – like the emerging LPR policy seeks to do. The topic is important to the local community and is therefore included as the first policy in JMNP2.</p>
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		<p>Whilst Gladman support the need for development to address the impact of climate change, we note that several elements of Policy 1 replicate the emerging requirements as detailed in Policy 85 of the Wiltshire Local Plan Review. Whilst it is only natural that the Steering Group would want to consider these topics, the neighbourhood plan will be read alongside the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (when adopted) and therefore there is no need to duplicate national or strategic policy requirements.</p>	<p>JMNP2 will be made ahead of adoption of the Local Plan Review. The later plan will carry more weight. To avoid the risk of policies in a neighbourhood plan being superseded by a later local plan, the JMNP is working with the eWLP in a complementary way.</p> <p>It is therefore pitched as ambitious as is reasonable possible given the status of the LPR and the ambition of the quaiying bodies and steering group to address climate change and taking into account the WMS Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update Statement 13th December 2023.</p>

## Policy 1 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p>Policy 1 Sustainable Design and Construction</p> <p>The future land owner supports the principle of this policy and are pleased to see the Town Council are committed to minimising carbon emissions. However, It is the Government's intention to set standards for energy efficiency through the Building Regulations. The key to success is standardisation and avoidance of individual Council's specifying their own policy approach to energy efficiency, which undermines economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers, and developers. The Council does not need to set local energy performance standards in a Neighbourhood Plan policy because of the higher levels of energy efficiency standards for new homes set out in the 2021 Part L Interim Uplift and proposals for the 2025 Future Homes Standard. In this regard the policy should be amended to align with the Building Regulations.</p>	The policy has been updated to reflect this need for flexibility, but is still ambitious in promoting and supporting the highest possible standards of design and construction.
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p>6.2 BH continue to rely on their representations made in respect of Policy 1 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. However, since their consultation response was submitted, the Ministerial Statement entitled 'Local Energy Efficiency Standards' was published in December 2023. The Statement sets out that:</p> <p><i>"There has been a long-standing debate within planning about both the best method and body to set energy efficiency and environmental standards. For a number of years, the plans of some local authorities have sought to go further than national standards in terms of such efficiency for new-build properties. Equally, there is a legitimate consideration for the Government to want to strike the best balance between making progress on improving the efficiency and performance of homes while still wanting to ensure housing is built in sufficient numbers to support those who wish to own or rent their own home.</i></p> <p><i>In 2015, in reference to an un-commenced provision in the Deregulation Act 2015 which amended the Planning and Energy Act 2008, a written ministerial statement—HC Deb, 25 March 2015, vol 584, cols 131-138WS—stated that until that amendment was commenced, local plan policies exceeding minimum energy efficiency standards should not go beyond level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Since then, the introduction of the 2021 Part L uplift to the Building Regulations set national minimum energy efficiency standards that are higher than those referenced in the 2015 WMS rendering it effectively moot. A further change to energy efficiency building regulations is planned for 2025 meaning that homes built to that standard will be net zero ready and should need no significant work to ensure that they have zero carbon emissions as the grid continues to decarbonise. <b>Compared to varied local standards, these nationally applied standards provide much-needed clarity and consistency for businesses, large and small, to invest and prepare to build net-zero ready homes.</b></i></p> <p><i>The improvement in standards already in force, alongside the ones which are due in 2025, demonstrates the Government's commitment to ensuring new properties have a much lower impact on the environment in the future. In this context, <b>the Government do not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulations.</b> The proliferation of multiple, local standards by local authority area can add further costs to building new homes by adding complexity and undermining economies of scale"</i> (our emphasis).</p> <p>6.3 The Statement confirms that unless higher standards are well reasoned and robustly costed, they should be rejected at Examination.</p> <p>6.4 There does not appear to be an evidence base document to justify the higher standards and as outlined in Section 7 below, only costs associated with current Building Regulation standards and not the enhanced standards outlined in the Policy, formed part of the viability testing.</p> <p>6.5 Consequently, as drafted, there is a danger that the emerging Policy does not accord with national planning policy.</p>	The policy has been updated to reflect this need for flexibility, but is still ambitious in promoting and supporting the highest possible standards of design and construction.

**Policy 1 - Sustainable Design and Construction**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response



## Policy 2 - Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 2 and supporting text	<p>This policy has been changed quite notably, rather than just covering community-led renewables.</p> <p>Policy 1 places more onerous requirements on renewable energy projects than existing national or local policy and should be reviewed. As recently as March 2023 the UK Government made it clear that a five-fold increase in solar PV generation is needed in order to meet the challenge of climate change and the move away from fossil fuels and energy imports (ref: <a href="#">Powering Up Britain</a>).</p> <p>Criterion 1e seeks to add a requirement for direct benefits to the local community. It is not clear what is meant by the wording 'direct benefits to the local community'. If this is a requirement that goes beyond/conflicts with national policy, then this requirement should be deleted.</p> <p>The paragraph following criterion 1e that starts 'Proposals for community energy generation...' appears as if it is part of 1e. This is probably not the intention. We suggest numbering this paragraph as '2.' and renumbering the following section that begins 'Schemes where the...' as '3.'</p> <p>A more constructive way to seek to reduce greenfield renewable energy development might be to make the policy more explicit by encouraging roof mounted solar to maximise renewable energy</p>	It is accepted that this policy should not be more onerous than local or national policy and it has therefore been reviewed.
Version A		Para 4.3.1 first sentence	It is suggested that the reference to NPPF paragraph 152 is amended to refer instead to NPPF paragraph 156. The Plan is not referring to latest version of NPPF. All references to the NPPF throughout the Plan should be checked for consistency	Agreed.
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 2 (p35-36)	Whilst Stantonbury support and promote sustainable design and construction, this policy is considered unnecessary given the significant climate change/energy efficient related policies proposed in the Wiltshire Local Plan, which will be sufficient in meeting the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy does not add any Melksham specific requirements to Sustainable Design and Construction and so should be deleted.	This Local Plan is the forthcoming development Plan and the JMNP2 is likely to be examined under the Core Strategy. This policy sets out the local ambition to support appropriate Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy generation.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 2 (p35-36)	This draft policy largely concerns proposals for renewable energy and low carbon energy generation projects/developments. We make no comment in relation to this draft policy.	Noted

**Policy 2 - Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	[Also included in Policy 1 and 3]	<p>This policy is both detailed and onerous. It goes well beyond national (including Building Regulations) and local plan requirements, without any justification as to why Melksham faces particular issues in this respect that require a distinct local approach.</p> <p>Much of the policy is merely an unnecessary repeat of the Local Plan policies (e.g. Policy 85 'Sustainable and local carbon energy', Policy 86 'Renewable energy', Policy 87 'embodied carbon', Policy 93 'Green and blue infrastructure'). However, the singular NP policy is cluttered and because it is not an exact duplicate of the Local Plan policies (to be tested though examination), it creates a messy and confusing development management platform, from which to consider planning applications. There is also reference to viability within the NP policy, which is a different approach to that taken in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We consider that this policy has no justification, and does not address a distinct local approach with justification. In the context of the Local Plan it should be deleted in preference for text that cross references to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The same applies to a number of other policies, including Policy 2 'Local Renewable and Low Carbon energy' and Policy 3 'Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management', relating to matters clearly addressed at a strategic level through national and local plan policy, and not requiring a distinct local approach.</p>	It is accepted that this policy should not be more onerous than local or national policy and it has therefore been reviewed.

**Policy 3 - Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	3	for clarity, it is suggested that the first paragraph of this policy is re-worded as follows: 'Particularly in the South Brook catchment area, Natural flood management works to conserve and enhance the ecological flood storage value of the water environment, including watercourse corridors and catchments, are supported. <b><i>This is particularly relevant to the South Brook catchment area which has been identified as a priority flood risk area</i></b> '.	Agreed.
Version A		Paragraph 4.4.3	it is suggested that the reference to NPPF paragraph 157 is amended to refer instead to NPPF paragraph 161. The Plan is not referring to latest version of NPPF. All references to the NPPF throughout the Plan should be checked for consistency.	Agreed.
Version A		Paragraph 4.4.6	states that a Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes has been produced emphasising the importance of SuDS – we have not seen this and therefore have not commented on this.	Noted.
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 3 (p37-38)	As noted above [Policy 1 and 2], the policy aims are already covered by policy in the proposed Local Plan and unnecessary repeat that policy. Policy 3 should be deleted.	Policy 3 reflects local issues and concerns with flooding. It is retained from JMNP 1 and will be updated as necessary.
Version A	Environment Agency	Policy 3 (p37-38)	Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management This policy is focused on surface water flooding. It should be expanded to include all sources of flooding, including fluvial flood risk.	Agreed.
Version B Letter emailed on 22 August 2024	Environment Agency	[also put in General]	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above Neighbourhood Plan. We offer the following advice on the plan, in addition to the comments we made on 30th November 2023. We are disappointed that our previous comments were not incorporated into this iteration of the Neighbourhood Plan. They were not based on our preference but on National Planning Policy.  <b>Policy 3: Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management</b> We note that this policy has not been updated as per the recommendation in our earlier letter. We strongly encourage the expansion of the wording of the policy to include all sources of flooding, including fluvial flood risk. There has been recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that requires all sources of flooding to be included.	Policy 3 was not updated in Draft B. The policy will be updated in the submission draft.
Version A	Wessex Water	4.4.6 (p38) [also included in Policy 7.1]	The redevelopment of the [Cooper Tires] site offers an opportunity to install Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which take a more natural form and deliver benefits for amenity, ecology and water quality. Future redevelopment of the site should deliver surface water separation and no surface water flow should enter the foul network. Please see further comments below on rainwater management which apply to all site allocations.	Agreed.
Version A	Wessex Water	4.4.3 - 4.4.6 (p37-38) [also included in Policy 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3]	The issues of sewer flooding and storm overflows are essentially due to poor rainwater management at source. Improving rainwater management through the planning process is essential to reduce flood risk and improve storm overflow discharge occurrences. We have expressed our support for proposed policy 95 of the draft Wiltshire Local Plan. Policy 95 requires a betterment for rainwater site run-off from major development which we support. As drainage is the deepest of all utilities, getting it right before anything is constructed is vital for good rainwater management and ensuring rainwater returns to the environment as locally as technically possible. Planning policies need to ensure that new development makes sufficient space for rainwater management on site rather than piping it off-site which exacerbates downstream capacity issues. Proposed Policy 95 does this by supporting the surface water drainage hierarchy. Where the Neighbourhood Plan proposes site allocations the layout and design of these should be in accordance with proposed Policy 95 and principles of good rainwater management.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan allocations will seek best practice for good rainwater management and this policy will be updated in line with policy 95 of the forthcoming Wiltshire Local Plan, but in recognition of the fact that the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 is likely to be 'made' ahead of adoption of the Local Plan - and it will be examined under the core strategy.

Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 3 (p37)	These policies have not been updated and hence we have no comments, other than to highlight that the site subject promotion in this letter would comply with these policies.	Noted.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 3 (p37 - 38)	These policies have not been updated and hence we have no comments, other than to highlight that the site subject promotion in this letter would comply with these policies.	Noted.
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	Policy 3 (p37 - 38) [Also included in Policy 1 and 2]	<p>This policy is both detailed and onerous. It goes well beyond national (including Building Regulations) and local plan requirements, without any justification as to why Melksham faces particular issues in this respect that require a distinct local approach.</p> <p>Much of the policy is merely an unnecessary repeat of the Local Plan policies (e.g. Policy 85 'Sustainable and local carbon energy', Policy 86 'Renewable energy', Policy 87 'embodied carbon', Policy 93 'Green and blue infrastructure'). However, the singular NP policy is cluttered and because it is not an exact duplicate of the Local Plan policies (to be tested though examination), it creates a messy and confusing development management platform, from which to consider planning applications. There is also reference to viability within the NP policy, which is a different approach to that taken in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We consider that this policy has no justification, and does not address a distinct local approach with justification. In the context of the Local Plan it should be deleted in preference for text that cross references to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The same applies to a number of other policies, including Policy 2 'Local Renewable and Low Carbon energy' and Policy 3 'Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management', relating to matters clearly addressed at a strategic level through national and local plan policy, and not requiring a distinct local approach.</p>	Noted. However it should be noted that the policy was largely unaltered from JMNP1 which has been independently examined.
Version B Letter emailed on 22 August 2024	Environment Agency	[also put in General]	<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above Neighbourhood Plan. We offer the following advice on the plan, in addition to the comments we made on 30th November 2023. We are disappointed that our previous comments were not incorporated into this iteration of the Neighbourhood Plan. They were not based on our preference but on National Planning Policy.</p> <p><b>Policy 3: Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management</b></p> <p>We note that this policy has not been updated as per the recommendation in our earlier letter. We strongly encourage the expansion of the wording of the policy to include all sources of flooding, including fluvial flood risk. There has been recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that requires all sources of flooding to be included.</p>	Policy 3 was not updated in Draft B. The policy will be updated in the submission draft.

## Policy 4 - Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Charging

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	4	<p>It is noted that this policy has not been updated, however, it is suggested this could be to try and address the emerging inequality that is being identified in relation to EV charging. Less expensive housing tends not to have in-curtilage parking and such spaces are more expensive to provide EV charging to. The layout of schemes and the parking solutions are triggering Building Regulations Part G exemption to be engaged meaning that these homes do not get EV charging from the outset. Retrofitting will be difficult and expensive. This will lead to people finding their own solutions such as running cables across shared or public spaces.</p> <p>This policy is supporting this emerging inequality. Therefore, the policy could be reviewed to add the following additional text: <b><i>“Support shall be given to proposals where the layout and parking arrangements are designed so as to provide charging for low emission vehicles (such as an electric vehicle charging point) regardless of the size or tenure of the home; and the developer commits to a condition to require such provision to every dwelling prior to its first occupation.”</i></b></p> <p>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 (EV) infrastructure which can take the form of EV charging points although other technologies are also out there now.</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.</p>	Agreed. Policy updated
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Para 4.6.3	It is suggested that the reference to NPPF paragraph 128 is amended to refer instead to NPPF paragraph 132. Plan is not referring to latest version of NPPF. All references to the NPPF throughout the Plan should be checked for consistency.	Agreed.
Version B	Version B, Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.5.5	Please be aware that with the withdrawal of Transwilt from the café and associated car parking, the potential for expansion of EV chargers or indeed the current use of the facilities are in some doubt.	
Version B	Version B, Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.6.5	Paragraph states, ‘see Appendix 1, page 122’. However, Appendix 1 starts on page 125. Please review and ensure all cross references throughout the document are correct.	
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 4 (p39-40)	The policy is unnecessary as vehicle charging requirements are already covered by building regulations	Noted. This policy reflects local aspirations and is retained from JMNP1.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 4 (p39-40)	These policies have not been updated and hence we have no comments, other than to highlight that the site subject promotion in this letter would comply with these policies.	Noted.

Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 4 (p39-40)	Catesby agree that new housing development should provide on-plot technology for charging low emission vehicles. The detail within Policy 4 is clear and concise regarding the delivery of new developments and vehicle charging. The policy should however be equally demanding of EV charging in other settings than housing, and as such this element of the policy could be strengthened.	Noted and agreed.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	Policy 4 (p39)	6.10 Amongst other things, the policy sets out that development proposals for houses with on-plot parking spaces and/or garages will be encouraged to provide charging technology for cars, such as charging points. 6.11 The requirements for electric vehicle charging points from new dwellings is now established in Part S of the Building Regulations. Consequently, Policy 4 of the emerging Plan does not serve a clear purpose, for it duplicates requirements set out in other regulatory regimes. The Steering Group should therefore consider whether this Policy is required.	Noted.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	Policy 4 (p39-40)	There is no requirement for the JMNP2 to have a policy on the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure when the matter is now addressed through Building Regulations with regard to new build and renovation developments.	Noted.
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	?	Such mitigation provisions are included under Policy 101 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan. However, the local plan is clear that infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles and other forms of low or zero emission transport are only one form of mitigation measure that could be considered / included in a development proposal. This approach is more responsive to ever-evolving technology, which is particularly relevant given the span of the NP to 2038.	The Local Plan is still at early stages of preparation therefore the JMNP2 is likely to be considered under the Core Strategy.
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		Policy 4 sets out, inter alia, that development proposals for houses with on-plot parking spaces and/or garages are encouraged to provide appropriately located charging technology for charging low emission vehicles, such as an electric vehicle charging point. The use of electric vehicles is rising rapidly, and it is natural that the Steering Group would look to respond through the JMNP2. However, as of June 2022 'Part S - Infrastructure for charging electric vehicles' of the Building Regulations 2010 already requires all new homes and buildings in England to have Electric Vehicle charging points fitted. For this reason, Gladman consider that detailed design issues such as those outlined in Policy 4 should be left for the Building Regulation process. The policy should be removed from the JMNP2.	Noted. It will however be retained and updated on the basis of advice from Wiltshire Council.

**Policy 5 - Preapplication Community Engagement**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Opac Ltd on behalf of private landowner re land at Shaw and Whitley	4.6.1 - 6 (p42)	This should allow for more community engagement with development proposals and help understanding of the policy basis for developments coming forward as well as allowing public input.	Noted. Engagement should be proportionate to the proposal.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 5 (42-43)	These policies have not been updated and hence we have no comments, other than to highlight that the site subject promotion in this letter would comply with these policies.	Noted.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	Policy 5 - para 2 (42)	6.12 As has been demonstrated over the past six months, BH are committed to a detailed and robust community engagement exercise concerning their development proposals on land to the north of the A3102. To date, this has involved meetings with the Town Council and Melksham without. They intend to consult the community more widely in the near future. 6.13 Given the above, BH are broadly supportive of Policy 5. However, they have concerns that the inclusion of references to the Melksham Community Engagement Protocol and the Wiltshire Statement of Community Involvement will give development plan effect to these documents, which currently do not form part of the Development Plan. Reference to both documents should be removed from the Policy and included within the supporting text.	Noted. The protocol sets out the process and approach for implementing the policy. Also - the policy was largely unaltered from JMNP1 which was independently examined, meets basic conditions and voted upon at referendum.
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		Whilst the intentions of Policy 5 are acknowledged, it appears to be little more than an unnecessary duplication of both national policy requirements and guidance set out in local authority guidance documents. Gladman consider the policy to be unnecessary as the information set out is already available. Consequently, the policy should be removed from the JMNP2.	The policy was largely unaltered from JMNP1 which was independently examined, meets basic conditions and voted upon at referendum.

Policy 6 - Housing in Defined Settlements

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	6	<p>This policy refers to the Settlement Boundary provisions of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Policy 1 and adopted site allocations; as well as the higher policy requirement in the emerging Local Plan for affordable housing of 40% (current policy is 30%). The Local Plan is emerging policy only at the current time. As the neighbourhood plan will likely be examined against adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) policies, it is suggested that this is reviewed. The neighbourhood plan should be checked for consistency throughout in this regard.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy 6 states that “at least 40% of new housing will be provided as Affordable Housing tenures to conform with Wiltshire Local Plan Policy 76”, which won’t become policy until the new Local Plan has been adopted. However, it also suggests 55% of affordable housing should be provided as discounted marketed products ... and in paragraph 4.7.8 that affordable housing delivered through developer contributions should be split 45% Rented and 55% discounted home ownership. Wiltshire Council does not support this tenure mix as it would not conform to the current requirements which are similar to Policy 76, which requires a tenure split of 65% Rented, 25% First Homes and 10% Shared Ownership homes. This is the split also reflected in the Council’s Interim Position Statement for First Homes, which recognises the evidence of significant need for affordable rent.</p> <p>The role of the Wiltshire Council Housing Enabling Team, as Affordable Housing consultee, involves checking the demonstrable need at the time of any planning application on a site-by-site basis and to ensure schemes are delivered in line with the adopted Local Plan affordable housing policies and procedures. This will involve looking at the latest credible evidence available at that time (including the Housing Register) and then to advise on a mix of affordable units (including adapted units) reflecting the current need in line with adopted policy...including smaller 1 bed homes (and large family houses too when the need is demonstrated), especially for affordable rented homes. Policy 6, as currently written, would conflict with this – and would compromise the ability to ensure that demonstrable need is met, as need changes over time. Neighbourhood plans normally allow flexibility for changing needs to be considered and the JMNP2 should also allow this flexibility.</p> <p>Policy 6, in referring to First Homes, is stating their local housing needs assessment supports delivery of First Homes at a 40% discount rather than the 30% discount currently being negotiated and secured in S106 Agreements across Wiltshire. The policy should be amended to be consistent with the strategic approach being taken. Wiltshire Council does not support a 40% discount for First Homes.</p> <p>It is recommended that amendments are made to paragraphs 3, 7 and 8 of this policy to allow for more flexibility in housing and affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.7.1 and references to settlement boundaries would benefit from review. They are a policy tool that while being generally supportive of development within them, do allow for development on the edge subject to compliance with development plan policies. Neighbourhood plans can also take the opportunity to expand the settlement boundary to reflect development that has taken place since it was last reviewed. We recommend this paragraph is amended to say ‘Wiltshire Council <i>may</i> amend boundaries during the Plan period...’ as it is not a fact that settlement boundaries will be amended during the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.7.5 - suggested paragraph could be amended to say ‘This technical evidence was reinforced with detailed feedback <i>to from</i> a community housing survey...’</p> <p>Paragraph 4.7.7 – it is recommended that this paragraph also recognises that there is a continuing need for 1-bed homes; as currently worded, this paragraph gives the impression that 1-bed homes need not be included in the mix to be provided.</p>	Agreed. Policy amended in line with suggestions and supporting text also updated in line with suggestions.
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paras 4.8.1 - 4.8.3	<p>It would provide useful context (here and/or elsewhere in the plan) to provide clarification as to why the first JMNP did not allocate homes, which is linked to the way in which development has come forward at the town and the level of development identified in Core Policy 15 of the Core Strategy. This could also set out the position regarding the most recent appeals for residential development at the town and any implications for the plan. Some specific comments against the wording as written are as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.1 - suggest this paragraph is amended to say, ‘but at Shaw and Whitley, there <del>had</del> <b>has</b> been no affordable housing delivery since <b>at least</b> 2000.’</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.2 - The final sentence of this paragraph should refer to the neighbourhood area housing requirement, not a ‘target’.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.3 – A residual housing figure for Melksham of 1,170 is stated. However, Table 4.2 of the draft LPR shows the residual as 1,120.</p>	Agreed.
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paras 4.8.5 – 4.8.6	<p>It is suggested that references to housing ‘targets’ are instead referred to as housing ‘requirements’ and references provided to the parts of the Local Plan where they are sourced from. Clarification should also be provided to say that these relate to the plan period to 2038 during which time the neighbourhood plan can be reviewed.</p>	Agreed.
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Para 4.8.7	<p>This paragraph states that ‘the Local Plan leaves site allocations to the Neighbourhood Plan to lead’. However, as stated in paragraph 4.8.4, the emerging Local Plan is proposing some housing site allocations. Suggest that this paragraph is amended to say ‘<b>the Local Plan leaves additional site allocations to the Neighbourhood Plan to lead to meet the identified neighbourhood area housing requirement over the plan period to 2038.</b>’</p>	This section of text has been changed.
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Para 4.8.14	<p>This paragraph states that ‘Applicants bringing forward development proposals for this site are strongly encouraged to follow the Community Engagement Protocol as included in Appendix 1’. Why just for this site? Suggest this refers to proposals for all sites coming forward in the neighbourhood area.</p>	Agreed.



**Policy 6 - Housing in Defined Settlements**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Opac Ltd on behalf of private resident re land at Shaw and Whitley	4.7.2, 4.7.3, 4.7.4, 4.7.6, 4.8.1, 4.8.6, 4.8.11 (p45-49)	Agree with the aspirations of this policy, however consider that there are few locations within Shaw and Whitley for 'windfall' housing, particularly of a scale to allow for the delivery of 40% affordable and discounted housing. As such, additional housing land allocation on the edge of these settlements would allow for housing of a mix of tenures and sizes which are unlikely to be achievable on smaller infill plots.	The JMNP2 does allocate sites within, and adjacent to, the settlement boundary
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.7.4 - 4.7.8 (p45-46)	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd considers that Policy 6 should make it clear that affordable housing requirements may vary on a site-by-site basis taking into account of local factors including the viability of development. This is particularly relevant on sites such as it's Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1) where abnormal costs such as demolition, ground remediation and flood mitigation are likely to be significant and disproportionate.	Agreed.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<b>Policy 6 Housing in Defined Settlements</b> As per previous comments relating to affordable housing within policy 7.1, policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policy 76 of the emerging local plan states 40% affordable housing provision will be provided on sites of 10 or more dwellings. Policy 6 broadly reflects this, however, fails to acknowledge that the provision of affordable housing may vary on a site-by-site basis taking into account evidence of local need, mix of affordable housing proposed and, where appropriate, the viability of the development. For this reason, the policy should be reworded as follows: "At least 40% of new housing subject to viability will be provided as affordable housing tenures in conformity with Wiltshire Local Plan policy 76."	The policy has been amended to reflect this need.
Version A	West Wilts Group of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	4.7.7 (P46), 4.8.9 -10 (P48) [also put in policy 7.1]	Unfortunately, the Government have allocated far too many houses to Wiltshire, and west and north west Wiltshire have suffered the most and Melksham has already had too many houses built on valuable greenfield land with more in the pipeline. The remaining area of land available [Cooper Tires] (29.5 acres) could be a mixed-use brownfield development of quality design and construction as per current Government guideline's utilising the area by building 3 or 4 storey flats rather than the usual single storey faceless housing estate model built on valuable greenfield land to the east of Melksham.	The JMNP2 needs to plan for housing requirements in line with national policy.
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 6 (p44-49)	The policy states a requirement for 50% new homes to meet accessible homes standards. However, it is not clear on what standards the policy is referring to. The proposed Local Plan includes a policy which sets out accessible homes standards clearly and this policy potentially conflicts with this. The Policy unnecessarily repeats Policy 76 in the Local Plan with regards to the provision of affordable housing.	This requirement has been removed in the updated policy.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	4.8.2, 4.8.4 and 4.8.7 (P47) and blue box on p48	We object to this draft policy as it refers to a flawed settlement boundary, justification for which has been provided in relation to draft Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft 2020-2038 (Regulation 19) September 2023 (the Local Plan Review Pre-Submission Draft Plan). Specifically, Melksham's settlement boundary defined by the Local Plan Review Policies Map (Local Plan Review 2020 - 2038 (arcgis.com)) fails to include the site [SHELAA 728], which due to its characteristics should be within Melksham's settlement boundary. Aside from its characteristics and suitability for residential development, all of which will be evidenced in detail later in this letter, around half of the site benefits from planning permission for 50 dwellings and the remaining half benefits from a recommendation for approval subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement (PL/2022/08155). Indeed, the committee report for PL/2022/08155 considers the size of the scheme to be appropriate for Melksham, and notes that the site is located just outside of the settlement boundary, meaning its location provides a genuine choice of transport modes.	The JMNP does not review the settlement boundary. This may be reviewed by Wiltshire Council.
Version A		Policy 6, para 1 and 4.8.2 (p47)	<b>Draft Policy 6 should be amended to ensure the site is considered as part of the defined settlement. Were the site [SHELAA 728] to be allocated for residential development as part of the JMNP2, this element of the objection would be removed.</b>	The JMNP does not review the settlement boundary. This may be reviewed by Wiltshire Council.
Version A		Policy 6, para 2 and 3 (P44) and 4.8.5 (P47)	Draft Policy 6 expects housing types and tenures to respond positively to meeting local needs, informed by the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Area Housing Needs Assessment (2023), which recommends a relatively even split for 2-bedroom, 3- bedroom, and 4-bedroom dwellings. Whilst we acknowledge the draft policy wording only expects proposals to be 'informed' by the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Area Housing Needs Assessment (2023), the policy should also allow for housing mixes to be informed by the most-up-to-date assessments.  The second paragraph of draft Policy 6 should be amended as follows: "New housing will be supported where proposals demonstrate how housing types and tenures have responded positively to meeting local needs, informed by the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Area Housing Needs Assessment (2023) <b>and subsequent housing mix assessments</b> ".	Agreed. The policy is updated to reference the need to draw on the most up-to-date assessment.

**Policy 6 - Housing in Defined Settlements**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		Policy 6, para 5	Draft Policy 6 expects 50% of new housing to meet accessible home standards. Firstly, the draft policy must define what it means by accessible home standards. Further, whilst in principle we support the need to deliver accessible homes, it does not appear that the JMNP2 has considered the costs of delivering such standards and the implications on development viability. As it stands, it is unclear whether the draft neighbourhood plan considers the viability impact.	This requirement is removed in response to consultee feedback.
Version A			Draft Policy 6 should be subject to viability testing.	Viability tests have been undertaken in relation to allocations in the JMNP.
Version A			Further, the policy should be worded to allow for greater flexibility to attract Registered Providers, as well as meeting the local need.	The policy has been updated to allow for greater flexibility.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		6.14 Policy 6 sets out various requirements that new residential developments in Melksham will need to accord with. This includes in relation to: (1) ensuring proposals respond positively to meeting local needs; (2) accessible home standards; (3) affordable housing provision; (4) the tenure of affordable housing; and (5) in terms of First Homes, the discount to be applied. A consideration of each requirement is set out below.	
Version A		Policy 6 - para 2 (p44)	<b>Local housing needs</b> 6.15 We note that the Policy makes reference to the 2023 Local Housing Needs Assessment. This is an evidence base document that is not intended to form part of the Development Plan. However, its inclusion in the Policy inadvertently gives the document development plan effect. Specific reference to the document should therefore be removed from future versions of the Plan. 6.16 As local housing needs change over time, the removal of the specific reference to the 2023 version of the local housing needs assessment will ensure that the Policy has a greater longevity before becoming out-of-date.	Agreed. The policy is updated to reference the need to draw on the most up-to-date assessment.
Version A		Policy 6 - para 5 (p44)	<b>Accessible housing</b> 6.17 The Policy establishes a requirement for 50% of new housing to meet accessible homes standards. It is not entirely clear which standards are being referred to, although it is assumed that reference is being made to Category M4(2) of Part M of the Building Regulations. As drafted, the Policy therefore lacks the clarity required by para. 16(d) of the NPPF. 6.18 In any event, it is noted that Policy 78 of the Local Plan Review requires that all new housing, both market and affordable, be constructed to at least building regulations standards M4(2), with 7% being constructed to M4(3) standards. Consequently, it would appear that this element of Policy 6 does not, in terms of para. 16(f) of the NPPF, serve a clear purpose, as it duplicates policy in the emerging Local Plan.	This requirement is removed in response to consultee feedback.
Version A		Policy 6 - para 6 (p44)	<b>Affordable housing quantum</b> 6.19 The proposed Policy establishes a requirement for at least 40% of new housing to be affordable housing. As set out in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, this accords with the requirements set out in Policy 76 of the Local Plan Review. Given the requirement is established in the emerging Local Plan Review it is not considered that this element of Policy 6 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan serves a clear purpose.	This requirement is removed in response to consultee feedback.
Version A		Policy 6 - para 7 (p44)	<b>Affordable housing tenure</b> 6.20 Emerging Policy 6 requires 'about' 55% of affordable housing provision to be provided as discount market affordable housing. This is a significant departure from the requirements set out in emerging Policy 76 of the Local Plan Review, which confirms that, ordinarily, the tenure mix in Wiltshire will be 65% affordable housing for rent, 10% shared ownership and 25% first homes. 6.21 This could, therefore, create a policy conflict for a decision maker, which, in line with Section 38(5) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, would be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. 6.22 Consequently, if the Neighbourhood Plan is made in advance of the adoption of the Local Plan Review, the tenure mix would only apply for the period of time until the Local Plan Review becomes part of the statutory Development Plan. If the Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to Examination after the Local Plan Review is adopted, then it is arguable that it would need to accord with strategic policies in the higher tier plan, including those relating to affordable housing. The tenure mix should therefore be re-considered.	This requirement is removed in response to consultee feedback.
Version A		Policy 6 - para 8 (p44)	<b>First Homes discount</b> 6.23 Policy 6 establishes that new residential developments should provide 25% of all affordable housing as First Homes, at a discount of 40%. This is a significant departure from the minimum requirements set out in national planning guidance and the emerging Local Plan Review, which suggest a minimum discount of 30%. 6.24 We do not consider that the evidence underpinning the emerging Plan sufficiently justifies the 40% discount proposed. The evidence base document assessed the implications of a 30%, 40% and 50% discount on the proposed First Homes. Whilst a 30% discount would make a First Homes product accessible to households on average incomes, a greater discount of 50% would only make First Homes "marginally affordable to households with two lower quartile earners15." Having recommended a discount of 40%, it follows that even fewer households with two lower quartile earners would be able to afford a First Homes product. 6.25 Consequently, whilst the greater discount would have little impact on improving the affordability of a First Home product to lower quartile earners, it would have a significant impact on the viability of a development. This could risk the achievement of other objectives of the Plan, including the overall level of affordable housing and the delivery of infrastructure, including at a pace that matches housing delivery. 6.26 No viability assessment has been provided to demonstrate that this requirement is a viable proposition. The viability implications of this requirement, together with the other requirements of the Policy are considered below.	The first homes discount percentage is based on the Housing Needs Assessment. The policy has been amended to now to include the words in bold "First Homes should be provided at <b>up to</b> a 40% discount". Viability can therefore inform the percentage of discount at the application stage.
Version A		Policy 6 (p44)	<b>Viability</b> 6.27 A viability assessment does not appear to have been undertaken to demonstrate that the requirements of Policy 6, other policy requirements of the emerging Development Plan (including those contained within the Local Plan Review) and the Community Infrastructure Levy, are viable propositions. This will need to be fully considered at the subsequent consultation stage.	Viability tests have been undertaken in relation to allocations in the JMNP.

**Policy 6 - Housing in Defined Settlements**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Private Resident representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	Policy 6, para 6-8 (p44)	<b>[They have put a lot of commentary in the document to support their comment, including on tenure, Appendix 6.2.2.28]</b>  8.6 Pegasus raise objection to the extent to which the emerging JMNP2 non-strategic Policy 6 criteria for affordable housing delivery goes further than the eWLP strategic Affordable Housing Policy 76. 8.7 The latest eWLP evidence base on housing need comprises the Wiltshire Housing Needs Assessment Update (Volumes 1 and 2) prepared by ORS in May 2022 / February 2023, the JMNP2 housing need assessment evidence base comprises the Melksham & Melksham Without Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) prepared by AECOM (July 2022). The evidence papers are dated within a very short time of each other (just two months) yet the emerging policy of the non-strategic JMNP2 goes further on affordable housing requirements than the eWLP.	This requirement is removed in response to consultee feedback.
Version A		Policy 6, para 7 (p44)	8.10 The above wording [Policy 6, para 7, p44] should be amended to reflect that First Homes fall within the scope of the Affordable Housing NPPF Annex 2 Affordable Housing definition. The Affordable Housing definition does not include wording referencing eligibility being subject to a test whereby local households are 'on below average incomes'. NPPF Bullet point 'c)' states that eligibility is to be 'determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices' and bullet point 'd)' 'provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market'. Similarly the wording in Policy 6 is not in accordance with the eligibility tests set out in the First Homes section within the National Planning Practice Guidance. The wording 'for first time buyers and local households on below average incomes' should be deleted. 8.11 While the JMNP2 AECOM evidence base drills down into the local needs of Melksham it was prepared at the same time as the wider Wiltshire evidence base and concern has to be raised over the emerging policy discrepancies.	The policy has been updated to introduce more flexibility
Version A		Policy 6, para 3&4 (p44)	8.18 In terms of housing mix Policy 6 references 'prioritising' two, three and four bedroom dwellings and bungalows in Melksham Town, whilst in Shaw and Whitley two and three bedroom homes are sought to 'address a shortfall in their availability'. These mix requirements are not tenure specific, but there are significant concerns about the evidence that underpins this policy wording.	The policy has been updated to introduce more flexibility
Version A		Policy 6, para 6 (p44)	8.36 Paragraph 6 of Policy 6 should be amended to state that Affordable Housing will be sought in conformity with adopted Local Plan policy. In this way, the Affordable Housing quantum sought in Policy 6 will be in conformity with the final position in the eWLP should this progress to adoption or with the current extant Local Plan policy which is routinely applied by the Council at 30% in Melksham.	Agreed. Policy updated.
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		There are two distinct elements to Policy 6 and Gladman suggest there is merit in splitting up the policy to focus on these components. The first element concerns the Settlement Boundary and Gladman contend that this facet should be worded more flexibly in accordance with Paragraphs 11 and 16(b) of the NPPF and the requirement for policies to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change and prepared positively. It is suggested that Policy 6 should support development proposals adjacent to the settlement boundaries provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development alongside according with other policies of the JMNP2 and other development plan policies. The remainder of Policy 6 as drafted concerns housing mix. It would therefore be logical to create a separate Housing Mix policy for the JMNP2. The housing mix policy must promote a flexible strategy to ensure a choice of housing options are available to residents over the course of the plan period. This is because evidence prepared on housing need only provides an assessment of need at a single point in time and will be subject to change over the duration of the plan period. The policy should therefore be modified so that it allows consideration of the most up-to-date evidence on housing need available. In respect of Affordable Housing, in terms of both the percentage to be provided and the tenure split, this element should be deleted. The adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy and emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Review will set the affordable housing requirement. Again, there is no need for the JMNP2 to duplicate policy.	The policy has been updated to introduce more flexibility
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Policy 6: Housing in Defined Settlements</b> 4.1. We support this policy. 4.4. However, more could be said about the way in which housing for older people will be secured to make this policy more effective. Although land is secured at the former Melksham library site for circa 50 age-restricted units within the Neighbourhood Plan area, we consider this is woefully insufficient. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that local plans should plan for a range of housing to reflect the needs of the community, and National Planning Policy Guidance is explicit that this includes the requirement to respond to the "critical" need for older persons housing. 4.5. Whilst it may be appropriate to limit care home or sheltered housing provision to only the "most sustainable" locations, well located sites within smaller settlements such as Shaw and Whitley are highly appropriate for age-restricted dwellings such as bungalows or 'downsizer' units which provide an important options for persons who are still active and mobile to remain in independent accommodation within their communities. 4.6. Since accommodation for older persons (without care provision) falls under the same use class (C3) as general housing, it is, in planning terms, difficult to compel developers to offer this kind of housing given it costs more to build and there is no grant funding or other financial incentive to off-set this. As such, the proposal to include age-restricted housing within the development at Land north of Folly Lane, is a significant benefit.	The policy has been updated to introduce more flexibility

**Policy 6 - Housing in Defined Settlements**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL01	[also included in policy 7.3]	3.6 Paragraph 4.7.7 states "at Shaw and Whitley the emphasis should be to provide smaller homes to re-balance the opportunities." We request that further information is added to this section of the JMNP2 to give clarify what housing mix the JMNP2 will seek at this location.	Evidence and detail on the Housing Needs are set out in the evidence base accompanying JMNP2
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		<p>2.4. As per our comments above in relation to the plan period, we note that no changes are proposed to draft Policy 6 in the latest draft NDP. We therefore continue to maintain that draft Policy 6 should be amended to recognise that the Land South of Western Way now has planning permission and is therefore a committed site within Wiltshire Council's housing land supply.</p> <p>2.5. We also note that draft Policy 6 states that there will be support for "proposals for sustainable housing development ...will be supported where they accord with the Settlement Boundary provisions of Wiltshire Local Plan Policy 1 and adopted site allocations".</p> <p>2.6. On the basis that the Land South of Western Way now has outline planning permission, we support the proposed allocation of the site in the draft NDP, albeit the settlement boundary should also be extended to include the site.</p> <p>2.7. As a result, the settlement boundary, referred to in Policy 6, and shown in Figures 1, 2 and 4, should be amended to include the Land South of Western Way.</p>	Noted.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	4.8.3 - 4.8.7 (p47)	<p>The JMNP2 acknowledges the Local Plan Review Pre-Submission Draft Plan's approach to allocating/attributing housing in Melksham. Specifically, draft Policy 17 of the Local Plan Review Pre Submission Draft Plan proposes three housing allocations totalling 845 new homes and requires the neighbourhood area designation to deliver 270 dwellings, this includes 200 homes at Melksham and 70 homes at Shaw/Whitley. We have submitted a representation to the Local Plan Review consultation objecting to the draft Policy 17 on two grounds. Firstly, the site subject to promotion within this letter is sustainable and suitable for residential development; and secondly, as we established in our representation, the Local Plan Review Pre-Submission Draft Plan's housing requirement is insufficient, meaning more homes are needed in Wiltshire and in turn Melksham.</p> <p><b>We object to the JMNP2 on the basis that it is failing to allocate sufficient homes in Melksham and the "site subject to promotion is a suitable site for residential development, favourable in many ways to the sites proposed for allocation within the JMNP2.</b></p>	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version A	SF Planning for Land east of Beanacre Road, SHELAA 3405		[This site thinks it should be allocated for housing, see further detail in their document at <b>Appendix 6.2.2.58</b> ]	
Version A			The site (or the remaining part) is ideal for residential development due to its sustainable location and capacity to accommodate enough dwellings to meet the identified need for Melksham in a sustainable location. Development at the site would present an opportunity to provide green infrastructure which acts as a buffer on the edge of Melksham. There are also opportunities to improve community access to green spaces and enhance footpaths.	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarnton Farm SHELAA 3525	(referred to in their document as policy 7, but may mean Policy 6, subheading: Allocations of Land for Housing) (p47 - 49)	<p>This Policy sets out how the housing strategy will be delivered through allocated housing sites. Five sites are allocated delivering approximately 208 dwellings in Melksham and 58 in Witley.</p> <p>2.5 It should be noted that Catesby have raised significant and substantial concern with the draft Local Plan strategy and considers the plan to fail the tests for soundness. For ease, <a href="#">the full representations made to the Regulation 19 Plan</a> are appended to this representation in order to explain why Catesby consider the strategy in this neighbourhood plan to equally be unjustified. In all cases, further housing is required, and it would benefit the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan to delay in order to run slightly after the Local Plan Review that it maintained consistency and did not need to be immediately updated.</p>	<p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509</p>
Version A			[They are promoting their site, from the document in <b>Appendix 6.2.2.21</b> ]	
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		It is understood that the Steering Group may, even having regard to the constraints identified above, want to retain both sites as allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, given the identified constraints, neither site can be relied upon to demonstrate that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered in full by 2038. Accordingly, at least one additional site should be allocated. To provide the necessary certainty over delivery, this should be on a previously undeveloped site. We draw attention to the opportunity on land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold.	A further site (with outline planning permission) will be included in the submission JMNP2

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		4.8.3 -4.8.7 (p47)	<p>4.10 If, as suggested above, the Local Plan Review's plan period is extended until 2041, the housing requirement within the Local Plan would need to increase by a further three years. In turn, this may result in an increase in the apportionment figure provided for the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 to meet. The Neighbourhood Plan will therefore need to be sufficiently flexible to respond to this change in circumstance, which may require the identification of one or more additional housing allocation.</p> <p>4.11 Moreover, BH are aware that representations were submitted to the Local Plan Review identifying that the local housing need is greater than is established by the Government's 'standard method,' which was used by the LPA to identify their requirement.</p> <p>4.12 If it is accepted that the County's local housing need figure is to increase, it is possible that given its role and function within Wiltshire (a Market Town) and it not being identified as being 'constrained,' Melksham's requirement could be increased. In turn, this could again result in an increased requirement to be met through the identification of housing land within this emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>4.13 To ensure that the emerging Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the emerging Local Plan Review and the evidence underpinning it, the housing requirement for Melksham to be accommodated within the Neighbourhood Plan should be carefully monitored as the Local Plan Review progresses.</p>	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing." Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509
Version A		4.8.10 (p48)	<p>5.35 The assessment work presented above suggests that there are significant deliverability and developability concerns with both [Cooper Tires and Old Library site] proposed housing allocations at Melksham; there is a lack of evidence to robustly demonstrate that they will come forward by 2038 in the manner proposed. Consequently, this risks the achievement of the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement, as set out in the emerging strategic policy. The reliance on these allocations therefore risks the Plan being not found to accord with the basic conditions.</p> <p>5.36 Notwithstanding the above, the aspiration to develop both sites is understood by BH. It is therefore suggested that one or more additional housing site is identified as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site should be used for the purpose of demonstrating that the housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan will be delivered over the Plan period. Given the necessary surety that will be required, this should be on a site that has not previously been developed. In this context we draw attention to the opportunity to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, which is a deliverable proposition and is located in close proximity to Melksham's railway station.</p> <p>5.37 The inclusion of additional housing sites would provide a strong fit with national planning guidance, which confirms that neighbourhood planning bodies are encouraged to, where possible, exceed their housing requirement.</p>	A further site (with outline planning permission) will be included in the submission JMNP2
Version A	Planning Sphere for Develop6, Land to the south of Old Loves Farm, Bowerhill, SHELAA 3345		<p><b>[They have a document and drawings to support their comments (redacted) Appendix 6.2.2.32]</b></p> <p>PlanningSphere have been instructed to make an 'omission' representation to the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2) on behalf of Develop6 Ltd who are the promoters of land south of Old Loves Farm, Bowerhill.</p> <p>A technical evidence for the site has been assembled following site surveys and an iterative pre-application enquiry process that was undertaken in 2022 and provided constructive feedback on the technical matters. We are concerned that the subject site was screened out prematurely by consultants acting for the Steering Group, and respectfully request, the subject site is reconsidered for allocation on the basis that the land is available and suitable for allocation, and in sustainability / accessibility terms is sequentially preferable to the sites that have been selected for allocation under draft Policies 7.3-7.5.</p>	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House		<p><b>[They think their site should be allocated and have more detail here (redacted) Appendix 6.2.2.28]</b></p> <p>Our client's site shown on the plan attached at Appendix 1 would form a logical extension to Policy 20 and therefore to the settlement of Melksham and satisfy the 'broad location for growth' that is stated in eWLP Policy 17 Melksham Market Town that will be required in the longer term. Policy 17 of the eWLP is attached at Appendix 2.</p>	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.
Version A			The JMNP2 does not identify the location of draft eWLP allocations on Figures, nor does it refer to the need for Melksham to provide future long-term growth beyond those allocations as stated in eWLP Policy 17. Doing so would better describe the emerging strategic planning framework for Melksham and the role and status of the JMNP2 in providing non-strategic policies and allocations in accordance with the NPPF para 18 (Sept 2023).	Noted.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		4.8.6 (p48)	9.1 While the allocation of vacant brownfield sites in the JMNP2 within Melksham is laudable brownfield sites are inherently difficult to deliver and their regeneration requires specialist expertise and funding. A range and mix of sites including brownfield and green field sites would ensure the delivery of a range and mix of housing products, including the delivery of affordable housing for Melksham.	Both greenfield and brownfield are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Version A			9.6 Non delivery of JMNP2 sites adds weight to our client's view that additional sites should be allocated in the eWLP to meet the housing needs of Melksham until 2038. 9.7 Alternatively, the JMNP2 could allocate greenfield parcels such as 1027 and 715 to compliment the eWLP strategic allocations of parcels 3478 and 3479 to ensure that identified housing need is met in the plan period.	Both greenfield and brownfield are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3645? (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)		[They are promoting their own site with (redacted) details at <b>Appendix 6.2.2.66</b> ]	Noted
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for <b>Martin Grant Homes</b> and landowners (Awdry) of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA 3645? (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.5 It is key to highlight the significant housing target increase across England as a result of the ongoing NPPF consultation. Wiltshire's annual housing target has increased from 1,917 homes per annum to 3,476 homes per annum, an increase of 81%. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, it is clear the new government is willing to drive housing delivery forward with these targets filtering through to local and neighbourhood plans.  2.6 The draft B JMNP2 has not increased the housing target to address our previous comments, and as such we wish to reiterate our original feedback. Housing targets and allocations within the draft B JMNP2 should be revisited following the significant drive for new homes under the Labour Government and NPPF consultation. Land north of Berryfield Lane being a suitable, available and sustainable site to delivery new homes.	The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.  As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for <b>Martin Grant Homes</b> and landowners (Awdry) of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA part 3105a/b (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		[They are promoting their own site with (redacted) details at <b>Appendix 6.2.2.67</b> ]	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Tor & Co, on behalf of Gleeson Land, re Land East of Melksham, an emerging allocation in Wiltshire Local Plan Reg 19 update, under Policy 18 (Tor&Co also represent Martin Grant)		<p>2.5 It is key to highlight the significant housing target increase across England as a result of the ongoing draft NPPF consultation. Wiltshire's annual housing target has increased from 1,917 dwellings per annum to 3,476 dwellings per annum, an increase of 81%.</p> <p>2.6 Wiltshire Council needs to understand where the additional housing will be located within the authorities area and as a consequence, Melksham is likely to need to take some of the identified additional housing need. Thus it is pertinent for the authority to consider if there are any reviewed or available sites which would represent a logical extension to Melksham.</p> <p>2.7 Notwithstanding the outcome of the draft NPPF consultation, it is clear the government is seeking to drive housing delivery forward with these targets (whether as per the draft NPPF or in a revised form) filtering through to local and neighbourhood plans. Indeed we would propose that the NPPF when it is published in its final form is unlikely to be materially different to the current draft.</p> <p>2.8 Given that Wiltshire Council will undoubtedly therefore need to review its draft local plan either before submission or as part of an immediate review, it would be prudent for the Steering Group to therefore await a steer from the Wiltshire Council / the government regarding their proposed way forward.</p> <p>2.9 Housing targets and allocations within the draft B JMNP2 should be revisited following the significant drive for new homes by the government and the NPPF Consultation. This will ensure that the forthcoming NP is responsive and compliant with both the NPPF and draft local plan (or its immediate review) over the plan period to 2038.</p> <p>2.10 Should the Steering Group consider it should progress with the draft B JMNP2, it should acknowledge that in the light of the likely changes to the NPPF, as with the Local Plan, an immediate review of the NP will be required.</p>	<p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p> <p>Wiltshire Council's Local Plan review document, Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</p>
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	[Also put in Gen Comments tab]	<p>It is considered that the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan is premature. The JMNP must be in accordance with the Wiltshire Local Plan which is currently under review. There may be significant changes to the Local Plan before it is adopted which could have significant impacts on policies within this Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>For example, Stantonbury have been promoting, and have plans to develop land at Upside Melksham for a mixed-use housing/employment development (indeed a planning application is currently registered with the Council). The site is an existing Principal Employment area. However, it can be demonstrated (and has been through representations submitted to the Council) that the site should no longer be given this status and it should be considered as a viable site for redevelopment for alternative uses. Were the site to be reconsidered as a potential allocation, including employment and housing, which we believe it should be, then this would have significant positive impacts for Melksham and on policies and proposals in the JMNP.</p>	<p>The draft JMNP2 covers the period 2020 - 2038 and is being prepared alongside the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy WCS (known as the Wiltshire Local Plan Review (LPR)), which plans until 2038. It therefore takes into consideration both the adopted (but out of date) WCS and emerging LPR. Planning Practice Guidance states that "Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. <b>They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its local plan</b>" Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509 (our emphasis) As part of Wiltshire Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan, <a href="#">Planning for Melksham, also confirms that the neighbourhood area requirement may be met over one or more iterations of a Neighbourhood Plan within the plan period.</a></p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of</p>



## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email of August 22 2024	The Stantonbury Building and Development Company. David Hambly, representing Upside, SHELAA 264		<p>We support policy 7. However we do consider that the exclusion of the Upside, Bath Road site is incorrect and that it should be included as an allocated site within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>A full planning application was submitted two years ago following an extensive public consultation exercise.</p> <p>The planning application is still being considered and is yet to be determined.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the EA flood maps covering the site are incorrect. We have spent the past two years extensively modelling the flood conditions in South Brook, including the most extreme flood conditions. We are very pleased to say that the EA have completely accepted the proposals we have made (without any change to the building levels we have used in the application) and they have withdrawn the holding objection, setting out conditions to go on a planning permission.</p> <p>We are currently updating the proposal to take account of the comments made during the consultation on the planning application. The revisions will be submitted in the coming two or three weeks followed shortly after by the updated ecological surveys Information and reports. We are meeting the Town Council Planning Committee on 27th August.</p> <p>In the Wiltshire Local Plan, the site is identified as an employment site. The scheme retains the current employment on site within the development, introduces new commercial units and replaces the former scrapyard with 112 dwellings.</p> <p>With our commercial agents (Carter Jonas) we have demonstrated that the commercial redevelopment of the site cannot meet the infrastructure and remediation costs. Failure to obtain planning permission for the development proposed will simply mean the re-use of the scrapyard with extremely low levels of employment.</p> <p>The site will be redeveloped in conjunction with a Housing Association and it will provide a range of house types, sizes and in particular, a wide range of housing tenures, meeting identified needs in the JMNP needs survey.</p> <p>The development proposed meets sustainable objectives; it is a short walk from the town centre, railway station and the site is convenient for bus services. The development includes valuable, strategic foot and cycle routes.</p> <p>The buildings have been designed to achieve zero carbon in use. The design is of the highest quality with a particular objective of standing a test of "time".</p> <p>The site will create excellent community facilities with the creation of a public park, giving access to and securing the future of local green space 1 (Policy 16). As well as creating public open space and foot and cycle routes, there will be a wildlife area, community orchard, wildflower meadow, community growing space and gardens, accessible green space and attenuation ponds, all designed into the existing landscape hedgerows and trees with a very large BNG gain.</p> <p>We would ask that policy 7 is amended to include the Upside site as an allocated housing site along with the provision of the public park/open space.</p>	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill,		<p>From previous correspondence, the Steering Group will be aware that Gladman are promoting 'Land South of Bowerhill' within the neighbourhood plan area for strategic residential-led development. Thought it is recognised that the neighbourhood plan is not seeking to allocate strategic scale sites, Gladman would nonetheless welcome your views on our development proposal and are keen to hear about the aspirations of the Steering Group and local community.</p> <p>Gladman recently submitted representations in respect of our land interest at Melksham to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Wiltshire Local Plan Review. Further detail on the suitability and sustainability of 'Land South of Bowerhill' is available within the Story Map submitted as part of our representation, which can be accessed from the following link: <a href="https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/0f973cb85b994273b38b64cbd988a34a">https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/0f973cb85b994273b38b64cbd988a34a</a></p> <p>I'd be pleased to discuss our proposals in further detail during a meeting with the Steering Group at a convenient time and suggest this could be done through either an in-person meeting or an online video call (e.g. via Microsoft Teams). Should the Steering Group be amenable to this, please could you provide me with some suitable dates and times.</p>	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes, representing land west of Semington Road and South of A350		<p>Bellway has land interests to the southwest of Melksham, within the Neighbourhood Plan Boundary, to the west of Semington Road and south of the A350. The site is circa 13.5ha and is identified on the plan at Appendix 1. The site has previously been promoted through the Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review process; although it has not been included as a draft allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan and is therefore an 'omission site'.</p> <p>Bellway submitted representations to the recent Wiltshire Council Pre-Submission Draft Plan Regulation 19 consultation which highlight the sustainability and deliverability of the site, which is necessary to deliver the additional housing required in the area within the next Plan period. These representations also highlight the importance of the site to enable the delivery of the Melksham Link of the Wilts and Berks Canal – a key Place Shaping Priority for Wiltshire Council in Melksham. The representations included at Appendix 2 for your information and context. <span style="color: red;">[no appendix attached]</span></p>	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p>The currently drafted JMNP2 does not propose the site for allocation. We maintain that the site should be proposed for allocation because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The JMNP2 should plan positively for enough housing, not just the bare minimum contained within the yet-to-be-adopted draft Wiltshire Local Plan;</li> <li>• The site selection process is not clearly justified with less preferable sites awarded allocation without reason; and</li> <li>• The site could offer a number of additional benefits which would help deliver other neighbourhood plan policies and objectives.</li> </ul>	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version A			<p><b>Policy 7: Allocations at Shaw and Whitley</b></p> <p>3.1. We object to the choice of allocations. The selection process has failed to respond justly and positively to the evidence base.</p> <p>3.6. The figure shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 3148 (Middle Farm A) to be suitable for allocation;</li> <li>• Sites MEL01 (Whitley Farm), 3246 (Land off Corsham Road) and MEL11 (Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane) to be potentially suitable for allocation; and</li> <li>• The remainder to be unsuitable for allocation.</li> </ul> <p>3.7. Firstly, it is therefore wholly unclear why MEL07, which is deemed unsuitable for allocation, is proposed as a site for 40 dwellings in the draft JMNP2, particularly given that MEL11 and 3246 with potential suitability have been rejected. This is unsound.</p>	A site allocation Topic Paper has been prepared setting out the process of allocation - this is in the evidence base to JMNP2. This clearly sets out the justification for proposed site allocations with full regard to the whole sites assessment process and representations made in support of sites.
Version A			3.8. Secondly, we would question the deliverability of 3148 (Middle Farm A) given it was allocated for development in the JMNP1, made in July 2021, and no planning application has yet been submitted.	There is no substantial evidence to support this claim. Pre-application meetings have been held with Melksham Without Parish Council on 24.11.22 and 05.06.24
Version B PDF emailed in August: <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/10fr04ZaKc39hZTmLjIi2IRz3Gt6SgTe3/view?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/file/d/10fr04ZaKc39hZTmLjIi2IRz3Gt6SgTe3/view?usp=drive_link</a>	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p><b>Policy 7: Allocations at Shaw and Whitley</b></p> <p>2.1. We continue to object to the choice of allocations in the villages. The selection process has failed to respond justly and positively to the evidence base.</p> <p>2.2. The draft Wiltshire Local Plan expects the JMNP2 to plan for at least 50 new dwellings, and assuming that the allocation of Middle Farm (plot A) of 18 dwellings from the JMNP1 is to be carried forward this results in an overall figure of 68 dwellings (albeit oddly the Local Plan also cites the figure of 73).</p>	A site allocation report has been prepared setting out the process of allocation - this can be in the evidence base to JMNP2. The draft Wiltshire Local Plan cites 5 windfall sites in Shaw & Whitley hence reducing the overall residual figure to 50 taking into account the 18 allocated in JMNP1 too.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management (HLM), 10.81 hectares of land to the south of		1.7 Since planning permission has now been granted the site represents a housing commitment and will at the next base date contribute towards Wiltshire Council's housing land supply. Given the proven suitability and sustainability of the site for development, we consider it should therefore also be allocated in the draft NDP for a development consistent with the description above.	A site allocation report has been prepared setting out the process of allocation - this is in the evidence base to JMNP2 and demonstrates why this site has now been allocated in JMNP2.
Version A	Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.10 The Land South of Western Way was considered as 'Site 9'. [ p8 of their (redacted) document at Appendix 6.2.2.39 sets out why they think their site should be allocated]	Now included as an allocation in the JMNP2
Version B	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		The proposed allocation of various sites to meet the housing need of the neighbourhood plan area is supported, however it is considered that certain elements of the new draft Green Wedges policy do not fully meet the basic conditions as outlined within the following sections.	Please see Policy 19.
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf of private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>[More detail in their document at Appendix 6.2.2.1 ]</p> <p>5.9 The preparation of the JMNP Part 2 must have regard to the strategic context at Wiltshire. As explained within our representations, proposed reforms to the NPPF will require increase of over 81% in the Local Housing Need, result in significant uplifts in the number of homes that will need to be provided for through the WLRP.</p> <p>5.10 As a sustainable settlement, identified in the WLRP for significant growth over the plan period, Melksham will be a key focus for growth in light of these emerging new increased housing targets, and it is without a doubt, that the WLRP and development strategy for Wiltshire will need to be revised to increase the number of houses to be delivered in the settlement over the plan period to 2038.</p> <p>5.11 Policies within the JMNP should not artificially frustrate the delivery of sustainable patterns of development and our concern is that, as currently drafted Policy 19REV does exactly that. As such, and in light of the Government's proposed reforms to national planning policies, the JMNP2 cannot be supported.</p>	<p>"The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p><b>Housing Supply</b></p> <p>2.22. Whilst the draft Wiltshire Local Plan identifies a need at Whitley for 73 dwellings to come forward (at non-strategic sites) in the plan period, oddly it refers to a 'residual' need of about 50 dwellings, which together with the existing allocation at Middle Farm, would only provide 68 dwellings. The JMNP2 Draft B now proposes 70 dwellings, but does not meet the number of 73 set out in the Wiltshire Local Plan. Whilst clearly we are promoting the site at Folly Lane as an alternative or complementary site to deliver this need, should the site not come forward, hopefully proposals at either Middle Farm or Whitley Farm can achieve a successful design to enable the LPA to support a slightly increased quantum of housing to make up the 3 dwellings at application stage.</p>	The draft Wiltshire Local Plan cites 5 windfall sites in Shaw & Whitley hence reducing the overall residual figure to 50 taking into account the 18 allocated in JMNP1 too.

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p>2.23. More importantly however, we still consider that to only plan for around the amount of homes sought by the draft Wiltshire Local Plan is short-sighted because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overall county housing requirement will almost certainly go up as a result of the proposed changes to National Planning Policy described in the Introduction above (with knock-on consequences for Neighbourhood Planning requirements); and</li> <li>2. The strength of the plan in resisting speculative development relies upon its age and allocation of sites (as per the tests in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework) – the plan will need to be updated with 5 years of being 'made' and contain a strategy for allocations.</li> </ol>	<p>"The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p>2.24. In choosing two sites with no further potential for (housing) growth, additional sites may need to be found now or for a future JMNP3. The site at Folly Lane provides ample opportunity for allocating additional housing both now and in future phases.</p>	<p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing. Any change in circumstances can be addressed through a future review of JMNP2.</p>

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	David Jarvis Associates for private landowner re land at Shaw Hill/Norrington Common		<p>3.2 The [landowners] own an 8ha area of land at Shaw Hill/Norrington Lane, which has previously been submitted to Wiltshire Council (as part of a larger area of land) as being suitable for housing development.</p> <p>3.3 Following further detailed assessment, it is considered that a significantly smaller 1.7ha area of the site provides a more logical and suitable location for residential development, with additional land also available for public open space, biodiversity enhancements and sustainable drainage.</p> <p>3.4 The developable area outlined in red on the site location plan at Appendix 1 is not designated as a Local Green Space within the emerging JMNP2 and is also outside the proposed Shaw/Melksham "Green Wedge". In addition, the land is not covered by any national landscape, ecological or heritage designations and it lies entirely within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>3.5 The illustrative site layout plan contained at Appendix 4 indicates a development of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approx. 26 homes, including affordable housing;</li> <li>• Vehicular/pedestrian access onto Shaw Hill</li> <li>• Open spaces and recreational areas;</li> <li>• Areas for biodiversity improvements and sustainable drainage</li> <li>• Community facilities, potentially including allotments;</li> </ul> <p>3.6 It is considered that this redefined development site is appropriate for consideration as an allocation within the emerging JMNP2, either immediately or in following iterations of the Plan.</p>	<p>The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Version B - Bloor 1 & 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>	housing numbers	<p>Meeting the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement for Melksham</p> <p>Having regard to Bloor Homes's capacity assessment of the Cooper Tires site and the former library site, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan does not provide an adequate number of new homes to meet its housing requirement, as established in the emerging Local Plan Review.</p>	<p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.</p>

## 7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 &3	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)	housing numbers	<b>Need for additional allocations</b> It is understood that the Steering Group may, even having regard to the constraints identified above, want to retain both sites as allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, given the identified constraints, neither site can be relied upon to demonstrate that the Plan's housing requirement will be delivered in full by 2038. Accordingly, at least one additional site should be allocated. To provide the necessary certainty over delivery, this should be on a previously undeveloped site.	The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.  As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.
Version B - Bloor 1 &4	Bloor 1 - Land north of the A3102, or land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3746	[this is the only bit separate from the other Bloor representation]	3.5 BH estimate that SHELAA site 3743 has a potential capacity of up to 45 dwellings. It is available for allocation through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.
Version B - Bloor 1 &5	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>WAY FORWARD</b> 5.51 The assessment work presented above suggests that there are significant deliverability and developability concerns with proposed housing allocations at the Cooper Tires site and the former Melksham library; there is a lack of evidence to robustly demonstrate that they will come forward by 2038 in the manner proposed. Consequently, this risks the achievement of the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement, as set out in the emerging strategic policy. The reliance on these allocations therefore risks the Plan being not found to accord with the basic conditions. 5.52 Notwithstanding the above, the aspiration to develop both sites is understood by BH. It is therefore suggested that one or more additional housing site is identified as an allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. The site should be used for the purpose of demonstrating that the housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan will be delivered over the plan period. Given the necessary surety that will be required, this should be on a site that has not previously been developed. 5.53 The inclusion of additional housing sites would provide a strong fit with national planning guidance which confirms that neighbourhood planning bodies are encouraged to, where possible, exceed their housing requirement.	Noted. A sites allocation Topic Paper has been prepared. This sets out landowner support for allocations and intentions for bringing sites forward within the criteria of allocations within the plan period. Any issue with delivery may be addressed through a future review of JMNP2
Version B email, August	Bloor 2 – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	only Bloor 2	3.3 Notwithstanding the above, there is the potential for SHELAA site 3310 to be incorporated into a wider parcel of land that could deliver in excess of 400 dwellings, subject to land owner agreement and a masterplanning exercise.	The submission is noted. However all available and potentially suitable sites have been assessed and have gone through a democratic process of assessment within the Steering Group and the wider NP process. Allocations are as proposed in the JMNP2. No further allocations will be made in this iteration of the Plan.

7 Allocations of Land for Housing

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		<p><b>Policy 7 'Allocations of land for Housing' – Summary</b></p> <p>In our previous representation, we objected to the JMNP2's allocations of housing land for two reasons. Firstly, that the JMNP2 fails to allocate sufficient homes in Melksham, and secondly, that the site subject to promotion is a suitable site for residential development, favourable in many ways to the sites proposed for allocation within the JMNP2. The amendments to Policy 7 and additional viability assessments do not change this view, rather they further substantiate our argument, that our site represents a preferable housing allocation to those proposed by Policies 7.1 and 7.2, due its reliability in providing housing to contribute to Melksham's housing need. The inclusion of a further allocation will contribute to delivering houses in Melksham, but is not sufficient to meet Melksham's housing requirement, especially given we understand the housing requirement figure prescribed by the Wiltshire Draft (Regulation 19) Local Plan to be flawed2</p> <p>. We also expect Wiltshire's local housing need to increase significantly if the Government's current reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Standard Method are adopted, this is discussed in the final section of this letter.</p> <p>Requested Change to Draft Plan: The JMNP2 should allocate the site for residential development. An allocation will ensure that the draft plan meets the basic conditions, notably (a), (d),(e) and (f).</p>	<p>The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.</p>
Version B, August email	WC Planning	Site allocation policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.6, 7.7	The site allocation policy numbers are out of sequence e.g. Policy 7.6 follows Policy 7.2 and Policy 7.7 follows Policy 7.3. This should be amended. It would be a lot less confusing if the five site allocations were simply numbered Policies 7.1 – 7.5 and in numerical order. The 'REV' and 'NEW' references should be removed.	Noted

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
--------	------	---	---------	----------



Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p>The plan's recognition of the importance of securing the comprehensive regeneration of this complex and important riverside site and the ongoing dialogue with Wiltshire Council is welcomed. The policy and supporting text would benefit from review following completion of the work we are undertaking on a framework masterplan (informed by appropriate evidence), as this will inform a revised policy setting out requirements and parameters to guide the development of the site. It will be important that a more detailed policy is developed to ensure any detailed masterplan prepared at the planning application is shaped in the right way. It should set out what development of the site is expected to achieve, including land uses and mitigation measures and provide greater confidence in deliverability.</p> <p>Policy 7.1 supporting text acknowledges the significant issues relating to this site – the most significant of which are the location of the majority of the site within flood zones 2 and 3 and significant land contamination from industrial processes on the site; as well as historic assets. It is expected that the ongoing dialogue between Wiltshire Council and the Qualifying Bodies will lead to the production of a framework master plan, supported by evidence, which will inform this revised policy.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, some detailed comments have been provided below on the supporting text:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.23 – this suggests that Wiltshire Council are master planning the site with the site owners which is not the case – the site owners are not involved. It should be clarified that we are working towards the production of a framework masterplan whereas the comprehensive master plan and design code should be produced by the applicant at planning or pre-application planning stage</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.25 – suggest the first sentence of this paragraph is amended to say ‘...deliver mixed-use regeneration which will comprise <b>housing</b>, employment and commercial, leisure and cultural uses...’ given the neighbourhood plans aim to secure some housing on this site as part of a mix of uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.26 – the reference to ‘at least’ could raise expectation about the level of housing that could be provided on the site and requires further consideration. Further work to inform a more detailed policy may help identify an appropriate level of housing and other land uses that should be provided for on site.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.26 is also recommended to be amended as follows:  <b>‘Subject to further feasibility and detailed design</b>, development should include at least 150 dwellings to include open market and affordable housing to contribute to meeting local housing needs and in conformity with adopted Wiltshire council housing policies and informed by the Melksham Housing Needs Appraisal (2023).’</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.27 – significant parts of the site are in Flood Zone 2 and 3. The views of the Environment Agency will be important in developing a more detailed policy to inform the appropriate development of the site. Through the sequential test set out in national policy, we should be aiming to direct residential development away from Flood Zone 3. The actual area available for residential development (based on fluvial flood risk) would currently be about 25% of the site area. We recommend including this and taking into consideration the following points when reviewing paragraph 4.8.27:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is significant pluvial flooding across the site (1 in 100yr + 40% climate change) – this is primarily just on the existing internal roads; however, it would likely be more extensive following the removal of the existing industrial buildings.</li> <li>•Half of the site is shown in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as being at high risk of groundwater flooding.</li> <li>•We would expect detailed fluvial and pluvial modelling to be undertaken in order to define risk as part of the sequential test, given the identified flood risk to this site. We are not saying currently that the site passes a sequential or exception test due to unknowns on potential layout and extents of more accurate model data.</li> <li>•Works within the River Avon functional floodplain may require flood plain compensation as part of any development proposals – these would need to be modelled and agreed with the Environment Agency.</li> <li>•Given the proximity to the River Avon, if infiltration drainage is not possible, we would be expecting to see a discharge to the Avon (rather than to a Wessex Water Sewer).</li> <li>•There are potential access / egress constraints on this site, so a Flood Emergency Plan would likely need to be produced and agreed.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 4.8.30 – suggest this paragraph also makes reference to the relevant draft LPR Policy as these are referred to in other parts of the neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood plan needs to be consistent throughout when referring to adopted Core Strategy policies and emerging Local Plan Review policies.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.31 – suggest this paragraph is amended to say ‘...identified as a non-designated heritage asset by Policy 21 of this Plan <b>and</b> is to be retained...’</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.8.36 - 4.8.38 - the comments towards sustainable design and construction are supported in principle. However, the supporting text could be more ambitious and refer to encouragement for net zero carbon in operation rather than “move towards carbon neutrality”. This is such a sustainable location that policy should be stating that private vehicle parking provision will be intentionally low. A maximum provision of 1 space per household would be logical rather than the reference to existing parking standards that set minimum parking requirements.</p> <p>ULEV charging needs to refer to Building Regulations and/or Wiltshire Council standards – like Policy 7.2 does. This is in case the council, in the future, sets a higher bar than the minimum national requirements.</p>	<p>Noted. The allocation requires the production of a master plan and delivery strategy to be approved by Wiltshire Council as before or as part of any planning application for the site. It is premature for the allocation to create such a document. A sites allocation topic paper and a specific Cooper Tires capacity study has been prepared that addresses the approach and justifications taken to the draft allocation of the Cooper Tires site and the amount and containment of residential development. In response to procedural issues raised through Reg 14 A consultation an initial sequential assessment of reasonably available sites within Flood Zone 1 has been undertaken. In response to representations residential development and associated capacity is reduced to about 100 dwellings land within Flood Zone 1 only. No commitment is made to residential development outside of zone 1, although the allocation supports greater amounts of residential development subject to addressing all forms of flood risk and mitigation. It is noted that this approach differs to that adopted by Wiltshire Council Local Plan in its proposed allocation of Flood Zone 2 land at Innox Mills for residential development without undertaking a sequential test.</p>

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	WC Planning	Policy 7.1 REV 'Land at Cooper Tires Factory Site	The plan's recognition of the importance of securing the comprehensive regeneration of this complex and important riverside site and the ongoing dialogue with Wiltshire Council is welcomed. It appears that the two-stage masterplan approach has now been dropped and that there is just a single stage now, to be developer-led at planning stage. However, we would still recommend that a developer undertakes a pre-app submission prior to submission of a full planning application to test assumptions and constraints. Policy 7.1 supporting text acknowledges the significant issues relating to this site – the most significant of which are the location of the majority of the site within flood zones 2 and 3 and significant land contamination from industrial processes on the site, as well as historic assets.	Policy still requires. It is premature to produce an allocation framework master plan. Capacity analysis has informed allocation commitments. A comprehensive master plan to be prepared by the landowner or applicant. Reg14 B reps on behalf of the owner indicate support for and intent to follow this path. The JMNP1 pre-application protocol addresses requirement for pre-app engagement.
Version B email, August			Criterion a – the reference to ' <i>at least</i> ' could raise expectations about the level of housing that could be provided on the site and requires further consideration. It would also undermine the policy if future viability assessment shows that only a lower amount could be delivered on site. Further work to inform this policy may help identify a more appropriate level of housing. Requiring ' <i>at least</i> ' 150 dwellings is considered unlikely to be accepted by an examiner and we recommend this is amended to say, ' <i>at least approximately 150 dwellings</i> .' However, if further viability assessment shows that the site could deliver a higher amount then this should be reflected in a higher number.	Noted and accepted
Version B email, August			Criterion f – public realm should be provided in other parts of the development not just along the riverside.	Noted and accepted
Version B email, August			Criterion 1 – a heritage assessment should also assess impacts on the wider site area not just on existing buildings	Noted
Version B email, August			Criterion 2 – for clarity and accuracy, we suggest requirement should say ' <i>protect <del>or</del> and enhance on-site heritage assets and their settings the setting of on-site heritage assets...</i> '	Noted
Version B email, August			Criterion 9 – in order to future proof this Plan should 'Building for a Healthy Life' be revised, we would suggest amending as follows: ' <i>Building for a Healthy Life (Homes England) or any subsequent revision</i> .' This addition should also be considered in other parts of the Plan where specific guidance/publications are referenced.	Noted
Version B email, August			Concept Plan - this policy refers to a supporting concept plan however it does not appear that one has been supplied. The supporting text links to the draft JMNP2 webpages which links to the ' <i>Cooper Tires Melksham: Initial Site Capacity Assessment</i> ' 17th of June 2024 document produced by AK Urbanism. Is the policy wording referring to the plan in Appendix 5 of this document titled ' <i>Potential Areas for Proposed Land Uses</i> '? It is recommended that the supporting concept plan is included in the NP not in a supporting document on a website. If Figure 6 is the Concept Plan, then this should be renamed ' <i>Cooper Tires Redline Concept Plan</i> '.	Allocation to have red line plan
Version B	WC Planning	Paragraph 4.8.25 (PB54)	As per our recommendation to amend the policy dwelling requirement to 'approximately', we suggest amending this paragraph as follows: ' <i>The allocation therefore sets proportionate expectation for development of <del>at least</del> approximately 150 homes up to 2038</i> .'	Noted. Allocation number reduced
Version B	WC Planning	Figure 6 (PB55)	If this is the Concept Plan referred to in Policy 7.1 then it should be renamed as ' <i>Cooper Tires Redline Concept Plan</i> '.	See above
Version B	WC Planning		We recommend that this Concept Plan shows the anticipated developable area for housing development given that the majority of the site is Flood Zone 3 and therefore not developable for housing.	See above
Version B	WC Planning	Paragraph 4.8.26 (PB54)	In order to more fully explain why only 10% affordable housing is being required, we suggest that paragraph 4.8.26 is amended as follows:	
Version B	WC Planning		<i>'As in other brownfield regeneration allocations promoted through the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, the requirement for amount of housing of Affordable Housing provision has been reduced to 10% of the total residential development to achieve a viable allocation, taking into account the significant constraints onsite, including contaminated land and flood risk.'</i>	Noted. Clause amended to address viability issues and not pegged to 10% minimum.
Version B	WC Planning	Paragraph 4.8.30	Plan is missing paragraph 4.8.30 – paragraph numbers jump from 4.8.29 to 4.8.31	Noted
Version A	Private Landowner re land at Whitley Golf Club	4.8.25, 4.8.26 (p52)	While I support development, it should be an asset to Melksham and the area, in that the developments should be 'smart design' to maximise residential and commercial units.	Noted
Version A	Private Landowner re land at Whitley Golf Club	4.8.29, 4.8.48 (p52 and p55)	The riverside should be use as a focus and the existing buildings including factory should kept and renovated as they are of historical importance to the area.	Heritage assessment required to inform conservation
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.25 (p52)	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd fully supports the Vision and Objectives for the JMNP. A residential-led mixed-use redevelopment of its Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1) is consistent with the Vision and delivery of key Objectives, notably the regeneration and intensified use of previously-developed employment land.	Noted
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.26 (p52)	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd considers that Policy 6 should make it clear that affordable housing requirements may vary on a site-by-site basis taking into account of local factors including the viability of development. This is particularly relevant on sites such as it's Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1) where abnormal costs such as demolition, ground remediation and flood mitigation are likely to be significant and disproportionate.	This issue is addressed in policy 7.1

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.25, 4.8.26 (p52)	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd fully supports the allocation of its Factory Site for mixed-use development. At paragraph 4.8.25 it is stated that regeneration will comprise 'employment and commercial, leisure and cultural uses' and at 4.8.26 it is stated that the development should include at least 150 dwellings. The feasibility and viability work undertaken to date points to residential-led development with some retained employment/commercial use likely to be sustainable including through adaptation of retained buildings of heritage value. It is considered that Policy 7.1 and its supporting text should be more ambitious in terms of the number of dwellings that can be delivered, which could be at least 300 in conjunction with reasonable provision for new employment/commercial uses, potentially some supporting leisure/cultural and other community uses, and having regard to the need for flood mitigation works.	Revised policy 7.1 provides support for residential development above c100 dwellings in flood zone1.
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.25 (p52)	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd fully supports the objective of ensuring that the site's redevelopment is complementary to Melksham Town Centre which in practice means that provision of 'town centre' uses such as retail and food/drink uses should be limited so as to not create a destination that acts to pull significant trade and activity away from the established Town Centre.	Revised policy 7.1 provides support for residential development above c100 dwellings in flood zone1.
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.25 (p.52) [also put in Policy 10]	The supporting text cross-references Policy 10 – Employment Sites which expects proposals for the reuse of employment land to generate the same number, or more. Permanent FTE jobs as the former use. In the case of the Factory Site, it will be important for this aim to be balanced with the other stated objectives for the Site including delivery of dwellings, as well as consideration of local economic factors including the demand for new employment space.	Noted
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.42 (p54) and 4.4.48 (p55)	The supporting text states that 'public access will be provided along the entire riverside frontage of the site' and requires 'provision of a new vibrant public riverside environment'. These aims are supported subject to ensuring that they can be achieved in tandem with any flood mitigation works that are found to be necessary to support residential-led development.	Noted
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.10.6 and 4.10.8 (p77) [also put in Policy 10]	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd generally supports this Policy. However, in consideration of the future of the Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1), it is likely to prove challenging to reprove an equivalent number of FTE jobs as the former use, particularly if the site is to be redeveloped for mixed use. For the Factory Site, the focus should be on providing high-quality, flexible employment space that is viable, market-facing, and compatible with residential development. Generally, Policy 10 should promote reproviseion of high quality, affordable, and flexible new employment space suited to the local market alongside the aim of sustaining FTE jobs.	The policy does not specify a balance of uses and requires a master planning process to resolve land uses.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		CTE is in advanced discussions with a development company and it is anticipated the sale of the site will be concluded shortly. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate for CTE to submit specific representations on the draft Plan at this stage, as Cooper Tires will not be responsible for the development of the site. Accordingly, these comments are made on behalf of future purchaser who cannot be named at present	Progress with sale welcomed. Comments made on behalf of new owner noted.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		Comments on behalf of the prospective purchaser. In progressing the proposed acquisition of the Cooper Tires site, the prospective purchaser has carefully considered the nature of the Site and its potential and are ambitious for its future and the contribution it can make to Melksham and its community. At this stage, the prospective purchaser broadly concurs with the vision for the Site set out in the draft Neighbourhood Plan of a mixed, housing led scheme, reflecting the heritage assets on the site and its attractive, riverside location. The prospective purchaser would also expect to bring the site forward within a flexible masterplan framework.	Noted

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p>However, given the complexities and costs that will be associated with bringing forward development on this key Site it is important to match ambition with pragmatism, to ensure viability and deliverability.</p> <p>It is within this context that these comments are made. Similarly, they also reflect the likely planning strategy the prospective purchaser will adopt in bringing the site to market. A key part of their approach is to address site risks and confirm the planning requirements (and costs) of development, so that housebuilders and other 'end users' can come forward with specific, detailed proposals within that wider, agreed context, thus ensuring delivery.</p> <p>To that end the prospective purchaser currently envisages submitting a hybrid application for the Site (i.e. outline, with detail for the heritage and some other elements) within the context of a masterplan framework and illustrative masterplan prepared in consultation with stakeholders and in the light of public consultation. A pre-application submission will be made to Wiltshire Council and they would hope that the Town Council would be open to direct engagement in the development of the masterplanning strategy. This approach will establish the mix and capacity of the site and development costs and viability as well as the approach to access, flood management, green infrastructure and biodiversity. It will also establish the key design principles.</p> <p>The subsequent hybrid planning approval will then enable the prospective purchaser to invest in the reclamation and preparation of the Site, before bringing it to market when detailed proposals can come forward, alongside the delivery of those heritage and other elements approved in detail. The prospective purchaser therefore considers that the policy supporting the redevelopment of the Cooper Tires site should reflect both the potential and challenges of the Site, not least viability, and should incorporate appropriate flexibility to ensure that a deliverable scheme can be brought forward. Again, this context is reflected in the comments made.</p>	<p>Intentions to produce master plan through engagement and hybrid planning application welcomed. Consistent with delivery of policy 7.1 and pre-application protocol. Master planning process to resolve viable land use balance with regard to policy.</p>
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p>In preparing these comments they have had regard in particular to the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 – Pre-Submission Consultation Draft B, June 2024</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Cooper Tires Melksham, Initial Site Capacity Assessment, AK Urbanism, 17th June 2024</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Scoping Opinion on Viability, Bailey Venning Associates, March 2024</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Addendum to scoping opinion on viability, Further development scenarios for land at Cooper Tires, Melksham, Bailey Venning Associates, July 2024</li> </ul> <p>In reviewing those documents, it is relevant to note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> There will be a number of constraints (and opportunities) to be addressed in bringing forward the site, including the management of flood risk; Flood risk sequential and exception tests will need to be considered.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The initial site capacity assessment prepared to support the JMNP, suggests that those parts of the site noted as being within Flood Zones 1 and 2 can delivery in the order of 150 units, with the bulk of the site, measured at 8.78ha and defined as Flood Zone 3, having the potential for additional dwellings, subject to meeting the Exceptions Test.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A housing (155 units) and commercial / retail scheme (9,669 sqm scheme, including a six-screen cinema) covering the whole site and tested for viability would have a significant negative land value (circa -£12 million) and would, of course, be unviable. Other viability assessments published in July 2024, suggest that housing as a standalone proposition may be viable (scenarios from 195 dwellings up to 300 units were tested), provided the costs of bringing forward the residual of the site are not included. Commercial development is note as a 'drag on viability'.</li> </ul> <p>It is within this context of challenging viability; the importance of housing both to address viability and contribute to a successful community whilst addressing flood risk; and the viability constraints on commercial; that the prospective purchaser submits the following comments on relevant part of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Commitment to address site constraints within master plan process welcomed. All options for achieving viability should be explored including reuse of existing fabric to maximise non-residential employment opportunities.</p>

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Policy 7.1REV Land at Cooper Tires Factory Site</b></p> <p>Overall, and as previously noted, the prospective purchaser is supportive of the Cooper Tires sites draft allocation within the JMNP and are also pleased at the ambition of Melksham Town Council to deliver a significant regeneration project within their town that could act as flag bearer for the brownfield first approach and deliver much needed development. However, in the context of the comments made above, some changes to the policy are sought to ensure that this draft allocation is deliverable and viable, and that the policy creates a suitable framework within which they can bring forward proposals.</p> <p>These requested changes reflect the context provided around viability, housing need, the approach to employment space as well as other uses.</p>	Noted. Allocation policy amendments have had regard to enabling regeneration in working engagement with prospective owner and with regard to other stakeholder and statutory consultees comments.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Viability</b></p> <p>Viability has been considered earlier in this representation and draws on recent viability work commissioned in support of the JMNP. This work supports the future owners' view that whilst the redevelopment of a brownfield, constrained site will always be challenging in terms of viability, housing as the primary use does provide the opportunity for a deliverable scheme whilst employment, commercial and potentially other uses would need to be very carefully considered as they will adversely impact on overall viability. In that context, whilst a mixed-use approach to the site is appropriate with selective opportunities taken to accommodate uses other than residential as part of creating a sustainable neighbourhood, the Cooper Tire site should be seen as a housing led opportunity.</p> <p>Draft Policy 7.1REV also states that proportionate financial contributions to infrastructure will need to be made. These include to education, health care capacity and measures to support walking and cycling. Given the challenging financial context, it is again important to ensure that any such contributions are considered in the context of scheme viability.</p>	Policy 7.1 supports further housing development where this supports a viable scheme delivery and subject to addressing flood risk and mitigation in line with national and Wiltshire policies. The required master planning process seeks to enable and secure a viable development mix and delivery strategy. The policy will nonetheless still expect the development to provide a viable mix of uses and environmental and community benefits.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <p>Melksham is identified as a Market Town within the Settlement Hierarchy by Policy 1 of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) and is therefore considered to be one of the more sustainable settlements within Wiltshire. The emerging policy states that 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.</p> <p>Over the emerging plan period (2020-2038) Melksham will be required to deliver approximately 2,160 dwellings of which Wiltshire Local Plan Policy 17 allocates three sites amounting to 845 dwellings. Presently, the Site is not a draft allocation within the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan however it does have the potential to meet a significant proportion of Melksham's need over the emerging plan period and beyond. Melksham Town Council has recognised this by including it as a draft allocation within the JMNP however the scale of housing need does underline the merit in seeking to maximise the potential of a centrally located, brownfield site such as the former Cooper Tires.</p> <p>As is stands, and subject to further feasibility work, the prospective purchaser intends to progress a housing led scheme comprising approximately 350 to 400 plus dwellings.</p>	The residual housing requirement for Melksham is 1120 dwellings. Wiltshire Local Plan and JMNP2 have jointly proposed allocation sites to address and exceed this. However, the value and potential of the Cooper Tires site to accommodate further housing beyond that allocated is recognised and supported, subject to addressing flood risk constraints. The commitment to progressing the master plan and addressing potential sequential and exceptions testing through this process may enable the site to accommodate housing outside of Flood Zone1. This process will inform the ultimate housing capacity within a mixed use approach.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>The provisions of the policy are broadly supported however the reference to affordable housing should reflect wider development plan policy and it would be helpful to have both additional clarity and flexibility in terms of the approach to other uses. The context of viability is particularly important.</p> <p>It is noted that policy 43 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policy 76 of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan states 40% affordable housing provision will be provided on sites of 10 or more dwellings. However, this policy does acknowledge that the provision of affordable housing may vary on a site-by-site basis taking into account evidence of local need, mix of affordable housing proposed and, where appropriate, the viability of the development.</p> <p>The Site's existing context and central location will inevitably point to higher density, more affordable housing at least in part. However, as a brownfield site it will have, as yet, unknown reclamation and infrastructure costs, which will need to be reflected in a deliverable strategy. Indeed, the viability work done in support of the JMNP underline the challenges in bring forward the Site. It is therefore considered that affordable housing contributions (and indeed other contributions) should be clearly placed within the context of a viability appraisal.</p>	Noted. Policy 7.1 addresses provision of affordable housing within the challenging viability context.

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Replacement Employment</b></p> <p>As the Town Council will be aware, the Site has, until recently, been in employment use in its entirety and so the reference to 'replacement employment and commercial floorspace' lacks clarity in terms of the extent of employment floorspace expected or of course feasible. The scope for employment and commercial uses (and indeed other uses such as community, leisure, cultural and retail uses) will be dependent on a range of factors – including the wider masterplan strategy, with the importance of creating a high quality, residential neighbourhood being the key driver as well as market demand and as we have underlined viability. Viability work undertaken in support of the JMNP clearly suggest that commercial / employment development may not be viable. It is therefore of vital importance that the policy recognises this and provides sufficient flexibility so that the allocation is deliverable and viable.</p>	The revised policy provides flexibility for the required master plan to set the viable land use mix and types of commercial employment uses. Whilst the viability assessment carried out for the JMNP2 highlights the challenge of securing a viable development mix, it is premature to resolve that housing delivery is the only method to address the challenge within the context of regeneration of constrained brownfield land. The required master planning process will enable the amount and balance of non-residential uses to be resolved with regard to all opportunities.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Other Uses</b></p> <p>Policy 7.1REV also refers to other uses – namely community, leisure, cultural and retail uses – again it is considered that these should be placed within the wider context of the overall masterplan strategy and the importance of project viability.</p> <p>The landscape, green and blue infrastructure and biodiversity sub-section is broadly supported however it suggested that it amended to the following to ensure there is sufficient flexibility within the policy ensuring that bringing the Site forward remains deliverable.</p>	See above re other uses. Noted re GBI
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><b>Amended Policy 7.1REV Land at Cooper Tires Factory Site</b></p> <p>In the light of the above comments, including in the proposed planning strategy it is considered that the Policy 7.1 REV should be reworded as follows:</p> <p><i>Land at the former Cooper Tires main factory site, as defined in figure 6, is allocated for development of:</i></p> <p><i>a. A mixed use, housing led scheme which will make the most effective use of the site, including its contribution to housing and other needs in the town, whilst reflecting its location on the River Avon and the importance of good design and the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods.</i></p> <p><i>b. At least 150 dwellings to include a minimum of 10% Affordable Housing to be provided within the JMNP2 period to 2038 subject to viability. Further housing will be supported in principle in the context of a comprehensive masterplan for the site and addressing key policy and constraints, including flood risk.</i></p> <p><i>c. Opportunities for other uses including employment, community, leisure, retail and cultural uses where they contribute to creating a sustainable neighbourhood, are consistent with other adopted policies, scheme viability and the delivery strategy.</i></p> <p><i>d. Replacement employment and commercial floorspace (class E, B2 and B8)</i></p> <p><i>e. Community facility, leisure and cultural uses; d. Retail (subject to conformity with adopted town centre retail policy)</i></p> <p><i>f. New accessible walking and cycling routes</i></p> <p><i>g. Riverside public realm</i></p> <p><i>h. Flood mitigation infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>A single comprehensive masterplan, phasing and delivery strategy for the development must be prepared, and then approved by the local planning authority, in advance of any detailed as part of any planning application being submitted for the whole or part of the allocated site. This must take account of the requirements of this policy and supporting concept plan. Detailed planning applications must be in accordance with the approved masterplan. Masterplan and detailed proposals should be prepared with early pre-application consultation with the local community.</i></p>	Revised suggested policy amendments are welcomed and noted and addressed within the wider context of other representations and suggestions. See submission policy 7.1.
Version B email, August	Cushman & Wakefield (C&W) on behalf of Cooper Tires and the prospective purchaser re Land at Cooper Tires Factory		<p><i>Proportionate Financial Contributions to Infrastructure will be sought for: will make proportionate contributions to:</i></p> <p>20 Early years, primary and secondary education</p> <p>21 Healthcare capacity to meet the needs created by the development.</p> <p>22 Measures to positively support walking and cycling in Melksham including links between the site, Melksham Railway Station and town centre and neighbouring facilities and communities.</p> <p><i>The level of contribution sought will be considered in the context of site viability and other relevant considerations, including deliverability.</i></p>	
Version A	Sustrans	4.8.29 -31 (p52)	This is such a large plot that it would be great to see it revitalised as I'm aware that it's been on the cards for a long time (i briefly worked on this at a previous job!) so there's lots of options here to improve but still keep some of the cultural heritage of the site.	Noted

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Sustrans	4.8.40 -42, 4.8.44-46 (p54)	The NCN does run across the river and there is bridge to the northern end of the site so a great option to tie this in to whatever development does get placed in this area.	Noted. However, bridge is not part of the allocation site or ownership.
Version A	West Wilts Group of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	4.7.7 (P46), 4.8.9 -10 (P48) [also put in Policy 6]	Unfortunately, the Government have allocated far too many houses to Wiltshire, and west and north west Wiltshire have suffered the most and Melksham has already had too many houses built on valuable greenfield land with more in the pipeline. The remaining area of land available [Cooper Tires] (29.5 acres) could be a mixed-use brownfield development of quality design and construction as per current Government guideline's utilising the area by building 3 or 4 storey flats rather than the usual single storey faceless housing estate model built on valuable greenfield land to the east of Melksham.	Noted. The allocation enables residential development and requires a master planning process to optimise the viable capacity of the site.
Version A	Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (ref land at Bath Road) - from Glenn Goodwin	[Also put in General Comments]	It is noted that the Draft JMNP2 seeks to allocate some 150 homes within a mixed use development at Cooper Tires Factory Site. Whilst the redevelopment of the factory site is an important opportunity for the town we note that the site does not reflect the WLPR perceived role of the NP to allocate "small to medium sites" and the delivery of housing through redevelopment of this site over the plan period cannot be certain. The policy could also helpfully state the number of homes and other land use objectives within the main policy, rather than supporting text, similar to Policy 7.2 Melksham Library site.	The draft allocation is supported by Wiltshire Council in principle. There is no veto on the nature of sites and NDP can propose to allocate. The revised draft allocation does provide a target housing delivery within the JMNP2 period within Flood Zone 1 land. NB dialogue with the owner's agent provides clear evidence of tangible steps towards enabling delivery of the site regeneration.
Version A	Environment Agency	4.8.27, 4.8.28 (p52), 4.8.54 (p56)	The new allocation for the Cooper Tires site is given its own new policy in the Plan. This allocation is not unexpected, but the wording of the policy does require some amendment. The attention given to flood risk is not proportional to the amount of flood risk present at the site. Nearly all the site (not just "significant parts of the site") is affected by flood zones 2 and 3. The proposal to include residential (more vulnerable - National Planning Policy Framework - Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) as stated in 4.8.48, triggers the need for this allocation to be Sequentially Tested as part of this Neighbourhood Plan. The NPPF/PPG makes it clear that this is expected within the Plan that intends to allocate the site - Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) If the site were to be allocated for 'less vulnerable' site uses only, which would mean the level of vulnerability would not change, the Sequential Test would not be required. A flood risk assessment (FRA) and suitable flood risk mitigation could be dealt with at planning application stage in that scenario. The main river adjacent to this site includes a weir and radial gate that are aging assets maintained by the Environment Agency. These assets will not necessarily be replaced when they reach the end of their life as they do not serve a flood risk management function. We would like to see the policy include aspirations to naturalise the channel in this location, including the removal of these structures, perhaps incorporated into 4.8.54. This would align with the aspirations already in that section and in Policy 3 and Policy 12.	Noted. The extent and areas of land within the site in flood zones 1, 2 and 3 have been assessed and taken into account. A sequential approach to allocation of sites within JMNP2 has been adopted. A sites topic paper has been prepared that sets this out. The revised allocation policy sets a target residential development quantum that is capable of being entirely located within land within flood zone 1 and at a density that will enable sustainable drainage and flood mitigation measures. The allocation does specify the areas of greater flood risk are currently appropriate for less vulnerable and non-residential uses. Whilst the allocation supports further residential development of the site, within zones 2 and potentially zone 3, this is not an allocation commitment and is subject to adequate testing being undertaken to establish the principle and necessary mitigations. The allocation requires a master planning process to be undertaken that includes this. The site regeneration is a high priority for Melksham. JMNP2 aims to enable this regeneration process and indicate its support for a mixed use scheme to establish a viable pathway to this. Viability testing and engagement with land owners has identified that residential development provides positive values to enable the site to be regenerated and flood risks addressed. The allocation has drawn upon the approach adopted by Wiltshire Local Plan in relation to the regeneration of Innox Mills, Trowbridge.
Version B, Letter emailed on 22 August 2024	Environment Agency	[also put in General]	<b>Policy 7.1 Cooper Tires Site Allocation</b> The majority of the site is affected by flood zones 2 and 3. The proposal includes residential use which is defined as more vulnerable. (National Planning Policy Framework - Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)) There is a need for this allocation to be Sequentially Tested as part of this Neighbourhood Plan. The NPPF/ Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that this is expected within the Plan that intends to allocate the site - Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk). If the site were to be allocated for 'less vulnerable' site uses only, which would then maintain the existing level of vulnerability, then the Sequential Test would not be required. A flood risk assessment (FRA) and suitable flood risk mitigation could be considered at the planning application stage.	See above
Version A	Wessex Water	4.8.28 ? (p52)	Our records do not indicate any public sewers or water mains within the former factory site. Our records indicate that an existing private sewage pumping station pumps foul flows from the site along a private rising main to a Wessex Water foul sewer in Scotland Road. Wessex Water offer a pre-planning enquiry service where we can indicate a likely future point of discharge for the redeveloped site. Depending on the proposed employment uses trade effluent consents may be required where it is proposed to discharge non-domestic effluent into the public sewer.	Noted
Version A	Wessex Water	4.8.55 (p56)	Where street trees are proposed these should be positioned away from underground services. We can provide further details of our required standoff details as the layout proposals for the site progress.	Noted
Version A	Wessex Water	4.8.28 ? (p52)	The redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to install Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which take a more natural form and deliver benefits for amenity, ecology and water quality. Future redevelopment of the site should deliver surface water separation and no surface water flow should enter the foul network. Please see further comments below on rainwater management which apply to all site allocations.	Noted. To be addressed through the required master planning process.

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wessex Water	?	The issues of sewer flooding and storm overflows are essentially due to poor rainwater management at source. Improving rainwater management through the planning process is essential to reduce flood risk and improve storm overflow discharge occurrences. We have expressed our support for proposed policy 95 of the draft Wiltshire Local Plan. Policy 95 requires a betterment for rainwater site run-off from major development which we support. As drainage is the deepest of all utilities, getting it right before anything is constructed is vital for good rainwater management and ensuring rainwater returns to the environment as locally as technically possible. Planning policies need to ensure that new development makes sufficient space for rainwater management on site rather than piping it off-site which exacerbates downstream capacity issues. Proposed Policy 95 does this by supporting the surface water drainage hierarchy. Where the Neighbourhood Plan proposes site allocations the layout and design of these should be in accordance with proposed Policy 95 and principles of good rainwater management.	Noted. To be addressed through the required master planning process. Residential development capacities have taken account of space to provide sustainable drainage in principle. See AKU capacity study.
Version A	Historic England	4.8.29 - 4.8.32 (p52)	The Cooper Tires site is large, occupying 12.88 hectares. Policy 7.1 is not specific in the character or quantum of development it might propose, but requires the preparation of a masterplan. Given the brownfield nature of the site its allocation would not seem to be an issue in principle and the masterplan preparation process can be designed to ensure that relevant heritage considerations are taken into appropriate account.	Noted
Version A	Maypool Estates - Waddeton Park - Land off Woodrow Road, Melksham (site 3107)		<p>Whilst this comment is made in respect of Draft Policy 7.1, it relates equally to all housing sites and takes an identical form in terms of each draft Policy allocating land for housing.</p> <p>This representation is made on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, in respect of land off Woodrow Road, Melksham. <b>[Appendix 6.2.2.19]</b></p> <p>The site was considered as a potential residential allocation in previous Neighbourhood Plan work (Site Reference 3107) and despite being entirely suitable for residential development it was dismissed by the plan making group.</p> <p>The suitability of the site for residential development was also fully considered by Wiltshire Council in determining application reference 16/05644/OUT for up to 77 dwellings. That application was refused because at that time the Council was of the opinion that it could demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing (against a previous housing target that is now updated to require further housing in the area).</p> <p>However, whilst there was no additional housing land requirements over existing allocations at that time, the consultation responses and Council Report confirmed that beyond that, there were no technical concerns in respect of residential development on the site as reflected in the fact that the sole reason for refusal related to the five year supply position.</p> <p>This demonstrates that there are no issues that cannot be fully resolved if the site is allocated for development. The site represents a logical extension of Melksham immediately adjacent to the existing settlement boundary in a highly sustainable location with good public transport links and ready pedestrian access to the centre.</p> <p>However (and as noted in respect of the November 2023 Local Plan consultation and the 2020 Neighbourhood Plan consultation), the site appraisal process is flawed and therefore the results as set out in the Aecom Site Options and Assessment, 2023 cannot be relied upon.</p> <p>There are very clear errors in the Aecom report in respect of the site and these errors have led to it erroneously being categorised as an Amber rather than Green site. Given that the consultants were aware of planning application 16/05644 (it is referenced in their report), it is impossible to understand how such inaccurate statements have been made in appraising the site. The errors in the Aecom Report are set out below:</p> <p>Impact on public rights of way – the previous application confirmed that there will be no impacts on any public rights of way;</p> <p>Pylons and impact on viability – the previous application confirmed that a scheme of around 70 dwellings can be delivered that is viable and unaffected by the pylons. The Illustrative Masterplan for that scheme is attached for information;</p> <p>Requirement for archaeological investigation – all necessary works were undertaken as part of the previous application and no matters remained outstanding;</p> <p>Canal restoration – the previous Illustrative Masterplan confirms that the line of the canal can be protected entirely in accordance with Development Plan objectives;</p> <p>Ecology and Trees – again, these issues were fully addressed to the satisfaction of consultees on the previous scheme;</p> <p>Development would have a medium negative impact on landscape and visual amenity – no such concerns were raised in respect of the previous application and the Landscape consultee supported the application.</p> <p>Further to this, the report notes that the development of the site will extend development into the countryside and result in the loss of agricultural land. This is clearly the case for any of the sites that seek to meet future housing needs beyond settlement boundaries and is common to all schemes. These are not therefore determinative factors in considering the future allocation of land beyond existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>For these reasons, we conclude that the site should have been recorded as green and suitable to progress to allocation.</p> <p>In order to prepare a sound plan, the Evidence Base must be reviewed and once it is accurate from a technical point of view it can be used to inform draft policies. This should include the subject site as a draft allocation. As it stands, the Plan is not based on robust or accurate information and the Plan should not be progressed further.</p>	this representation does not relate to policy 7.1 Land at Cooper Tires. The sites allocation process is set out in the Sites Allocation Topic Paper and related technical assessments. No change is proposed.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Towson Farm) SHELAA 728	7.1 (p50)	This draft policy allocates this site for a comprehensive and exemplary mixed-use conservation and development. The SOA considered the site could deliver 325 dwellings, albeit the JMNP2 fails to set an explicit housing target. We have summarised our concerns in relation to the suitability, availability, and achievability of the proposed residential allocation below, with reference to the SOA:	The submission allocation includes a specific residential target of approximately 100 dwellings.
Version A		Flood Risk and Contamination - 4.8.27 (p52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. Flood resilience and protection measures will pose a significant burden (in terms of both time and money) on the redevelopment of the site.</li> </ul>	The required master planning process will resolve issues raised below
Version A		Flood Risk and Contamination - 4.8.28 (p52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential land contamination – the site’s current use may have led to site contamination, which is yet to be investigated. Significant contamination issues would detrimentally impact the viability of the development, delaying delivery and potentially reducing the elements of the development, like affordable housing.</li> </ul>	



**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		Trees - 4.8.55 (p56) [screen of trees?]	• Landscape – the proposal will impact on views of the Avon Clay River Floodplain which is a key landscape asset, further the site is likely to be visible from the opposite side of River Avon from King George V Park. This will impact the developable in terms of quantum.	
Version A		Heritage - 4.8.29 - 4.8.32 (p52 - 53)	• Heritage – the SOA states: “Direct impact subject to further heritage impact assessment. The site is occupied by a grade II listed C19 large house, now in use as an office building. Its associated gate piers, gates and railings are also identified as designated heritage assets. The site is also in close proximity to a number of listed public houses in close proximity. Further heritage assessment would be required. Redevelopment of the site may provide an opportunity to improve the setting of these designated heritage assets”. Heritage therefore poses a complicating factor to the site’s redevelopment that may lead to a reduced developable area.	Historic England has supported the master planning requirement to address heritage issues.
Version A		Land Uses - 4.8.25 (p52)	• The potential loss of an employment use – the SOA states: “[p]artial residential development of the Cooper Tires site may not be compatible with its existing industrial operations”. Further, it is not clear if the loss of employment has been considered and justified in relation to Core Policy 35 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, or draft Policy 10 of the JMNP2, which concerns employment sites.	
Version A		?	• Availability – the SOA does not confirm if the site is available, the JMNP2 suggests the existing factory is due to close at the end of 2023. This should be investigated further, given the likely delays associated with the issues discussed above, it is vital to ensure any allocation will deliver within the required timeframe.	
Version A		Land Uses - 4.8.25 (p52) [150 dwellings]	The JMNP2 needs to allocate at least 200 homes in Melksham to comply with the Local Plan Review Pre-Submission Draft Plan, and as has been discussed, we argue that this housing target should be increased. The issues discussed above seriously calls in to question whether the site is suitable and achievable to deliver the required homes, issues that the site subject to promotion in this letter [SHELAA 728] is free from. <b>In principle we are not calling for the residential aspects of this allocation to be reduced, as there is a likely need to boost housing delivery in Melksham over the prescribed 200 dwellings. However, this letter demonstrates the sustainable and deliverable nature of the site that we are promoting, and that it represents a preferable development site for residential development when compared to the allocation proposed by draft Policy 7.1. We therefore object to Policy 7.1.</b>	The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and “Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.” The consideration of the suitability and deliverability of the Cooper Tires site allocation is distinct from consideration of SHELAA site 728.
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snariton Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 7.1 (p50)	...There is however a lack of clarity of what the site will deliver. The policy text within the box specifies very little for the development, unlike other allocated sites in the draft Neighbourhood Plan where specific criteria set out what and how development should come forward. The important directional detail within the supporting text should be brought into the policy text.	The allocation requires a master planning process that will determine the land use balance and detailed form parameters. The allocation is clear on the expected residential delivery within the JMNP2 period.
Version A		Land Uses - 4.8.26 (p52)	2.8 The Cooper Tires is by far the biggest site delivering 75% of the Melksham housing requirement as set by in the draft Local Plan, currently at the Regulation 19 consultation stage. Catesby is of the opinion that the Regulation 19 Consultation Plan housing strategy is not justified, effective or sound and further housing across the Chippenham Housing Market Area, including Melksham, will be required. Catesby’s explanation as to why further housing should be allocated to Melksham is set out in their Regulation 19 consultation representations, and as such are appended to these representations for context.	The JMNP2 is being prepared under the current NPPF and the emerging WLP (as well as the adopted Core Strategy). The allocations made in the plan have been through a robust and transparent process. Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and “Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing.”
Version A		Flood Risk - 4.8.27 (p52) and 4.8.23 (p51) - challenges	2.9 The first major concern with the Cooper Tires site is that over 75% of this site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The site has a high risk of flooding from river flooding, surface water flooding and reservoir flooding. Housing is considered to be a More Vulnerable use, see table 1, below. Depending on whether the site is within Flood Zone 3a or 3b, development would either not normally be allowed or an exception test required. There is no evidence of any Strategic Flood Risk Assessment having been undertaken nor is the commentary in the Site Options and Assessment sufficient for allocating a site with this degree of flood risk. There is a significant risk that the site will not be able to deliver housing based on its flooding constraints alone. This is a ‘showstopper’ for this site within the plan.  Figure 1. Flood Risk Vulnerability and flood zone ‘incompatibility’ (National Planning Policy Guidance, Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 7-079-20220825)	The allocation does not seek to allocate residential development within Flood Zone 2 or 3. The allocation requires a master planning process that will include necessary flood risk assessment and mitigation to support all development and enable residential development in zones 2 or 3. Representations received on behalf of the landowner support the process and commit to addressing flood risk. The motivation appears to be to prevent JMNP2 enabling the regeneration of what is clearly a high priority and highly sustainable site, in an attempt to divert JMNP2 housing requirements to site 3525. This is not planning positively in the community’s interest. Any outcome in relation to the regeneration of land at Cooper Tires is distinct. It does not alter the outcomes of the sites assessment process or recommended allocations in JMNP2 with regard to SHELAA site 3525.
Version A		4.8.19 (p51) - Employment	2.10 Notwithstanding flooding constraints, as set out above and within the policy supporting text, this site is in employment use. Current and emerging policy at the county level protects employment sites. Melksham is identified as a Market Town and is set to grow with further planned housing in the next Local Plan. Employment land will need to be retained to support housing growth and deliver sustainable development, of which the economic arm would be most important for consideration here. The policy is not clear about how the employment land will be replaced. It has also not been demonstrated that the site is no longer viable for other employment uses and is therefore not consistent with Policy 35 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2.11 There is no direction or specification to the amount of employment use or mixed-use development for this site. Further detail is required which results from an appropriate evidence base.	The allocation seeks mixed use regeneration of the site including a viable mix of employment land uses. It requires a master planning process to resolve the appropriate mix with regard to of site viability and adopted employment land policy. There is no conflict with strategic policy identified by the strategic planning authority.

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		4.8.26 (p52)	2.12 Regarding the housing element proposed in this scheme, the supporting text suggests 150 dwellings. There is no guidance on what an appropriate dwelling per hectare amount is, whether it should be multi-storey or include sufficient garden land or play space for this town centre site. It also does not detail how housing should come forward with other uses. These details cannot be left to later stages.	Site capacity analysis (AKU 2024) provides clear evidence of density assumptions.
Version A		Contamination - 4.8.28 (p52) and 4.8.23 (p51) - challenges	2.13 Of specific and significant concern with this site is its deliverability. It is a contaminated site, with current pollution levels unknown or the level of remedial work required, the cost of which could be significant to remediate the land to be compatible with residential uses. This could significantly impact viability for a developer and result in delay of the construction and occupation of dwellings on-site. 2.14 As pollution levels are unknown, and therefore the extent and cost of remedial work required the impact on project viability are unknown. Not only adding delay, as detailed above, remedial costs could likely be so prohibitive the developer will be unable to deliver affordable housing, first homes and any other form of discounted dwellings. The site would then not deliver the much-needed affordable housing for Melksham. This is a genuine concern and further work on required remediation should be undertaken ahead of allocation so that the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Group are reassured that the site will deliver the housing it requires. For these reasons, Catesby does not believe that the site can deliver in the 0-5- and 6-10-year period of the NP, and alternative sites need to be allocated to deliver housing at the right time.	Evidence of remediation costs have been provided and built into viability modelling. Catesby Estates concerns are noted. See comments above.
Version A		Heritage - 4.8.29 - 4.8.32 (p52)	2.15 The site is adjacent to the Melksham Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings and structures. The policy text does not detail how the allocation should respect these heritage assets.	Policy criteria address this issue
Version A		Biodiversity - 4.8.53 - 4.8.54 (p55-56)	2.16 It is unknown whether the site will be able to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG [Biodiversity Net Gain] on site. The Pre-Submission version of the Wiltshire Local Plan requires 20% BNG. 2.17 It should be noted that a development of this size and scale would likely require an Environmental Statement	As above
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snariton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		2.1 The site's locational sustainability is acknowledged, as is its likely need to be regenerated. However, there is a complete lack of confidence that this site is able to deliver what the neighbourhood plan seeks to achieve through the site's allocation.	Noted.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snariton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		Remove site 7.1, Cooper Tires unless the following can be evidenced to an appropriate level of - Flooding and site capacity, including undertaking a sequential test. - the extent of remedial work required. - the cost of such remedial work - The impact of remedial work and its impact on project viability and the delivery of affordable	Noted. Refer to Site analysis and Allocations Topic Paper. No deletion of allocation. This is not in the community interest and will not have any relationship to JMNP2 resolution regarding site 3525.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	[all these are expanded below]	BH have identified a number of concerns with the proposed allocation. These relate to:	
Version A			(1) the lack of justification for the loss of the employment site to non-employment uses;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(2) the loss of employment land could result in a greater number of unsustainable journeys to work, to locations outside of Melksham, which could increase transport related emissions and have adverse public health consequences;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(3) access is proposed onto the A350, which has been identified as being constrained;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(4) no assessment of the development's heritage impact has been undertaken;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(5) flooding constraints could impact on the form of residential development on the site, which may result in housing typologies that do not accord with evidenced local needs;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(6) the viability of the site's development, including remediation, needs careful consideration;	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(7) the marketing information suggests that the landowner's development aspiration does not align with the emerging Policy. We question whether the site is therefore available for the quantum of development proposed; and	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]
Version A			(8) no timetable is provided for the site's development. The proposed allocation is therefore considered to be aspirational over deliverable.	[this was in the intro and is expanded further below]

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	7.1 (p50-56)	5.3 BH have identified a number of concerns with the allocation of the Cooper Tires Factory and its proposed policy context. These concerns are provided below. General observation 5.4 As a general observation, the proposed policy framework for the allocation is succinct. For instance, other than a reference to a mix of uses being acceptable, the policy does not provide any indication of the typology of uses that will be acceptable, or the quantum of development. Similarly, only one policy test is provided for the site. This level of detail differs from the detail provided for the other proposed allocations. 5.5 The significant level of information provided within the supporting text to the Policy could be used to develop further policy tests.	Noted. This representation does not relate to promoted SHELAA site 3310. The outcome of consideration of policy 7.1 does not have any direct relationship to the promoted site, or decisions made by JMNP2 in relation to it. The required master planning process will resolve the balance and quantum of land uses beyond that specified in the allocation. NB Land use capacity analysis (AKU 2024) provides illustrative evidence of residential and non residential uses.
Version A		4.8.17-19 (p50-51) and Land Uses, 4.8.25-26 (p52),	<b>Loss of employment land</b> 5.6 As stated within the consultation document, the site has been used for employment purposes for well over 100 years. It is understood that the site currently contains some 37,161 sq.m/400,000 sq.ft of commercial buildings.. Whilst no proposed floorspace figure is provided within Policy 7.1 or its supporting text, given the mixed of uses proposed, it is possible that a loss of employment floorspace could result. 5.7 We also note that despite, at the time of writing, the site still being occupied, it is currently the subject of a marketing exercise. However, rather than testing whether the site could be re-purposed for employment uses in a manner consistent with, for instance, Policy 35 of the Core Strategy, a mix of uses is instead being promoted. The robust evidence required by the Development Plan to justify the site's loss does not seem to have been provided.	The allocation seeks mixed use regeneration of the site including a viable mix of employment land uses. It requires a master planning process to resolve the appropriate mix with regard to of site viability and adopted employment land policy. There is no conflict with strategic policy identified by the strategic planning authority.
Version A		7.1	<b>Jobs to homes imbalance</b> 5.8 The loss of employment land from the site could have a number of unintended consequences, including accentuating the amount of out-commuting from Melksham to other settlements for work, which would lead to unsustainable travel patterns, increased emissions and adverse effects on public health. These unintended consequences would also cut across many of the issues identified by the Steering Group that the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address.	
Version A		Access and Transport, 4.8.43 (p54)	<b>Access onto the A350</b> 5.9 Para. 4.8.43 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan confirms that access is to be provided from the A350. However, following consultation with the local community, the A350 in Melksham is identified as being "particularly constrained at peak times..". The development proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan could therefore exacerbate these concerns. 5.10 Whilst it is acknowledged that the loss of the existing use could be used to off-set the impact of the proposed development, this will need to be robustly evidenced by a highway assessment at the plan-making stage. Without this evidence, there can be no certainty that the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF would be met. Similarly, there would be a lack of understanding as to whether any off-site highways improvements would be required, their feasibility and their cost. The lack of this evidence therefore risks Priority 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan being achieved.	An initial transport assessment provided by the land owner has been undertaken and forms part of the allocation evidence base. The required master planning process will resolve an acceptable access strategy that may not rely on A350 access.
Version A		Heritage, 4.8.29 - 4.8.35 (p52 - 53)	<b>Heritage</b> 5.11 The text supporting Policy 7.1 identifies a number of heritage constraints within and surrounding the Cooper Tires site. It does not appear that a heritage impact assessment has been undertaken to assess the effect of the development on these assets. It is also noted that there is an expectation that any high value archaeological remains are preserved in situ, which could have an impact on the quantum of development that is achieved from the site. 5.12 Specialist heritage advice will be required in the formation of the comprehensive masterplan referred to in the Policy and the framework masterplan referred to at para. 4.8.23 of the consultation document. The heritage effects of the development would need to be fully understood to ensure that the quantum of development proposed by the policy is achievable and accords with national planning policy.	Initial heritage assessment has been undertaken and forms part of the allocation evidence base. To be addressed through the required master planning process.
Version A		Flood Risk and Contamination, 4.8.27 (p52)	<b>Flood risk</b> 5.13 The Neighbourhood Plan rightfully confirms that significant parts of the site are located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. 5.14 It is noted that para. 161 of the NPPF states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development, taking into account all sources of flooding. This is to be undertaken by applying the sequential test, and then, if necessary, the exceptions test. Para. 162 of the NPPF confirms that the aim of the sequential test is to steer development to the areas of lowest risk. Development should not be allocated if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in an area with a lower risk of flooding. 5.15 Whilst it is acknowledged that ordinarily sequential tests are not required for development involving a change of use <sup>13</sup> , it will be necessary to ensure that any development, is, amongst other things, safe for its lifetime taking account the vulnerability of users. The Site Options and Assessment Report suggests that this is likely to require the more vulnerable uses being placed on upper floors. This would suggest a flatted development. Careful consideration should be made of how such a design approach would meet the housing needs of the area. This is discussed in more detail below.	No residential development is allocated outside of Flood zone 1.
Version A		?	<b>Local housing needs</b> 5.16 The design response likely to be required to overcome the flood risk associated with the site would suggest that ground floor commercial uses are required, with residential accommodation on upper levels. This would suggest flatted development. 5.17 The emerging concept masterplan should clearly set out how it responds to the identified evidence of local housing need. We note that para. 212 of the Local Housing Needs Assessment for Melksham confirms that the greatest need is for three bedroom dwellings, followed by two and four bedroom dwellings. It concludes that "new development is brought forward in a relatively even split for 2- bedroom, 3-bedroom, and 4-bedroom dwellings" which suggests that flatted development would not meet needs. 5.18 The allocation at the Library site (see below), which appears to also be for flatted development, would mean that the form of development on both allocated sites within the Neighbourhood Plan would not align with the Steering Group's own assessment of housing need.	-The required master planning process will resolve the housing mix. Capacity assessments (AKU 2024) test capacity scenarios compatible with a range of housing typologies addressing the HNA findings. The HNA clearly states a lack of specialist accommodation for older people and growing need.

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		?	<p><b>Viability and implications on infrastructure and affordable housing provision</b></p> <p>5.19 Given the historic and long-standing uses on the site, it is of little surprise that it is contaminated. To remediate the site to a suitable standard such that it will be able to accommodate residential development could be a significant abnormal cost.</p> <p>5.20 The emerging Policy also places other financial costs associated with the site's development, including exemplary multi-modal transportation solutions; public access along the riverside frontage; a walking and cycling route to the railway station; the replacement of the existing subway crossing with a signal controlled crossing facility; enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities to King George V Park (including a convenient river crossing); bus stops every 200m; the reuse of existing building materials; and given the requirement for an exemplary quality design, the use of expensive new building materials.</p> <p>5.21 The cost of these requirements will need to be considered in a detailed viability exercise alongside other policy requirements within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan, including those relating to infrastructure, sustainable construction, affordable housing, and other housing standards.</p> <p>5.22 The viability assessment will also need to respond to Policy 8 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to ensure that infrastructure works are programmed in co-ordination with housing to ensure that it keeps pace with the needs of the community. This will mean that infrastructure and financial contributions will need to be provided alongside, or ahead of, when they are required. Delayed contributions to aid cash flow would conflict with Policy 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>5.23 Without a detailed viability assessment, which, as stated above, is a requirement for a neighbourhood plan, there can be no certainty that the proposed allocation is a deliverable or developable proposition. This therefore risks the achievement of 75% of the Local Plan Review's housing apportionment to be delivered via allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan at Melksham (150 of 200 dwellings).</p> <p>5.24 Should the assessment work show that the development is not viable, the Steering Group will have to make the difficult decision of acknowledging that a reduced planning policy and development obligation's package will be required or accept that one or more alternative allocation should be made. This will require careful consideration and a balance to be struck between the previously developed land strategy and the delivery of other key objectives of the Plan, including affordable housing and infrastructure.</p>	Noted. The required master planning process will resolve housing numbers, mix and affordable housing provision.
Version A		Land Uses, 4.8.26 (p52)	<p><b>Landowner aspiration</b></p> <p>5.25 As set out above, the site is currently the subject of a marketing exercise. However, and perhaps relating to the viability concerns presented above, there appears to be a disconnect between the quantum of development proposed in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for the site (150 dwellings) and what is being proposed by the landowner. The marketing information suggests that on a like for like basis, the landowner suggests that there exists the potential for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 495 dwellings; and</li> <li>• 87,500 sq.ft of commercial floorspace.</li> </ul> <p>5.26 We therefore question whether the site is available for the form and quantum of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	The landowner and prospective new owner has maintained the availability of the site through representations made and has contributed to revisions to the allocation. The required master plan will resolve development uses and design.
Version A		?	<p><b>Delivery timetable</b></p> <p>5.27 National planning guidance suggests that neighbourhood plans should consider providing indicative delivery timetables for allocations. We cannot find a delivery timetable for this site within the Plan's evidence. One should be provided in future consultations of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	JMNP2 policy 7.1 states that regeneration of the site could extend beyond 2038 and commits only to about 100 dwellings by 2038. The master plan states a requirement for a delivery strategy. Any future potential issues with delivery will be addressed via a future JMNP2 review.
Version A		?	<p><b>Aspiration over deliverability</b></p> <p>5.28 Given the concerns raised above, it is considered that the allocation is overly aspirational, at the expense of being deliverable. On balance, it is considered that, given the site's constraints and the costs associated with the necessary developer contributions package, the site's development in the manner set out in the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely.</p> <p>5.29 The reliance of this site to deliver 75% of the Plan's requirement from the Local Plan Review risks, if the site does not come forward, the Neighbourhood Plan not according with strategic policies in the emerging Local Plan Review and national planning policy.</p> <p>5.30 We set out a suggestion below of how the site could be retained within the Plan, but in a manner that ensures adherence with national and local planning policy.</p>	Noted
Version A		?	<p><b>Local Plan Review</b></p> <p>5.31 We note that an announcement about the site's closure was made public over a year ago. It could therefore have been identified as an allocation within the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. The LPA, perhaps owing to the constraints identified above, decided to proceed with an alternative strategy and the allocation of other sites to meet Melksham's local housing needs. The Steering Group is recommended to consider why an alternative strategy was taken forward by the LPA.</p>	
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	?	<p>9.4 In the case of Policy 7.1 Land at Cooper Tires Factory Site it is clear that the site has flood risk, contamination and heritage constraints, plus the emerging policy seeks to deliver new high quality public realm including access to the riverside plus the retention of two existing buildings for community purposes. All of these factors will impact on the viability of a scheme for the site and the likelihood of a viable scheme for a scheme that only delivers 'at least 150 dwellings', including both open market and affordable homes being delivered. (Please note the point made under Policy 6 re: the eWLP raising concern over the viability of delivering affordable housing on brownfield sites in Melksham).</p> <p>9.5 It is also unclear whether Policy 7.2 Land at the Former Melksham Library Site is deliverable and whether there is any market interest in delivering the site for extra care or a residential care home as stated in the policy.</p>	Noted. See responses above. Comments re policy 7.2 misplaced.

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
				JMNP2 policy 7.1 states that regeneration of the site could extend beyond 2038 and commits only to about 100 dwellings by 2038. The master plan states a requirement for a delivery strategy. Any future potential issues with delivery will be addressed via a future JMNP2 review.
Version B Email 12 August 2024	Network Rail	p51	<p>Policy 7.1REV: Land at Cooper Tires Factory Site – 150 dwellings This is a new allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan for 150 dwellings, replacements employment and commercial spaces community facilities (leisure and cultural) and retail.</p> <p>The site is within close proximity to a PROW network which crosses over a level crossing known as Melksham 22 footpath crossing. Access and movement is considered under policy 7.1 and aims to make safe and convenient walking connections to the existing public realm.</p> <p>This should include consideration for use of the level crossing and a material increase in risk as a result of development. Development proposals that will have a significant impact on railway infrastructure are to be assessed in consultation with Network Rail where the consideration of the effect of vehicular and non-vehicular traffic on use of level crossings is assessed through the submission of a Transport Statement. Following assessment, any mitigation needed as a result of significant impact to level crossings should be funded through developer contributions and reflected in the abnormal costs in land value.</p>	The required master planning process will assess and resolve the impacts of development and necessary transportation infrastructure contributions proportionate to the impact of development on the transport network.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p><b>Cooper Tires site</b> BH have identified a number of concerns with the proposed allocation. These relate to: (1) the overly optimistic capacity assessment for the site; (2) the lack of justification for the loss of the employment site to non-employment uses; (3) the loss of employment land could result in a greater number of unsustainable journeys to work, to locations outside of Melksham, which could increase transport related emissions and have adverse public health consequences; (4) access is proposed onto the A350, which has been identified as being constrained; (5) no assessment of the development's heritage impact has been made publicly available; (6) the Plan's evidence base does not provide a robust sequential test to justify residential development in Flood Zones 2 or 3; (7) the ability to reduce CL receipts or reduce affordable housing further with the use of vacant building credit could reduce the benefits derived from the scheme for the community; (8) no assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that no suitable or viable town centre sites exist to accommodate the town centre uses proposed; (9) the Plan's supporting evidence suggests that a mixed use development on the site is unviable; and (10) given the viability conclusions, it is likely that only a residential development will result. Some of the benefits used to justify the allocation will therefore not materialise. A residential only development should therefore be retested, including via the SEA process. The proposed allocation is therefore considered to be aspirational and not a deliverable proposition.</p>	Noted. This representation does not relate to promoted SHELAA sites 3478, 3479, 3742 and 3844. The outcome of consideration of policy 7.1 does not have any direct relationship to the promoted site, or decisions made by JMNP2 in relation to it. The allocation provides evidence to support its deliverability which is reinforced by representations made on behalf of the sites new owner.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 3	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p><b>Cooper Tires Initial Capacity Assessment</b> Bloor Homes do not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the sequential test has been passed for the proposed allocation. Consequently, only land within Flood Zone 1 should be used to accommodate residential development (2.16ha). This will reduce the capacity of the site to a maximum of 108 dwellings, although this could reduce further for technical reasons and if the proposal were to make a more complete response to meeting the settlement's housing needs.</p>	Only land within Flood zone 1 is being promoted for residential development.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 4	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p><b>General observation</b> 5.5 They are pleased to see that the Steering Group have formulated a detailed policy for the site, which provides a greater understanding of the mix and typology of uses anticipated and the quantum of residential development expected. The level of detail provided is now commensurate with the detail provided for other allocations.</p>	This supersedes and replaces previous Bloor Homes reps

Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 & 5	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>Residential capacity</b> 5.6 The allocation seeks the provision of at least 150 dwellings from the site. For the reasons outlined in Section 7 of this consultation response, BH considers this capacity to be overly optimistic. They consider that the capacity should be capped at 108 dwellings, although even this might be too optimistic if the intention is for the housing mix to fully respond to identified needs within the settlement and if SuDS are required to be re-located from their current location within Flood Zone 3, to Flood Zone 1. 5.7 For the reasons set out below, no reliance should be placed on the ability of residential development to be accommodated in Flood Zones 2 and 3.	The allocation promotes development of approximately 100 dwellings within flood zone 1.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 6	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>Loss of employment land</b> 5.8 In their original representations, BH raised concerns that the marketing exercise being undertaken by the landowner had not tested whether, in line with emerging Policy 65 of the Local Plan Review, the site could be re-purposed for employment use. These concerns remain. 5.9 However, BH also note that the emerging policy framework for the site requires “replacement employment and commercial floorspace.” This wording is unclear as to whether there is an expectation for no net loss of employment floorspace, or whether some loss of provision will be accepted. They note the requirements of emerging Local Plan Policy 65 which suggests that unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for employment land in the location, provision should be made for its replacement of a similar size and quality nearby.	See response above.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 7	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>Heritage</b> 5.13 Tests 1 to 3 of the emerging Policy confirm that the site is subject of above, and potentially below ground, heritage constraints. Despite this acknowledgement, no heritage assessment work has been undertaken on behalf of the Steering Group to understand whether the form of development proposed in the emerging policy would result in harm to any of the heritage assets within and surrounding the site, what the resultant level of harm would be, and whether the development should proceed (see paras. 205 to 209 of the NPPF). This is particularly important given Basic Condition (b) requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. 5.14 Whilst reference is made to a Heritage Asset Survey that was undertaken on behalf of the landowner, it has not been published as part of the Plan’s evidence. We are therefore unable to understand whether the work assessed the impact of a development proposal, or simply noted the location and the existing condition of each asset.	Noted
Version B - Bloor 1 & 8	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>Flood risk [Refer to Appendix 6.2.2.18 for more details]</b> 5.15 As outlined in the Environment Agency’s response to the first Regulation 14 consultation, “nearly all the site” is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Indeed, the Cooper Tires Initial Capacity Assessment confirms at para. 6.3 that over 83.23% of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with over two-thirds of the site being located within Flood Zone 3.  5.16 Given these constraints, the Environment Agency have confirmed that a sequential test is required. The sequential test prepared to support the allocation is provided within the Site Allocations Topic Paper.	

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 & 9	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		5.19 On the basis of available evidence, development should therefore only be focused in the areas of the site that are located in Flood Zone 1. As demonstrated in Section 7 of this representation, BH consider that this would reduce the residential capacity of the site to between 86 and 108 dwellings, but even this might be optimistic if the development is intended to fully respond to the housing need within the settlement and if SuDS are required to be relocated to Flood Zone 1.	See response above
Version B - Bloor 1 & 10	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Development contributions and affordable housing</b></p> <p>5.20 As outlined in the site's marketing material, the proposed allocation contains approximately 37,100sq.m of commercial buildings2</p> <p>. The Site Allocations Evidence Topic Paper confirms that manufacturing ceased on the site in December 2023. Consequently, in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) terms, the buildings are likely to be considered as being 'in use.' This means that for each square metre of new chargeable development on the site that is to be developed, there is a reduction in the CIL charge by one square metre. Consequently, the scheme's redevelopment could result in a significantly reduced CIL payment, which ordinarily would be used to mitigate against the scheme's impact in the local area.</p> <p>5.21 If the buildings are not considered to be 'in use' by the time an application is determined, then the applicant would be able to benefit from vacant building credit. This could significantly reduce the affordable housing requirement from the site, including to below the affordable housing requirement as expressed in test (a) of the emerging Policy. This will result in a key public benefit, which is already lower in comparison to the requirements from allocations made at Melksham in the Local Plan Review, not being achieved.</p> <p>5.22 The likely affordable housing yield from the proposed development needs to be carefully considered, given that, as outlined in para. 2.1.1. of the Plan, the community have identified the need for affordable housing. In contrast, the emerging Local Plan Review would require a development on a greenfield site to provide 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>5.23 It is also noted that there appears to be a disconnect with the affordable housing requirement outlined in emerging Policy 7.1 and the requirement established in Policy 6 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, which requires "at least 40% of new housing" to be provided as affordable housing.</p> <p>5.24 In addition, viability testing has indicated that a mixed use scheme on the site is unlikely to be able to provide any planning obligations.</p>	Noted. The required master planning and delivery strategy will address the land use and viability/contributions made by the site regeneration. Policy 7.1 does not exempt development from addressing policy compliance, but accepts a flexible approach may be required to achieve viability.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 11	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Town centre uses</b></p> <p>5.25 Tests (b), (c) and (d) of emerging Policy 7.1 seek to ensure that a number of main town centre uses, as defined by the NPPF, are provided as part of the development proposals for the Cooper Tires site. As shown on Figure 10 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the Cooper Tires site is located outside of the town centre and the primary shopping area.</p> <p>5.26 To ensure conformity with para. 90 of the NPPF, evidence will need to demonstrate that there are no suitable and viable town centre sites that could accommodate the town centre uses proposed at the Cooper Tires site. This is particularly important as protecting and enhancing the vitality of the town centre is an objective of the Plan (Objective 7). Given that the mix of uses proposed is a key benefit of the scheme, this work should be provided to support the proposed allocation and not left to the development management stage to determine, when a key benefit of the scheme, which helped to justify the site's allocation, could be lost.</p>	The required master planning process will resolve the land use mix and if and how much town centre use floorspace may be proposed within the regeneration. At this point conformity with town centre policy will be addressed.

**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 & 12	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>5.27 The first Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan listed a number of requirements from the development that do not appear to have been taken forward in the current consultation version of the Plan. This included exemplary multi-modal transportation solutions; the replacement of the existing subway crossing with a signal controlled crossing facility; enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities to King George V Park (including a convenient river crossing); and bus stops every 200m.</p> <p>5.28 No explanation has been provided as to whether these are still required, or if they are not, the reasons why they are no longer required. Should they continue to be requirements of the development, then they should be listed in the policy and their associated costs reflected in the viability work.</p> <p>5.29 In a similar vein, test (c) of the Policy requires a community building, but no further information is provided about how the community building is proposed to be used and whether the development is expected to fund its delivery. Such considerations should be included within the Policy. If the expectation is that it is to be developer funded, then this should be accounted for in the viability assessment.</p> <p>5.30 This is particularly important, as para. 1.1.6 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan identifies that additional infrastructure has been highlighted by many residents as being important to enable Melksham and Melksham Without to grow in a sustainable way. Promoting the delivery of infrastructure to address the needs of the population is also a key objective (Objective 6).</p>	Revised Policy 7.1 sets criteria that must be addressed through the required master planning and delivery strategy process. Proportionate contributions will be sought towards off-site transport infrastructure and access including specific reference to connections to Melksham Station. This provides reasonable flexibility as to how this achieved. On site land uses are to be resolved through the required master plan, including other non-residential uses including community uses. The site development criteria clearly require on-site community benefits including an accessible public realm and riverside meeting community aspirations identified as priorities through JMNP2 and Town Centre Master Plan engagement.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 13	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Aspiration over deliverability</b></p> <p>5.40 BH's representation to the first Regulation 14 consultation concluded that the allocation of the Cooper Tires site was overly aspirational, at the expense of being deliverable. This has since been demonstrated in the viability evidence base documents.</p> <p>5.41 The reliance on this site to meet the majority of the Neighbourhood Plan's requirement from the Local Plan Review risks, if the site does not come forward, a shortfall in housing land at Melksham, which may result in the submission of speculative planning applications.</p> <p>5.42 That said, BH understand why the Steering Group would like to encourage the regeneration of the previously developed site. As such, they provide a suggested approach to retaining the allocation, but in a manner that ensures that the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement is achieved in full, below.</p>	Neighbourhood plans are not required to allocate sites or fully meet an identified housing requirement. Changes in site delivery circumstances relating to JMNP2 will be the subject of monitoring and may be addressed through a review of JMNP2.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 14	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Local Plan Review</b></p> <p>5.43 We note that an announcement about the site's closure was made public over a year ago. It could, therefore, have been identified as an allocation within the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan Review. The LPA, perhaps owing to the constraints identified above, decided to proceed with an alternative strategy and the allocation of other sites to meet Melksham's local housing needs. The Steering Group is recommended to consider why an alternative strategy was taken forward by the</p>	
Version B - Bloor 1 & 15	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<p><b>Local Planning Authority.</b></p> <p>5.44 Indeed, given the strategic nature of the site's challenging constraints, which are set out above, and the required level of technical work that will be required to overcome these constraints, it might be more appropriate for the site to form an allocation in the Local Plan, where such considerations can be tested more fully through that process, including at Examination. If the Steering Group wish to continue to allocate the site, then there will be a need to supplement its evidence base, in the manner set out above.</p>	The site is not a Principal Employment Site in Wilts Core Strategy. It is not proposed to be allocated as such in the Wilts Local Plan Review. The strategic authority has resolved not to consider the site as necessary to meeting its strategic strategy. Wiltshire Council has not objected to the JMNP2 allocation. The required master plan and delivery strategy process is will be supported by more detailed analysis and evidence to support specific proposals. The intention to follow this route has been confirmed by Reg 14 B reps made on behalf of the new owner. The allocation is considered to be appropriate for JMNP2.



**Policy 7.1 - Land at Cooper Tires**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		<p><b>Requested Changes to the Draft Plan:</b></p> <p>Overall, the additional text added to Policy 7.1, together with the viability assessments reinforces the concerns set out in our previous representation. We are not calling for the residential aspects of this allocation to be reduced, as there is a likely need to boost housing delivery in Melksham. However, our representations have demonstrated the sustainable and deliverable nature of the site that we are promoting, and that it represents a much more reliable allocation of housing than land at Cooper Tires Factory Site. Our site is a preferable development site for residential development when compared to the allocation proposed by draft Policy 7.1. We therefore object to Policy 7.1. In the absence of an allocation for our site, the draft plan will not meet the basic conditions, notably (a), (d) and (e).</p>	The consideration of Land West of Semington Road is addressed in the sites allocation evidence base on its own merits.

**Policy 7.2 - Land at the Former Melksham Library Site**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.2 and supporting text	<p>Flood risk - there are 1 in 1000 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change surface water flood pathways on site – these would need to be managed as part of the drainage strategy. We recommend this is taken into consideration in the policy and supporting text.</p> <p>Flood risk - Lowbourn (adjacent to the site) is shown to be at high risk of pluvial flooding – dependent on the site layout there may need to be a Flood Emergency Plan produced. We recommend this is included in both the policy and supporting text.</p> <p>It is not clear in the supporting text to the policy why the type of housing required by the policy is proposed. It would be helpful to clarify this and explain why the level of affordable housing is 100%. We note that the old Melksham Library has not been included on the draft list of locally valued non-designated heritage assets (page 111). To date we have had no indication that it has any specific architectural merit or is particularly identified or valued as a local landmark. On this basis, the Council's current plan is to demolish the old library in order to fully utilise the potential of the site.</p> <p>Policy 7.2 1a – suggest omitting “<del>or development of a residential care home</del>” ... Care homes do not provide affordable housing and are not a direct equivalent.</p> <p>Policy 7.2 1b – suggest adding ‘...will be 100% affordable housing to rent <b>or to purchase through shared ownership through a registered social provider</b>....’</p> <p>Policy 7.2 1c – suggest qualifying this criterion as follows: “separate commercial floorspace <b>where appropriate to the overall purpose of the development</b>”. We are currently not considering commercial floorspace.</p> <p>Policy 7.2 Section 4 para 4 – Suggest omitting the reference to a care home: ‘Housing <del>or care home</del> development must be designed...’</p> <p>Policy 7.2 Section 7: Please note that 100% affordable housing is not subject to CIL.</p> <p>Policy 7.2 Figure 7: If the “Resident amenity buffer” is to be maintained on this diagram, it would be useful to identify the implications of this designation. As shown, it could suggest that there will be no development in this significant portion of the site. We suggest changing the description to “<b>Low impact development area</b>” to signify that there may be development in this area but of lower height and with careful avoidance of overlooking.</p>	See Reg 14 B comments
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.2REV 'Land at the Former Melksham Library Site'	Housing requirement – to increase flexibility, we recommend amending policy text as follows: <i>‘...of <del>up to</del> <b>approximately 50 extra-care dwellings</b>...’</i>	Agreed
			Flood risk - Lowbourn (adjacent to the site) is shown to be at high risk of pluvial flooding – dependent on the site layout there may need to be a Flood Emergency Plan produced. We recommend this is included in both the policy and supporting text.	Agreed
			We suggest that the introduction to this policy includes a requirement for proposals to take account of the principles within the Concept Plan – as included in other site allocation policies - in Figure 7 and that Figure 7 is renamed ‘ <b>Library site Redline-Concept Plan</b> ’.	A site redline plan is now included (not a concept plan)
			The policy seeks financial contributions for healthcare capacity (criterion 19), walking and cycling (criterion 20) and car parking improvements (criterion 21). As this is intended to be a 100% affordable site, having to make these contributions may impact viability and thus risk non-delivery.	Wording amended to be clear that proportionate financial contributions may be sought
Version B	WC Planning	Figure 7	If Figure 7 is the Concept Plan, then we suggest renaming <b>Library site Redline Concept Plan</b>	Red line plan now included in the Plan
			Resident Amenity Buffer: we commented previously in July 2023 and requested that the term ‘resident amenity buffer’ be omitted in order not to provide any hindrance to the flexibility and the most effective use of the developable area. Any potential overlooking of properties on Union Street will be carefully considered in consultation with residents and will meet current NPPF guidance.	The figure has been replaced with a simple redline plan

**Policy 7.2 - Land at the Former Melksham Library Site**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
			If the "Resident amenity buffer" is to be maintained on Figure 7, it would be useful to identify the implications of this designation. As shown, it could suggest that there will be no development in this significant portion of the site. We suggest changing the description to "Low impact development area" to signify that there may be development in this area but of lower height and with careful avoidance of overlooking.	The figure has been replaced with a simple redline plan
Version B	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	4.8.36 (p B59)	We note the concern raised about flooding – not to the site itself (where there is only a low incidence of concern in a very small area that will be considered as part of the drainage strategy) but to the possibility of approach roads being affected. Wiltshire Council will address this in our Design and Access Statement after relevant consultation.	Noted.
Version B	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.8.41 (p B59)	Your comment that the extra care housing should be within purpose designed blocks with communal internal and open space and parking is noted. The finished design will be suitable for the delivery of extra care and will be based on a scope put together with service users and subject matter experts that will be subject to internal and community consultation before submission for planning. The Council is committed to building to a standard and character commensurate with the conservation area and in line with design guidance.	Noted.
Version B	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.8.42 (P B59)	The independent viability assessment provided uses and different underlying assumptions than those used by the Council. Crucial in the viability of the development will be either reinvestment of Right to Buy receipts, or affordable homes subsidy from Homes England, both of which will be available.	Noted.
Version A	Cricket Club landowner		While I support development, it should be an asset to Melksham and the area, in that the developments should be 'smart design' to maximise residential and commercial units.	Unsure as what 'smart design' refers to.
Version A	Historic England	3 (Heritage) and 4 (Character and Design) (p57)	The Former Library Site lies within the Conservation Area and policy 7.2 makes reference to the need for development to protect and enhance this and adjacent Listed Buildings. The policy overall is detailed in its setting out of the criteria which successful development is expected to comply with. The policy also identifies that around 50 extra care apartments or a care home should form the basis of any redevelopment. It is not clear how the number of apartments has been determined in terms of the site's ability to accommodate them comfortably, and it seems implicit that the realisation of the policy's ambition will necessitate the demolition of the site's existing buildings. This is not necessarily an issue but that loss and its replacement development will need to be informed by an understanding of the role currently played by the site in contributing to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting(s) of other relevant heritage assets.	Demolition of the former library has been approved through conservation area consent. The proposed development is required to be supported by a robust heritage assessment and statement.
Version A	Historic England		It should be noted that at the time of writing Historic England is in receipt of a pre-application consultation for the site which confirms our formal interest in its development at the planning application stage. Our response to that consultation can no doubt be helpful in the identification and dissemination of considerations which need to inform successful development and thereby any further substantiation or finessing of policy 7.2.	Noted.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 7.2 (p57)	This draft policy allocates the following land uses at this site: a) about 50 age restricted or extra care apartments (Class C3) or development of a residential care home (Class C2) to meet the identified local needs for accessible and affordable housing for older and/or disabled people; b) residential units will be 100% affordable housing to rent through a registered social provider; c) separate commercial (class E) floorspace; and, d) associate parking.  As with draft Policy 7.1, we have summarised our concerns in relation to the suitability, availability, and achievability of the proposed residential allocation below, with reference to the SOA:	We are aware that there are a number of constraints this site (as noted) that need to be mitigated as part of development proposals. Please see the Site Allocation topic paper (prepared after Regulation 14 A) for more detail.

**Policy 7.2 - Land at the Former Melksham Library Site**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		3. Heritage (p57)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is in a Conservation Area and is in close proximity to a number of heritage assets. These constraints will limit the development-potential of the site and potentially the number of residential units. This is evident in the Council's refusal of application ref. 20/08520/FUL.</li> </ul>	
Version A		5. Green/Blue Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a group of significant trees at the site that will limit the developable area.</li> </ul>	
Version A		4.8.61 (p60)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SOA also highlights potential policy conflict with the Wiltshire Core Strategy in relation to the loss of community facilities (Core Policy 49), the loss of existing car parking (Core Policy 64), and the loss of employment land (Core Policy 35).</li> </ul>	
Version A		?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The demolition of existing buildings, which could pose viability issues.</li> </ul>	
Version A		1. Land Uses (p57)	<p>The JMNP2 needs to allocate at least 200 homes in Melksham to comply with the Local Plan Review Pre-Submission Draft Plan, and as has been discussed, we argue that this housing target should be increased. The issues discussed above seriously calls in to question whether the site is suitable and achievable to deliver the required homes, issues that the site subject to promotion in this letter is free from. As with Policy 7.1, in principle we are not calling for the residential aspects of this allocation to be reduced, as there is a need to boost housing delivery. However, this letter demonstrates the sustainable and deliverable nature of the site that we are promoting, and that it represents a preferable development site for residential development when compared to the allocation proposed by draft Policy 7.2. We therefore object to Policy 7.2.</p>	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	1. Land Uses (p57)	It is considered unlikely that the quantum of development proposed for the Former Melksham Library can be accommodated on the site with other policy requirements.	We are aware that there are a number of constraints this site (as noted) that need to be mitigated as part of development proposals. Please see the Site Allocation topic paper (prepared after Regulation 14 A) for more detail.
Version A	Policy 7.2 (p57-59)	5.32 BH have concerns that the development proposed by Policy 7.2 of the emerging Plan will not be able to be accommodated on the former library site. The Policy requires the provision of approximately 50 age restricted/extra care apartments or a care home to be provided on two or three storeys; separate Class E provision; car parking; and a 20% biodiversity net gain, all on a 0.5ha site. Along with the requirement for a 20% tree canopy cover, this is considered to be unrealistic.		
Version A	1. Land Uses (p57)	5.33 Evidence will need to be provided through the plan-making process to demonstrate that the quantum of development proposed could be accommodated on the site alongside the other policy requirements.		
Version A	1.b (p57) and para 2 (p57)	5.34 There is also some confusion over the tenure of the proposed housing. Whilst policy test 1(b) suggests that all the residential units will be affordable housing for rent, reference is then made to "market and affordable housing." This should be clarified in future versions of the Plan.		
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House		8.30 Additionally, the above [see p14 of their document at Appendix 6.2.2.28] is within the AECOM HNA conclusions on the need for specialist (i.e. non-general needs) housing for older people; there are no conclusions reached within the AECOM HNA on the net additional requirements for Category M4(2), or for wheelchair users Category M4(3) housing standards in new homes. Conclusions within the Wiltshire Housing Needs Assessment Update on the need for such housing (and underpinning the approach to M4(2) and M4(3) standards in eWLP Policy 78) are subject to challenge through responses to the September to November 2023 Regulation 19 eWLP consultation, as are aspects of the eWLP viability evidence.	Noted.
Version A		Policy 7.2 (p57-59)	9.5 It is also unclear whether Policy 7.2 Land at the Former Melksham Library Site is deliverable and whether there is any market interest in delivering the site for extra care or a residential care home as stated in the policy.	Please see the Site Allocation topic paper (prepared after Regulation 14 A) for more detail.

**Policy 7.2 - Land at the Former Melksham Library Site**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 & 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>The former Melksham Library site</b> It is considered unlikely that the quantum of development proposed for the former Melksham library can be accommodated on the site with other policy requirements.	Noted. The allocation provides flexibility for the number of units. JMNP is not bound to meet the identified housing requirement. Should detailed proposals for the site fall short of expectations, shortfalls may be addressed through subsequent plan review. Please see the Site Allocation topic paper for more detail.
Version B - Bloor 1 & 3	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		5.45 In their representations submitted to the first Neighbourhood Plan consultation, BH raised concerns that the development proposed at the allocation would not be able to be accommodated on the site. The reasons are set out in para. 5.32 to 5.34 of their representation which is provided at Appendix 3 and are not repeated here.  5.46 However, it is noted that the Site Allocation Evidence Topic Paper confirms that the promoter has agreed to “a reasonable and deliverable ambient density of c50-60DPH upon which to calculate residential capacity.” Utilising these density ranges on the 0.65ha site would result in a capacity of between 33 to 39 dwellings.  5.47 BH also note that part of the justification for the allocation of the site (and the lower affordable housing requirement at Cooper Tires) is that it will come forward as a 100% affordable housing scheme. If that is to be used as a planning benefit to justify the allocation, then it should be reflected in the emerging policy for the site.	The site is promoted for specialist accommodation for older people. It is well-known that this consists of smaller c1 and 2 bed units within higher density development. The allocation enables a higher density (c76 dph) to secure an efficient use of the site in this context. The allocation does not require 100% affordable development. This is an option that will be supported.
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		<b>Policy 7.2 'Land at the Former Melksham Library Site'</b> The changes to the Policy largely relate to additional and amended expectation criteria. The Viability Assessment suggests that a development at the site for 50 sheltered dwellings would be unviable, whether it was 100% market housing or 100% affordable housing. Whilst not explicitly stated in the Viability Assessment, this appears to be excused as the site is owned by the Council, and grant or other funding for the development is suggested to address the financial deficit. As set out in our previous representation, this development raises serious concerns in relation to its suitability and achievability during the JMBP2's lifetime, which are further substantiated by the changes to the Policy and the Viability Assessment.	The allocation does not require 100% affordable provision. This is an option that will be supported.
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		Policy 7.6 'Land South of Western Way Bowerhill' This new policy allocates land South of Western Way, Bowerhill for up to 210 dwellings and a 70-bed care home, reflecting the upheld appeal concerning planning application ref. PL/2022/08504. The planning permission at the site is only in outline, Policy 7.6 reads as a policy to shape an application (or applications) for reserved matters at the site, as is seen in its various expectations. The delivery of this site has been established at appeal, no further comments are made in this respect.	

Policy 7.6NEW - Land South of Western Way, Bowerhill

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		Since planning permission has now been granted the site represents a housing commitment, and we are therefore pleased to see the site now included as a draft allocation within the draft NDP. However, we have included within these representations some specific comments on the draft policy wording for the site allocation (Policy 7.6: Land South of Western Way Bowerhill) primarily to ensure consistency between the NDP and the outline planning permission. 1.5 Changes are recommended within these representations, which in our view are required in order to ensure the NDP is found sound when examined in the future.	Noted
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.1 Whilst we fully support the inclusion of the Land South of Western Way (Policy 7.6) as a draft allocation in the plan, reflecting the fact that the site is a 'committed housing site', we consider that the draft policy for the site requires amendments to ensure consistency with the outline planning permission, and ultimately to ensure it is found sound at examination. Some of the policies proposed in the NDP would conflict with the outline planning permission or create outcomes which are either not viable or undesirable. 3.2 We have therefore set out below a number of comments on aspects of draft Policy 7.6, and where necessary have suggested changes to the wording.	Agreed
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.3 Firstly, criteria 2 of the draft policy requires the site to deliver an increase in tree canopy cover of 20% in accordance with other draft policies in the draft NDP. There are two main conflicts with this approach. First, neither the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy nor the emerging Local Plan include policy requirements for a specific canopy cover increase. And second, there are no conditions attached to the outline planning permission for the site which require a specific increase in canopy cover. Indeed, any requirement for increased canopy cover is likely to impact upon the cost of delivering the development and a viability assessment may therefore need to be provided in support of the NDP to demonstrate that the scheme would still be viable. It would clearly be far better to avoid this.	This criteria has been removed
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.4 It is therefore concluded that reference to a specific % canopy cover be removed. The approved parameter plans attached to the outline planning permission provide sufficient comfort that tree canopy cover will be increased as part of the green infrastructure framework, without the need for a specific requirement. Our suggested change is as follows: <i>Provide a scheme of site landscape, green and blue infrastructure and communal outdoor space that protects existing trees, contributes positively to resident health and wellbeing and increases on-site tree canopy cover <del>by 20%</del> in accordance with JMNP2 Policies 12, 14, 17 and 18.</i>	Agreed
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.5 Secondly, it is noted that criteria 7 requires the development of the site to be resilient to and/or mitigate climate change and make proportionate contributions to Wiltshire's Carbon Neutrality targets including potential significant use of renewable energy and sustainable construction methods.	Agreed
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.6 The outline planning permission includes a series of planning conditions which make reference to a number of approved plans which future development should adhere to. However, no sustainability framework has been developed at this stage and there are no conditions requiring a specific level of renewable energy use. Such specific matters will be explored at the reserved matters stage and governed by Building Regulations at the time of implementation, and we therefore recommend at this stage that the use of the word 'significant' is removed. Our suggested change is therefore as follows: <i>Be resilient to and/or mitigate climate change and make proportionate contributions to Wiltshire Carbon Neutrality targets including potential <del>significant</del> use of renewable energy and sustainable construction methods in accordance with JMNP2 Policies 1 and 2.</i>	

Policy 7.6NEW - Land South of Western Way, Bowerhill

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		In terms of criteria 13, whilst the majority of the requirements for pedestrian and cycle connectivity are consistent with the outline planning permission, there is no ability to connect the site directly to Bowerhill employment area due to land ownership constraints. Furthermore, any connection to the Public Right of Way to the west would be via Western Way. The following change is therefore required to ensure consistency between the draft policy and outline planning permission: <i>Create a pedestrian and cycle only access from Western Way and a pedestrian and cycle path network including a spine and orbital pedestrian route connecting with on-site green and blue infrastructure facilitating connections to neighbouring communities, schools and facilities including from the principal site access from Maitland Place. <del>and Bowerhill employment area</del></i>	Agreed
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.8 We are particularly concerned that criteria 16, which requires the provision of bus stop facilities, is not consistent with the outline planning permission for the site. Whilst the S106 agreement attached to the outline planning permission does require a financial contribution towards bus services to serve the development, there is no requirement for the provision of bus stops as it would simply not be viable, or indeed desirable to divert a bus into the site. The requirements which now form part of the S106 agreement for the planning permission have been negotiated by specialist officers at the Council and we urge caution against any deviation from this in draft policy. Such a request, as set out within criteria 16 as currently drafted is not a sound approach, and should therefore be deleted in its entirety: <del>Provide bus stop facilities within less than 5 minutes easy walk of all residents and contributions to provide a viable service.</del>	Amended to "contribute towards the provision..."
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.9 Furthermore, in practical terms, there is no requirement to enter into a further S106 Agreement at the Reserved Matters stage and therefore this element of the draft policy is simply not deliverable or sound.	Noted.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.10 We equally consider that requirements 20 – 23 which request financial contributions towards education, healthcare and public transport are not necessary as part of the site allocation policy. Some of the requests are inconsistent with the S106 agreement attached to the outline planning permission and are therefore unlikely to meet the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. For example, the outline planning permission does not require any contributions towards primary or secondary education as there are currently sufficient places available to accommodate the pupils generated by the development. In addition, even if a new planning application was submitted in the future, that application would be required to make financial contributions towards local infrastructure. These should however be informed by calculations made by Wiltshire Council officers at the time based upon up to date need rather than be guided by a site specific allocation policy.	This has been amended.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management re land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		3.11 These elements of draft Policy 7.6 should therefore be deleted in their entirety: <del>Financial Contributions to Infrastructure will make proportionate contributions to: Early years, primary and secondary education. On, or off-site healthcare capacity to meet the needs created by the development. Measures to positively support walking and cycling and public transport use between the site, Melksham town centre and Melksham railway station and linking into existing networks. Contributions towards a Melksham Transport Strategy.</del>	

**Policy 7.6NEW - Land South of Western Way, Bowerhill**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 & 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		5.48 BH have no comments regarding the proposed wording of Policy 7.6.  5.49 Whilst they are supportive of the allocation of the site in order to ensure positive outcomes at the reserved matters stage, the housing provision from the site should not be attributable to meeting the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement as set out in the emerging Local Plan, which is possibly what is being referred to within the consultation document's foreword. As a site that benefits from planning permission, it should be considered as a commitment, rather than a new allocation.  5.50 Should the aspiration be to attribute the housing yield from the site towards meeting the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement, then the site, on its own, would meet the Neighbourhood Plan's housing requirement, which could make it even more difficult to justify residential development in Flood Zone 2 on the Cooper Tires site.	Noted.
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road	they wish the land west of Semington Road to be treated the same way	<b>Requested Change to the Draft Plan: Allocation of Land West of Semington Road:</b> We request that the same approach is taken to the site as for Policy 7.6, and the eastern portion is allocated for 50 dwellings in accordance with the existing planning permission (ref. 20/07334/OUT and ref. PL/2023/00808). Similarly, the western part of the site should be allocated for residential development (regardless of the result of the appeal). Any failure to do so would mean that the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the basic conditions under Schedule 4B TCPA 1990, notably paragraph 8(2) (a), (d) and (e), as it will not reflect national policy, nor contribute to sustainable development, nor be in general accordance with the development plan.	
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		Policy 7.6 'Land South of Western Way Bowerhill' This new policy allocates land South of Western Way, Bowerhill for up to 210 dwellings and a 70-bed care home, reflecting the upheld appeal concerning planning application ref. PL/2022/08504. The planning permission at the site is only in outline, Policy 7.6 reads as a policy to shape an application (or applications) for reserved matters at the site, as is seen in its various expectations. The delivery of this site has been established at appeal, no further comments are made in this respect.	Noted.
Version B	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.6 NEW 'Land South of Western Way Bowerhill'	We suggest that this policy includes a requirement for proposals to take account of the principles within the Concept Plan – as included in other site allocation policies - in Figure 8 and that Figure 8 is renamed ' <i>Land South of Western Way Redline Concept Plan</i> '. Single comprehensive masterplan - any submitted reserved matters application will have to comply with the approved parameter plans in the appeal decision and therefore reference to a masterplan in this case is not relevant. We suggest amending the policy text as follows: ' <i>...must be in accordance with <b>the approved parameter plans, a single comprehensive masterplan, phasing and delivery strategy for the development of the site that has been approved by the local planning authority.</b></i> ' Criterion 2 – in relation to the requirement to increase onsite tree canopy cover by 20%, a landscape parameters plan has already been approved and any reserved matters application would need to comply with that. Therefore, further requirements in terms of tree canopy cover are not likely to be acceptable. Criterion 20 – financial contributions towards education places is considered acceptable. However, early years provision was agreed via s106 and no request for primary or secondary education provision was requested by the council's education team when this was reviewed at the <u>appeals stage</u> – this will not be renegotiated at the reserved matters stage. But the council may request contributions towards education places. Criterion 23 – a requirement for contributions towards a Melksham Transport Strategy is unlikely to be acceptable as a S106 has already been agreed which provides for transport related contributions.	Agreed. Agreed. Agreed.
Version B	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.8.48 – 3rd bullet point	The reference to ' <i>on-site and off-site infrastructure and contributions to support wider community</i> ' is likely to not be possible as infrastructure contributions have already been agreed through the S106 and the council is not in a position to renegotiate on submission of a reserved matters application.	Wording updated  Removed.
				Removed.



**Policy 7.3 - Land at Whitley Farm**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
--------	------	---	---------	----------

Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 and supporting text	<p>The final paragraph of policy 7.3 is missing its heading number. It should say ‘9. Contributions to Local Infrastructure’.</p> <p>Conservation/Heritage – The allocation of Whitley Farm is considered to conflict with the council’s statutory duties as well as national and local policies.</p> <p>From the point of view of the historic environment the main statutory tests are set out within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16 (listed building consent) and 66 (planning application) requires that special regard be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment (Section16). The policy requires that great weight be given to the conservation of heritage assets and advises a balanced approach with the public benefits which may result from proposals being weighed against any harm caused. National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council’s Core Strategy Core Policy 58 ‘Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment’ requires that “designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance.”</p> <p>The Council’s Core Strategy Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design requires a high quality of design in all new developments.</p> <p>The emerging policies in the new Local Plan continue to reflect these requirements. Wiltshire Council has also commissioned research, in conjunction with Historic England, in respect of historic farmsteads within the county – the suite of documents including the Farmsteads Assessment framework which is intended to help applicants consider the issues and potential for change based on understanding of the historic character and significance of a site. Historic England have also produced a number of documents which provide advice in respect of the conversion of historic farm buildings: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/</a></p> <p>Site: Whitley Farm is a good example of a large late C17 stone farmhouse. Adjacent stands a large stone barn of similar date with an attached c18 outbuilding to the right. A C19 limestone mounting block against outside wall of farmyard is also listed. Remnants of other historic agricultural buildings arranged in a multi-yard layout should be considered as curtilage listed in association with the farmhouse. The farm as a whole constitutes a rare retention in a village setting which makes a significant contribution to the rural character and appearance of the area as well as having an intrinsic value in its own right.</p> <p>A series of large modern farm buildings lie to the north-west, west and south-west, extending the area of the current farmyard. Such buildings are an accepted and familiar part of the modern agricultural landscape and they provide an expected and immediately understandable context for the historic farm. Their removal would be largely neutral in impact.</p> <p>The farm is surrounded by open fields which remain in agricultural use, providing the farmhouse with an agricultural setting and assisting in the understanding and appreciation of the significance of the farmhouse as a heritage asset.</p> <p>Assessment: At present, we have not been provided with any evidence that the farm is redundant and</p>	
-----------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--

Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	We suggest that the policy includes a requirement for proposals to take account of the principles within the Concept Plan in Figure 9 and that Figure 9 is renamed ' <i>Land South of Western Way Redline-<del>Concept</del> Plan</i> '.		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p><b>Conservation/Heritage</b> – The allocation of Whitley Farm is considered to conflict with the council's statutory duties as well as national and local policies. The policy fails to demonstrate that a housing allocation (which necessarily commits the LPA to a specific quantum and type of development) on this site will be compatible with the statutory duties placed on the Council under Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 or with the aspirations set out in the Council's own policies set out in the Core Strategy and, in due course, the Local Plan. <b>Wiltshire Council objects to the inclusion of this policy.</b> It is noted that the allocation has been revised upwards from 10 to 15 houses. The Council has maintained a consistent objection to the allocation of this site.</p> <p>A similar conflict is manifest within the policy itself as it is impossible to be confident that policy criterion 2 (which requires that any development "Secures the protection or enhancement of the setting of Whitley Farmhouse and barn (Grade II)") is achievable within the context of the proposed allocation. From the point of view of the historic environment the main statutory tests are set out within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16 (listed building consent) and 66 (planning application) requires that special regard be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.</p>		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning				
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning				
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment (Section16). The policy requires that great weight be given to the conservation of heritage assets and advises a balanced approach with the public benefits which may result from proposals being weighed against any harm caused. National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		The Council's Core Strategy Core Policy 58 'Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment' requires that "designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance."		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		The Council's Core Strategy Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design requires a high quality of design in all new developments.		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		The emerging policies in the new Local Plan continue to reflect these requirements.		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	Wiltshire Council has also commissioned research, in conjunction with Historic England, in respect of historic farmsteads within the county – the suite of documents including the Farmsteads Assessment framework which is intended to help applicants consider the issues and potential for change based on understanding of the historic character and significance of a site.		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		Historic England have also produced a number of documents which provide advice in respect of the conversion of historic farm buildings:		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/</a>		
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	<b>Site:</b> Whitley Farm is a good example of a large late C17 stone farmhouse. Adjacent stands a large stone barn of similar date with an attached c C18 outbuilding to the right. A C19 limestone mounting block against outside wall of farmyard is also listed. Remnants of other historic agricultural buildings		

Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Whitley'	arranged in a multi-yard layout should be considered as curtilage listed in association with the farmhouse.	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		The farm as a whole constitutes a rare retention in a village setting which makes a significant contribution to the rural character and appearance of the area as well as having an intrinsic value in its own right.	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		A series of large modern farm buildings lie to the north-west, west and south-west, extending the area of the current farmyard. Such buildings are an accepted and familiar part of the modern agricultural landscape and they provide an expected and immediately understandable context for the historic farm. Their removal would be largely neutral in impact. The farm is surrounded by open fields which remain in agricultural use, providing the farmhouse with an agricultural setting and assisting in the understanding and appreciation of the significance of the farmhouse as a heritage asset.	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	<b>Assessment:</b> At present, we have not been provided with any evidence that the farm is redundant and evidence would be required to indicate that this is the case and that there is no continuing requirement for agricultural buildings or access to work the surrounding land. The policy notes (4.8.13) that "consideration of the potential to allocate land for housing development has been supported by detailed consideration of the heritage setting of the listed farm buildings and impact on the landscape setting of the elevated site". However, elsewhere the text refers (4.8.63) to "Independent heritage assessments undertaken in 2020 as part of preparing JMNP1, validated by Wiltshire Council" and we are not aware that any new study has been undertaken. The assessments commissioned by the NP Team at this point were brief 'in principle' assessments which are insufficient to act in justification for an allocation for a specific use and quantum of development in these circumstances.	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		Current planning policy advises that the best use of heritage assets is usually to continue in the use for which they were built. If continuation in the current use is no longer possible then an alternative use must be sought, which should be the "optimum viable use" for the assets i.e., the least harmful use which can secure the future of the assets. (NB Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that this may not necessarily be the most profitable use). Assuming that the farmland is now being farmed from elsewhere and there is no longer an agricultural need for the current farmyard, commercial or industrial uses may well offer less damaging options for securing the future of the buildings and policy requires that all options are investigated. Heritage assessment commissioned previously by the NP Team makes this point also. Residential use is likely to cause the greatest level of harm to both the fabric and character of the buildings and their setting – and whilst it is acknowledged that on occasions it may offer the only viable solution this is by no means a foregone conclusion. It would be quite usual for marketing to be required to show that residential use is the only viable option for the site and that the harm that would be caused by residential conversion is justified. This process has clearly not been undertaken and it cannot be assumed that a residential conversion will be acceptable.	

Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p>In the event that it was shown that residential use offers the only option, proposals for the listed buildings would need to be presented via a detailed scheme, with the proposed scope, level and details of development fully justified in terms of how they will achieve the conservation of the designated heritage assets. The starting point is likely to be a very modest scheme converting the main historic buildings with as little subdivision as possible to preserve the character of the buildings. Such a proposal would need to be submitted in the form of a full application developed following detailed heritage assessment of the buildings and, for this reason, the site is inappropriate as a housing allocation which, by its nature, requires an 'in principle' acceptance of development for a certain number of units. The current 'Heritage Assessment' provides no detailed assessment of the fabric, structural condition or character of the existing buildings and does not objectively demonstrate that there is any potential for conversion without causing unacceptable harm. Significant additional levels of detail would be required in order to support any future scheme or before any commitment could be given to support for a residential use.</p>	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p>It is noted that the proposed allocation site has been reduced both in scope and in terms of the proposed developable area since the draft policy emerged in the first version of the NP (later removed) – however, the footprint of the proposed development still stretches significantly beyond the historic farm layout and continues to risk severing the heritage assets from the surrounding agricultural landscape which contributes to their setting. It remains the case that no evidence (for example in the form of options assessment or possible layouts) has been provided to indicate either that housing is the most appropriate option in this location or that the proposed number of units can be justified or accommodated without unacceptable harm.</p> <p>Together with the associated need for car parking and multiple domestic curtilages, there is potential for a housing scheme, even of this relatively modest scale, to result in a very significant loss of the rural and agricultural character of the surroundings to the listed assets. This would be compounded at night-time by the need for internal and external lighting. The development would not only be harmful to the listed farmhouse and buildings (Core Policy 58) but would also be out of character with historic settlement pattern (Core Policy 57).</p>	
Version B, August	WC Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	<p>In summary, leaving aside the conversion of the existing listed buildings which would require detailed justification, which is not provided, there is strong potential for a housing scheme to cause a significant level of harm to the setting of the listed buildings. This harm would likely be considered to be less than substantial for the purposes of interpreting paragraph 196 of the NPPF but potentially at the highest end of that category.</p> <p>National policy and appeal case history suggests that the public benefits of providing housing per se should not be considered as sufficient to offset significant heritage harm at this level.</p>	
Version B, August	WC Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	<p><b>Conservation/Heritage Conclusion:</b></p> <p>In our opinion the draft plan fails to demonstrate that a housing allocation (which necessarily commits the LPA to a specific quantum and type of development) on this site will be compatible with the statutory duties placed on the Council under Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 or with the aspirations set out in the Council's own policies set out in the Core Strategy and, in due course, the Local Plan. Officers object to the inclusion of this policy.</p>	Noted. The allocation will be amended to remove direct allocation to enable a specific amount and extent of housing and be restricted to enabling the regeneration of the redundant farm site and buildings.
Version B, August	WC Planning	Policy 7.3 REV 'Land at Whitley Farm, Whitley'	<p><b>Flood risk – suggest that policy criterion 12 is amended as follows: '<u>...to mitigate flood risk downstream and within the site...</u>'.</b></p>	

Version B, August	WC Planning	7.3 - Paragraph 4.8.55 (P B 67)	This paragraph suggests that the Council has previously supported a concept development layout for 18 dwellings – however, this is a misrepresentation of the advice given which provided no support in principle due to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets.	
Version A	Opac Ltd	1-8 (p61-62)	<p>This policy illustrates the difficulties in seeking to allocate small areas of previously used land to provide meaningful housing provision within Shaw and Whitley.</p> <p>Policy 7.3 proposes approximately 10 new dwellings (which must include affordable housing) and the conversion of a listed barn, but also requires development to be environmentally sustainable; be supported by a heritage statement and mitigate any 'harm' to the listed barn through design; provide an archaeological assessment and mitigate any impact on identified remains; be built to a high quality design; be supported by an LVIA and include landscape improvements; achieve a 20% BNG; provide ULEV charging infrastructure; be supported by a flood risk assessment and then make financial contributions to local infrastructure.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging the importance of each of these aspirations, the cost of the assessments, reporting, mitigation and infrastructure requirements on a scheme of 10 units which includes affordable housing provision would make such a proposal unviable. It would be a better approach to allow sites such as this to come forward as windfall sites and allocate land that is more readily deliverable within the plan period.</p>	
Version A	Wessex Water	8. Flooding (p62) [also included in Policy 3, 7.1 and 7.2]	The issues of sewer flooding and storm overflows are essentially due to poor rainwater management at source. Improving rainwater management through the planning process is essential to reduce flood risk and improve storm overflow discharge occurrences. We have expressed our support for proposed policy 95 of the draft Wiltshire Local Plan. Policy 95 requires a betterment for rainwater site run-off from major development which we support. As drainage is the deepest of all utilities, getting it right before anything is constructed is vital for good rainwater management and ensuring rainwater returns to the environment as locally as technically possible. Planning policies need to ensure that new development makes sufficient space for rainwater management on site rather than piping it off-site which exacerbates downstream capacity issues. Proposed Policy 95 does this by supporting the surface water drainage hierarchy. Where the Neighbourhood Plan proposes site allocations the layout and design of these should be in accordance with proposed Policy 95 and principles of good rainwater management.	

Version A	Historic England	3 (Conservation ) (p61), 4.8.63 (p63)	The Whitley Farm site was originally proposed as a site allocation in the existing Neighbourhood Plan and was one which generated much advice from Historic England during its preparation process on the need for evidence to substantiate its policy. While the site was removed from that Plan we were made aware of supporting evidence that had been prepared, including a 2020 Heritage Assessment. We note that this Assessment now forms part of that supporting the site's inclusion in the review version of the Plan. Proposed policy 7.3 suggests approximately 10 new dwellings for the site and makes reference to existing designated assets on the site and the need for sensitivity to minimise the likelihood of harm to them. This latter phrasing suggests that it is not clear that development as proposed can take place without causing harm, which, if caused, would be inconsistent with policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. We are aware that Wiltshire Council expressed serious concerns over the inclusion of the site in the existing Plan, and these may well remain extant as far as its proposed inclusion in the review version is concerned. We would therefore strongly encourage liaison with the Council's planning and conservation officers to help verify the appropriateness of the site in principle for development and in particular as proposed in the policy. Certainly the current wording of the policy lends credibility to the suspicion that further evidence or exploration of other options may be necessary.	
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		These policies propose allocations in Whitley and hence are not relevant to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	
Version A	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for		1.7. NPE have previously issued a technical evidence base to support the allocation of the site. It has not been repeated or enclosed at this stage of consultation but is available if required.	
Version A	Whitley Farm site MEL01		1.9. The site is available, achievable and deliverable. The site is under the sole ownership of NPE, is no longer required for its historic architectural use and is available for residential development immediately. It provides the opportunity to conserve and enhance the historic farm complex with sensitive residential development that could enhance the setting of listed buildings and contribute to the community's housing needs in Whitley. Given the site's context within the existing built up area of Whitley, it is highly suitable to deliver a small scale residential development.	
Version A		[also included in policy 6]	3.6 Paragraph 4.7.7 states "at Shaw and Whitley the emphasis should be to provide smaller homes to re-balance the opportunities." We request that further information is added to this section of the JMNP2 to give clarify what housing mix the JMNP2 will seek at this location.	
Version A			3.9 As a general comment, to avoid duplication of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan policies and Policy 7.3 should be repeated to remove these cross references.	
Version A			3.11 Part 6 of Policy 7.3 requires updating to correct a spelling error as follows: "Development will include a landscape landscaping and green and blue infrastructure that will..."	

Version A		<p>Section 6</p> <p>[also included in policy 13]</p> <p>3.12 In relation to Part 6.d of the policy, whilst we would expect compliance with the Wiltshire Local Plan with regards to biodiversity net gain, we are aware of multiple objections to the 20% requirement being pursued.</p> <p>3.13 We assume that the neighbourhood plan will not be made in advance of the Local Plan. However, if the neighbourhood plan does move ahead in advance of the local plan, there is no basis to increase above a requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain as if the local plan is adopted it will take precedence.</p>	
Version A		<p>Section 9</p> <p><b>. Contributions to Local Infrastructure</b></p> <p>3.14 We request clarification as to what local infrastructure delivery is required since this is not included within the policy or accompanying evidence base. In addition, we assume this part of the Policy should be updated to read as follows:</p>	
Version A		<p>4.4 The Whitley Farm site is no longer required for agricultural uses by Neston Park Estate as the buildings are in disrepair and do not meet modern standards, and the Estate has several other operational farm yards.</p> <p>4.5 Our client is supportive of the allocation of Whitley Farm for residential development which will bring forward the site's redevelopment and avoid the site falling into further disrepair. As set out above, we request some minor amendments to Policy 7.3 to ensure that the JMNP2 meets 'the basic tests'.</p> <p>4.6 In summary, the site is available, achievable and deliverable and can be brought forward in the short-term. Redevelopment of the site would conserve and enhance a site which is no longer required for its historic agricultural use, enhance the setting of listed buildings and contribute to the community's housing needs in Whitley. If an allocation is secured, NPE will progress with preparing a full technical evidence base and liaise with Wiltshire Council through pre-application discussions to agree design principles ahead of a planning application submission.</p>	
Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL01	<p>5.10. If the current policy is taken forward, we have suggested minor edits to the wording as follows. In relation to Part 6 of the policy, whilst we support the amendment to reflect the national requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG), this policy erroneously includes a requirement to deliver a minimum 10% net gain in on-site biodiversity. This does not reflect the biodiversity hierarchy as set out in Articles 37A and 37D of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. There should be an acknowledgement within policy that biodiversity enhancements can be provided both onsite or within wider land control. NPE control other land within the vicinity of the site and a better biodiversity solution may</p>	



Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL02		<p>5.11. We welcome the clarifications of what proportionate financial contributions will be sought in Part 18 – 20.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that the precise scope of any planning obligations will need to be defined through a planning application process in due course, with suggested contributions from various stakeholders, including officers at WC and MWPC. We expect the following areas will be a focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable Housing</li> <li>• Offsite highways</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Flood mitigation and landscaping</li> </ul>	
Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL03		<p>5.13. With Paragraph 185 of the NPPF and the site’s heritage assets in mind, it is NPE’s view that this is the minimum the Neighbourhood Plan should provide. The absence of any policy for the site would result in the absence of a positive policy framework to support the bringing forward of comprehensive redevelopment proposals for the site and the reuse of the existing Listed barn, contrary to the NPPF. Furthermore, it is noted that a comparable approach has already been accepted by Wiltshire Council in previous ‘made’ Neighbourhood Plans, for example the Holt Neighbourhood Plan (2016 – 2026) incorporating the Tannery site as a regeneration policy (Policy H1.1).</p>	
Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL04		<p>4.4 The Whitley Farm site is a redundant agricultural complex, with many of the buildings in disrepair and the cost of redeveloping the site means that ongoing agricultural use is not viable. Furthermore, the location of the site near the centre of the village, and served with a local road network not appropriate for large farm machinery, means that it is not an appropriate site for the modern large scale farming operated by the Neston Park</p>	
Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL05		<p>4.5 As set out within these representations, the alternative of employment uses are not viable at the site, given the significant investment required for demolition and remediation of the land when compared to the relatively modest rental income for businesses in locations such as Witley. Equally, there are several more appropriate existing locations providing opportunities for businesses to rent space within the local area.</p>	
Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL06		<p>4.6 Our client is supportive of the allocation of Whitley Farm for residential development which would give certainty to the future of the site by providing a policy framework which enabled a detailed planning application to be brought forward, and avoid the site falling into further disrepair. As set out above, NPE has suggested some minor amendments to Policy 7.3 to ensure that the JMNP2 meets ‘the basic tests’.</p>	

Version B email, August	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL07		<p>4.7 However, officers at Wiltshire Council have raised concerns about the degree to which the policy defines the nature of the future use. There is an acceptance from officers of the need to find a meaningful end use for the site and, while the points set out above indicate that residential use is likely to be the only viable option, their preference is for a policy which supports redevelopment and provides a mechanism for the detail to be evolved through the pre-application and application process, but does not pre-determine the scale and uses. An alternative policy wording has been provided which follows this approach and is available to the Examiner should they also consider that this is more appropriate than the current draft allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	

**Policy 7.4 - Land at Middle Farm Plot A**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.4 and supporting text	Land at Middle Farm – Plot A and B – in this instance the ‘reason for these policies’ section comes before the policies. Suggest this is reviewed to ensure a consistent approach with other policies of the Plan. Climate change - this is a location where there will be a reliance on private vehicle use. So, the scheme should be encouraged to provide at least a ULEV charge point to every unit as per comments above re Policy 4.	Agreed.
Version A	Cricket Club landowner	8.Flooding (p66)	With my business and land neighbouring this area I am concerned with the development increasing the rainfall run off onto our land (Whitley Golf Club and Westlands Farm)	Criteria 12 requires any proposed development to address on-site water management to avoid impacts on neighbouring land and potentially make improvements upon the existing situation.
Version A	Opac Ltd on behalf of prive resident re land at Shaw and Whitley	Policy 7.4 (p65-66)	This area of is identified for a small housing allocation within JMNP1. The site has not yet come forward for development (no planning application has been submitted) which does raise a question as to how deliverable it is within the plan period. In itself, Plot A arguably provides a natural extension to the housing immediately south of it. As the first part of a more significant housing allocation it is less suitable as, cumulatively, Plots A & B result in a significant and unnatural direction of growth for Whitley that would push a block of housing into open countryside. As such, on its own Plot A may have some merit as reflecting the built form of the village, but as part of a larger allocation is unsuitable. A further relevant consideration are the stipulations as to how development should take place on Plots A (&B). As with the objection to the site at Whitley Farm, for a relatively small amount of housing (including affordable housing) the associated costs involved with investigations, reporting mitigation and community infrastructure contributions raise significant concerns as to the viability of this development and thus its delivery in the plan period.	The revised Reg14B combined allocation of Plot A and B includes c1.5 hectares (c20%) of Plot B. This includes 1 hectare of GBI including buffer landscape. It is considered a significant reduction that addresses issues raised by AECOM stage 1 site assessment. See sites allocation topic paper.
Version A	Historic England	Policy 7.4 [also put in Policy 7.5]	Middle Farm was a site allocated in the current Plan. It is proposed to modify that provision within policy 7.4 as Plot A and to allocate additional land as Plot B. While the extension of the site into adjacent land may seem a logical and practical evolution Plot B is 5 ha and three times larger than Plot A. It will therefore be necessary to evaluate the cumulative impact of such an allocation on relevant heritage assets to determine the in-principle suitability of such a proposal and the specific nature and quantum of development envisaged.	See above
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		These policies propose allocations in Whitley and hence are not relevant to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing ‘Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley’ (MEL11)	[also put in policy 7.4]	MEL07 versus MEL11 3.12. As can be seen, [p8 of their doc at Appendix 6.2.2.30] the sites perform equally well. The principal difference is that whilst both sites are considered to be sensitive in landscape terms, MEL11, is located next to the settlement boundary whereas MEL07 is not. The decision to allocate MEL07 over MEL11 is therefore unjustified.	See submission allocation. This is located adjacent to the settlement boundary.

**Policy 7.5 - Land at Middle Farm Plot B**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 7.5 and supporting text	Land at Middle Farm – Plot A and B – in this instance the ‘reason for these policies’ section comes before the policies. Suggest this is reviewed to ensure a consistent approach with other policies of the Plan where policies are always presented first. The paragraph numbering in the policy is incorrect; number 4 is used twice. Climate change - this is a location where there will be a reliance on private vehicle use. So, the scheme should be encouraged to provide at least a ULEV charge point to every unit as per comments above re Policy 4.	Agreed and text updated.
		[error in numbering (there's two 4s) so I have included what it is and what it should be (eg 7/8. Flooding)]		
Version A	Cricket club landowner	7/8. Flooding (p68)	With my business and land neighbouring this area I am concerned with the development increasing the rainfall run off onto our land (Whitley Golf Club and Westlands Farm)	Noted. See flood risk clauses in the Policy.
Version A	Opac Ltd for Provate Resident re land at Shaw and Whitley	p 67-68	As an addition to Plot A, Plot B would result in a most unnatural way to expand Whitley into open countryside. This allocation would not reflect the historic growth patterns of the village and would push the settlement into surrounding farmland in a form that would be visually awkward. There are better locations around Whitley and Shaw to provide the housing proposed for these two adjoining sites. The land shown to the south of Shaw and NE of the A365 on the accompanying plan is available for residential development and has areas of land where a far more natural housing allocation could be provided that would follow the natural grain of the settlement.	See Site Allocations topic paper for the detailed assessment and reasoning for the sites chosen for allocation
Version A	Historic England	Policy 7.5 [also put in Policy 7.4]	Middle Farm was a site allocated in the current Plan. It is proposed to modify that provision within policy 7.4 as Plot A and to allocate additional land as Plot B. While the extension of the site into adjacent land may seem a logical and practical evolution Plot B is 5 ha and three times larger than Plot A. It will therefore be necessary to evaluate the cumulative impact of such an allocation on relevant heritage assets to determine the in-principle suitability of such a proposal and the specific nature and quantum of development envisaged.	Noted. See heritage clauses in the Policy.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		These policies propose allocations in Whitley and hence are not relevant to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.

**Policy 7.5 - Land at Middle Farm Plot B**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)	[also put in policy 7.4]	MEL07 versus MEL11 3.12. As can be seen, [p8 of their doc at Appendix 6.2.2.30] the sites perform equally well. The principal difference is that whilst both sites are considered to be sensitive in landscape terms, MEL11, is located next to the settlement boundary whereas MEL07 is not. The decision to allocate MEL07 over MEL11 is therefore unjustified.	See Site Allocations topic paper for the detailed assessment and reasoning for the sites chosen for allocation

**Policy 7.7NEW - Land at Middle Farm Plot A**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	(Private Landowner) continues to support the extant residential allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley in the JMNP1, and supports the emerging allocation Policy 7.7 of the wider site. (Private Landowner) wrote to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in March 2024 to express this support. A feasibility exercise has been undertaken which confirms that a scheme of 'about 55 dwellings' can comfortably be accommodated at the site and address all policy criteria.	RW (Site allocation land owner)representations noted.
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	Representations An area of land at Middle Farm (known as Plot A in JMNP1) benefits from an extant allocation for c. 18 dwellings in the JMNP (Policy 7). The site was selected as "viable and capable of development at a scale and density that complements Whitley's existing character" (paragraph 4.8.5). Policy 7 sought for Plot A to contribute some affordable housing in line with Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy 43 (30%). Further to the JMNP being 'made', (Private Landowner) instructed a number of technical advisors to prepare an outline planning application for Plot A, and a pre-application meeting was held with the Parish Council on 5th June 2024, and we are pleased to confirm that the application for "up to 22" dwellings will be submitted imminently. The pre-submission JMNP2 has been informed by an evidence base which includes a 'Site Options and Assessment' prepared by AECOM. The report references Plot A as 3148 and Plot B as MEL07. In terms of the former, the report concludes that Plot A is suitable for development. (Private Landowner) supports the continued allocation of Plot A.	
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	In contrast, the report considered Plot B to be unsuitable for development due: to the scale of expansion into the countryside when the site provides a buffer between the village and the electricity substation; the associated impacts on users of the PROW; the lack of connectivity with the adopted highways network (although noting that there is potential to be connected through Plot A); together with the potential impacts on the Green Infrastructure Corridor, loss of Grade 3 agricultural land, potential impacts on designated heritage assets and proximity to the electricity substation.	
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	Despite these comments, the consultation draft sought to retain and revise the allocation of Plot A and allocate a further c. 40 dwellings at 'Plot B'. In response to the AECOM report, a revised site area was proposed to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. This is included in the evidence base as a 2024 Update "Figure 9a: Land at Middle Farm Redline Plan." It is submitted that the integration of the two plots to create one larger site would result in a far more appropriate density development. The previous iteration of Plots A and B combined created a total site area of 6.6ha which, based on the proposed total allocation of c. 58 dwellings would result in a development of only 9 dwellings per hectare (dph). (Private Landowner) sensibly proposed a reduced site area with a 3ha site incorporating a c. 2ha developable area (surrounded by an ample landscaped buffer to ensure a soft transitional edge with the surrounding countryside and screening of the electricity substation to the east) which would result in a more appropriate density of 30dph. This would not only provide for an improved site efficiency, it would also mitigate the potential landscape impact raised by AECOM.	
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	(Private Landowner) acknowledges and supports the proposed deletion of policies 7.4 and 7.5 and their replacement with allocation 7.7 in the JMNP2 which aligns with Figure 9a as set out above. (Private Landowner) supports the wording of draft Policy 7.7 which states: "The 3 hectare plot of land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley as identified in figure 9a is allocated for development of about 55 dwellings including affordable and accessible housing and bungalows." (Private Landowner) understands that the residual housing requirement for Shaw and Whitley is 50 dwellings (over and above the extant allocation at Plot A). (Private Landowner) supports the flexibility of the housing numbers that could be developed at the site.	

**Policy 7.7NEW - Land at Middle Farm Plot A**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	The Housing Needs Assessment (2022) states that Shaw and Whitley lack smaller, more affordable properties. There was also local feedback from the community which reflected a need for bungalows. (Private Landowner) agrees that the village would benefit from bungalows and it is suggested that the western edge of the site adjacent to Corsham Road would be a sensible location for them.	
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	(Private Landowner) is aware that there is a need for smaller homes in Whitley due to local people wishing to downsize. (Private Landowner) therefore supports the text at 4.8.65 which commits to 10% of dwellings being built to Lifetime Homes Standards (when compared to the adopted Core Strategy which requires only 7%).	
Version B, Letter emailed on 20 August 2024	RW Planning for private landowner of Middle Farm, Whitley	7.7NEW	To conclude, (Private Landowner)supports the draft Policy 7.7 in the JMNP2, and commits to the site through the imminent submission of a planning application to develop part of the site. If the referendum leads to the JMNP2 being 'made', he commits to the wider site being developable and will pursue an application to develop it as soon as possible to help fulfil the identified housing requirement for the village.	
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, re 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		Confusingly the wording at paragraph 4.8.57 erroneously refers to the previous allocation of plot B being for 30 dwellings, which would suggest that the updated combined allocation is proposing a greater level of housing, this is not the case – in total 3 less units are now proposed.	The allocation is clearly for c55 dwellings.
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, re 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		2.5. As set out in our previous representations, we object to the fact that the although the site selection process was informed by the AECOM report "Site Options and Assessment 2023" which provided a traffic light assessment for site suitability, the outcomes of those findings were largely ignored.	See Sites Allocation Topic Paper. The sites assessment undertaken by AECOM formed stage 1 and 2 of a four stage process run by JMNP2. The technical report provides evidence and is not binding upon JMNP2 when addressing wider policy objectives and site selection. It can be clearly seen that JMNP2 allocation 7.7 has a significantly reduced allocation area to respond positively to minimising identified impacts. Furthermore Site 7.7 has no adverse impact on the distinction between Shaw and Whitley which was identified as an impact of site MEL11. This is a stated high priority issue for the community.
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, re 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		2.6. Fundamentally, given that Middle Farm B was assessed as unsuitable yet is proposed for allocation, however our site at Folly Lane was assessed as potentially suitable (the same category assigned to Whitley Farm) but is not proposed for allocation is profoundly unsound, despite the tweaks to the allocations. We maintain this objection.	See above and Site Allocation Topic Paper.

**Policy 7.7NEW - Land at Middle Farm Plot A**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, re 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		2.7. The Draft B version of the JMNP2 and the associated evidence base attempt to provide some justification, however the evidence provided is not sufficiently robust.	To be considered by examination.
Version B, August	WC Planning	Policy 7.7 NEW 'Allocation of Land at Middle Farm, Corsham Road, Whitley' - Fig 9a (p B70)	The policy refers to a Concept Plan. If Figure 9a is the Concept Plan then it should be renamed ' <i>Land at Middle Farm Redline Concept Plan</i> '.	Red line plan used within submission policy.



**Policy 8 - Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	
Version B Email 12 August 2024	Network Rail	p72	Policy 8: Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities Under this policy, housing developments should consider infrastructure requirements which are to be delivered either through CIL, planning conditions or S106 agreements. Where development impacts level crossings and mitigation is required, these financial contributions should be secured through a S106 agreement.	Noted.

**Policy 9 - Town Centre**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 9 and supporting text	Criteria (a) refers only to Local Plan Policy 68 whereas the final paragraph of the policy refers to both the Core Strategy policy and Local Plan policy. Consistency in referring to existing and emerging policies throughout the plan is essential and the plan as a whole should be reviewed. Criteria (e) refers to 'Commercial Area' but this is not shown on Figure 10 and should be included. Criteria (f) refers to 'see Figure 7' – this should be amended to say Figure 10. Paragraph 4.9.6 refers to the 2011 Wiltshire Town Centre and Retail Study. This has been updated by the 2020 Wiltshire Retail and Town Centres Study. This should be referred to instead.	Agreed. Policy updated.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.

**Policy 10 - Employment Sites**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 10 and supporting text	<p>Policy 10 – suggest the wording of the first sentence is amended to ‘Proposals for the retention, <del>intensified</del><b>intensification</b> and reuse of...’</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.1 – with regards the Wiltshire Employment Land Review, please be aware that there is a 2023 Update to this report on the LPR consultation page at Current consultation (Reg 19) autumn 2023 - Wiltshire Council. This paragraph refers to the 2017 version.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.3 – suggest this is amended to say ‘Wiltshire Core Strategy Core <del>Policies</del><b>Policy</b> 35...’. Also, although this paragraph is accurate in quoting Core Policy 35, it might be helpful to clarify what the updated Use Classes Order classifies the B1 (office) as. See emerging Local Plan Review Policy 64 for equivalent E class i.e. E(g) (i-iii).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.7 – suggest the first sentence is amended to say: ‘<b>Wiltshire Local Plan</b> Policy 64...’. We also suggest for clarity that this paragraph is expanded to explain that Policy 64 is also supportive of employment development on unallocated sites adjacent to Melksham as a Market Town where they are appropriate to the role and function of the settlement and certain criteria are met.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.8 – suggest the first sentence refers to LPR Policy 68 instead of Policy 64.</p>	Agreed.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.10.7	We suggest the first sentence is amended to say: ‘ <b>Emerging Wiltshire Local Plan Policy 64</b> ...’. We also suggest for clarity that this paragraph is expanded to explain that Policy 64 is also supportive of employment development on unallocated sites adjacent to Melksham as a Market Town where they are appropriate to the role and function of the settlement and certain criteria are met.	Agreed and done.
Version A	Knorr Bremse	4.10.2 (p75) and 4.10.4 - 8 (p76)	The Local Plan shows a significant demand for employment land yet the Plan only allocates 5ha for employment within Melksham. A number of larger companies in the area are seeking sites of over 75,000 sq feet to enable their business to grow and are frustrated that their requirements are not being taken into account. Failure to support these entities and their requirements will lead them to seek alternative locations. The resulting relocation will place jobs at risk, and inevitably impact the local community adversely in many ways. Small local businesses will see less trade, and commuting will worsen, to mention just a couple of issues. The lack of available sites needs to be addressed urgently, and land allocated accordingly.	The Town and Parish Council are keen to ensure that local businesses and economy area supported. Whilst there is no allocation, the Plan, as submitted aims to be generally supportive of use of land for employment reasons.

**Policy 10 - Employment Sites**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Gompels Healthcare	4.10.2 (p75) and 4.10.4 - 8 (p76)	<p>The Wiltshire Local Plan review identifies that Melksham has an important strategic employment role and has historically been able to attract large stable employers. It has a strong specialisation in the manufacturing industry in line with SWLEP priorities. Historical employment was dominated by Cooper Tire and Rubber company who are closing their Melksham operation with the loss of around 350 jobs. Melksham is now unable to attract, or even retain the large national and multinational employers of the past due to the lack of available space for their manufacturing and warehousing facilities. The draft neighbourhood plan recognises that the largest employment sectors in Melksham are manufacturing and wholesale and states that the expansion of new employment opportunities is desirable to reduce the amount of out commuting. However, Policy 10 simply seeks to retain, intensify and reuse existing employment land, in particular for small and start up business. There is no support for the existing large employers of Melksham who are in desperate need of expansion space. A healthy local economy relies on having a range of business sizes, it is often the case that the larger business support the smaller businesses and give them the scale of work that they need to underpin their financial stability. Even larger business have many small business units within them and a huge diversity of jobs that would simply not be found in smaller and startup businesses. Jobs like HR Directors, Financial Controllers, Account Directors or Senior Buyers are vital to support the surrounding villages and economy and unlikely to be found in smaller businesses.</p> <p>There are several large employers in Melksham who have been desperate to find additional expansion space over the last 2-4 years, ranging from 80,000 sq ft to 200,000 sq ft. This space for high value manufacturing and storage will create 100s of jobs and secure many more.</p> <p>The local plan review identifies that the employment land review shows a significant demand for employment land in the Melksham area. Despite this, the plan only allocates 5ha of land for employment within Melksham (site 1a) which is completely insufficient for the needs of the existing business. The draft Neighbourhood plan also fails to recognise this demand and allocate for, or even support the expansion of the largest employers in Melksham.</p> <p>The allocation of a site such as SHLAA site 3331 which is available and deliverable in the immediate term would allow the growth and retention of a number of Melksham's largest employers. It is adjacent to Melksham, but sufficiently removed to limit impact on nearby residents, and provides good transport links from the A350 and A365 as well as the future Melksham Bypass.</p> <p>Without the allocation of significant, suitable new employment space within Melksham, hundreds of jobs are at risk, and out commuting will worsen, when these businesses are forced to relocate to allow for their continued growth.</p>	The Town and Parish Council are keen to ensure that local businesses and economy area supported. Whilst there is no allocation, the Plan, as submitted aims to be generally supportive of use of land for employment reasons.
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.8.25 (p.52) [also put in Policy 7.1]	The supporting text cross-references Policy 10 – Employment Sites which expects proposals for the reuse of employment land to generate the same number, or more. Permanent FTE jobs as the former use. In the case of the Factory Site, it will be important for this aim to be balanced with the other stated objectives for the Site including delivery of dwellings, as well as consideration of local economic factors including the demand for new employment space.	The policy has been updated to exclude sites allocated by the Neighbourhood Plan
Version A	Cooper Tires	4.10.6 and 4.10.8 (p77) [also put in Policy 7.1]	Cooper Tire & Rubber Company Europe Ltd generally supports this Policy. However, in consideration of the future of the Factory Site (as proposed under Policy 7.1), it is likely to prove challenging to reprovide an equivalent number of FTE jobs as the former use, particularly if the site is to be redeveloped for mixed use. For the Factory Site, the focus should be on providing high-quality, flexible employment space that is viable, market-facing, and compatible with residential development. Generally, Policy 10 should promote re provision of high quality, affordable, and flexible new employment space suited to the local market alongside the aim of sustaining FTE jobs.	See response in allocation policy.
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 10 (p75-76)	<p>Stantonbury support the principles of Policy 10 which expresses that proposes for reuse of previously developed employment land should be supported.</p> <p>The Upside Melksham site is an example of a previously developed employment site which no longer serves a purpose for solely employment and is no longer viable as such. In this case, the site and surrounding area would benefit from its sustainable redevelopment for a mix of housing, employment and public open space.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 10 - Employment Sites**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Towson Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.

**Policy 11 - Sustainable Transport and Active Travel**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 11 and supporting text	<p>The policy does not take opportunities to distinguish between private vehicles which is something that has emerged in recent years. There is a subset to this because it's important to promote ULEV options above other private vehicle use through for example promoting a minimum amount of charging in development.</p> <p>We suggest that at the least the hierarchy is updated in the supporting text to show this differentiation with ULEV private vehicles above petrol/diesel private vehicles. It will be impactful because all required travel plans will then be prioritising ULEV over petrol/diesel.</p>	<p>Distinguishing between different types of private vehicles has not been added to the text. We were unable to find any information linking to this. The policy aims to encourage sustainable forms of transport with private vehicles of any kind being bottom of the hierarchy.</p>
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Fig 11 (P B81)	<p>One of the 'other key walking routes' (MELW100) is currently recorded through a house and as such is not available to walk. We are aware of it and it's on the list to resolve.</p> <p>As a note, the priority routes established within the Melksham LCWIP are about to go out for final consultation. These routes will define and shape future walking and cycling provision for the Melksham area. This will be completed / reported by September 2024 and may have information pertinent to the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The town and parish council both submitted comments at the various stages of the LCWIP development.</p>
Version A	Network Rail	4.11.1 - 3 (p77) [also included in General Comments tab]	<p>Level Crossings</p> <p>Any development of land which would result in a material increase or significant change in the character of traffic using rail crossings should be refused unless, in consultation with Network Rail, it can either be demonstrated that they 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.</p> <p>There are 3 level crossings within the plan area that may be affected by future development:</p> <p>Melksham Without 85 Footpath Crossing WEY 99.12  Melksham Without 92 Footpath Crossing WEY 99.41  Melksham 22 Footpath Crossing WEY 100.32</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Version A	Network Rail	4.11.1 - 3 (p77) [also included in General Comments tab]	<p>Level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing</li> <li>• By the cumulative effect of development added over time</li> <li>• By the type of crossing involved</li> <li>• By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from site includes a level crossing</li> </ul> <p>By developments that might impede pedestrians ability to hear approaching trains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs</li> <li>• By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using a level crossing</li> <li>• By any development or enhancement of the public rights of way</li> </ul>	
Version A	Network Rail	4.11.1 - 3 (p77) [also included in General Comments tab]	<p>It is Network Rail's and indeed the Office of Rail Regulation's (ORR) policy to reduce risk at level crossings not to increase risk as could be the case with an increase in usage at the level crossings in question. The Office of Rail Regulators, in their policy, hold Network Rail accountable under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, and that risk control should, where practicable, be achieved through the elimination of level crossings in favour of bridges or diversions.</p> <p>The Council have a statutory responsibility under Schedule 4 (j) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order, 2015) to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the rail volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway.</p>	
Version A	Sustrans	Fig 11 (p78) [CYCLING LEVEL OF SERVICE?]	<p>It's good to see that the Cycling Level of Service tool is being used to determine the quality of routes within the town.</p> <p>ot's good to see that the target is reduction of travel with private cars and that this is emphasised throughout the entire neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks (though we must note that we are not clear on what the Cycling Level of Service Tool is)</p>
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 11 (p77-78)	<p>Policy 11 repeats policy in the proposed Local Plan (Policy 71) and is therefore unnecessary. It should be deleted</p>	<p>This is a key issue for the local community. The policy is as it was in JMNP one and has not been altered, though the supporting text has.</p>

**Policy 11 - Sustainable Transport and Active Travel**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Towsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.

## Policy 12 - Green Infrastructure

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 12 (p82)	The Policy is unnecessary and repeats the requirements of Policy 93 in the proposed Local Plan. The policy should be deleted.	The policy was largely unaltered from JMNP1 which was examined and voted upon at referendum.
Version A	Environment Agency	Policy 12 (p82)	It would be wholistic to expand this policy to become 'green and blue infrastructure'. The blue element covers watercourses and waterbodies, many of which are valuable corridors/areas for users (human and wildlife) of green infrastructure. This would then also be well aligned with the Wiltshire Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Agreed.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	Fig 12 and p86	It is unclear as to why the Melksham Canal Link Project features on the figure. The scheme is not deliverable, as demonstrated by the historic planning application (from 2012), which has not been progressed and remains subject to major objections from statutory consultees. Further it is not viable and does not have the support of the landowner. There is no information with respect to how this scheme can be delivered and it should be deleted from the plan (as per representations also made to the Reg 19 local plan).	The Canal Link project is a protected route in the Core Strategy.



Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p><b>Policy 12: Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>5.1. We support this policy.</p> <p>5.2. The allocation of the site (either wholly or in part) would help to deliver the policy objective by securing a part of the site for publicly accessible green infrastructure/open space on what is currently privately owned land.</p> <p>5.3. The same can not be said for the proposed allocations, which have limited 'non developable' land available to deliver public open space, green infrastructure or biodiversity enhancements.</p>	Noted.
Version B, August	WC Planning	Policy 12	<p>This policy makes clear the objective it supports/serves, and the importance is there. Promoting healthy lifestyles and wellbeing is enhanced through identifying the need to protect, support and develop community facilities. However, this policy could be expanded on to include and reference playing pitch provision (inc. artificial pitches), recreation spaces, children's play areas, playgrounds, formal Play, skate parks and teen facilities. There could be specific reference to the use of financial contributions (S106) from developers to be used for local community sports, play or pitch infrastructure and/or strategic priorities within the Wiltshire Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) which is an evidence base within the local plan.</p> <p>PPS priorities/options for Melksham are included in the action plan of the strategy, and these would help to meet any current deficiencies, whilst providing for future demand and should be the priority for S106 leveraging and investment. The Strategic Need for at least 1 full size 3G Artificial Turf Pitch is a high priority.</p>	Noted and updated.

## Policy 13 - Biodiversity

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 13 and supporting text	<p>Suggest first sentence of policy is corrected to remove typo as follows: '...will be expected to deliver a measurable biodiversity enhancements...'</p> <p>The policy does not stipulate what percentage BNG would be required for developments within the neighbourhood plan area. The supporting text refers to the 10% minimum required under the Environment Act 2021 and that the Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review aims to seek a minimum of 20% BNG. The allocated site policies in the neighbourhood plan require developments to achieve a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain. It is recommended that this policy is amended to include a minimum 20% BNG requirement for all relevant developments within the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>The modification statement states that there have been no changes made to Policy 13 however, the previous requirement for a minimum of 10% BNG has been removed. Figure 13 - Wiltshire Council will shortly be providing updated mapping to the Wiltshire and Swindon Biological Records Centre (WSBRC) for the 2km consultation zone around the lesser horseshoe bat core roost associated with the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC that the south-easternmost section of the neighbourhood plan area falls within. It is suggested that to inform any future update of the neighbourhood plan (in particular Figure 13 and the accompanying Green Infrastructure report), that updated mapping is requested from WSBRC that shows the consultation zone.</p>	The policy has been updated to reference the 20% as set out in the Local Plan Review, which is, at this stage, still a draft document and not adopted. The JMNP2 has no evidence to require 20%.
Version B, August	WC Planning	Paragraph 4.14.5	This paragraph refers to information on Local Green Spaces being on pages 93-95 but this is on pages 96-98. Please check consistency of all referencing in the Plan.	Now correct.
Version A	Salisbury and Wilton Swifts and North Wiltshire Swifts	4.13.3 (p84)	<p>The Melksham Neighbourhood Plan should be in line with the draft Wiltshire Plan: Policy 88 of the draft Wiltshire Plan details the ecological enhancements required of new development. It is very important that the wording of Policy 13 of the Melksham Plan cross references Wilts Policy 88 and makes clear that all development will be expected to follow Policy 88.</p> <p>Policy 89 of the draft Wiltshire Plan requires a minimum 20% net gain in biodiversity, therefore the wording of Policy 13 of the Melksham Plan should also include the wording 'a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain'.</p>	The policy has been updated to reference the 20% as set out in the Local Plan Review, which is, at this stage, still a draft document and not adopted. The JMNP2 has no evidence to require 20%.

## Policy 13 - Biodiversity

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email 14 August 2024	Salisbury & Wilton Swifts		<p>Please would you forward our email to your Planning Committees for their consideration of endorsing our comment on the Planning Portal should they support this outline application. As a parish you will be losing land to a 'Built Environment' and a growing issue is the lack of ecological mitigation and enhancements developers provide. A Built Environment can be wildlife friendly and it is important that the numbers of ecological measures such as bird, bat and bee bricks, reptile refugia and hibernacula are agreed at this outline stage so that they are automatically included with any Reserved Matters application, at which point they should be clearly marked on site drawings and building elevations.</p> <p>Please watch this wonderful little RSPB 4 minute video showing how easy it is to help swifts and other small building dependent birds who use the same nesting provision - New swift video</p>	Mention of swift bricks, and other wildlife features has been incorporated into the supporting text.

**Policy 13 - Biodiversity**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email 21 August 2024 in response to Teresa	Salisbury & Wilton Swifts		<p>Dear Teresa</p> <p>Thank you for your email and for the link to your Design Code. It is really heartening to hear that your councils do support our comments.</p> <p>In an ideal world the Melksham NHP and Design Code would cross reference the Wiltshire LP Pre-Submission Draft (Cabinet Version) 2020-2038 September 2023, but I note that the Design Code was finalised before the draft Wiltshire Local Plan, so perhaps next time round.</p> <p><a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/11976/Wiltshire-Local-Plan-Pre-Submission-Draft-2020-2038-Regulation-19/pdf/Wiltshire_Local_Plan_Reg_19_web_accessible_version.pdf?m=638313273627430000">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/media/11976/Wiltshire-Local-Plan-Pre-Submission-Draft-2020-2038-Regulation-19/pdf/Wiltshire_Local_Plan_Reg_19_web_accessible_version.pdf?m=638313273627430000</a>, page 243, 5.136: 'Designing in space for nature is critical as highlighted by recent population trends of some of the UK's most threatened species that inhabit our built environment. The recent BS 42021:2022 guidance should be followed with regards to integral nest boxes, with the exception of the minimum required ratio of integral nest boxes to dwelling given this policy outlines a greater minimum ratio than that stated within The British Standard. The British Standard has demonstrated high occupancy rates of such features and Wiltshire Council seeks to ensure the best outcomes for wildlife within the built environment. The advice of a professional ecologist should be sought when determining the appropriate boxes for the area.'</p> <p>Policy 88 Biodiversity and Geodiversity (page 246) – Biodiversity in the Built Environment: 'As a minimum, the following are required within new proposals: ...1. integrate integral bird nest bricks (e.g., swift bricks) at a minimum of two per dwelling;'</p> <p>Whilst the Design Code does mention bird bricks it does so in terms of shelter and protection, which are important, but with no mention of providing nesting opportunities which is even more important, and there are no bird bricks/boxes included in the illustrations, which is a shame:</p> <p>'New development should propose small interventions into the built environment to provide species with cover from predators and shelter during bad weather.</p> <p>Some examples are bird, bat and bee bricks, reptile refugia and hibernacula within the development, in order to increase biodiversity (see Figures 138- 143, overleaf).'</p> <p>Integrated universal bricks provide nesting opportunities for 4 red-listed birds plus other small cavity nesting species - see The Duchy of Cornwall sites: <a href="https://nansledan.com/duchy-nest-brick-project-boosts-endangered-wild-birds/">https://nansledan.com/duchy-nest-brick-project-boosts-endangered-wild-birds/</a>) and British Standard BS42021 Integral nest boxes - selection and installation for new developments <a href="https://knowledge.bsigroup.com/search?query=BS42021&amp;type=products">https://knowledge.bsigroup.com/search?query=BS42021&amp;type=products</a>).</p> <p>As Local Plans and NHPs come around for updating, more and more are including specific references to integrated universal bird bricks as a great biodiversity enhancer not only for the small cavity nesting species that are finding it increasingly difficult to find places to nest, but also for overwintering moths and butterflies etc and birds seeking winter refuge.</p> <p>We can only hope.</p>	Mention of swift bricks, and other wildlife features has been incorporated into the supporting text.

**Policy 13 - Biodiversity**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Email 22 August 2024	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group		<p>In summary, please consider endangered urban wildlife such as red-listed bird species which inhabit buildings in Melksham.</p> <p>I understand that the local Salisbury &amp; Wilton Swifts Group have provided comments, so I also request that you update in line with their suggestions, as they have additional local knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered red-listed species which are present but declining in Melksham return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.</p> <p>Please also add to the policy: Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in new developments including extensions, in accordance with best practice guidance such as BS 42021 or CIEEM. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist.</p> <p>In more detail:</p> <p>This is because nesting sites in buildings are excluded from the Biodiversity Net Gain methodology so need their own clear policy.</p> <p>Swift bricks are the only type of bird box specifically mentioned as valuable to wildlife in national planning guidance, along with bat boxes and hedgehog highways (NPPG Natural Environment 2019 paragraph 023). The National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes (2021) also recommends bird bricks (Integrating Habitats section on page 25, and Creating Habitats section on page 26).</p>	Mention of swift bricks, and other wildlife features has been incorporated into the supporting text.
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 13 (p84-85)	Biodiversity is covered in a number of policies within the Proposed Local Plan and this additional policy does not provide anything more and should be deleted.	<p>The Local Plan Review, which is, at this stage, still a draft document and not adopted.</p> <p>The policy represents an important local issue, is largely unchanged from JMNP1 which has been examined and voted on at referendum.</p>

**Policy 13 - Biodiversity**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Natural England	4.13.2 (p84) and fig13 (p85)	<p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</b></p> <p>However, we refer you to the attached annex [Appendix 6.2.1.7 ] which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.</p> <p>Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species.</p> <p>Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission standing advice.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.</p> <p>For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>	Noted.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.

**Policy 13 - Biodiversity**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Savills on behalf of Neston Park Estates for Whitley Farm site MEL01	[also included in policy 7.3]	<p>3.12 In relation to Part 6.d of the policy, whilst we would expect compliance with the Wiltshire Local Plan with regards to biodiversity net gain, we are aware of multiple objections to the 20% requirement being pursued.</p> <p>3.13 We assume that the neighbourhood plan will not be made in advance of the Local Plan. However, if the neighbourhood plan does move ahead in advance of the local plan, there is no basis to increase above a requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain as if the local plan is adopted it will take precedence.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 14 - Open Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Policy 14: Open Spaces</b> 6.1. We support this policy. 6.2. The allocation of the site (either wholly or in part) would help to deliver the policy objective by securing a part of the site for publicly accessible green infrastructure/open space on what is currently privately owned land.	Noted.
Version B, August	WC Planning		This policy makes clear the objective it supports/serves, and the importance is there. Promoting healthy lifestyles and wellbeing is enhanced through identifying the need to protect, support and develop community facilities. However, this policy could be expanded on to include and reference playing pitch provision (inc. artificial pitches), recreation spaces, children's play areas, playgrounds, formal Play, skate parks and teen facilities. There could be specific reference to the use of financial contributions (S106) from developers to be used for local community sports, play or pitch infrastructure and/or strategic priorities within the Wiltshire Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) which is an evidence base within the local plan. PPS priorities/options for Melksham are included in the action plan of the strategy, and these would help to meet any current deficiencies, whilst providing for future demand and should be the priority for S106 leveraging and investment. The Strategic Need for at least 1 full size 3G Artificial Turf Pitch is a high priority.	Noted and text updated.



## Policy 15 - Community Facilities

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 15 and supporting text	The evidence base of the Wiltshire Playing Pitch Strategy (PSS) is not mentioned. This is an important document and is currently being renewed (target completion 2024) - this will identify what needs there are for new pitches and could inform the next version of the plan in line with national planning policy. However, the Action Plan of the current document has been kept up to date on an annual basis. A key action within the plan is the strategic need for a full size 3G Artificial Turf pitch within the Melksham Community Area. It would be good to carry this over and reference in the new neighbourhood plan.	This need is noted in the supporting text.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	15	This policy makes clear the objective it supports/serves, and the importance is there. Promoting healthy lifestyles and wellbeing is enhanced through identifying the need to protect, support and develop community facilities. However, this policy could be expanded on to include and reference playing pitch provision (inc. artificial pitches), recreation spaces, children's play areas, playgrounds, formal Play, skate parks and teen facilities. There could be specific reference to the use of financial contributions (S106) from developers to be used for local community sports, play or pitch infrastructure and/or strategic priorities within the Wiltshire Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) which is an evidence base within the local plan. PPS priorities/options for Melksham are included in the action plan of the strategy, and these would help to meet any current deficiencies, whilst providing for future demand and should be the priority for S106 leveraging and investment. The Strategic Need for at least 1 full size 3G Artificial Turf Pitch is a high priority.	Noted and text updated.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		We have no comments in respect of these policies due to them either not being materially changed or a lack of relevance to the site subject to promotion in this letter.	Noted.
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 15 (p89)	Catesby supports the aspirations of the Community Facilities Policy. Land at Snarlton Farm is able to deliver land for a new community building.	Noted.

Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p>[narrative on how their site MEL011 would meet this policy in their document at <b>Appendix 6.2.2.30</b> , p13]</p> <p><b>Policy 15: Community Facilities</b></p> <p>7.1. We support this policy.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 16 and supporting text	<p>Proposed Local Green Space (LGS) allocations have been submitted for the following sites and our comments are as follows, which we would be happy to discuss with you in more detail:</p> <p>Initial sites presented – a summary of the Council’s response for the initial sites was presented to Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council and is attached to this Regulation 14 response.</p> <p>Additional sites – three additional sites were presented to the Council subsequently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Dorset Crescent play area and green – the Council are not supportive at this stage as this site may offer opportunity for sustainable development. Recommend and request site is deleted from the neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>o Heather Avenue Play area and green – this relates to the formal play area and we are supportive in so far as it relates to our title and non-highway land.</li> <li>o Lancaster Road (former golf course) – the Council are not supportive of this allocation as the site holds a strategic purpose. Recommend and request site is deleted from the neighbourhood plan. See also comments on Policy 19 below.</li> </ul> <p>See attached document entitled ‘Melksham Neighbourhood Plan – Local Green Spaces. Wiltshire Council Land’ which sets out details of the initial proposed Local Green Spaces owned by Wiltshire Council and whether the Council supports or does not support proposed sites. It is recommended and requested that sites that the Council does not support are deleted from the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The evidence base of the Wiltshire Playing Pitch Strategy (PSS) is not mentioned. This is an important document and is currently being renewed (target completion 2024) - this will identify what needs there are for new pitches and could inform the next version of the plan in line with national planning policy. However, the Action Plan of the current document has been kept up to date on an annual basis. A key action within the plan is the strategic need for a full size 3G Artificial Turf pitch within the Melksham Community Area. It would be good to carry this over and reference in the new neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>LGS 47. Dorset Crescent: The Council's comments have been considered. The designation is to be retained as JMNP2 is submitted.</p> <p>Heather Avenue Play Area is LGS48 (Primrose Drive): Support noted</p> <p>LGS 46. Fields/old golf course (behind Christie Miller): The detailed information given as landowner has been taken into account and the LGS site is therefore removed.</p>
Version A	Wiltshire Council as Landowner	LGS3	Not supportive - Potential to restrict the operation of the wider land holdings around Melksham Hub, Melksham House, Cemetery etc. Would support allocation of cricket ground only , provided it does not impact on existing use	<p>These comments were appended to Wiltshire Council's Regulation 14 response, but were made as part of the informal consultation. Amendments to the areas covered by the designations have been made where appropriate and in response to the Council's comments. Some spaces have been retained regardless of objection. See LGS report for full detail.</p>
Version A		LGS 5	Not supportive Potential to restrict the operation of the wider land holdings around Melksham Hub, Melksham House etc. Would support none access areas, subject to access rights being permitted	
Version A		LGS 12	Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A		LGS 14	Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red. Designation should exclude the area outlined in blue with is maintainable highway	
Version A		LGS 20	Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red. Not supportive of area outlined in blue designation clashes with school playing field,	
Version A		LGS 21	WC is owner of Southern part only—see clarification plan. Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A		LGS28	WC Response—Ownership differs (see clarificationplan). Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red. Designation should exclude the area outlined in blue with is maintainable highway	
Version A		LGS29	WCResponse—Ownership excludes paths that cross the site and play area. Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership (plan to follow).	
Version A		LGS30	WC Response—Ownership differs slightly—exclude highway elements—see clarification plan. Supportive of designation as it relatesto WC ownership,edged red.	
Version A		LGS31	WC not owner of whole Seeclarification plan Supportive of designation as it relatesto WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A	LGS38	WC Response—Ownership differs—see clarification plan. Supportive of designation as it relatestoWCownership, edged red.		

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		LGS40	WCResponse-Not owner of whole (See Clarification Plan)- Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A		LGS41	WC Response–Ownership excludes paths that cross the site and a strip of land. Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A		LGS43	WC Response Not owner of whole (See Clarification Plan)- Not supportive-opportunity to explore for affordable housing purposes on part of site.	
Version A		LGS44	WC Response- Slight difference in boundaries(See ClarificationPlan)-Supportive of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version A		LGS45	WC Response-Not owner of whole(See Clarification Plan)-Supportive Of designation as it relates to WC ownership, edged red.	
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council as landowner	LGS Map Reference No (on p B98)	[more detail in <b>Appendix 6.2.2.68</b> ]	
		3	Recreation/cricket area to rear of Melksham Campus Object – see slide	The designation area was reduced in response to early consultation feedback from WC
		4	Copse Area in The Spa Object – see slide	The proposed LGS is retained despite objection. The Steering Group consider this area of land to be important to the setting of The Spa, a distinct area of important local heritage as noted in the Neighbourhood Plan and designated heritage assets. It has therefore been decided to retain the proposed LGS and take forward for examination.
		5	Approach to Melksham House	The area covered by the LGS has been amended as requested by WC
		6	Dog Walking Area behind The Spa Not owned by WC	The site, as per the designation now (LGS47) is Public Open Space, and Wiltshire Council the owner, who confirmed by email in September 2024 that they have no objection to its inclusion as a LGS.
		11	Riverside Drive Object – see slide for recommendation to reduce the allocation to cover parts effected by flood zone only.	The area covered by the LGS has been amended as requested by WC
		10	Land between Duxford Close and the boundary of Industrial Estate Supportive	Noted.
		12	Beverley Close, Green Space Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		13	Forest Community Centre Recreational Space Supportive	Noted.
		14	Brunswick Park (including MUGA) Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		20	POS Rear of Grasmere/Wellington Drive Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		21	Green with trees in Berryfield Lane Not owned by WC	Noted.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
		23	Football Field separating Windsor Avenue/Cornflower Way Part Supportive & Part Object - see slide	Wiltshire Council are Supportive of designation in far as it relates to land in their ownership. They object to the land owned by the NHS being included.  The area proposed for LGS designation has been updated to remove the area of land owned by the NHS. See the LGS report for full detail
		24	Weavers Croft Not owned by WC	Noted.
		25	Hornbeam Crescent/Semington Road Supportive	Noted.
		29	Clackers Brook (Queensway) Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		30	Brabazon Way, Bowerhill Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		31	Hornchurch Green, Bowerhill Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		32	Hornbeam Crescent Green Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		32	East of Melksham (Clackers Brook) Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		37	Sarum Avenue Green Not owned by WC	
		39	Primrose Drive Nature Reserve Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		40	Locking Close, Bowerhill Supportive	Noted.
		41	Beaufort Close-Kestel Court, Bowerhill Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		42	Harvard Close, Bowerhill Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		44	Roundponds Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		45	Verge to rear of Hornbeam Crescent adjacent to A350 Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
		46	Verge on corner of Westinghouse Way/Swift Way, Bowerhill Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
			Dorset Crescent Supportive	Noted.
			Heather Avenue Supportive, but see slide	Noted.
Version A	Cricket Club private la	Fig 15 (p94)	I object to the inclusion of some of my private land being included in the 'Green Space' and Green Wedge. My agent, Simon Chambers of LPC Town & Country Planning, has submitted in detail our reasons for why our private land should not be included in the plan.	Noted.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	West Wilts Group of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)		<p>Dear Neighbourhood Planning Team,</p> <p>I read with great interest the following local newspaper articles :-</p> <p>Melksham Independent News 23/11/23, front page &amp; pages 6 &amp; 7.  Wiltshire Times 1/12/23, page 5. <a href="#">[Cooper Tires Area B]</a></p> <p>I fully support the 700 responses (and counting) in support of the Melksham Green Space campaign group who are campaigning to include the above area in the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan as a designated green space so that it can be protected for future generations from unwanted development.</p> <p>The huge benefits, as detailed on the front page and page 7 of the Melksham Independant News are as follows:-  Provide a public amenity in the centre of Melksham by offering diverse woodland with grass and wild flower meadows.  Protect open green spaces which help improve both physical and mental wellbeing. It will also help to mitigate land lost to all the ongoing housing developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Reduce pollutants along this stretch of the river. Land adjacent to the River Avon is currently farmed, and by-products from this run-off along this stretch of the river ends up as silt. Samples taken from Conigre Mead Nature Reserve after flooding contain silt and maze, which is grown adjacent to the river.</li> <li>* Reduce flooding. More trees would help mitigate flooding.</li> <li>* Safeguard current, and attract more biodiversity. The creation of Conigre Mead Nature Reserve is an example of what can be done, but Conigre Mead is only 3 acres; "Just think of what can be done with 38.5 acres" says the group.</li> <li>* Provide a green corridor connecting other habitats and other environmental initiatives.</li> <li>* Contribute in the reduction of CO2.</li> </ul> <p>Unfortunately, the Government have allocated far too many houses to Wiltshire, and west and north west Wiltshire have suffered the most and Melksham has already had too many houses built on valuable greenfield land with more in the pipeline.  The remaining area of land available (29.5 acres) could be a mixed-use brownfield development of quality design and construction as per current Government guideline's utilising the area by building 3 or 4 storey flats rather than the usual single storey faceless housing estate model built on valuable greenfield land to the east of Melksham.</p> <p>May I ask you to consider the above comments when you are compiling the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan.  Kind regards,  Ken McCall, Member of the West Wilts Group of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)</p>	<p>This public consultation offered the opportunity for the public to specifically suggest any additional spaces. The Melksham Green Space Group have submitted proposals for two Local Green Spaces that has been reviewed. Both proposed 'plots' from the Group will be included as proposed LGS in the submission version of the JMNP2 for examination. LGS48 &amp; 49 refer.</p>

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	owner of the land at the golf club in Whitley	policy 16 (p93) [also put in Policy 19]	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the neighbourhood plan. I am the owner of the land at the golf club in Whitley, marked both for a 'green wedge' and as 'green space.</p> <p>In regards to the area marked for green community space. This land is owned by myself and my brother and has historically been used by my family for agricultural purposes. When the cricket club's previous landlord terminated their lease on the ground they used in Atworth, they asked me whether I would have any land to help them out in regards to relocating. We decided they could use a part of one of our fields for this. I have supported the cricket club and allowed it to remain a facility for the community only charging a nominal rent and maintaining the grounds. Without our support the cricket club arguably would no longer exist.</p> <p>A large part of this field is used for agricultural purposes, and with the threat of the National Grid wanting to take some of our land back, there is the possibility that we will need to use the whole field for agriculture in the future. I strongly object to this field being marked as a green space for the community. It is owned by my family and we should be able to decide how it is used.</p> <p>The potential inclusion of our family land as a green space for the community sends a troubling message to myself and other local landowners. That is, if you champion local facilities and offer private space for this purpose you run the risk of having control of your land removed from you. I find this very concerning and makes me think we may be better off terminating the cricket club's lease now.</p> <p>As you are aware there has recently been a field purchased in Whitley for use for the community which should be designated as a green space for the community as that is what the owner bought it for. This is marked in Purple on the attached map. <b>[Appendix 6.2.2.9]</b></p> <p>I also question the inclusion of some of my land in the green wedge. I am greatly concerned by the inaccuracy of the drawings of the green wedge and the inclusion of a current house within it, this greatly distorts the drawings. The green wedge line should follow the pink line I have added. I respect the thought that the villages of Shaw and Whitley should not be joined, but a more accurate drawing of the green wedge proposal would point to the use of the golf course driveway as a border. Leaving the land to the south of the Golf Club's driveway <b>Marked in Blue</b> in the green wedge. I believe the land <b>Marked in Red</b> should not be included in the green wedge. In a previous plan it was marked as a potential for development. I believe this should be reconsidered as it is a viable and obvious place for future development in Whitley without blurring the boundaries of the village. I ask that any decisions made of this land need to be made by people who have visited the location as the map you have drawn is inaccurate, and I would welcome a site meeting.</p> <p>I would also question why Shaw schools playing fields have not been included in the green wedge? As looking at the aerial map this would seem a lot more logical.</p>	The detailed information given as landowner has been taken into account and the LGS site is therefore removed.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	BBA Architects on behalf of Stantonbury, representing land at Upside Melksham, SHELAA 264	Policy 16 (p93-95)	<p>Stantonbury have previously commented on the Local Green Spaces policy and the proposed inclusion of land running alongside the South Brook in June 2023, and our comments made then are still relevant and therefore repeated below: The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 102) states that Local Green Space Designations should only be used where the Green Space is: (a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; (b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and (c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice guidance (NPPG) reiterates the importance that the green space must be demonstrably special to the local community and states Local Green Spaces may be designated where those spaces are demonstrably special to the local community (Paragraph 009 Reference ID: 37-009-2140306)</p> <p>In its current form, the green space cannot be considered to be of any particular significance. It is not open to the public, nor is it particularly attractive. Whilst the site does provide some habitat from an ecology perspective, it is not of any particular significance. Ecology Assessments submitted with the planning application PL/2022/06221 considered the largest proportion of the site to be modified grassland of low distinctiveness and of moderate condition. In its current form therefore, the existing areas of green space within the Upside site do not qualify for Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>However, the scheme proposed as part of the current planning application for the Upside, Melksham site (PL/2022/06221) would deliver an area of open space which could, when completed, be considered of special significance to the local community. This would then mean the open space could be considered for Local Green Space designation in the future. The proposals would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide linear parkland, adjacent to the South Brook which would be available for public use.</li> <li>• A considered landscape scheme which provides an appropriate, integrated and attractive setting to existing houses and proposed future development at Upside.</li> <li>• Provide management of the open space areas to provide improved habitat for local biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that both Melksham Town Council and Melksham Without Parish Council did not object to the current planning application for the Upside site.</p> <p>Stantonbury see the delivery of improved open space, which will benefit the wider community, as integral to their vision for the Upside site. However, this can only be delivered if the open space is included and considered as part of the wider redevelopment of the site, as proposed in the current planning application. Any Local Green Space Designation occurring before planning permission for the whole site has been secured could undermine and conflict with proposals and then jeopardise the delivery of improved open space. We therefore see there are two options available as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole Upside, Melksham site is allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan for a mix of residential / commercial and open space, with areas defined, aligned to current planning application proposals to ensure they are deliverable.</li> <li>The Local Green Space designation comes forward once planning permission has been granted for the site and the area of open space has been defined.</li> </ol> <p>Stantonbury are committed to providing an area of green open space which will be accessible to the wider community, but this can only be brought forward with the development of the whole of the Upside site, and cannot be defined or designated in isolation.</p>	Noted. The Steering Group consider that the space meets the criteria of the NPPF and that the designation would not conflict with the current planning application.
Version A	Melksham Green Spaces Group	policy 16	Request for 2 x green spaces on plot B of Cooper Tires land (separate spreadsheet with 900 responses)	Received and reviewed. Both proposed 'plots' will be included as proposed LGS in the submission version of the JMNP2 for examination.



**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		This is a new draft policy that designates land as local green spaces, providing significant policy protection for such designations. The site subject to promotion in this letter is not affected by this draft policy and its proposed designations, no further comment is made.	Noted.
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	Policy 16 (p93-95)	<p>The policy is being applied to 50 individual sites within the neighbourhood area, covering all green spaces of any developable size. It is clearly it is being used as an 'anti-development' policy. This approach is entirely contrary to national and local plan policy; national policy (NPPF paragraph 101) is to use the policy to protect green areas of particular importance, and to be consistent with local planning of sustainable development and to complement investment in sufficient homes. The excessive and extensive application of the policy, as highlighted by Figure 15, seeks to preclude the delivery of homes on all vacant space within the neighbourhood area, which is inconsistent with the strategic policy to deliver homes within the urban area according to the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>....</p> <p>In conflict with this position, clearly and cumulatively, the intended LGS policy covers an extensive tract of land.</p>	<p>The Local Green Spaces included in the draft JMNP2 are ones that the Steering Group considered passed the necessary tests of Para. 106 of the NPPF subject to feedback from the community and landowners as part of this consultation. This number of Local Green Spaces seems proportionate to the size of the plan area covering both town and villages.</p> <p>There are a number of green spaces across the plan area in both the town and rural areas that are considered to meet 1 or more of the LGS criteria in conjunction with allocations for housing is considered to be part of sustainable development in the Plan area.</p>
Version A	Gladman representing land South of Bowerhill		<p>Policy 16 seeks to designate 50 sites as Local Green Spaces (LGS) and therefore protect them from development due to their local significance or community value.</p> <p>In order to designate land as Local Green Space, robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the NPPF must be demonstrated. In relation to the designation of LGS the criteria given by the NPPF (paragraph 102) are as follows:</p> <p><i>"The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</i></p> <p><i>(a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i></p> <p><i>(b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and</i></p> <p><i>(c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land."</i></p> <p>In addition to the above, the PPGs also clear that LGS must not undermine the aim of plan making to identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and that blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Having reviewed the Local Green Spaces Report (September 2023) Gladman contend that this does not provide proportionate or robust evidence as required by the PPG to designate such land in several instances. Failure to demonstrate how each designation meets the tests set out in NPPF paragraph 102 is contrary to the requirements of national policy and guidance and is therefore inconsistent with basic condition (a).</p> <p>In particular, Gladman do not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to justify the designation of site LGS28 (Brabazon Way). Based on the Steering Groups own assessment, the proposed LGS only meets one of the five criteria set by NPPF paragraph 102b), that being 'tranquillity'. The assertion, however, that the site is tranquil, is not justified by evidence base documents. The reality is that the proposed LGS is heavily influenced by human activity associated with adjacent residential and commercial development, in addition to the lightly trafficked Brabazon Way. Resultingly, Gladman do not consider it to be a 'tranquil' environment.</p> <p>In light of the above, Gladman do not consider that the proposed designation of LGS28 meets all of the requirements of paragraph 102 of the NPPF and therefore the JMNP2 does not meet basic condition (a). We request that this proposed designation is removed from the plan.</p> <p>In relation to LGS50, this falls within land that Gladman are promoting for residential-led development and its designation as LGS is also not supported. As indicated through our indicative Development Framework Plan<sup>3</sup> these allotments will be maintained and enhanced with the land transferred to the current management company or potentially the Parish Council(s) if requested. This designation is not necessary and Gladman politely request that it is removed from the JMNP2.</p>	<p>LGS28 is considered to meet para 106 (formerly 102) of the NPPF and is therefore retained. LGS 50 is considered to clearly meet para 106 (formerly 102) of the NPPF and is therefore retained.</p>

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	LPC for private landowner re LGS6 at Whitley	Fig 15 (p94)	<p><b>Policy 16 Designating Valued Local Green Spaces</b></p> <p>The policy seeks to designate areas of green land which are suggested to be of importance to the local community as Local Green Space (LGS) in order to provide special protection against development.</p> <p>The NPPF outlines that LGS designations should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li>b. demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li>c. local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed LGS of interest is site reference LGS6 at Whitley as identified on the extract from Figure 15 below. The Local Green Space Designations Draft Evidence Base Report R.14 (September 2023) recognises that the site is within private ownership and considers the NPPF tests outlined above. It says the land is “Used regularly for the local cricket team and matches providing a local community focus, [and] For the local community it also provides natural beauty and a calming natural experience to walkers in the area”.</p> <p>Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 – Figure 15 extract – Local Green Space <b>[p2 of Appendix 6.2.2.11]</b></p>	The detailed information given as landowner has been taken into account and the LGS site is therefore removed.
Version A			<p>The proposed designation of LGS6 is not however considered to fully meet the NPPF policy tests. The land is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves and is accessed via a Public Right of Way (footpath ref. MELW84); however the proposed designation is for an extensive tract of land which is not fully utilised for recreation.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Planning Local Green Spaces guidance produced by Locality examines the tests and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and advises that, “Consideration of whether the green space is local in character and not an extensive tract of land suggests spaces within a locality, rather than, for example, extensive green areas in the countryside around a settlement”. A large part of the land proposed to be designated is open land on the edge of the settlement. Furthermore, the land is within private ownership and therefore the long term use of part of the land as a cricket pitch cannot be guaranteed. The land is leased therefore it is not a secured use of the former agricultural land. The continuing need for the land to be used for recreation is under review because it is understood that other land off Corsham Road may become available for community uses to serve Whitley and Shaw.</p> <p>The removal of LGS6 from the policy 16 would not prevent the future use or enjoyment of the land by the local community. The recreational use of part of the land is protected by existing policies within the development plan, which seek to retain and enhance recreation facilities, and the use of the Public Right of Way can continue in perpetuity. The PPG confirms that “There is no need to designate linear corridors as Local Green Space simply to protect rights of way, which are already protected under other legislation” (Paragraph: 018 Ref ID: 37-018-20140306).</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that site LGS6 be removed from the draft JMNP2 to ensure it complies with the ‘basic conditions’, in particular the requirement to comply with national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. It is suggested that it would be more appropriate to protect the recreation use of the land by identifying the site under draft Policy 15 ‘Community Facilities’ the same as the adjoining Golf Course (as shown on Figure 14b). As said that protection already existing within the development plan.</p>	The detailed information given as landowner has been taken into account and the LGS site is therefore removed.
Version B letter emailed in August	LPC for private landowner re north of Whitley Golf Course	LGS6	The proposed designation of LGS6 is not however considered to fully meet the NPPF policy tests. The land is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves and is accessed via a Public Right of Way (footpath ref. MELW84); however the proposed designation is for an extensive tract of land which is not fully utilised for recreation as clearly shown on the following plan and aerial photograph:-	Representatives of the Steering Group have met with landowners about this LGS. No changes or updates to LGS were included in the draft B. However, in consideration of responses to draft A of the presubmission plan, the LGS is deleted.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B letter emailed in August	LPC for private landowner re north of Whitley Golf Course	LGS6	The Neighbourhood Planning Local Green Spaces guidance produced by Locality examines the tests and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and advises that, "Consideration of whether the green space is local in character and not an extensive tract of land suggests spaces within a locality, rather than, for example, extensive green areas in the countryside around a settlement". A large part of the land proposed to be designated is open land on the edge of the settlement as identified on the map and aerial photograph above. It is therefore clear that that extent of the land proposed to be designated as a Local Green Space does not comply with the relevant policy tests.	
Version B letter emailed in August	LPC for private landowner re north of Whitley Golf Course	LGS6	<p>However, notwithstanding the above, the land is within private ownership and therefore the long term use of part of the land as a cricket pitch cannot be guaranteed. The letter dated 29 July 2024 stated that the land is leased therefore it is not a secured use of the former agricultural land, and the continuing need for the land to be used for recreation was under review because it is understood that other land off Corsham Road may become available for community uses to serve Whitley and Shaw.</p> <p>The owners of the land have however now served notice on the Cricket Club of termination of the lease. It is the intention of the owners to restore the land to its original agricultural use.</p> <p>An application has been submitted to Wiltshire Council for a Lawful Development Certificate which would confirm the lawful use of the land for agriculture without the need to obtain planning permission. A copy of the submitted Supporting Statement is enclosed for information (and the application reference number will be confirmed in due course).</p> <p>It is therefore respectfully requested that site LGS6 be removed from the draft JMNP2.B to ensure the plan complies with the 'basic conditions'. The designation of the land as a Local Green Space would not contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development because the recreational use will soon cease to exist and the land restored to its original agricultural conditions and use.</p>	
Version B Email sent 9 August 2024	for private landowner, Summer Leaze Farm	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 50 (pB98)	<p>I have recently been informed by one of the organisers of the Locking Close Allotment, that this land is being considered as suitable for the local green space designation.</p> <p>We own the land and I was very upset and disappointed to hear the news this way rather than to be contacted directly. It would appear that the only reason that this piece of land has been identified is because it is already being used as an allotment in an agreement that is working perfectly well. The committee pay minimal fee and in turn they get to use the land as allotment. Why does it need to change? It is already serving the community, is not of any historical value or place of significance and is only close to a small section of the community. It has been targeted purely because we have agreed to the allotment, if we had refused the allotment in the first place then his discussion would not be happening. This is not encouraging me or any farmer to consider helping out the community again, if we agree to small projects and on the back of this goodwill the council decide to take the land as green space?</p> <p>Why cost taxpayers money to take into council hands a small piece of land that is being used as an allotment in an agreement that is already working.</p> <p>So yes I strongly object.</p>	<p>In line with guidance on designation of LGS, early contact was made, as well as contact at the Regulation 14 consultation stage.</p> <p>A landowner representative of the three landowners responded to the early contact about the potential designation of the allotments (summer 2023). The representative said he did not support the designation.</p> <p>The space has been put forward by the community as a valued green space that they wish to see protected; the site manager also made a representation to withdraw the site on the basis that there is only a short term lease. As a LGS needs to be capable of enduring beyond the plan period this site will not be progressed beyond Regulation 14 stage.</p>

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Letter emailed on 21 August 2024	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB	Policy 16, p96	Policy 16 proposes including the area of open land to the south west of the Melksham Community Hospital that is in NHS ownership within a larger Local Green Space designation (Reference LGS21, Figure 15). The NHS requires flexibility with regards to the use of its estate to deliver its core objective of enabling excellent patient care and supporting key healthcare strategies such as the NHS Long Term Plan, and also to maximise the potential benefits to the local community from the development of this area of open land where, if taken forward, the Local Green Space designation would prevent built development on the part of the proposed LGS21 that is owned by the NHS. This would conflict with Objective 13 of the Neighbourhood Plan as well as with BSW ICB objectives to maximise use of the existing estate to deliver improved services.	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will be excluded from the area included in LGS21 (as numbered in the pre-submission drafts of the Neighbourhood Plan).
Version B Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposal that the field owned by Whitley Golf Club, and used by Whitley Cricket Club, be designated as a green space. I play for Whitley Cricket Club, which was formerly Golden Fleece Cricket Club. It is a lovely little club that gives members of the community of all ages the opportunity to play cricket, whether that be to give a little competition in their life or to provide them with the social experience they get from the friendly club.</p> <p>As much as I agree with the sentiment that we should protect our green and public areas, the proposal actually threatens the freedom that the community have to this space.</p> <p>The proposal may force the land owner to change the lease on the land to agricultural use, as understandably they don't want to be dictated to as to what they can do with their land. This land is only used for leisure now because the owners were generous to open it up to the public in the first place!</p> <p>It is used as a cricket pitch for Whitley Cricket Club and as a public footpath. The owners have no intention to take this space away from the community and want it to be used for cricket for many years to come, but ironically this may be what happens as a result of your green space proposal.</p> <p>Please withdraw this area from your proposal, the field is already being used for leisure and it's FINE AS IT IS! The cricket club is a big part of our community and we don't want our home taken away from us.</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>I am writing to object to the field that contains Whitley cricket club being designated green space.</p> <p>I understand that this is being proposed with the best of intentions, but it has caused the owner of the field to put in motion proceedings to evict Whitley cricket club, and re designate the land for agricultural use.</p> <p>This is the worst of all worlds!</p> <p>From next year, no amenity field, the probable extinction of Whitley Cricket Club, and bad will from the owner which could accelerate a planning application.</p> <p>If it left as it is, then cricket can be continued to be played for the foreseeable future. If the green space application proceeds, the neighbourhood plan will have the death of WCC on its hands!</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>I wish to object to the proposal for allocation of the Cricket and field - community area, Whitley as a Local Green Space for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current use as cricket field is subject to status of the cricket club, which is currently very good, but long-term stability is not guaranteed;</li> <li>2. As far as I am aware the landowner may wish/need at some point to consider alternative uses for the space, which could be subject to the status of the cricket club;</li> <li>3. The cricket club may wish to seek consent to enhance the pavilion facilities at some point, so any restrictions on building could jeopardise these proposals;</li> <li>4. In general, there should be no action taken on the status of the field that would result in the premature ejection of Whitley Cricket Club from the field, which may be an outcome from the landowner's actions to oppose or block the proposal for LGS6.</li> </ol>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	The changing of this field to either agricultural usage or green space will both mean that the Whitley cricket club will no longer have a ground to play on. With this in mind I would like the field to be left as it is so that Whitley CC are able to continue playing and support the village community	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	I play for Whitley cricket club and want the ground to stay as a green area so that I and future players can continue to enjoy this benefit to the village	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	I want to confirm that I'm against Whitley cc as being a green space. Please take this into consideration as if it becomes a grtspace we will bizarrely lose our club Speak to the club for more information regarding this Ian Mccaughan Chairman Whitley cricket club	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	It has been brought to my attention that you propose to classify Whitley Cricket Club Ground as a green space under your neighbourhood plan. Although I can understand the logic behind this proposal it will, not could, see the owners of the land reclassify it and hence force WCC off the site. Can you please amend your proposal to leave the ground under it's current classification and safe guard the club for the future.	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	It has been brought to my attention that you propose to classify Whitley Cricket Club Ground as a green space under your neighbourhood plan. Although I can understand the logic behind this proposal it will, not could, see the owners of the land reclassify it and hence force WCC off the site. Can you please amend your proposal to leave the ground under it's current classification and safe guard the club for the future.	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	Please do not go ahead with trying to make Whitley cricket ground a green space. We will lose the cricket ground as the farmer who kindly lets us use the ground will return it to agricultural use.	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	I would like to put my views forward on Whitley cricket pitch / field . We do not wish it to be designated as a green space , which some what pigeon holes its use , but would rather it was put back to agricultural land this would actually help to safe guard this area for the future , so it can be used by the local community	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	I am writing this email as a very concerned person who plays for Whitley Cricket club.  I learned of the councils plans to turn the ground into a green space which is supposedly meant to protect the cricket club. However, if this were to go through then the land will be changed to agricultural and we would no longer have anywhere to play.  Whitley golf club have always been so supportive of the club and helped massively to get the pitch to where it is today and want us to play here for the continuous future.  I am asking that you reconsider as we all want this cricket club to stay here for a long time and feel it adds so much to the local community.  This space is fine being left as it is and that way we get to remain to play here.	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>I would like to voice my concerns at the Whitley Cricket pitch being classed as green space.</p> <p>This cricket club holds more of an importance as just a cricket club.</p> <p>It is a club where people of all ages, ability and backgrounds have come together to not only get fit and play but also help mental health and well-being.</p> <p>The club has worked hard through volunteers to improve the facilities at the ground and if this land was deemed green space it could in years destroy all this hard work and cause a number of players to be without a team and without that release for people to get out and talk and enjoy themselves.</p> <p>This would be a travesty and backward step where in society we are trying to improve everyone's mental health (since Covid especially)and encourage everyone to get on.</p> <p>Sport brings everyone together.</p> <p>I hope that when a decision is reached the wider picture will be looked at and not that this is just a cricket club.</p> <p>Without this ground many will be without a team to play for and their lives could be impacted from a social perspective.</p> <p>I appeal to your human nature that you will do what's best for the current facility and continue to promote fitness and wellbeing in the area.</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>Please DO NOT change the status of Whitley cricket ground to "Green Space" as the effect of this will be exactly the opposite of what I think you are trying to achieve and certainly exactly the opposite of what everyone involved with Whitley Cricket Club wants. The effect of the proposal would be to force the owners to revert back to an Agricultural usage as this would be the only way that they could maintain a perfectly reasonable flexibility to do what they want with their own land in future.</p> <p>Land that they have very generously allowed the cricket club to use for the last 10 or so years since their previous ground was lost. There is no intention for it to be anything other than a cricket ground for the foreseeable future but quite sensibly the owners would not want to give up their right to apply for development approval in future as a result of their generosity in providing a home to the cricket club for a period of time. The current informal, community centric, approach has worked well, please follow the common sense adage of "If it ain't broke, don't fix it". There is a very real possibility that the proposal, which feels heavy, and high, handed, will actually kill off the local cricket club to the detriment of the community. Please desist.</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>In order for Whitley Cricket Club to continue to have a ground at which to play, it is vitally important that Whitley Cricket Field is NOT designated a 'Green Space'.</p> <p>I appreciate that this may seem counterintuitive, but if the landowners are forced to return the land to agricultural use to prevent it becoming a Green Space with restrictions on its long-term future use, the Club will lose its home. Whitley Cricket Club is very special to both the local and wider community. It is a place where players and supporters, young and old, from all walks of life, come together to share sport, teamwork, volunteering and camaraderie. It is precisely the type of Club which should be protected and supported, so therefore in order for the Club to be able to continue to play cricket and be such an important part of so many people's lives, the land should not become a designated Green Space.</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.
Version B, Email 22 August 2024	Whitley Cricket Club member	Fig 15 (pB97) and no 6 (pB98)	<p>I am writing to object to the green space proposal for the land that contains Whitley cricket club. This will be counteracted by the land owners re designating the land for agricultural use and will probably be the end of our local village cricket team.</p>	Evidence from the landowners, and community responses have been taken into account. As such this space is not considered to meet the designation criteria and will not be designated as LGS.

**Policy 16 - Local Green Spaces**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf of private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>3.14 It is noted that the allocation of LGS on the site at Dunch Lane has not been carried forward through consultation on the JMNP2. However, the specific requirements of LGSs differ from those of the green wedge designation. Rather than the above identified criteria, the purposes of the policy is to preserve coalescence between settlements and meet objective 15 of the JMNP 2 'Ensuring that new development is sympathetic to our built heritage and the character of the area, with high standards of design.'</p> <p>3.15 Moreover, it should be noted that the site at Dunch Land is agricultural land in private ownership. PRoW MELW92 runs parallel to a short part of the north-eastern boundary but there are no rights of public access to the site which the landowner makes clear through signage and other associated restrictions.</p>	This is not allocated as LGS.

**Policy 17 - Trees and Hedgerows**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 17 and supporting text	<p>We support this policy and hope that the aspiration for 20% tree canopy coverage can be achieved because there are numerous benefits from planting trees including carbon sequestration and more resilience to our changing climate.</p> <p>The last paragraph of Policy 17 could be interpreted a number of ways though. Does it imply 20% coverage over the whole development area or 20% of gardens and streets? Clarification would be prudent. Suggest it needs a “e.g.” be inserted before “in gardens and in streets”, or a comma inserted after “on site”. Improved grammar will make the meaning (and moreover the policy outcomes) clearer.</p> <p>Page 98 – The Importance of Trees info box – bullet point 3 says ‘reenspaces’ instead of ‘greenspaces’.</p>	Policy suggestions accepted.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Natural and Built Environment Chapter heading (p B99)	We would like to see the title of this chapter renamed to ‘ <i>Natural, <del>and</del> Built and Historic Environment</i> ’	Agreed.
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Paragraph 4.17.1	This paragraph refers to a tree planting scheme due to take place in November 2023 which has now passed. Please amend.	Done.
Version A	The Stantonbury Building and Development Company (ref Upside Melksham)	Policy 17 - Ancient and Veteran Trees (p97)	The policy includes unnecessary and unhelpful detail. The buffer required around an ancient or veteran tree will be defined by the extent of the root protection area (and other site factors).	The part of the policy commented upon has not changed since the JMNP1 which has been validated at examination and referendum.
Version A		Policy 17 - New Trees (p97)	The policy refers to 20% tree cover. However additional tree planting may not always be the best approach in meeting requirements such as a biodiversity net gain and therefore there may be conflict in trying to meet these different aims	This policy is a supportive one which the target of 20% encouraged in recognition of variable factors such as BNG.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	Policy 17 - New Trees (p97)	<p>6.28 Amongst other things, Policy 17 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan encourages development proposals to provide 20% tree canopy coverage where possible, in gardens and in streets.</p> <p>6.29 BH is committed to the provision of street trees within their new developments. There are clear benefits associated with the provision of street trees, including helping to create green neighbourhoods, improving air quality, providing shading and mitigating the impact of climate change. Views of street trees from all homes has also been found to be beneficial to the mental health and wellbeing of an area.</p>	Noted.
Version A			6.30 Notwithstanding the above, there appears to be a lack of evidence to justify the quantum of tree canopy provision set out within the Policy. This will need to be provided to ensure that the Plan is founded on robust evidence. Implications, including on highway design, will also need to be fully considered.	Evidence has been gathered to establish current Tree Canopy Coverage in the area and the 20% is based on research and guidance as cited in the JMNP2.



Version A		Policy 17 (p97)	6.31 It is also noted that whilst para. 131 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that new streets are tree lined and opportunities are taken to provide trees elsewhere, including within parks and orchards, no reference is made to the provision of trees within gardens. Indeed, given that trees within gardens will be conveyed with a property, there can be no surety that the future owner of the home will retain trees in the medium to longer-term. To ensure their longevity, the planting of trees should be focused in areas of development sites that are not within the ownership of private individuals.	Noted.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	Policy 17 (p97)	<p>10.1 Pegasus raise objection to the inclusion of the proposed final sentence of this policy;  “Development proposals are encouraged to aim for 20% tree canopy coverage on site where possible – in gardens and in streets.”</p> <p>10.2 The proposed on site 20% tree canopy coverage is considered an unreasonable request for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiltshire Council will have specific street and pavement adoption requirements involving specific off set distances between streetlights and trees</li> <li>• Street trees require ongoing maintenance, their berries and fruits can cause a nuisance to pavement users or householders, their roots can damage pavements and their leaves can block surface water drains.</li> <li>• Trees in the street can affect visibility splays causing safety issues for pedestrians and vehicle users.</li> <li>• There is no guarantee that once dwellings are sold that trees in private gardens will be kept in perpetuity. Mature trees can cause household maintenance issues with leaves affecting guttering and drainage if specimens are not well maintained. If a tree is perceived as a nuisance by a householder it will be removed.</li> <li>• The best BNG can be achieved by using native trees however these trees are not always appropriate for domestic gardens. Ornamental varieties are not the best trees for BNG purposes.</li> <li>• A tree in a domestic garden will substantially reduce space for other uses such as the growing of food, outdoor play by children or the simple enjoyment of a garden as a result of overshadowing.</li> </ul> <p>10.3 The JMNP2 should focus on appropriate tree planting for biodiversity net gain in suitable public open space and amenity area locations on a site rather than seeking a higher tree canopy coverage across a site including in gardens and on streets.</p>	Evidence has been gathered to establish current Tree Canopy Coverage in the area and the 20% is based on research and guidance as cited in the JMNP2. This policy is a supportive one which the target of 20% is encouraged.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	New Trees (p97)	Whilst the policy provides some flexibility for the loss/replacement of some trees, this provision appears to exclude unavoidable loss/damage to trees of good Arboricultural or amenity value. This goes well beyond the provisions of the NPPF which does not make any distinction between the quality or value of trees other than in respect to veteran trees and ancient woodland. National policy is to retain existing trees where possible (NPPF para 131) but unavoidable loss is not precluded. It may not always be possible to avoid losses, for example to achieve appropriate access and associated visibility splays, or to achieve necessary connections through a development site. In this respect, we consider the policy goes beyond national objectives. Notwithstanding the above, Martin Grant Homes does support new tree and hedgerow planting.	The policy references a well established methodology for arriving at agreement on numbers of replacement trees.

Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A &3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	Other existing Trees and Hedgerows (p97)	<p>[what they say about how their site MEL11 will help the green wedge between shaw and whitley - <b>Appendix 6.2.2.66</b>]</p> <p>3.17. In any of these scenarios, the risk of coalescence would be negated by a simple plan to accompany the policy in the JMNP to set out broadly where built form is to be located and where green infrastructure is to be located (as has been done in the case of policy 7.3 for Whitley Farm. This is beneficial in preventing unwanted development on the land, as the remainder of the site would effectively be protected by any alternative (more intensive) development by virtue of the allocation policy.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 18 - Landscape Character**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Opac Ltd on behalf of private landowner of land at Shaw and Whitley	p101-102	The proposed housing allocations at Middle Farm, Whitley would not conform with the aspirations of this policy.	This policy seeks to ensure a sensitive response to landscape and is not site specific.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Towsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 18 (p101 - 102)	Minor modifications are proposed to this draft policy when compared to the JMNP1. The development of the site subject to promotion in this letter [SHELAA 728] would be consistent with draft policy 18's expectations, as has been evidenced in relation to the appeal and recent outline planning application at the site.	This policy is not proposed to be updated in JMNP2 - it remained as in the examined and voted upon a referendum JMNP1. However, following consultation feedback, it is been updated to reflect wider landscape objectives.
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarltan Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 18 (p101 - 102)	Policy 18 sets out how development proposals should respect the landscape character. The policy and supporting evidence however ignore future growth of Melksham and the infrastructure that is likely to be delivered during the plan period.	This policy is not proposed to be updated in JMNP2 - it remained as in the examined and voted upon a referendum JMNP1. However, following consultation feedback, it is been updated to reflect wider landscape objectives.
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A &3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	Fig 4 (p18) and Fig 19 (p108)  [Also put in 'Settlement Boundaries' tab]	We note that development proposals will be expected to respond sensitively to the transition between settlement edge and countryside and maintain the separate identity of settlements. However, this is on conflict with, and undermines, the Local Plan (Reg 19). Specifically, under 'providing new homes' para 2.11 confirms, as an outcome, that 'Development, wherever possible, will have maintained the separate identity of the outlying villages near to the Principal Settlements and Market Towns, Swindon and Bath.' The reason being that sustainable development sometimes does lead to the joining up of main settlements with outlying areas of housing. This is exactly the case south of Melksham, Melksham, Bowerhill and Berryfield are clearly already joined, as demonstrated at Figure 4 of the NP. Further, and do not have separate identifies. Indeed, Figure 19 of the NP clearly characterises much of the Bowerhill and Berryfield areas as the same as Melksham. There is no separate identify of settlement to the south of Melksham, and the settlement boundary should reflect this position.	This policy is not proposed to be updated in JMNP2 - it remained as in the examined and voted upon a referendum JMNP1. However, following consultation feedback, it is been updated to reflect wider landscape objectives.
Version A	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		[narrative on how their site MEL011 would meet this policy in their document at <b>Appendix 6.2.2.30, p14</b> ] Policy 18: Landscape Character 8.1. We support this policy.	This policy is not proposed to be updated in JMNP2 - it remained as in the examined and voted upon a referendum JMNP1. However, following consultation feedback, it is been updated to reflect wider landscape objectives.

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 19 and supporting text	<p>The Green Wedge policy includes extensive areas of land next to defined settlement boundaries and would benefit from review. This is a restrictive policy that could undermine the ability to bring forward appropriate sustainable land uses on the edge of settlements over the plan period. For example, the emerging Local Plan allows for new community facilities (Policy 81) and employment development (Policy 64) adjacent to settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Also, the proposed Green Wedges include land within and next to the Principal Employment Areas at Bowerhill and Hampton Business Park. Core Policy 34 'Additional employment land' of the adopted Core Strategy allows for additional employment land to come forward adjacent to settlement boundaries to help retain or expand businesses. There is currently a shortage of land to meet the needs of local employers and as such these policies could restrict the sustainable expansion of established employment areas. As such there is particular concern about these two areas, which is further questioned by the recent appeal in the Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham area.</p> <p>Figure 17 – Green Wedge 'Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham' area to be amended to reflect the recent appeal decision on 'Land South of Western Way' which grants planning permission on part of this proposed Green Wedge. Also, the Council are not supportive of the designation of the former golf course as part of the Green Wedge or as Local Green Space as it holds a strategic purpose. We recommend and request this site is deleted from the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Figure 17 – Green Wedge 'Melksham and Berryfield' area to be amended to reflect the recent planning permission for PL/2022/08155 of 53 dwellings (Strategic Planning Committee 29/11/23) on part of this proposed Green Wedge.</p>	<p>The Green Wedges are valued for the role they will play in preventing the coalescence of settlements and retaining the distinct identity of settlements. However, it is acknowledged that there is a need for some flexibility in the policy to address local needs. The policy will be updated to be less restrictive.</p> <p>The Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham Green Wedge will be deleted from the Plan due to the appeal decision and the strategic and employment related purposes that part of the site holds for Wiltshire Council.</p> <p>'Melksham and Berryfield' area has been amended to reflect the recent appeal hearing decision on PL/2022/08155 on 30th September 2024.</p>
Version B, August	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p>Also, the proposed Green Wedges include land next to Hampton Business Park Principal Employment Area. Core Policy 34 'Additional employment land' of the adopted Core Strategy allows for additional employment land to come forward adjacent to settlement boundaries to help retain or expand businesses. There is currently a shortage of land to meet the needs of local employers and as such these policies could restrict the sustainable expansion of established employment areas. As such there is particular concern about this area.</p> <p>The Council welcomes and supports the deletion of the Green Wedge 'Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham' as previous concerns were raised due to a recent appeal decision at Land South of Western Way and proposals for strategic purposes at the former golf course site.</p>	<p>The policy has been updated to reflect recent circumstances.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the second iteration of the policy, which attempted to cover local circumstances in which development in a Green Wedge would be acceptable, needs to expand the flexibility for development in a green wedge where benefit outweighs harm.</p>
Version A	Cricket Club private	Fig 17 (p105)	This is not an acknowledge government policy. The green wedge in Whitley / Shaw includes a house.	The Evidence Base document to the policy sets out the planning policy context.
Version A	Opac Ltd on behalf of private landowner	a. (p103) and Fig 17 (p105)	<p>The plan to provide green wedges between settlements is a good one in principle, however the green wedges shown in Figure 17 includes land which it is submitted could be used for a housing allocation at Shaw.</p> <p>Section a. of this policy should more clearly state that it allows for development proposals to be brought forward in these areas, so long as it could be shown that they would not result in settlements merging together.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Should a proposal come forward within the referenced area, the planning application will be decided taking into account the policy criteria that any development proposals within defined green wedges must not (individually or cumulatively) lead to the coalescence of settlements. Therefore any development that demonstrates that this is not the case, will be meeting policy criteria.</p>
Version A	Semington Parish Council	4.19.7 (p 104) and fig 17 (p105) [also included in General comments tab]	<p>This response comes from Semington Parish Council. It is informed by the consideration of your emerging plan by the Semington Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group.</p> <p>The parish Council supports the changes you have made to your neighbourhood plan. Specifically, we welcome the new Policy 19 on Green wedges.</p> <p>One of the priorities for Semington parish council, reflecting the wishes of the whole population, is to ensure that the physical separation of adjacent communities is maintained: specifically, the separation of Semington and Bowerhill and Berryfield. As such, your new policy is highly relevant to Semington as a parish and community, and is, unsurprisingly consistent with the policies within our own emerging neighbourhood plan that are focused on landscape sensitivity.</p>	Support noted.

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email 18 July 2024	Semington Parish Council	4.19.8 (p108)	Semington Parish Council fully supports Policy 19 [Green Wedges] of the updated Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan JMNP. In particular, we welcome paragraph 4.19.8 which establishes the case for a Green Wedge between Berryfield and the northern edge of the Kennet & Avon canal to prevent the coalescence of Melksham and Semington. As this paragraph notes, there has been co-ordinated work between the Semington Neighbourhood Plan and the JMNP and this area of landscape is identified as important in both, and covered through policies. As the Canal is not simply an administrative boundary, but also an important landscape and physical feature of both Melksham Without and Semington, both Neighbourhood Plans aim to protect the highly sensitive and valued landscape around the canal.	Support noted.
Version A	Owner of the land at the golf club in Whitley	policy 19 (p93) [also put in Policy 16]	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the neighbourhood plan. I am the owner of the land at the golf club in Whitley, marked both for a 'green wedge' and as 'green space'. In regards to the area marked for green community space. This land is owned by myself and my brother and has historically been used by my family for agricultural purposes. When the cricket club's previous landlord terminated their lease on the ground they used in Atworth, they asked me whether I would have any land to help them out in regards to relocating. We decided they could use a part of one of our fields for this. I have supported the cricket club and allowed it to remain a facility for the community only charging a nominal rent and maintaining the grounds. Without our support the cricket club arguably would no longer exist.</p> <p>A large part of this field is used for agricultural purposes, and with the threat of the National Grid wanting to take some of our land back, there is the possibility that we will need to use the whole field for agriculture in the future. I strongly object to this field being marked as a green space for the community. It is owned by my family and we should be able to decide how it is used.</p> <p>The potential inclusion of our family land as a green space for the community sends a troubling message to myself and other local landowners. That is, if you champion local facilities and offer private space for this purpose you run the risk of having control of your land removed from you. I find this very concerning and makes me think we may be better off terminating the cricket club's lease now.</p> <p>As you are aware there has recently been a field purchased in Whitley for use for the community which should be designated as a green space for the community as that is what the owner bought it for. This is marked in Purple on the attached map. <b>[Appendix 6.2.2.9]</b></p> <p>I also question the inclusion of some of my land in the green wedge. I am greatly concerned by the inaccuracy of the drawings of the green wedge and the inclusion of a current house within it, this greatly distorts the drawings. The green wedge line should follow the pink line I have added. I respect the thought that the villages of Shaw and Whitley should not be joined, but a more accurate drawing of the green wedge proposal would point to the use of the golf course driveway as a border. Leaving the land to the south of the Golf Club's driveway <b>Marked in Blue</b> in the green wedge. I believe the land <b>Marked in Red</b> should not be included in the green wedge. In a previous plan it was marked as a potential for development. I believe this should be reconsidered as it is a viable and obvious place for future development in Whitley without blurring the boundaries of the village. I ask that any decisions made of this land need to be made by people who have visited the location as the map you have drawn is inaccurate, and I would welcome a site meeting. I would also question why Shaw schools playing fields have not been included in the green wedge? As looking at the aerial map this would seem a lot more logical.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icen Evidence Base Report.</p> <p>This policy is in the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that.</p>
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 19 (p103) , 4.19.6 (p104) and Fig 17 (p105)	The Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment 2023 is the evidence base for the JMNP2 in relation to Green Wedges and includes the western part of the site. The justification for the Green Wedge is to prevent coalescence between Melksham and Berryfield. As has been explained above, the allocation of the site for housing would not result in coalescence as suggested by the Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment 2023, and to continue to suggest so is contrary to both the appeal decision and officers' recommendation and assessment in relation to PL/2022/08155. <b>This objection is also relevant for draft Policy 19 – the site should not be designated as a Green Wedge.</b>	<p>Should a proposal come forward within this defined area (edged black in the representation) the planning application will be decided taking into account the policy criteria that any development proposals within defined green wedges must not (individually or cumulatively) lead to the coalescence of settlements. Therefore any development that demonstrates that this is not the case, will be meeting policy criteria.</p> <p>The evidence base report clearly sets out the value of a policy designating wedges to help promote consistent decision-making.</p>

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A		Policy 19 (p103), Fig 17 (p105)	<p>This is a new policy and represents a significant addition to the neighbourhood plan. The draft policy proposes to designate the western part of the site as a Green Wedge, which would pose a significant barrier to developing the site. Earlier in this letter we have objected to the JMNP2's approach to site allocations, and in doing so have rebutted a criticism levied at the potential development of the site [SHELAA 728] in relation to landscape-impact. In doing so, we have explained why the development would not result in the coalescence of Melksham and Berryfield and have evidenced this using the Council's assessment of the outline planning application concerning the western part of the site, and the Inspector's decision concerning the appeal on the eastern part of the site.</p> <p><b>We object to this policy, Figure 17 of the JMNP2 should be amended to remove the Green Wedge designation affecting the site as per the Figure 3 below, where the area edged black should be removed from the designation. [see page 9 of Appendix 6.2.2.60]</b></p>	<p>Should a proposal come forward within this defined area (edged black in the representation) the planning application will be decided taking into account the policy criteria that any development proposals within defined green wedges must not (individually or cumulatively) lead to the coalescence of settlements. Therefore any development that demonstrates that this is not the case, will be meeting policy criteria.</p> <p>The evidence base report clearly sets out the value of a policy designating wedges to help promote consistent decision-making.</p>
Version A	SF Planning for Land east of Beanacre Road, SHELAA 3405	Policy 19 (p103)	<p>Our client is not against a Green Wedge policy in principle and understands the rationale for introducing green wedges via the neighbourhood plan. However, as the green wedge and green gap study by Icenl and Aecom recognises, the allocations should be proportionate. Our client disagrees with the statement at paragraph 4.19.5 of the draft neighbourhood plan and does not consider any of the allocations (in their current form) to be proportionate. However, they are focusing this submission on their site to the north of Melksham. [see further detail in their document at Appendix 6.2.2.58]</p> <p>2.3 A review of the policy map in section 1 above showing the green wedge allocations makes it clear that the proposed green wedges appear, in the view of our client, to be being used as a way of introducing a quasi 'green belt' to prevent further development around Melksham, even in sustainable locations. This is because such large areas of land in multiple locations have been selected.</p> <p>It cannot be proportionate to have a site capable of accommodating 460 plus houses to be covered entirely with a green wedge to prevent the coalescence of a village with 135 households. Allocating a much smaller area of land in the northernmost part of the site would be proportionate, would serve the intended purpose of the policy, and would prevent the green wedges forming a de-facto green belt as mentioned above. It is noted that the Aecom/Icenl report advised that the areas of land included as green wedges should not be disproportionately extensive.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icenl Evidence Base Report.</p> <p>This policy is in the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that.</p>
Version A		Policy 19 (p103)	<p>The approach to Green Wedges in the neighbourhood plan is disproportionate, resulting in sites being allocated as green wedges which far exceed what is necessary to prevent coalescence. The allocation of the site, in its current form, is disproportionate and therefore inappropriate. It is our client's view that allocation as a green wedge is unnecessary but, without prejudice to that argument if it is considered necessary then a much smaller area is required in order to achieve the aims of designating green wedge areas.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icenl Evidence Base Report.</p>
Version A	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525	Policy 19 (p103)	<p>The Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Group have sought to allocate Green Wedges in order to prevent development in the area and the alleged coalescence of villages. All of the wedges sit adjacent to the settlement boundary of the settlements within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>2.23 There is no evidence that these Green Wedges are necessary, or that they would safeguard a landscape of high and irreplaceable quality. They should be removed from the Plan.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icenl Evidence Base Report.</p>
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART	4.19.2 and 4.19.3 (p103)	<p>There is no justification for the introduction of a policy which, by intent, seeks to frustrate sustainable development opportunities from coming forward. This is clearly apparent from NP paragraphs 4.19.2 and 4.19.3. Sustainable development opportunities have come forward around the settlement of Melksham, either through the plan led approach or development management approach, as a consequence of a housing land supply shortfall. All proposals are judged under the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF. Seeking to add layers of policy designation to frustrate further opportunities for sustainable development, to help meet identified needs is contrary to the NPPF and to the basic conditions with respect to sustainable development.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icenl Evidence Base Report. This is in the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that.</p>

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	Fig 19 (p108)	<p>Further, we note the statement, at NP para 4.19.4, that:            “Green Wedges can help prevent (further) erosion of local character and identity that can happen. The protection of certain areas of countryside outside settlement boundaries as green wedges can help prevent (further) erosion of local character and identity arising from ‘coalescence’ or the merging together of places that were once separate.”</p> <p>However, a green wedge is proposed to the south of Melksham, which has already merged and which has no particular local character, being of the same character as many parts of Melksham as confirmed at Figure 19 of the NP. It is non-sensical for the Green Wedge Study (page 73) to form the view that the A350 defines the southern edge of Melksham. It did in the past, but no longer does. Clearly, there is development extending southwards from Melksham, beyond the A350, both to the east and west of Semington Road.</p> <p>Further the Green Wedge, as proposed is not entirely free from residential development, and why focus on residential development when the policy is orientated towards seeking to retain open character. There is a significant amount of development, existing and proposed, in this purported green wedge.</p> <p>The Local Plan provides no support for the introduction of a ‘green wedge’ policy, either as a separate policy or as part of the Policy 17, neither does the NPPF.</p> <p>It is relevant that the Wiltshire Local Plan Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal (Table 5.18) finds no major adverse effects with respect to development south of the town including land adjacent to Berryfield. This is a relevant factor for the NNP, under the basic conditions.</p>	<p>The evidence base report for this policy sets out a discussion on coalescence between settlement areas to the south of the Plan area. It also sets the policy context.</p> <p>The evidence base report clearly sets out the value of a policy designating wedges to help promote consistent decision-making with regard to the issue of coalescence.</p>
Version A		Priority Statement 3 (p115)	It is further relevant, in any event that the NP references the Melksham Canal Link Project which, whilst we say should be deleted, would not maintain open character, would lead to the loss of trees and hedgerows, and would introduce significant urbanising effects.	Noted. The Canal Link project will be decided against the adopted Local Development Plan policies.
Version B email, August	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		<p><b>Policy 19 ‘Green Wedges’</b></p> <p>2.16 There is no justification for introducing a policy that intentionally seeks to prevent sustainable development opportunities from emerging. This intent is clearly evident in NP paragraphs 4.19.2 and 4.19.3. Sustainable development opportunities have arisen around the settlement of Melksham as demonstrated earlier, either through a plan-led approach or a development management approach, due to a shortfall in housing land supply. All proposals are evaluated under the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as outlined in the NPPF. The attempt to impose additional layers of policy designation to hinder further sustainable development opportunities, which are necessary to meet identified needs, is contrary to the NPPF and the basic conditions related to sustainable development.</p>	These issues are discussed in the supporting evidence base document that underpins the policy.
Version B email, August	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		<p>2.17 Further, we note the statement, at NP para 4.19.4, that:            “Green Wedges can help prevent (further) erosion of local character and identity that can happen. The protection of certain areas of countryside outside settlement boundaries as green wedges can help prevent (further) erosion of local character and identity arising from ‘coalescence’ or the merging together of places that were once separate.”</p>	Noted.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B email, August	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.18 However, a green wedge is proposed to the south of Melksham known at 'Melksham and Berryfield' within Figure 17 of the JMNP2. The designated area, which has already merged, and which has no particular local character, being of the same character as many parts of Melksham. It is non-sensical for the Green Wedge Study (page 73) to form the view that the A350 defines the southern edge of Melksham. It did in the past, but no longer does. Clearly, there is development extending southwards from Melksham, beyond the A350, both to the east and west of Semington Road.	This area is assessed as meeting the criteria in the supporting evidence base document that underpins the policy.
Version B email, August	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.19 It is significant that the policy terms relate to 'wedge' although the modification statement references a desire to prevent coalescence. Clearly there is no gap, it is an area of undeveloped land, albeit with policy proposals to develop it, within an urban context. There is no longer any support in national policy for the approach of introducing restrictive policies to prevent otherwise sustainable development. Further, the Local Plan provides no support for the introduction of a 'green wedge' policy, either as a separate policy or as part of the Policy 17.	These issues are discussed in the supporting evidence base document that underpins the policy.
Version B email, August	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105A & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.20 It is relevant that the Wiltshire Local Plan Reg 19 Sustainability Appraisal (Table 5.18) finds no major adverse effects with respect to development south of the town including land adjacent to Berryfield. This is a relevant factor for the NP, under the basic conditions.	The policy is amended to ensure greater flexibility to deliver necessary social, economic or environmental benefits.



**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes, representing land west of Semington Road and South of A350		<p>Bellway's land interest in Melksham is designated in the draft JNMP as part of a 'Green Wedge' under draft Policy 19. The purpose of the Green Wedge designations is to "prevent the coalescence of villages/towns, and to protect local character and identity" (para 4.19.1). Bellway's land interest forms part of the proposed 'Melksham and Berryfield Green Wedge'. Bellway objects to draft Policy 19 in its current form for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>The 'Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment' (March 2023), prepared by AECOM and Icen Projects to underpin draft Policy 19, states that "many Neighbourhood Plans that designate green wedges do so in a context where there are already restrictive policies at a higher level, such as Green Belt, AONBS, or green gaps/wedges in the Local Plan" (para. 3.62). Bellway's site is not within Green Belt, nor an AONB, and neither the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy or the Pre-Submission Draft of the Local Plan Review include a policy or any supporting text on green wedges. The Local Plan should confirm the strategic context for Green Wedges (if a need exists) alongside the need for major growth at Principal settlements. Neighbourhood Plans cannot set constraints that would impede proper strategic planning of a settlement via the ongoing Local Plan Review. The Local Plan needs to be fully Examined and found to be sound prior to the JMNP considering the need or otherwise for such designations.</p> <p>The 'Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment' also confirms that the extent of separation between Melksham and Berryfield has already been reduced. There has been considerable change to the south of Melksham, with new development having taken place to the east and west of the A350, as well as approved development to the south of the A350. This has changed the area's context which is now integrated with and forms part of the wider Melksham. The identity and character of Berryfield can be preserved through a smaller green buffer to the south of Bellway's site, retaining visual links to the west whilst still enabling the canal link project, as identified on the illustrative site layout included at Appendix 2.</p> <p>In its assessment of the proposed Melksham and Berryfield green wedge, the 'Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment' states that the southern edge of Melksham is defined by the A350. This is incorrect, as development has been approved (allowed by appeal ref. 3285428) to the south of the A350, integrating Melksham with the wider rural landscape to the south. Further, the 'green wedge character' is described in the Assessment as promoting a sense of openness due to the limited built form. However, a number of large agricultural buildings are present within the site. The evidence must be reviewed to ensure it is accurate and fairly assesses the need for the establishment of proposed Green Wedges once the direction of strategic growth is clear.</p> <p>Moreover, as set out above, Bellway's site provides a unique opportunity to enable the delivery of the Melksham Canal Link and contribute to the restoration of the Wilts and Berks canal – a key priority for Wiltshire and Melksham. The draft JMNP completely overlooks this. Given the reliance on developer contributions to deliver the canal link, designating the site as a green wedge would result in the project being undeliverable. The JMNP must recognise that policy aspirations cannot be pursued in isolation, designating Bellway's site as a Green Wedge would be contrary to strategic policies in the local development plan and would fail to contribute to sustainable development in Melksham.</p> <p>The 'Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment' concludes that "after Regulation 14 consultation, the policy should be amended if necessary, based on the representations received by consultees (or for any other reason deemed appropriate)" (para. 5.6). Bellway objects to draft Policy 19 in its current form. The proposed Green Wedges must be reviewed in light of these representations and Bellway's land removed. As drafted, the draft Policy fails to meet the basis conditions tests of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development, and general conformity with strategic policies in the local development plan. The JMNP cannot set constraints that would impede strategic planning ahead of the Local Plan Review being Examined and adopted.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icen Evidence Base Report. This is in the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that.</p>

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Savills on behalf of Hallam Land Management (HLM), 10.81 hectares of land to the south of Western Way, SHELAA 1025 - 210 houses & care home		<p>2.11. Our response to the proposed designation of the Land South of Western Way as a Green Wedge as part of Policy 19, and the supporting evidence, is set out in the Appeal Statement prepared for the recent appeal (Appendix 4).</p> <p>2.12. This Appeal Statement was prepared by FPCR and specifically addressed 'Green Wedge' matters including those raised as part of the draft NDP.</p> <p>2.13. Overall, that Appeal Statement, for the appeal which the Inspector ultimately allowed, stated that, for the proposed Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham Green Wedge, there are not clear gaps between the settlements, instead these settlements are already joined. At Melksham and Berryfield, recent development has taken place (or been granted consent) along Semington Road, which physically connects Melksham and Berryfield.</p> <p>2.14. The Statement also confirms that the proposed Green Wedge in this location is not a gap because it does not separate Melksham from other distinct settlements, as coalescence has already taken place; and it is not a wedge because it does not open out into the wider countryside. The proposed area is already contained on all sides significantly by development.</p> <p>2.15. Overall, the Statement concludes that there is no justification for a Green Wedge policy covering the area of land identified at Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham, and the Land South of Western Way plays a minimal role in the understanding of the separate settlement identities. Furthermore, development of the site would make no difference to how the two settlements are currently experienced.</p> <p>2.16. We urge the Steering Group to review the Appeal Statement attached at Appendix 4, particularly in the context that the site has now been allowed on appeal (Appendix 3) and that outline planning permission exists for the site. The site should therefore be removed entirely from the Green Wedge designation under Policy 19.</p>	Due to recent appeal decisions and Wiltshire Council uses for the site, the Berryfield, Bowerhill and Melksham Green Wedge (location 7) will be deleted from this policy.
Version A	LPC for for private landowner re LGS6 at Whitley		<p><b>Policy 19 Green Wedges</b></p> <p>The broad objective of the policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements is supported, however the extent of the Green Wedges is considered to be excessive, and the policy wording is overly restrictive. The large parcels of land between the settlements within the neighbourhood plan area would unnecessarily prevent the careful natural expansion of settlements. The policy wording is also not positively framed and would restrict any form of development which may result in loss of opportunities to provide development that support and benefit the local communities in the future. A policy identifying a green buffer between settlements is considered to be more appropriate rather than the entire land between settlements. As such, while the broad objective is supported in principle, the current policy and areas proposed for designation is opposed. The reason for the objection is discussed further below and without prejudice to this position certain amendments are recommended.</p> <p>The Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment (March 2023) by AECOM acknowledges that there is no statutory or Government definition of 'green gap' or 'green wedge' within the planning system or planning policy guidance to consider and assess such designations. The methodology used in the report is recognised (i.e. settlement character, green wedge character, and planning considerations), however it is considered that characteristics of the land owned by [private landowner] and its ability to contribute toward the future growth and objectives of the plan have not been adequately considered.</p>	The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icen Evidence Base Report. This is in the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that.

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A			<p>Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment Figure 9: Recommended green wedge between Whitley and Shaw [page 4 of Appendix 6.2.2.11]</p> <p>The area of interest is location 1; the land between Whitley and Shaw. The Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment outlines that the green wedge, as identified on the map above, is found to provide physical and perceptual separation between the two villages and is therefore recommended for designation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The land within the green boundary includes an existing residential property and an area of land previously considered to be suitable for development. The Site Assessment Report (September 2018) by AECOM, produced as part of the evidence base for the original Plan, states that the site identified in red on the map below "is relatively unconstrained, with no significant landscape or biodiversity designations. The site is also located outside of the boundary of any flood risk zones, has good access, and is close to local public transport links into Melksham town centre. As such the site is considered as appropriate for taking forward for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan". The site was not taken forward due to the availability of other sites for development and allocation within the Plan, however the land continues to be available for residential development and would represent a natural extension to the village with space for a green buffer to the south.</p> <p>Residential Property within proposed Green Wedge area Site Assessment Report (September 2018) by AECOM Site 13: Land east of Corsham Road (opposite First Lane) [ page 5 of <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/12dBG2SH1FccSF6ur2yvtQ7scikWlj3k/view?usp=sharing">https://drive.google.com/file/d/12dBG2SH1FccSF6ur2yvtQ7scikWlj3k/view?usp=sharing</a> ] The area of land in question is also a single field that is physically well related to the existing built up area of the village and is well contained from a landscape and visual perspective. It is therefore recommended that the boundary of the proposed Green Wedge be amended to exclude the land or amended to ensure the land can contribute towards the natural rounding off of the village in the future as shown in blue on the plan below:- [ page 6 of <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/12dBG2SH1FccSF6ur2yvtQ7scikWlj3k/view?usp=sharing">https://drive.google.com/file/d/12dBG2SH1FccSF6ur2yvtQ7scikWlj3k/view?usp=sharing</a> ]</p> <p>Suggested Modification to Proposed Green Wedge Boundary It suggested that the proposed modification to the proposed Green Wedge boundary would again ensure the draft JMNP2 complies with the 'basic conditions' and be compliant with national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>The Identified areas of Green Wedges are included on the basis on the Aecom / Icen Evidence Base Report. Whitley and Shaw are, in physical terms, two separate villages. The potential green wedge would act to retain the rural setting of each village and their respective identities. The clear edge to each village and intervening field boundaries provide physical features along which the boundary of the green wedge can be drawn.</p> <p>The Green Wedge policy is set within the context of sustainable, plan-led development which is being tackled by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan review processes and allocations for housing and employment land as part of that within the current plan period.</p>
Version A, Email February 1 2024	Gompels, Sasha A'Court		<p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan 2 identifies a number of green wedge areas to support the separate identity of the town and adjoining villages.</p> <p>The extent of the Berryfield and Semington green wedge is of concern due to its proximity to the Hampton Park Industrial Estate. There are a number of large local employers located within the Hampton Park and Bowerhill Industrial Estates who are desperate for room to expand to secure their growth, the jobs of their employees, and provide additional local employment.</p> <p>The area to the south of the Hampton Park Estate and Air Ambulance Base would be an ideal location for the expansion of the Industrial area of Melksham. The green wedge would prohibit this and further constrain the options of local businesses looking for room to expand.</p> <p>A reduced green wedge area, possibly following the track to Newtown Farm, would leave sufficient space for the expansion of the industrial estates and in turn protect jobs and provide additional local employment opportunities, but still protect the distinct identities of Melksham and Semington.</p>	<p>This concern is understood and shared by the Town and Parish Council. A revised policy will seek to address this.</p>

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, Email June 28 2024	Gompels, Sasha A'Court	19REV	<p>Gompels Healthcare Ltd welcome the revised Policy19REV: Green Wedges.</p> <p>The previous version, combined with Policy 10, failed to recognise the desperate need for significant new employment sites in Melksham to accommodate the needs of Melksham's largest employers.</p> <p>The recognition of the difficult circumstances Melksham's largest employers find themselves in is hugely welcome. The revised policy will ensure Melksham stands the best chance of retaining its large employers, giving them more potential options to expand locally, rather than having to look for options outside of the Town and even County.</p>	Support noted.
Phase A Email submission - 20 February	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm	4.19.7	<p>I understand that you have agreed [private landowners] (Our clients) can make late reps on the above, as they did not receive notification of the draft Plan and it potentially affects land they own.</p> <p>Our clients particularly object to draft Policy 19: Green Wedges: Together with the southern part of the plan that accompanies it:</p> <p>Their land is adversely affected by the southern most of the designations above. Paragraph 4.19.7 is the paragraph in the draft Plan troubles them:</p> <p>Whilst our clients accept that 'Bowerhill and the village of Semington in the Parish to the south exhibit distinct characters'. They do not accept that 'the land between them' ... 'is considered to provide the function of a Green Wedge'. That land includes some of our clients land, part of which forms the your southernmost Green Wedge in the draft Plan. The 'open land' referred to in the draft plan, which 'prevents coalescence' includes our clients' land to the north of the Kennet &amp; Avon Canal, the Canal &amp; its tow path and land to the south going up to the Semington built-up area.</p> <p>As you will know, Semington Parish Council has also been working on its Neighbourhood Plan, and a Reg 14 draft is now out to consultation 1st February – 15th March. Its draft Plan takes a slightly different approach, designating a large tract of land north of Semington, as an 'Area of High Landscape Sensitivity to protect' [Map2: Overall Development Approach]</p>	Noted. The cross boundary work and overlapping objectives are highlighted in both plans and will be examined as such.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Phase A Email submission - 20 February	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm		<p>Draft Policy SEM 6: relates to Green Blue Infrastructure and Nature Recovery. This provides various protections for the corridor of the Avon and Kennet Canal. Draft Policy SEM 7 relates to Protecting Semington's Actively Rural Landscape</p> <p>This policy seeks to maintain the open character of the Area of High Landscape Sensitivity</p> <p>Assessment</p> <p>Between the two draft neighbour plans, they introduce policies to protect the canal itself, the land to the south north of Semington for landscape reasons and land to the north of the canal as a Green Wedge, which includes our clients' land.</p> <p>Whilst our client does not object to a policy protecting the canal corridor, as this in itself provides a physical barrier to Bowerhill and Semington coalescing, they do object to all of the open land shown in the Green Wedge to the south of Melksham being approved within Policy 19. They believe the Parish Councils should have a joint study of this area, and only protect the most sensitive areas. Whilst our clients may be prepared to accept some of their land in a Green Wedge designation, they believe Melksham's and Semington's policies, looked at as a whole, are overkill and need to be refined. In their current form, they are not considered to meet the Basic Conditions as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations.</p> <p>Specifically it is not considered that the following Basic conditions are complied with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Have regard to national policies and advice, such as the National Planning Policy Framework;</li> <li>* Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;</li> <li>* Be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area (Wiltshire Core Strategy and our other development plan documents).</li> </ul> <p>Our clients are likely to make similar representations on Semington Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted. The cross boundary work and overlapping objectives are highlighted in both plans and will be examined as such.
Phase A, Email to Semington Parish Council - Feb 20 2024	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm - EMAIL TO SEMINGTON PARISH COUNCIL, copied to JMNP2		<p>Dear Parish Clerk</p> <p>Please see reps I have sent today regarding a green wedge proposal to the north of the Kennet &amp; Avon Canal in the draft Melksham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Reference is also made to your policy SEM 7 in your draft Neighbourhood Plan currently out to consultation.</p> <p>As you can see our clients consider the two parish councils do not seem to have a coordinated approach to inhibiting the coalescence of Semington and Bowerhill, and we believe between the two plans it is overkill.</p> <p>We would be grateful if could also treat this email as an objection to your current draft neighbourhood plan for the reasons stated.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Phase A, Email to Semington Parish Council - Feb 21 2024, following a request from Semington for clarification	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm - EMAIL TO SEMINGTON PARISH COUNCIL, copied to JMNP3		<p>Dear all</p> <p>You are correct that our objection primarily concerns Melksham's designation of part of our client's land as Green Wedge. However, when you have two neighbouring parishes preparing neighbourhood plans at approximately the same time, it is important for each examiner to be aware of each of the plans' proposals, particularly where they have similar aims. I believe each of the NPGs also need to be aware of each of the plan's proposals, so there is not 'overkill'.</p> <p>Whilst Melksham's Green Wedge policy to the south of the town is very clear in what it is trying to achieve – stopping the coalescence of Bowerhill and Semington, your proposed very large area High Landscape Sensitivity (HLS) shown in Map 10 between Semington and the Canal, virtually abuts Melksham's Green Wedge.</p> <p>Your plan in paragraph 6.30 mentions that 'the areas of HLS provide strong sense of separation between the settlement boundary and the parish boundary with Melksham' and 'It is strategically important to retain the fields either side of the High Street to (inter alia); 'To maintain the separation of the settlement of Semington from the parish boundary with Melksham Area'</p> <p>So, whilst your Parish does not call your policy a Green Wedge policy, like Melksham, they both share a similar same aim of preventing coalescence.</p> <p>The point I wish the Examiners of both plans to consider is that, with so much land either side of the canal being proposed as buffers to stop coalescence, is this large amount of land actually required to achieve this aim, and particularly on the Melksham side of the canal we believe their Green Wedge could be rolled back, so our client's land is less adversely affected, whilst still having coalescence prevented.</p> <p>I still request my email, of yesterday, together with this clarification email, is put in front of your examiner. I am also copying this email to Melksham.</p>	Noted.
Version B Email submission - August 7 2024	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm	4.19.7 (P107)	<p>Firstly, we note paragraph 4.19.7 has been added in Draft B:</p> <p>As a result, the seventh possible Green Wedge, which was assessed as a candidate in your Green Gap and Wedge Study has had to be removed from Draft B, which to some extent undermines the Council's Green Wege ideas in the south..</p> <p>Land south of Western Way has a planning reference PL/2022/08504 and was allowed on appeal in November 2023 because the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. As a result, important development plan policies including a policy 6 in the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan (July 2021) which restricts development to within settlement boundaries was found to be out of date along with Wiltshire Core Strategy policies. The Inspector found that in respect of 5YHLS the position was somewhere between 3.9 and 4.6 years, so a 5 years supply could not be demonstrated. The Inspector favoured increase housing supply over out of date restrictive planning policies.</p> <p>It would appear that the NP2B is acknowledging this decision, and rightly removing this proposed green wedge site. It would appear that the Town Council in its JMNP2 policies continue to restrict development to within the settlement boundary and allocated sites (POLICY 6) and additionally are adding this truncated Green Wedge policy. The seventh green wedge has now been omitted. Housing Land supply in Wiltshire is still not strong. Whilst the presumption in favour of development now cites 4 year supply, as being the key determinant rather than five, we now have a new government that is committed to actually delivering 300,000 homes per year, is proposing to bring back mandatory housing targets for councils and whose primary goal is to boost economic growth, through amongst other things house building. It is very likely Wiltshire Council (as well as other plan making bodies) will come under further pressure in the near future to improve housing delivery, as this government seeks to implement its election commitments to reform the planning system.</p>	A green wedge was removed due to permission for housing being granted on the majority of the wedge area.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm	Policy 19REV (p106)	Secondly, we also note that the following paragraph has been inserted into the Draft B of the policy: [Policy 19REV final para (p106)]  Whilst our client welcomes this change, it does somewhat weaken the Council's stance on the importance of the green wedges. It also begs the question, why should there only be exceptional circumstance for sustainable employment land, why not other sustainable and priority uses like housing. This is particularly so in the light of the new government's economic growth agenda, which takes in both employment and housing.	The policy was amended to take account of feedback from the first Regulation 14 consultation. The aim is ensure the policy is not overly restrictive. Further amends are made to the submission policy in line with this objective.
Version B	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm	4.19.8 (p108)	A further additional paragraph include in the commentary to Policy 19 is as follows: [4.19.8 (p108)]  The comments made in our original representation below are still relevant here. We accept that there could be a Green wedge along the canal corridor, which could take in part of our client's site. There could be something similar on the south side of the Canal in Semington. However, what we have in the two draft neighbourhood plans is two very different approaches – a landscape approach in Semington, which takes in large tracts of land, whereas Melksham has its Green Wedge approach, which seems rather random and does not appear to create a coherent buffer along the canal corridor to prevent coalescence between the two settlements. Whilst the above paragraph says 'co-ordinated' work has taken place between the two Councils, this is not apparent in the two vastly different approaches taken. Perhaps one consultant would be best looking at this with a consistent approach to creating a modestly sized buffer on both sides of the Canal to prevent to possible feared coalesce.  We would also suggest that perhaps one examiner should be appointed to determine these two neighbourhood plans which are running to relatively similar timetables and could do with a more consistent and coordinated approach, particularly to the buffer centred on the Canal.	Independent examiners will be selected and appointed by Wiltshire Council with input from the qualifying bodies. Both Plans acknowledge the other. The examiner will undertake the examination in line with the regulations that govern the process.
Version B	Cliff Lane on behalf of private landowner of Snarlton Farm		Finally, can we please ask that as this neighbourhood plan progresses, consideration should be given to the Deputy Prime Minister's Ministerial Statement on 30th July and the draft revised NPPF launched that day for consultation. These are significant new material considerations. Matters in these documents affect your evidence base, particularly the reintroduction of mandatory housing targets, the reintroduction of SYHLS targets instead of 4 year and the bringing back of 5% buffers in supply. All of these changes will increase the housing supply needs of Wiltshire, which will have to be delivered by neighbourhood plans and Councils own emerging local plan. If these targets are not met, we again could see a rash of speculative planning applications because of lack of supply. Better the plan-led system takes account of these significant changes in government guidance	As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a> ) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."  Further allocations to meet increased housing need may be considered in future reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		2.1 We wish to raise very serious concerns about proposed Policy 19: Green Wedges. 2.2 We are not convinced by the evidence which underpins the Green Wedges, and the policy is therefore not robustly justified. Nor has there been any direct consultation or correspondence on the matter with the landowners. 2.3 The "Green Wedge" of greatest concern to our clients is that which covers his land and is described as "Berryfield and Semington." The "wedge" contains built form, and includes several alternative boundaries and edges, therefore its entire scale is not clearly justified, nor is it necessary. Moreover, there are alternative, more positive approaches to the imposition of a buffer, including accessible green space which could be delivered alongside development at the edge of Melksham, and improvements such as better accessibility, longer-range foot and cycle paths, biodiversity, and landscape and environmental enhancements.	The objection to the inclusion of this area is noted. It is however retained on the basis of the evidence base that underpins this policy.  These issues are discussed in the supporting evidence base document that underpins the policy.  The policy itself has been updated to ensure sufficient flexibility.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		Reviewing what is recorded in the Green Wedge evidence for the JMNDP; the character is defined, but no special qualities, which are necessary to protect, are identified. All that can be read is a review of the current character,	Noted.

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		2.5 The characteristics listed above – the influences of built form, and the glimpse views in particular – provide the potential for additional built development alongside appropriate landscaping, they do not necessarily require the imposition of “Green Wedges.” None of the characteristic are so sensitive that they could not be retained and accommodated alongside some further development. It is also very telling that in the assessment there is no mention of the air ambulance station, and only a passing reference to Outmarsh farmyard, both of which are significant built form in the proposed Green Wedge at Location 5: Berryfield and Semington.	The objection to the inclusion of this area is noted. It is however retained on the basis of the evidence base that underpins this policy.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		2.6 The suggested justification for retaining a Green Wedge at location 5: Berryfield and Semington, appears to rest on an assessment that Bowerhill and Semington exhibit distinct characters, and that the existing land between them is open and prevents their coalescence.	Noted.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		2.8 Therefore, we are very concerned that the “Green Wedges” in general, and specifically at Location 5: Berryfield and Semington are an attempt at creating Green Belt. This is something that is a strategic matter, and only acceptable through Local Plans where there are exceptional circumstances (see NPPF paragraph 144). We also note that it is reported in Appendix A of the Green Wedge assessment that “the emerging [Wiltshire] Local Plan will not contain such a strategic designation.”	These issues are discussed in the supporting evidence base document that underpins the policy.  The policy itself has been updated to ensure sufficient flexibility.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		2.9 The cumulative effect of the Green Wedges alongside the proposed Local Green Spaces (Policy 16/Figure 15), has the potential to conflict with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which warns against trying to create a local level Green Belt through a neighbourhood development plan. Should the Green Wedge remain in the JMNDP at the next stage of consultation, we will consider this matter in greater detail. For the Parish Council’s reference, the PPG – which refers to Local Green Space, but the highlighted point is relevant to the proposed Green Wedges too – is as follows:	The policy is amended to ensure greater flexibility to deliver necessary social, economic or environmental benefits.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		4.11 We would like to highlight to the Parish Council that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states: “It is important to minimise any conflicts between policies in the neighbourhood plan and those in the emerging local plan, including housing supply policies. This is because Section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the document to become part of the development plan.”  (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509) 4.12 It follows that an emerging Neighbourhood Plan must be consistent with the content of an emerging Local Plan and must not introduce unnecessary restrictive policies that could constrain the ability of a future district wide Local Plan to meet its objectives. Our particular concern are the Green Wedges that are being considered, and that these types of ‘gap’ policies ought to be a strategic decision, based on the needs of the district and a balance of those needs and meeting them in a sustainable way.	The policy is amended to ensure greater flexibility to deliver necessary social, economic or environmental benefits.
Version B Email 13 August 2024	Canal and River Trust, Jane Hennell	19REV	The Trust welcome the explanation for the boundary for the proposed Berryfield and Semington Wedge and it is noted that joint working between the adjacent neighbourhood plan areas will result in a larger wedge than highlighted here. To aid clarity, and link between the various sections of the plan, additional detail explaining the green wedge in relation to the proposed canal link would be helpful. The Green wedge should be shown to have no adverse impact on any future restoration of the canal, either using the original or revised route.	The policy is amended to ensure greater flexibility to deliver necessary social, economic or environmental benefits.



**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email 15 August 2024	private landowner of hangars at Lancaster Road, Bowerhill	19REV	<p>I am writing as the owner of the 8 old hangars at Lancaster road , Bowerhill which you have included as a Non designated heritage asset .</p> <p>My point is in relation to the old 9 hole golf course ( to the West of the site ) which I fully support being a green space as having been unused for many years has created a wildlife haven and an attractive walking area with several paths through it which are used by many walkers .</p> <p>This was part of the recreation facility for the old Christie Miller Sports centre and has in my mind historical relevance for protection so I fully support the land being included as part of your green spaces .</p> <p>When Wiltshire Council were trying to sell the Christie Miller site and old golf course my offer showed keeping the golf course site as it was and just to re vamp the old Sports Centre .</p>	Noted.
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>The broad objective of the policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements is supported, however the extent of the Green Wedges is considered to be excessive, and the policy wording is overly restrictive. The large parcels of land between the settlements within the neighbourhood plan area would unnecessarily prevent the careful natural expansion of settlements. The policy wording is also not positively framed and would restrict any form of development which may result in loss of opportunities to provide development that support and benefit the local communities in the future. A policy identifying a green buffer between settlements is considered to be more appropriate rather than the entire land between settlements. As such, while the broad objective is supported in principle, the current policy and areas proposed for designation is opposed. The reason for the objection is discussed further below and without prejudice to this position certain amendments are recommended.</p>	Noted. The policy has been updated to be more positive and flexible across all possible development scenarios.
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>The Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment (March 2023) by AECOM acknowledges that there is no statutory or Government definition of 'green gap' or 'green wedge' within the planning system or planning policy guidance to consider and assess such designations. The methodology used in the report is recognised (i.e. settlement character, green wedge character, and planning considerations), however it is considered that characteristics of the land at Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road, Melksham and its ability to contribute toward the future growth and objectives of the plan have not been adequately considered.</p>	It will be the examiner to conclude whether the evidence base is adequate for this policy.
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>The area of interest is location 3; the land between Melksham and Beanacre. The Green Gap and Green Wedge Assessment outlines that the green wedge, as identified on the map above, is found to provide physical and perceptual separation between Beanacre and Melksham and it is therefore recommended for designation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>The land within the green boundary includes an existing SHELAA site (ref 3405). The Site Assessment Report (June 2023) by AECOM states the site is not suitable for development, however this is at odds with the evidence base produced by Wiltshire Council as part of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. The evidence paper 'Planning for Melksham' (September 2023) details that the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary, and while developing the site would have potential heritage and landscape impacts, "the site is large and development may be able to mitigate such impacts".</p> <p>The site was considered in further detail as part of the Sustainability Appraisal which considered the allocation of strategic housing and employment sites to meet future level of need up to 2038, and whilst the Council currently considers there are other more sustainable sites available, the land presents an opportunity to deliver a sensitive development that meets future needs, mitigates any adverse impacts, and delivers long lasting social and environmental benefits.</p> <p>The land, as identified in red on the plan below, is available for residential development and would represent a natural extension to the settlement with space for a green buffer to the north.</p>	Noted.
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>The area of land in question is an open agricultural field which presents an opportunity to deliver an appropriate quantum of development for the site alongside delivering structural landscaping around the periphery of the land to improve the existing transition between the built environment and open countryside. The Green Wedge could be located further north, as proposed on the maps below, to ensure it serves its purpose, and also contribute towards the protection of the setting of the Grade II Listed Beechfield House.</p>	Noted.
Version B PDF	LPC for private landowner re Halfway Farm, Beanacre Road		<p>Draft Policy 19 'Green Wedges' outlines that in exceptional circumstances employment uses on land within green wedges will be supported provided it can be demonstrated there is not suitable alternative land within Melksham or Bowerhill or outside the defined green wedges. It is considered that this exception should also be extended to residential development in order to ensure that sufficient land is available to meet future housing needs.</p> <p>It is suggested that the proposed modification to the proposed Green Wedge policy and boundary would ensure the draft JMNP2B complies with the 'basic conditions' and be compliant with national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.</p>	The policy has been updated to be more flexible across all possible development scenarios.

Policy 19 - Green Wedges

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>[More detail in their document at <a href="#">Appendix 6.2.2.1</a>]</p> <p>5.1 Our Representations set out above are focused on the approach to Green Wedges Policy 19 REV within the JMNP 2, in the context of land north of Dunch Lane, Melksham.</p> <p>5.2 For reasons explained within these representations there are significant concerns that the approach to Green Wedge policy amounts to a blanket restriction on residential development. Such an approach is inconsistent with national policy and has no sound basis in local Development Plan policy.</p> <p>5.3 As explained, WCS Core Policy 51 already addresses the key objectives of Policy 19REV: Green Wedges, in requiring proposals to demonstrate and assess the impacts on the landscape, in considering the coalescence of a proposal. The purpose of the JMNP2 policy is therefore unclear and it is questionable if this is policy is required in addition to the existing protection afforded by the WCS.</p> <p>5.4 Built development within areas of land between settlements does not by default amount to coalescence, as the separate identity of settlements is not defined only by the physical proximity between one settlement and another. Policy REV19 fails to recognise or acknowledge this.</p> <p>5.5 Whilst the previous planning application at this site was eventually withdrawn, it is explained within these representations that a development scheme was and is possible which preserves the setting of both listed buildings and maintains the clear separation of Melksham with Beanacre.</p> <p>5.6 On the basis of the supporting evidence, the JMNP 2's assessment of this site fails to consider how a suitable scheme may come forward within the objective and intent of Policy 19REV. The evidence base fails to consider this context and simply seeks to justify the restriction of development in Green Wedge areas without regard to wider strategic considerations. There is no grading of the associated site sensitivities across the wider study area to understand which locations are more or less likely to have a detrimental impact on settlement identity and coalescence, and the policy fails to consider the scope to deliver development, applying a blanket approach to all areas identified in the Green Wedge or Green Gap.</p> <p>5.7 Policy 19REV as currently drafted seeks to provide a basis on which to resist residential development, whilst adopting a more flexible approach for employment proposals. The reasons for this are not adequately explained.</p> <p>5.8 The policy as written should afford flexibility for all development proposals on Green Wedge Sites, such as that anticipated for the exception of employment uses. However, should a Green Wedge site be capable of delivering employment uses, no rationale is demonstrated as to why this should only be limited to this use.</p>	The policy has been updated to be more flexible. It adds local detail to Core Policy 51
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group for Waddeton Park re 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		3.1. We support the proposed change to this policy to make clear the purpose of the Green Wedges rather than prescribing specific design criteria (e.g. retention of all hedgerows, avoidance of lighting etc.) as previously proposed.	Noted.

**Policy 19 - Green Wedges**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		The evidence base supporting Policy 19 remains not robust or credible and should not be relied upon. It is contrary to the clear expectation of the PPG 41-040 that evidence should be robust. The JMNP2 Version B includes updated policy-wording and an updated figure that depicts the Green Wedges, the updated figure removes the Berryfield, Bowerhill, and Melksham Green Wedge. As the Policy still proposes to designate the western part of the site as a Green Wedge and is not supported by a credible evidence base, our objection remains.	Noted.

## Policy 20 - Locally Distinctive, High Quality Design

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning		<p>Policy 20 on design references the new adopted Melksham Design Guide and Codes (AECOM, 2023), which together with this neighbourhood plan will comprehensively at this level assist developers and provide a tool in consultation on design matters in consideration at a site-specific level, and which the broad wording in the Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 and its update in the draft Local Plan will sit alongside.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.20.6 – it is suggested that the reference to NPPF paragraph 125 is amended to refer instead to NPPF paragraph 127. Plan is not referring to latest version of NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.20.7 – paragraph refers to 2021 NPPF update when the latest update is 2023. Suggest this is corrected.</p>	Agreed.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728	Policy 20, para 2 (p106)	<p>This draft policy has been modified to require developments to be ‘informed’ by the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023). Whilst the development of the site subject to promotion in this letter [SHELAA 728] would be capable of meeting this draft policy, including being informed by the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023), we object to the current drafting of the policy as it is ambiguous. Specifically, the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023) is overly prescriptive meaning a decision-maker could interpret ‘inform’ in a manner that resists any development that does not strictly follow the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023). This would place an overly restrictive burden on future development, to the detriment of innovation. Further, the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023) should be updated to reflect the recent resolution to grant outline planning permission on the western part of the site and the planning permission at the western part of the site.</p> <p><b>We object to draft Policy 20; it should be amended to place less weight on the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes (2023).</b></p>	Policy 20 on design references the new adopted Melksham Design Guide and Codes (AECOM, 2023), which together with this neighbourhood plan will comprehensively at this level assist developers and provide a tool in consultation on design matters in consideration at a site-specific level, and which the broad wording in the Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 and its update in the draft Local Plan will sit alongside.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310	Policy 20, para 2 (p106)	<p>6.32 Policy 20 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan sets out how locally distinctive and high-quality design will be delivered in Melksham. The design principles set out within the emerging Policy are, in the main, largely unobjectionable.</p> <p>6.33 Notwithstanding the above, we note that the emerging Policy refers to the National Design Guide, Wiltshire Council design policy, and the Melksham Design Guideline and Codes. These documents are all guidance documents that are material to the consideration of a planning application, but do not constitute development plan documents for the purpose of Section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. However, by making reference to these documents, the Policy inadvertently gives development plan effect to them. Reference to these documents should therefore be removed from the Policy and only included within the Policy’s supporting text.</p>	The policy is deliverable through application of the evidence base which includes the Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes.
Version A	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd representing	Policy 20, para 2 (p106)	<p>11.1 Pegasus note reference to the AECOM Melksham Design Code and Guidelines (2023) in Policy 20.</p> <p>11.2 The AECOM report provides a review of the existing built form of Melksham and guidance on design principles for new development coming forward in the neighbourhood area.</p>	Noted.

Version A	SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House	Policy 12 (p83)	<p>11.3 P.83 DC.03 Green and blue infrastructure and eco-design and Figure 151 suggests that no new build homes should be on the gas grid by 2025 at the latest, however the Government is no longer wedded to this target with Rishi Sunak extending the deadline until 2035 in a speech made on Wednesday 20th September 2023<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>11.4 There is also no requirement in building regs for new build dwellings to provide solar battery storage or air source heat pumps. Figure 151 should be amended accordingly.</p>	Figure 151 in the Design Code and Guidelines reflects a policy position in time. As policy positions frequently change, the information in the document is a snapshot in time and still reflects local aspirations to move away from fossil fuels.
Version A			<p>11.5 The aspiration of the AECOM Design Code and Guidelines (2023) is that it should be adopted as the Design guide for Melksham, however it should not be so overly prescriptive that it prevents the use of future innovative materials and design solutions for new residential development, nor should it go beyond national policy in the National Design Guide (2021)<sup>5</sup> or the adopted policies of the development plan.</p> <p>11.6 Moreover, design codes that are too onerous risk affecting the viability of schemes, especially on brownfield sites, and will prejudice the delivery of identified housing targets for Melksham up to 2038.</p>	The Melksham Design Guidelines and Codes has been drafted to support locally specific, and climate responsive design. Development proposals need to take the document into account, and the LPA will take it into account, as supporting material to the JMNP when reaching a decision on a specific planning application.

## Policy 21 - Local Heritage

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Wiltshire Council Strategic Planning	Policy 21 and supporting text	<p>Policy 21 should also include below-ground archaeological sites in the considerations that need to be addressed by a planning application.</p> <p>An extra sub-section should be added to Policy 21 (section e?). This would state that any planning application must not only consider heritage issues but show that they have been fully taken into account via a heritage statement and that archaeological surveys of a particular site may be required prior to the determination of an application.</p>	Policy suggestions accepted.
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		<p>Minor amendments have been made to this draft policy in the JMNP2, to which we have no comment. We can confirm that the development of the site subject to promotion in this letter [SHELAA 728] would be consistent with this policy.</p>	Noted.





**Priority Statement 2 - Levels of Growth and Infrastructure**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	PS2 (p114)	Priority Statement 2 expresses concern about recently permitted development and insufficient infrastructure provision. However, all major permitted development is accompanied by conditions and legal agreements to secure infrastructure that is necessary, reasonably and fairly related to the development. It is unclear what the Council's seek to achieve in writing this unwarranted concern into the NP.	The concern is not considered 'unwarranted' by the Steering Group.

**Priority Statement 3 - Wilts and Berks Canal Restoration**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B, (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	PS3 (p115)	Priority Statement 3 references a scheme that simply is undeliverable, being unsuitable (noting outstanding EA objections to a historic application), unviable, noting a lack of funding, and undeliverable, noting no support from the landowners.	It is included as a locally important and live planning application
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for Martin Grant Homes and landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.14 Whilst it is noted that the area is affected by the route of the Melksham Canal Link this is clearly undeliverable due to landownership constraints, notwithstanding the outdated baseline evidence, old ecological surveys and holding objections from statutory consultees – none of which has been resolved since the submission in 2021, or updated in recent years such that recent requirements are met, for example in respect to EIA development. Further, it provides an indication of the acceptability, in principle, of development in this area – the canal project would further introduce significant elements of urbanising infrastructure across the land. The landowners and Martin Grant Homes have objected to the live planning application on site for the canal link.	It is included as a locally important and live planning application
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for Martin Grant Homes and landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.15 It is inappropriate to continue to protect this route within this plan period for a canal link. In any event the route is currently safeguarded by the Wiltshire Plan, and it is unnecessary and inappropriate to repeat the safeguarding in the neighbourhood plan. This is another example as to why the review neighbourhood plan is premature.	It is included as a locally important and live planning application
Version B email, August	Tor&Co for Martin Grant Homes and landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		2.21 It is further relevant, in any event that the NP references the Melksham Canal Link Project which, whilst we say should be deleted, would not maintain open character, would lead to the loss of trees and hedgerows, and would introduce significant urbanising effects.	It is included as a locally important and live planning application

Version A	Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes, representing land west of Semington Road and South of A350	p86	<p>Melksham Canal Link Project</p> <p>Bellway supports the draft JMNP’s recognition of the Melksham Canal Link Project (page 86) which will provide significant economic, environmental and social benefits to Melksham. The proposed route for the new Melksham link of the Wilts and Berks Canal runs through Bellway’s site and would be safeguarded in any future development.</p> <p>The restoration and new Melksham link of the Wilts and Berks Canal is a key priority for Wiltshire Council. The adopted Core Policy supports the project, and Core Policy 16 safeguards the proposed route. The Local Plan Review Pre-Submission draft provides further support, recognising that the canal “can bring significant benefits in term of attracting visitors to Wiltshire, contributing to the local economy, promoting sustainable transport through the provision of walking and cycling routes and provided an important element of the strategic green and blue infrastructure network” (para. 5.202).</p> <p>The ‘Infrastructure Delivery Plan’ published as part of the Regulation 19 evidence base for the Local Plan Review states that the Melksham Link Project will cost £39m and is to be funded by developer contributions and grant funding. However, the extent of grant funding is unclear. The Wilts and Berks Canal Trust website states that the prospect of a lottery grant is unlikely, and the focus is now on enabling development. As such, its delivery relies on the development of sites west of Melksham, including Bellway’s land west of Semington Road.</p> <p>However, the draft JMNP does not provide a coherent plan and strategy for how the Melksham Canal Link will be delivered and overlooks the need for developer contributions, and therefore development of sites including Bellway’s land interest, to ensure its delivery. Policy aspirations such as this cannot be pursued in isolation, and therefore the plan fails to meet the basic condition test of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.</p>	<p>This is not a policy, but is instead a statement of local priority. As such it is not subject to examination to consider if the Basic Conditions are met.</p>
-----------	---	-----	--	--

**Priority Statement 4 - Progressing the Town Centre Master Plan Area Regeneration**

Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response

**Priority Statement - General Comments**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson - duplicate comment)	PS1 (p113)	<p>However, it is unclear as to the purpose, relevance or direction of these statements. It is unclear as to how they might meet the basic conditions, in supporting sustainable development, or complying with the local plan. For example, Priority Statement 1 highlights the importance of the Melksham by-pass and confirms that the Council's will support efforts to progress its delivery, but in the very same sentence states that:</p> <p>"Support for the progression of the project does not assume the support of both the Town council and/or the Parish Council will be given to any final proposed scheme."</p> <p>It is unclear as to what this might mean, and could be interpreted that the Council's will encourage spending of public money on progressing a scheme that they will ultimately not support.</p> <p>Martin Grant Homes, and the landowners of land to the north of Berryfield, suggest that all of the priority statements are deleted from the NP.</p>	The statements cover locally important issues considered to be outside the scope of the Plan.

## Final Comments

Source	Name	Comment	Response
Version A	Bloor Homes	Given their interests within Melksham, BH are pleased to see the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Part 2 proceed to the Regulation 14 stage. Indeed, the Steering Group should be commended for bringing forward a second Neighbourhood Plan, just over two years after the first Neighbourhood Plan was made. This will ensure that Melksham benefits from an up-to-date and locally specific development plan document that will reflect local aspirations on the type, design, location and mix of new development within the area. However, whilst BH are supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group's commitment to progressing their second Neighbourhood Plan, they draw attention to a number of areas that they believe require further consideration to ensure that the emerging Plan satisfies the basic conditions. We provide these comments in a constructive manner, with a view to continuing the collaborative approach to policy and proposal formation. The representations are made to assist the Steering Group move forward with the Neighbourhood Plan at pace.	Noted
Version A	Historic England	Otherwise, we congratulate your community on maintaining its enthusiasm and commitment to its Neighbourhood Plan and the willingness to review and update it. On the assumption that our advice above can be successfully accommodated we wish your community well in the making of its next generation Plan.	Noted
Version A	Lichfields on behalf of Bellway Homes, representing land west of Semington Road and South of A350 [also put in basic conditions]	The JMNP as currently drafted does not meet the basic conditions required by the Regulations. Firstly, the preparation of the JMNP is premature given the ongoing Wiltshire Council Local Plan Review process. In order to ensure the Plan conforms with strategic policies in the local development plan, it must follow the Examination and adoption of the Local Plan Review once decisions on strategic growth have been confirmed. Further, the JMNP fails to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development with regards the Melksham Canal Link project. It fails to provide a coherent plan or strategy for the delivery of this key infrastructure, and completely overlooks the reliance on developer contributions to ensure delivery. Finally, draft Policy 19 requires amendments to ensure the JMNP does not set constraints that would impede the strategic planning of Melksham via the ongoing Local Plan Review process.	Noted.

## Basic Conditions

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Does the Plan have regard to National Policies?</b></p> <p>4.2 The plan has had a degree of regard to National Policies but it does not deliver the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. There are serious questions surrounding the deliverability of the main housing allocation proposed in the plan, which have not been addressed and therefore this Basic Condition is not complied with.</p>	Refer to the Basic Conditions statement - and answers to other points in this spreadsheet.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Does the Plan have special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses?</b></p> <p>4.3 The plan has a degree of regard to preserving listed buildings, although the absence of detail within the Policy test for allocated site 7.1, could result in an impact on listed buildings within the vicinity. In this respect this Basic Condition is not complied with.</p>	Refer to the Basic Conditions statement
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Does the Plan have special regard for the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area?</b></p> <p>4.4 The plan has regard to listed buildings but does not consider the wider impact of development outside the Conservation Area having an external influence on proposed sites. In this respect this Basic Condition is not complied with.</p>	Refer to the Basic Conditions statement
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Is Sustainable Development achieved?</b></p> <p>4.5 No, this Plan would not result in sustainable development. It will not deliver sufficient housing. Housing that is allocated in Melksham is in high flood-risk areas, National Policy directs development to outside of flood risk areas.</p>	Refer to the Basic Conditions statement

## Basic Conditions

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Is the Plan in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority?</b></p> <p>4.6 For the reasons set out in these Representations there are fundamental problems with the Regulation 19 consultation draft of the Local Plan in terms of Legal Compliance and Soundness. In particular the Plan falls far short of what is required to be delivered to meet the minimum Local Housing Need for the County. This translates to a shortfall in the housing provision in Melksham. As a consequence this Neighbourhood Plan is at risk of either failing this Basic Condition or becoming out of date immediately upon being made in terms of the housing allocated. This is a situation that the Parish Council can easily avoid by delaying the production of the Neighbourhood Plan until after the Examination of the Local Plan so that the correct housing requirement can be planned for.</p> <p>4.7 Furthermore the proposed allocation of the Cooper Tire site appears to contradict the policy objective in the Local Plan that seeks to protect existing employment sites. This contradiction needs to be resolved in order to comply with this Basic Condition.</p>	<p>Percieved issues with the Local Plan noted as well as housing numbers allocated by the JMNP2. As set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing." Point responded to at other points in this document. The detail of the allocation of Cooper Tires is covered through the neighbourhood plan and supporting material.</p>
Version B PDF emailed in August	Neame Sutton for Catesby Estates re Land at Snarlton Farm SHELAA 3525 (Version B)		<p><b>Other basic conditions</b></p> <p>4.8 On the information provided to date, other basic conditions are met.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		<p>5.3 The JMNDP Steering Group, and ultimately the Town and Parish Councils, should review its policies to ensure they meet the Basic Conditions, and with particular reference to policy 19 (but potentially also 16, 17 and 18), and be sure that the evidence which underpins them is robust, and justified and that the proposed polices follow the recommendations contained in that evidence.</p>	<p>Refer to the Basic Conditions statement</p>



**Basic Conditions**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		<p>NPPF 14</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan cannot benefit from paragraph 14 of the NPPF given its failure to make allocations to meet its identified need. However, the current uncertainty as to the housing need figure underscores further why paragraph 14 would have to be disapplied, as the JMNP2 would not have assessed its identified housing requirement on a correct basis and would not contain policies and allocations to meet the correctly identified housing requirement.</p> <p>With this mind, all work on the JMNP2 should now be paused until after the new NPPF is published, to not do so would mean the draft plan would breach the basic conditions (a), (d) and (e).</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in response to the <a href="#">Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation</a> on 19 December 2023 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The current consultation on the NPPF is just that - consultation only at this stage. Therefore the Neighbourhood Plan, at this advanced stage continues to be prepared with regard to the current version of the revised NPPF (19th December 2023). We would also add, as set out in Planning Guidance Neighbourhood Planning Guidance (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2</a>) the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body, and "Housing requirement figures for neighbourhood plan areas are not binding as neighbourhood planning groups are not required to plan for housing."</p>

Site Options and Assessment 2023 Report (AECOM)

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic representing land west of Semington Road (behind Townsend Farm) SHELAA 728		The Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan Site Options and Assessment 2023, AECOM June 2023 (the SOA)... As per Figure 1, the SOA scores the site as an amber. It is important to note that the SOA only considered the western part of the site for allocation, the eastern part was discounted as it benefits from outline planning permission. <b>We object to only the western part of the site being considered; the existence of planning permission should not preclude allocation, which provides greater long-term certainty in the plan-led system. When considering the JMNP2, the site should be considered as a whole.</b> They have listed a number of challenges to the AECOM Site Options report about their site - in their document (redacted) <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T9HR9gNgV6PyCMpzC62SLNL6w1VJd0Gp/view?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T9HR9gNgV6PyCMpzC62SLNL6w1VJd0Gp/view?usp=drive_link</a> for details.	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version A			We object to the SOA finding the site as 'potentially suitable', as had been evidence, the site should be considered 'suitable'. The JMNP2 should allocate the site for residential development.	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite		The technical work which has been prepared on behalf of BH demonstrates that SHELAA site 3310 is suitable for residential development. The Steering Group's assessment work regarding the site should therefore be reconsidered in light of this. This will result in a more favourable assessment of the site.	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version A	George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		7.4 Land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, has been considered within the Neighbourhood Plan's Site Options and Assessment report. The Steering Group's assessment work has formed the conclusion that this site is unsuitable for development. As set out above, in some cases, the Steering Group's assessment work conflicts with the assessment work prepared on behalf of BH. A summary of their concerns is provided below.	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version A	Bloor Homes South West - concerning Land north of the A3102, or land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3743		<b>[They have challenged what the site assessment says -see full document for details: <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EnLLVYGuomeipUBiaqEQxXuNlinghVi/view?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EnLLVYGuomeipUBiaqEQxXuNlinghVi/view?usp=drive_link</a></b>  7.4 Land to the north of the A3102 has been considered within the Neighbourhood Plan's Site Options and Assessment report. The Steering Group's assessment work has formed the conclusion that part of this site is unsuitable for development. As set out above, in some cases, this conflicts with the assessment work prepared by Wiltshire Council as part of the Local Plan Review and BH own technical work. A summary of their concerns is provided below.	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version A	Pegasus for private landowner representing SHELAA 1027 land rear of Savernake Avenue & SHELAA 715 Woodrow House		<b>[The developers have listed what their comments are on p18 and 19 of this document: <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xcctu-t1FfcN67MA--PB0-DyhgAxK5M/view?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xcctu-t1FfcN67MA--PB0-DyhgAxK5M/view?usp=drive_link</a></b>	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.

Site Options and Assessment 2023 Report (AECOM)

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B Email	Blue Fox on behalf of private landowner re land north of Dunch Lane		<p>3.10 The Site Options and Assessment 2023 completed by Aecom, considers all the sites submitted for consideration in the preparation of the JMNP2. The assessment erroneously sets out that the development of the site at Dunch Lane would lead to the coalescence of the two distinct settlements and diminish the rural character of the Beanacre. It also notes that the site contains woodlands subject of a Tree Preservation Order and Priority Habitats.</p> <p>3.11 The Aecom assessment also focuses on the site constraints and restrictions, rather than the site characteristics and opportunities as a whole. The JMNP2 goes on to apply these constraints and restrictions in their entirety, to rule out the site as a suitable location, rather than considering the development potential in accordance with the identified characteristics of the site which are set out in the Aecom assessment.</p> <p>3.12 On these assumptions, the site was subsequently considered unsuitable for development and was not carried forward for further consideration as part of the assessment and preparation of the draft JMNP2. We do not agree with the approach taken in the site options assessment to only critically assesses the site without considering the appropriate characteristics. It is considered that the site at Dunch Lane is capable of delivering a sustainable development scheme with appropriate mitigation and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p>	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.
Version B PDF emailed August	Carter Jonas for private landowner re Land South of Melksham		<p><b>3.0 LAND PARCELS 1003, 1004 AND 1019</b></p> <p>3.1 First, we would like to refer to the Wiltshire Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), published in 2017, which covers the three land parcels 1003, 1004 and 1019.</p> <p>3.2 In the SHELAA the sites are assessed as suitable, available, achievable, and deliverable for residential development. The land is suggested to have a cumulative housing capacity of over 1,000 units. This is despite the assessment recognising the existence of “Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land” on site.</p> <p>3.3 The SHELAA also notes the need to manage the setting of nearby heritage assets, and the potential to support the improvement of the Melksham Canal link.</p> <p>3.4 The Melksham Site Options and Assessment (June 2023), however, comes to some contradictory conclusions. The differences are however, not explained, and neither are they supported by our clients.</p> <p>[1003 - Land to South of Berryfield (Area 1) Outmarsh Farm, 1004 - Land South of Hampton Park, 1019 - Land to South of Berryfield (Area 7) Outmarsh Farm are all detailed in this (redacted) document: <a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wekkc2CejaEhLgQHsZGRYcpYmJx3fa-H/view?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wekkc2CejaEhLgQHsZGRYcpYmJx3fa-H/view?usp=drive_link</a> , p5-7]</p>	The Site Assessment report was undertaken independently by AECOM as part of a Locality Technical Support Package. Refer to the Site Allocations Topic Paper for more details of how sites were assessed and selected.

## Site Allocations Topic Paper

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		2.10. Critically, the text makes it evident that the JMNP2 team has liaised with the Middle Farm promoter to redesign the allocation in response to the concerns raised by the LPA and objectors. The promoters have (quite rightly) been given the opportunity to work positively with policy makers to find design solutions to concerns and promote sustainable development, rather than simply writing off a development opportunity. The same thing has seemingly happened at Whitley Farm where the design parameters on the allocation plan and the planning application submission requirements have been made more onerous.	Pegasus has been afforded two formal opportunities to engage in JMNP2 process. Consideration of Folly Lane is set out in the Sites Topic Paper. JMNP2 decision on allocation is for matters of principle relating to maintaining distinction and separation between Shaw and Whitley. It is not a matter of phasing.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		2.11. The fact our client was not afforded the same opportunity is unjust. This is particularly so given that we made clear that owing to the large size of the site we would be happy to discuss with the JMNP2 team where development might come forward or how it could be phased.	See above.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Visual Impact</b> 2.13. The Middle Farm allocation has been made smaller and more efficient with the aim of reducing visual impact, which is welcomed, however this is to the detriment of the provision of a more substantial area of public open space which has now been lost. Design strategies for Folly Lane have been presented which would reduce visual impact but whilst offering unparalleled benefits in terms of the significant extent of public amenity and wildlife space which could be created.	Allocation reserves 1 hectare (c33%) of green space.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Heritage</b> 2.14. The notion that any heritage impacts at Middle Farm B are mitigated by the existing allocation of Middle Farm A is unsatisfactory. A robust assessment of the proposals at Middle Farm (as a whole) and Folly Lane would need to be undertaken should one wish to draw comparisons between the two, and support the assertions of the Topic Paper that the heritage impacts of Middle Farm are 'less direct' than at Folly Lane.	Allocation requires scheme to assess and address heritage impact. Similar impacts on listed heritage as noted in supporting evidence. Not an issue of principle to weigh in favour of Folly Lane
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Accessibility</b> 2.15. Whilst Middle Farm B can make use of the access proposed for Middle Farm A, we are unclear what degree of technical work has been undertaken to date to demonstrate deliverability. Regardless, that does not prohibit suitable access being achieved for Folly Farm and we have submitted work undertaken to this effect. The comments also chose to ignore the information contained within our earlier Vision Document which showed how the existing public right of way network could be enhanced and extended to offer excellent walking and cycling opportunities between the settlements and for recreational purposes.	Points about Folly Lane noted.
Version B PDF emailed in August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<b>Coalescence</b> 2.16. We dispute the assertion that the allocation of Folly Lane would result in the direct coalescence of Shaw and Whitley. The design proposals set out and explained the ways in which the area(s) of housing at the site could be developed and we would expect that design parameters would be put in place with an allocation to manage this accordingly.	Points about Folly Lane noted.

Site Allocations Topic Paper

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		<b>Site Allocations Topic Paper</b> A number of concerns were raised regarding the evidence base document, including: (1) incorrectly summarising the Local Plan Review's site selection process at Melksham, by excluding the assessment against the settlement's Place Shaping Priorities; (2) incorrectly stating that one allocation is proposed at Melksham in the Local Plan Review; (3) reliance upon the Neighbourhood Plan's Site Options and Assessment Report, which is considered to be flawed. The assessment incorrectly concluded that a number of sites at the settlement, including allocations in the Local Plan Review, were unsuitable for residential development; (4) the reliance on the Neighbourhood Plan's Site Options and Assessment Report, rather than the Council's SHELAA to identify reasonably available sites within the sequential test will have resulted in fewer sites being considered through that process than should have been included; (5) as a site that is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the Cooper Tires site should have been excluded at the second assessment stage; (6) consequently, the Neighbourhood Plan's requirement could have been met in sequentially more preferable sites; (7) the residential capacities identified for the Cooper Tires site and the former Melksham library are over inflated; (8) many of the evidence base documents referred to in order to justify the Cooper Tires site are not publicly available to review; (9) given the conclusions of the viability assessment, many of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives that the mixed use development of the Cooper Tires site are considered to help achieve will not be realised; (10) the Neighbourhood Plan's viability conclusions regarding the Cooper Tires site have not been properly reflected in the evidence base document; and (11) the Sustainability Appraisal compression assessment score for the Cooper Tires site is overinflated.	Topic Paper Updated. There is reference to sites. JMNP2 has had regard to both AECOM assessment and SHELAA assessments. This is clearly stated in the Topic Paper. The site is located within FZ1,2 and 3. JMNP2 is not obligated to meet its entire 'requirement'. JMNP2 has selected the most sustainable brownfield and greenfield sites based on JMNP2 and WLP assessment. Capacities are based upon sites capacity analysis presented in evidence base. Allocation policies provide flexibility for detailed proposals capacity. The allocation commits to 100 dwellings in plan period. It does not specify the amount or mix. The evidence base documents include the viability assessment.
Version B - Bloor 1 and 3	Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)  AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)		7.3 Despite BH's concerns relating to the Site Options and Assessment report, which provided vastly different conclusions to the assessment work presented in the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan for SHELAA sites 3478, 3479, 3742 and 3743, no review or addendum has been undertaken. BH's concerns with the analysis presented for sites 3478, 3479, 3742 and 3743 within the Site Options and Assessment Report is set out in paras. 7.4 to 7.14 of their December 2023 representation, which is provided at Appendix 3. As their concerns about this assessment work have not been addressed, it follows that their concerns remain.  7.4 As is demonstrated below, rather than addressing these deficiencies, it appears that a greater reliance is placed on the assessment work in other new evidence base documents, such as the Site Allocation Topic Paper, further compounding the issue. These issues, and other concerns are set out in turn below.  7.5 As set out above, these comments are made with the intention of assisting the Steering Group to move forward with the Neighbourhood Plan with alacrity.	Concerns noted. The examiner can resolve if Cooper Tires is not sequentially sustainable as brownfield site.

## Viability Evidence

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		<p>VIABILITY</p> <p>7.20 It is noted that a viability assessment has not been provided with the Regulation 14 version of the Plan. Given the previously developed land strategy being proposed by the Steering Group at Melksham, this will be an essential element of the Plan’s evidence base. It will need to demonstrate that the proposed allocations are developable propositions, having regard to anticipated developer</p> <p>16 See table 13 in the Planning for Melksham background paper.</p> <p>17 Table 15.</p> <p>contributions and other costs resulting from policy requirements. As the proposed allocations are likely to come forward in the context of the emerging Local Plan Review, a consideration of the policy obligations contained within that Plan, together with any additional policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, and any infrastructure requirements and abnormal costs, should be considered.</p> <p>7.21 Without such evidence, surety cannot be provided that the proposed allocations, which are previously developed sites, will come forward and contribute to meeting the Neighbourhood Plan housing apportionment for Melksham. The Plan may also, in the context of para. 16(b) of the NPPF, be considered to be overly aspirational, at the expense of being a deliverable proposition.</p> <p>7.22 We note that the need for a viability assessment is specifically referred to in the PPG as being a requirement when neighbourhood plans propose to allocate sites for development<sup>18</sup>. The absence of one therefore risks non-conformity with basic condition (a).</p>	A Viability Assessment has been prepared and had been shared as the Plan is progressed.
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p>5.33 It is only when a standalone residential scheme is assessed, which could not deliver the community benefits that are sought by the redevelopment of the site and which formed key considerations in the evidence base work underpinning the emerging Plan, could a viable proposition result. Even then, for a number of the development options tested, only a marginal level of viability would result.</p> <p>5.34 As stated in Section 7, the viability appraisals were undertaken with inputs which favour the development proceeding. For instance: (1) BH consider that the area of the site that is assumed to be available for residential development is over inflated; (2) given the policy objectives in the emerging Local and Neighbourhood Plans, build costs are likely to be higher; and (3) no allowance for planning obligations has been made.</p> <p>5.35 Given the conclusions provided in the Neighbourhood Plan’s own evidence, it is considered that the development proposed at the Cooper Tires site as set out in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan is not a deliverable proposition.</p> <p>5.36 We therefore question whether the statement provided at para. 4.8.6 of the emerging Plan is correct. It currently states:</p> <p>“...assessment of greenfield and brownfield led site allocation options through Strategic Environmental Assessment and sustainability and viability assessments of the potential allocations confirmed that JMNP2 sites represent the most sustainable and a deliverable approach.”</p>	As amended and included in the submission version of the Plan, the allocation of Cooper Tires is considered to be deliverable.

## Viability Evidence

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B PDF, August	Pegasus Group on behalf of Waddeton Park Ltd, representing 'Land north of Folly Lane and south of First Lane, Shaw & Whitley' (MEL11)		<p><b>Viability</b></p> <p>2.25. A March 2024 Viability Report has been produced by Bailey Venning which assesses some of the new/alterd allocations including Whitley Farm. It is not apparent that the same exercise has been undertaken for Middle Farm. We assert that all proposed allocations should be subject to viability review to ensure deliverability, particularly in the case of Middle Farm where plot A has been allocated but remains undeveloped after a number of years.</p> <p>2.26. Similarly, it would be wholly reasonable to viability test other suitable/potentially suitable proposed sites such as Folly Lane.</p>	Proportionate evidence for JMNP2 have been undertaken and therefore Viability Assessments were undertaken on the brownfield and previously developed land site allocations, and not on green field site allocations. Deliverability of Middle Farm is addressed in the allocations topic paper.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment - New Addendum Version B**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
--------	------	---	---------	----------



Strategic Environmental Assessment - New Addendum Version B

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Bloor Homes South West – land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA site 3310		<p>STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>7.11 The assessment of options for accommodating development at Melksham assesses two options only; entirely on previously developed land, or entirely on greenfield land. Such an assessment lacks the necessary granularity of site specific considerations, which include matters relating to the viability of a proposal and its deliverability/developability.</p> <p>7.12 Indeed, it is instructive to note that the Site Options and Assessment Report identifies an adequate quantum of housing land on previously developed land to meet over half of the residual requirement for Melksham as identified in the Regulation 19 Local Plan (1,120 dwellings over the period 1st April 2022 to 31st March 2038). Despite this availability of previously developed land, and the requirement for the Local Plan Review to promote a justified strategy, the LPA chose a different development strategy for the settlement, involving the use of previously undeveloped land. This differing strategy is likely to have been formed having regard to concerns that a previously developed land first strategy would not result in the full delivery of Melksham’s local housing need figure; often the abnormal costs associated with development on such sites are higher than bringing forward development on previously undeveloped land. In many instances, these abnormal costs could render a proposal unviable, only viable at particular points within an economic cycle which could be some time away, or viable with a reduced developer contributions package. The latter point will clearly have adverse effects on other considerations, including affordable housing provision and infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>7.13 Whilst, given the nature of neighbourhood planning, the Steering Group are able to promote a different strategy to that proposed through the Local Plan Review, national planning guidance confirms that the content within emerging Local Plans and the evidence on which it is founded will be material for the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. Consequently, should the strategy continue to be pursued, there will need to be surety that the housing apportionment to be met in this Neighbourhood Plan is, as a minimum, delivered in full by the end of the Plan period. If that certainty is not provided, then the Plan risks not according with the basic conditions.</p> <p>7.14 In addition to the general point made above, BH are also concerned with the over simplistic analysis provided for each option against the SEA themes, which again lacks the granularity required.</p> <p>7.15 For instance, in terms of air quality, previously developed sites are considered, within the evidence base, to be more preferential because they are within closer proximity to public and active travel networks. However, SHELAA site 3310 is located in closer proximity to Melksham train station than some of the previously developed sites assessed. A similar criticism could be levied towards the assessment of both options against the transport and movement objective.</p> <p>7.16 The assessment of both options against the historic environment objective similarly lacks the site specific assessment required when considering the impact of development on designated heritage assets. Whilst the assessment work concludes that development on previously developed sites is more preferable (presumably because any harm would be more limited and could even result in improvement, which in itself is unsubstantiated), initial technical work prepared on behalf of BH concerning another previously undeveloped site within Melksham suggests that its development would result in a neutral impact on designated assets in the surrounding area.</p> <p>7.17 Given the above, BH does not consider that the SEA provides an assessment of reasonable alternatives for accommodating development at Melksham. If this approach is to be taken forward in future iterations of the SEA, then it is strongly suggested that, given the concerns relating to the deliverability of a previously developed land option only, as a minimum, an assessment of a hybrid</p>	<p>Site 3310 is greenfield agricultural open countryside in the setting of a grade 2 listed farm. The assessment of all reasonable alternative sites set out in the Sites Topic Paper and SEA &amp; addendum clearly demonstrates why it is not suitable. Furthermore JMNP2 is not obliged to meet the housing requirement.</p> <p>The representation’s focus on the community’s wishes and positive approach to enabling regeneration of town centre related brownfield land is not related to addressing the particular merits of site 3310 and does not add material evidence that would lead to review of the site assessment.</p> <p>The main SEA report has been undertaken soundly and appropriately.</p> <p>Strategic greenfield site allocations options are currently considered within the emerging Local Plan. In light of this, JMNP2 considers non-strategic scale site options for a potential allocation. This fundamental premise for the JMNP2 is reflected by the approach taken in the SEA.</p> <p>Given the availability of both greenfield and brownfield site options within and adjacent to Melksham Town, the SEA considered the relative sustainability merits of taking forward a greenfield-first or brownfield-first approach to development. The SEA highlights that the preferred approach (i.e., brownfield-first) was informed by: the various surveys and evidence base documents prepared to support the JMNP2; responses from community consultation events; and, the findings from the site assessment and SEA.</p> <p>Given the proposed allocations for Melksham Town within the JMNP2 are both brownfield sites, this clearly demonstrates that the preferred approach has been tested (and informed by) the SEA.</p>

**Strategic Environmental Assessment - New Addendum Version B**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B - Bloor 1 and 2	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>	FOR SEA Addendum in Version B	<p><b>New Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum</b></p> <p>Bloor Homes have identified a number of issues with the evidence presented for the Cooper Tires site. They consider that the sustainability outcomes for the site have, particularly having regard to the conclusions of the viability work, worsened, not improved.</p>	
Version B - Bloor 1 and 3	<p>Bloor 1 (Land at New Road Farm, Policy 20 in the draft LP and SHELAA 3478, 3479, 3742, 3744)</p> <p>AND repeated in Bloor 2 (land to the west of the A365, Shurnhold, opposite George Ward Gardens, SHELAA 3310)</p>		<p>7.14 BH have the following concerns with the SEA Addendum:</p> <p>Policy 7.1REV Land at Cooper Tires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As set out in Section 5 above, the evidence base has not identified a viable mixed use scheme for the Cooper Tires site.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> For the reasons set out above, BH do not consider that surety can be provided at this stage that 150 dwellings can be provided on the site.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The report outlines that “proportionate contributions” to improve community facilities will be expected. However, the viability work has demonstrated that a mixed use development of the site is not viable, even without taking into account any planning obligations.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The viability work demonstrates that a mixed use scheme that includes 10% affordable housing is not a viable proposition.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No technical work is available to justify the conclusion that “additional residential development will have no material harmful impact on the effect of development of the Cooper Tires site on nationally designated heritage assets or locally designated assets.”</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A mixed use development, even including up to 300 homes has proven not to be viable. Therefore, even the residential development within that proposal would not generate a sufficient return to remediate the site.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The additional evidence would suggest that the sustainability outcomes of the site have worsened, not improved.</li> </ul>	See responses above in relation to site 3310.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment - New Addendum Version B**

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version B, August	Tetlow King for Terra Strategic re Land west of Semington Road		<p>In relation to Policies 7.1 and 7.6, the Draft SEA fails to not assess the site subject to promotion in this letter as an alternative, meaning the likely environmental effects of the plan have not been judged against reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The error in the Strategic Environmental Assessment exercise is of a fundamental type upheld by the courts in (1) <i>Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v Forest Heath DC</i> [2011] EWHC 606 (Admin); (2) <i>Heard v Broadland DC</i> [2012] EWHC 344 (Admin) and (4) <i>Ashdown Forest Economic Development LLP v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government</i> [[2015] EWCA Civ 681 – specifically that the SEA Reports collectively do not provide any proper identification of reasonable alternatives and thereafter fail to carry out any necessary evaluation. There is therefore a breach of Regulation 5 in addition to Regulation 12 and Annex 2, and a related breach of basic condition 8(2)(f): (f) “the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations”. This latter term incorporates the duties under the SEA Regulations, previously under the SEA Directive.</p>	<p>See responses above. It is also premature and unfortunate that the representation identified potential for legal challenge to JMNP2 within its consultation period. It is a non-strategic plan produced by voluntary representatives of the community in its interest.</p>

## Settlement Boundaries

Source	Name	Page No. / Para. No. / Policy No.	Comment	Response
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)		<p>There have been a series of appeal decisions allowing further development to the south of the town, which require an amendment to the settlement boundary. These decisions have allowed residential development on the western and eastern side of Semington Road.</p> <p>The consequence is that the settlements of Melksham and Berryfield are joined in practical terms. It is entirely inappropriate for Berryfield to be classified as a small village, separate from Melksham. It is part of Melksham, and the settlement boundary of Melksham should be updated to reflect the settlement boundary on the ground. In this context note that page 79 of the Green Wedge Study identifies the area of Berryfield separated from Bowerhill, and therefore comprising built development both to the east and west of Semington Road; clearly already coalesced with Melksham.</p>	There are no changes to the Settlement Boundaries proposed in the Plan. The Settlement Boundary was last reviewed by Wiltshire Council as part of the Housing Sites and Allocation Plan. It may be reviewed by either the qualifying bodies as part of future reviews, or by Wiltshire Council. In line with Wiltshire Council methodology, any review of the settlement boundary would not include any allocated site, or unimplemented permissions .
Version A	Tor&Co on behalf of Martin Grant Homes and the landowners of land at Berryfield Lane, and west of Semington Road, south Melksham, SHELAA PART 3105a & 3105B (Tor&Co also represent Gleeson)	Fig 4 (p18) [Also put in Policy 18 tab]	<p>We note that development proposals will be expected to respond sensitively to the transition between settlement edge and countryside and maintain the separate identity of settlements. However, this is on conflict with, and undermines, the Local Plan (Reg 19). Specifically, under 'providing new homes' para 2.11 confirms, as an outcome, that 'Development, wherever possible, will have maintained the separate identity of the outlying villages near to the Principal Settlements and Market Towns, Swindon and Bath.' The reason being that sustainable development sometimes does lead to the joining up of main settlements with outlying areas of housing. This is exactly the case south of Melksham, Melksham, Bowerhill and Berryfield are clearly already joined, as demonstrated at Figure 4 of the NP. Further, and do not have separate identifies. Indeed, Figure 19 of the NP clearly characterises much of the Bowerhill and Berryfield areas as the same as Melksham. There is no separate identify of settlement to the south of Melksham, and the settlement boundary should reflect this position.</p>	There are no changes to the Settlement Boundaries proposed in the Plan. The Settlement Boundary was last reviewed by Wiltshire Council as part of the Housing Sites and Allocation Plan. It may be reviewed by either the qualifying bodies as part of future reviews, or by Wiltshire Council. In line with Wiltshire Council methodology, any review of the settlement boundary would not include any allocated site, or unimplemented permissions .