

Swindon - New Eastern Villages

Planning Obligations

Revised Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

July 2016

Blank Page

Contents

	Page No.
1. Introduction	2
2. Purpose	2
3. When did consultation take place?	2
4. Who was consulted?	2
5. Summary of the main issues raised	3
6. Post consultation changes	17

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The statement sets out who was consulted on the New Eastern Villages (NEV) Planning Obligations Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Illustrative Masterplan, Village Proformas and NEV IDP Update.

2. Purpose

- 2.1 The SPD sets out Swindon Borough Council's (SBC) approach to securing the infrastructure required by planning obligations as a consequence of development at the NEV. The approach detailed within the SPD seeks to achieve the effective delivery of infrastructure to enable sustainable growth at the NEV, and to ensure the right infrastructure is delivered in the right place, at the right time.
- 2.2 In accord with the Local Plan and in particular Policy NC3, the SPD requires a comprehensive approach for dealing with delivery of the NEV, including the provision of infrastructure necessary to create a sustainable development as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3. When did consultation take place?

- 3.1 Public consultation on the draft SPD took place between Thursday 21st March and Wednesday 4th May 2016. 374 consultee responses were received to the draft SPD. In total this generated 891 individual comments.

4. Who was consulted?

- 4.1 In accord with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations, all statutory consultees and interested parties were notified of the consultation.
- 4.2 A formal public notice was made available in the locally distributed newspaper, together with publication on the Swindon Borough Council website, and hard copies of documents were made available at all libraries and Parish / Town Councils within the Borough.

5. Summary of the Main Issues Raised

5.1 All comments have been logged on a 'record of interested parties', and have been responded to by relevant Officers. The following paragraphs seek to summarise the comments made. Due to the high number of responses received, it is not appropriate to detail them all within this Statement of Consultation.

Stakeholder responses

5.2 Comments were received from stakeholders including:

- Ainscough Strategic Land
- Barberry (Swindon) Ltd
- Basingstoke Canal Society
- Capitaland Property Group Ltd and Capital Planning Ltd
- DV4 Properties Swindon Co. Ltd
- Cotswold Canal Trust
- Dorset & Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service (DWFRS)
- East Challow Parish Council
- Environment Agency
- Forestry Commission
- Gloucestershire County Council
- Hannick Homes, Hallam Land and Taylor Wimpey (DLA)
- Hannick Homes and Peploe Trust (DLA)
- Haydon Wick Parish Council
- Highways England
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd

- South Marston Parish Council
- Sport England
- Swindon Bicycle Users Group
- Swindon Clinical Care Group (CCG)
- Thames Water
- The Ramblers
- Wanborough Parish Council
- Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
- Wilts & Berks Canal Trust (including responses from their members Nationwide)
- Woodlands Trust
- Vision for Wroughton
- Individuals throughout the Borough, and in adjacent areas.

5.3 A number of key themes and issues are highlighted in the consultation responses, as well as more specific comments related to infrastructure provision:

- Support for the principles of the SPD,
- The need for early delivery of essential infrastructure, including key transport interventions,
- Support for the safeguarding and future delivery of the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal within the NEV development area,
- Support for a comprehensive network of public footpaths and cycleways,
- The need for detailed site assessments, a landscape appraisal and site wide biodiversity strategy to safeguard and positively respond to environmental constraints and opportunities including the North Wessex AONB,
- The need for clarification on the typologies within the Green Infrastructure Strategy, and in relation to the Great Western Community Forest,
- Clarification on the evidence base behind the exact sports provision at the NEV, including built sports facilities,

- The need to fund rail improvements from commercial development,
- Design and layout considerations to ensure emergency access can be achieved throughout the NEV including the provision of associated infrastructure (for example, fire hydrants),
- Consideration for a fire station to be sited at the most southern point of the NEV.

5.4 Detailed comments from Land Owners, Strategic Land Promoters and Developers are addressed separately in paragraph 5.11 of this Statement.

Council's Response

5.5 The Council acknowledges that planning obligations are just one of a number of mechanisms which can help secure timely delivery of infrastructure at the NEV. The revised draft SPD has been amended at paragraph 2.7 to reflect this.

5.6 Almost 90% of the consultation responses received relate to the safeguarding, and delivery, of the Wilts and Berks Canal. Local Plan Policy NC3 requires that the canal alignment within the NEV area is safeguarded, and Policy EN11: Heritage Transport requires that the long term re-establishment of the Wilts and Berks Canal as a navigable waterway is not prejudiced by new development. A number of the consultation responses specifically requested the Council secure financial contributions from the NEV developers to fund construction/delivery. This would not meet the statutory tests for securing s106 planning obligations, in that they must be:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms,
- Directly related to the development,
- Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

5.7 The Council is developing a NEV Green Infrastructure Strategy with key delivery partners which will support the principles as set out in the SPD and which help to inform Illustrative Masterplan. The Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide further details on the location and typologies of open space and Great Western Community Forest planting.

5.8 A Borough wide Playing Pitch Strategy helps inform and guide playing pitch provision at the NEV. The strategy is being developed with key partners, including Sport England, and is expected to be formally adopted by the end of 2016.

5.9 With regards to public rights of way, revisions made to the Illustrative masterplan have sought to address this. Please refer to paragraph 5.20 for more details.

5.10 It is not considered appropriate to secure developer contributions towards rail improvements as a result of commercial development at the NEV.

Comments from Land Owners, Strategic Land Promoters and Developers

5.11 In summary, comments made from **Ainscough Strategic Land Ltd** relate to:

- In general terms, the infrastructure requirements set out for each development village (whether those are site specific or NEV wide requirements) are broadly consistent.
- That the masterplan does not accurately reflect planning applications submitted at the NEV.
- That the infrastructure needs of an individual development village should be subject to a Transport Assessment rather than being tied to fixed infrastructure requirements.
- Comments were also made on detailed matters including school provision and access arrangements.
- Clearly, it is important to ensure that the delivery of required infrastructure is fairly apportioned between contributing developments to ensure that the costs are shared equally between different development schemes.
- It is suggested that a copy of the wider illustrative masterplan should be incorporated within the finalised document for ease of reference.
- It is considered that the proposed development phasing schedule is not a prescriptive policy requirement and does not accurately reflect how the NEV will be realistically built out and should incorporate a number of access points to enable delivery at several locations at the NEV.
- The draft Village Proformas indicate that contributions will be pooled between the nine separate development villages, whilst the Planning Obligations SPD confirms that this will be refunded if Local Growth Funding is secured. It is unclear how this system would operate.
- It is unclear how highway linkages between development islands are to be funded and delivered when they fall outside of the applicant's redline or extent of ownership.

The Council's response

- 5.12 The Council's response is that the purpose of the SPD is to set out a clear framework for the coordination and timely delivery of infrastructure and that the illustrative masterplan provides key principles and guidance for proposals at the NEV. Please refer to paragraph 5.21 which addresses the masterplan in more detail. It is appropriate to ensure that all developments are subject of a Transport Assessment, in accordance with Local Plan policy and that the infrastructure requirements are appropriate to ensure that coordinated and comprehensive development at the NEV can be achieved.
- 5.13 The Council understands the complex land and ownership arrangements at the NEV. In line with the comprehensive approach required by Policy NC3, the Council will seek from landowners / developers a consortium approach to enter into planning obligations agreements, pursuant to S106 (Town and Country Planning Act) or S278 (Highways Act), for the purpose of securing equitably and fairly the delivery of infrastructure which is necessary in order to deliver comprehensive and sustainable development.
- 5.14 As stated at paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 of the SPD, the indicative delivery areas detailed in the Local Plan helps to identify the Council's preferred approach to the phasing of the housing and the related infrastructure to support the new communities at the NEV. If planning applications are submitted in advance of the preferred phasing, the onus will be on the relevant developer(s) and/or interested parties to deliver the appropriate level of infrastructure to support the new community until such time the delivery of other development parcels / villages come forward.
- 5.15 With regards to forward funding (as stated at paragraph 4.8 of the SPD), in instances where this is secured to deliver shared infrastructure early to facilitate the unlocking of developable land through the construction of relevant infrastructure, contributions will be secured retrospectively associated with the grant of permissions that post-date that infrastructure delivery, to reimburse the funder(s) of that item in the event that no equalisation framework agreement has been signed to manage such.
- 5.16 With regards to the highway linkages between development islands, the Council will seek to secure contributions from developers towards the delivery of linkages between villages and will require the land from relevant landowners.
- 5.17 In summary, comments made from **Barberry Developments Ltd** related to the following:
- Suggest that the Council should negotiate separate, stand-alone agreements with landowners and developers.

- It must be made clear that any additional infrastructure items sought must be fully justified on the basis of guidance set out in the Framework and CIL regulations.
- Consider that the Council should take the lead on equalisation agreements.
- The Police Station access and footpath 5 improvements should be site specific infrastructure items.

The Council's response

- 5.18 The Council consider that in the interests of delivering that to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of the necessary planning obligations, a framework Section 106 Agreement will ensure the effective delivery and maintenance of the required infrastructure.
- 5.19 The Council agree that any changes to the infrastructure items and/or costs will be subject to public consultation, as stated in Paragraph 1.16 of the SPD. The evidence base for additional items and alterations to costs will be detailed in the NEV IDP.
- 5.20 The Council will work with landowners and developers to assist with equalisation if agreement is not reached, as detailed in paragraph 4.5 of the SPD.
- 5.21 Improvements to the Police Station access are a strategic requirement to ensure there is capacity on the road network to enable the development of the NEV as a whole. The new link across the railway (footpath 5) is necessary to enhance movement for some but not all development within the NEV. The Village Proformas have been amended to reflect this.
- 5.22 In summary, comments from **Hannick Homes, Hallam Land and Taylor Wimpey** related to the following:
- Framework Agreement approach is unrealistic due to the considerable number of landowners and developers who have interests in land and/or development schemes that comprise the NEV allocation.
 - A flexible approach is required by national guidance including supplementary planning documents. Such documents should avoid adding inappropriately to the burdens on development.
 - It is critical that infrastructure costs are fully understood and made readily available to interested parties to ensure viability of schemes is fully

considered. This applies to cost changes of below 10% and para 2.22 should be amended accordingly.

- It is critical that the schemes identified in the IDP are necessary and are appropriately evidenced.
- Should be clear that the costs of infrastructure provision or requirements may need to be reviewed specifically in the context of the approval of specific applications.
- Clarification on whether the Illustrative Masterplan is intended to form part of the SPD.
- Clarification on whether the village proformas intend to form part of the SPD.
- A series of detailed comments that relate to the Illustrative Masterplan.

The Council's response

- 5.23 The purpose of the SPD and accompanying documents is to provide clear and transparent information which relates to the delivery of infrastructure at the NEV. The SPD provides more detail and guidance as set out in Local Plan NC3 and is completely justified in its approach.
- 5.24 In terms of the concern relating to overburdening development, the SPD seeks to ensure that contributions are secure without undermining the viability and deliverability of the schemes.
- 5.25 The Council have removed paragraph 2.2 from the SPD and commit to an annual review of costs that would be subject to public consultation. Please refer to paragraph 1.16 of the SPD for more details.
- 5.26 The village proformas accompany the Planning Obligations draft SPD. All documents, including the SPD, the Masterplan, the IDP and Village Proformas provide a robust framework for securing infrastructure delivery.
- 5.27 The Council will require development proposals to come forward in broad accordance with the Illustrative Masterplan.
- 5.28 In summary, comments from **Capital Land Property Group Ltd and Capital Planning Ltd**
- Indications are that the SHMA will require an increase in dwellings to cover the period to 2031. It is important therefore that the potential efficient use of land east of Swindon, is not prejudiced at this stage and this should be recognised and recorded in the draft SPD

- It is acknowledged that there is no overall developer consortium controlling the NEV area as witnessed by the various planning applications submitted in this area with the majority still undetermined and significant areas still to be subject to planning applications.
- The proposed infrastructure requirements for the development at Great Stall East are not justified. Safeguarding the land for such facilities also impacts on the viability of a development proposal for this part of the NEV.
- Draft Village Proformas and Infrastructure Requirements are not up to date.
- Park and Ride, District Centre Community Centre, libraries, New Eastern Villages Community Hub and District Heating Network are not described as being essential to serve the development or critical to its delivery. It is considered therefore that contributions related to these projects do not meet the requirements of Reg 122 and should be removed.

Council's response

- 5.29 It is not the purpose of the SPD to cross refer information in the emerging SHMA, this forms part of the Local Plan review process. The SPD is underpinned by the adopted Local Plan 2026.
- 5.30 The Council understands the complex land and ownership arrangements at the NEV. In line with the comprehensive approach required by Policy NC3, the Council will seek from landowners / developers a consortium approach to enter into s106 planning obligations for the purpose of securing equitably and fairly the delivery of infrastructure which is necessary in order to deliver comprehensive and sustainable development including the delivery of library services, community facilities, Park & Ride and District Heating Network.
- 5.31 The Council consider that the infrastructure requirements for Great Stall East including the Secondary School and Park & Ride sites are well located spatially to serve the entire NEV. Development proposals will be required to contribute on a "pro-rata" basis for both the site and build costs, and will be compensated for loss of remunerative development land under equalisation/S106 arrangements.
- 5.32 The village proformas have been revised to reflect the latest information as relates to the delivery of on-site and off-site infrastructure at the NEV.
- 5.33 In summary, comments from **DV4 Properties Swindon Co. Ltd**
- Consider that the title of the SPD is misleading to potential consultees and as such this invalidates the consultation process.

- The SPD seeks to introduce policies far wider than those simply involved with “Planning Obligations”.
- The SPD is quite clearly a land use document and seeks to adopt as policy the NEV Masterplan and other documents as well as other land use policies which are not planning obligations.
- Local Planning Regulations state that the allocation of sites and policies for their development cannot be devolved from a local plan to SPDs.
- Consider that development management policies, site allocations and infrastructure contributions cannot be “hidden” in SPDs.
- The SPD fails to acknowledge or recognise the requirement for the delivery of other land uses within the NEV, in particular, employment land uses critical to the Borough Council and the local plan’s economic development strategy.
- Consider the agreement will not capture all development parcels within the NEV, as permission already granted at The Hub (known as Symmetry Park) and therefore an alternative mechanism is required to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of necessary infrastructure costs.
- Whilst development management requirements can be a means to ensure comprehensive development anti-ransom provisions are not lawful. The rejection of entering such an agreement would not provide the Council with reasonable ground for resisting planning permission.
- In respect of the NEV Masterplan, paragraph 4.3 states that this has been “comprehensively updated” in partnership with a wide range of stakeholders.
- The Illustrative Masterplan needs to conform far more closely to the adopted Figure 11 Inset Diagram in identifying land uses. In its present form the Masterplan, being part of the SPD, is seeking to allocate sites and policies, not in accordance with the Local Plan.
- The Great Stall East and Great Stall West villages are seen as gateways to Swindon and that it is essential that high quality design and use of high quality materials is achieved. These comments together with the absence of a pro-forma which covers the employment area would confirm that the employment land is not considered to be part of the villages.

The Council’s Response

- 5.34 The SPD has been prepared in accordance with Planning Regulations and sets out the principles established by Policy NC3, as detailed in the Local Plan 2026 in particular, to secure the provision and implementation of necessary infrastructure to support development at the NEV.

- 5.35 As stated in Policy NC3, the NEV is a mixed use development and the village proformas and accompanying IDP (NEV Update) reflect this drawing upon other relevant policies in the Local Plan. Additional wording has been added to the Great Stall East village proforma to provide clarity on the proposed employment uses at Great Stall West. It is not considered necessary to prepare a separate village proforma for employment land as development of the NEV needs to be considered as a whole.
- 5.36 The intention of the SPD is to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of the necessary planning obligations and the effective delivery and maintenance of the required infrastructure. The planning consent at The Hub provides infrastructure requirements as appropriate for the employment uses at this location.
- 5.37 The Illustrative Masterplan reflects Figure 11 of the Local Plan by showing the entire area north of the River Cole as “District Centre” (which includes residential development). The map legend now includes B8 (Storage and Distribution) and any development in this use class must be developed in a “form that complements” the District Centre (Policy NC3). The LPA is commissioning a more detailed District Centre brief to provide further guidance for the successful development of the centre.
- 5.38 In summary, comments from **Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd**
- Support for the draft Illustrative Masterplan.
 - Support the designation of the District Centre as set out in the draft Illustrative Masterplan.
 - Inclusion of Sainsbury’s store will allow the store to provide the anchor for the new District Centre, and allow Sainsbury’s to better serve the existing communities along with future communities that will be part of the NEV.
 - The proposed infrastructure, as illustrated on the draft masterplan should allow strong vehicular connectivity, public transport and pedestrian permeability to ensure the District Centre is well connected with the new, future residential communities.

Council’s response

- 5.39 The Council acknowledges the support for the Illustrative Masterplan, and welcomes the ongoing active role from Sainsbury’s in the NEV.

Parish Councils

- 5.40 In summary, comments from **Wanborough Parish Council**:

- Clarification of ownership and maintenance of flood risk areas.
- Does not clearly state how developers will deliver the appropriate infrastructure, when a development is out of phase.
- Not specific on how the character of existing villages will be protected from urban characteristics.
- Specific comments relating to Redlands including housing numbers and density, access to Wanborough Road and leisure provision.
- Specific comments relating to the design and location of the Southern Connector Road.
- There should be more specific details on healthcare provision.
- The supply of water and waste provision is not referred to.
- Housing density should be higher at the centre of the NEV, than on the outskirts.

Council's response

- 5.41 Policy NC3 of the Local Plan 2026 requires that the early delivery of any sites should not compromise the delivery of the overall infrastructure of the NEV.
- 5.42 Concerns relating to design, character, drainage and infrastructure costs of Redlands, and the impact on nearby villages will be considered as part of the planning application and subsequent design codes.
- 5.43 The detailed design and siting of the Southern Connector Road will also be dealt with through the planning process.
- 5.44 Ongoing engagement with all of our partners including NHS England, CCG, other health care providers and Thames Water will ensure that appropriate strategies and implementation plans meet demand for healthcare and utilities.
- 5.45 In summary, comments from **South Marston Parish Council**:
- The Illustrative Masterplan does not show all path and cycleways and lacks effective Rights of Way hierarchy.
 - Concerned by the lack of funding for the construction of pedestrian and cycle links across the NEV. Request a separate item in the IDP for traffic management costs towards pedestrian and cycle safety within the NEV and further afield.

- Suggest an additional age group category for the provision of early year's provision.
- Request greater clarity as to the number and type of sports located at the Sports Hubs.
- Healthcare contributions should allow for the construction of white rooms as part of any strategy for dispersed healthcare.
- Consider the contributions towards the construction of community facilities to be too small; unless other costings contribute towards a mixed use community facility.
- How off-site flood alleviation works would be controlled.
- A number of amendments have also been suggested for the South Marston and Rowborough Village Proformas.

Council's response

- 5.46 The Illustrative Masterplan details indicative strategic pedestrian and cycle routes; further discussion with local groups will inform the specific location of links as part of an overall route hierarchy, and the delivery and associated costs will be further informed through the planning application process.
- 5.47 Early year's provision is now incorporated within the delivery of the primary school, or by private provision.
- 5.48 Ongoing engagement with Sport England and other partners will ensure the type and quantity of sports provision meets increased demand.
- 5.49 The Council are working closely with health care providers to ensure appropriate facilities are provided both locally (where required) and strategically through the delivery of a doctor's surgery at the district centre.
- 5.50 The provision of community facilities at South Marston must reflect the needs of the village, and offer flexibility in accordance with Policy RA3 of the Local Plan.
- 5.51 Where off-site flood alleviation works are required to mitigate the impacts of development, this can be secured through planning condition. A strategic approach to sustainable drainage solutions (SuDS) is sought, with guidance and policy reinforced through the emerging NEV SuDS Vision.
- 5.52 In summary, comments from **Wilts & Berks Canal Trust**:
- W&BCT is unable to understand how land drainage is adequately dealt with.

- The document does not include the requirement for the proposed development to make provision for the funding of the building of the canal or its infrastructure. Our aim is to see the construction of the canal in NEV as an enforceable part of the infrastructure development and that will mean that the canal must be built as part of any built development.
- Raise the issue of long term responsibility and maintenance of SuDS. At least some of this responsibility (i.e. to keep the SuDS and or canal in working order) could be managed by WBCT on a paid basis from the developers.
- Specific comments relating to flood mitigation measures.
- WBCT have produced two detailed Technical Notes which explain in engineering detail how the canal and its related infrastructure can act as proper conduit for aggregate volume water egress:
 - Note 1 (dated March 2016) - which deals with Water Management generally and describes how the Wiltshire and Berkshire canal provides flood mitigation; and
 - Note 2 (dated April 2016) - which describes how the canal can provide a flood barrier to protect the NEV.
- As demonstrated throughout the UK and Europe, canals add value to residential development, provide for leisure and recreation and public amenity to the localities through which it travels.
- WBCT master planning has reviewed the traffic planning and road infrastructure plans proposed as it might affect the development and access to the canal. WBCT consider the fragility of the presently planned road infrastructure makes it unlikely the road network will be able to cope satisfactorily with peak traffic flows.
- Specific comments relating to relevant Local Plan policies.
- Require that the Canal be added to IDP. The existing IDP has £34,429,000 allocated for Major Open Space, £3,320,800 for Local Open Space, and £10,906,000 for a Nature area. Some of this funding is already allocated to providing the green space of the canal line and could be used to construct the canal.
- Insert an additional infrastructure item - *“Wilts & Berks Canal - Construction of canal from Commonhead to A420 Acorn Bridge - £35million - shared on and off site - WBCT feasibility Reports”*

- The SPD now includes the canal corridor as a protected route within the development and WBCT congratulates SBC on this change to the proposals. However, WBCT believes that more needs to be included within the SPD in order that the NEV development and infrastructure gains the benefits that a built canal will provide.
- WBCT believes that the construction of the canal, and properly integrating it with the development islands of NEV, will produce a distinctive and beneficial character to this exciting and significant new development on the east of Swindon.

Council's response

- 5.53 In accordance with the Local Plan, the Illustrative Masterplan reflects the safeguarding of the canal alignment at the NEV and planning applications will be required to comply with EN11: Heritage Transport and NC3: New Eastern Villages of the adopted Local Plan to ensure that development does not compromise the delivery of the canal.
- 5.54 The cost of the construction and maintenance associated with the delivery of the canal cannot be secured through the Planning process and therefore its inclusion within the NEV IDP is not justified. The Council can only secure contributions for infrastructure that is required to make the development acceptable in Planning terms.
- 5.55 The Council acknowledge the comments relating to the possibility of using the canal for flood mitigation and drainage. The draft Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) Vision for the NEV recognises the opportunity to utilise the canal. Please refer to the draft SuDS Vision document that is currently out to public consultation.
- 5.56 With regards to transport planning, the highways infrastructure included within the NEV IDP is justified and based upon the relevant evidence base as set out in the NEV IDP schedule.

Post consultation changes made to the NEV Planning Obligations SPD

5.57 As a result of comments made to the draft SPD and accompanying documents, the following changes have been made:

- Update to the illustrative masterplan, please refer to paras 5.4 and 5.5 of the main SPD document for more information. For ease of reference these are included below at para 5.57.
- Amendment to Table 1 which summarised the infrastructure items required at the NEV.
- Inclusion of a table which highlights all other considerations when determining planning applications but are not necessarily captured by S106 agreements (Table 2 in main SPD document).
- New section on Economic Viability (Section 7 of main SPD document).

Post consultation changes made to the NEV Illustrative Masterplan

5.58 In addition to the points addressed above, the following changes have been made to the **New Eastern Villages Illustrative Masterplan**:

- Additional strategic footpath and cycleways included,
- Revisions to strategic road network in South Marston,
- Revision to District Centre zone annotation,
- Addition of District Centre Use land parcel west of permitted HUB/The Symmetry Park employment Area,
- Addition of housing parcel alongside the existing vehicular access to Lotmead Business Village,
- Realignment of the Southern Connector Road and addition of housing parcels to development at Foxbridge,
- Minor revisions and corrections to Masterplan.

Post consultation changes made to the NEV Village Proformas

5.59 In addition to points addressed above, the following other changes were made to the village proformas:

- The presentation of the village proformas has changed to provide more clarity,

- The infrastructure items within the village proformas has been amended to include more detail,
- Consistency in the referencing of the infrastructure items in the village proformas and in the infrastructure requirements list (IDP),
- Updates to local guidance and policy documents has been clearly referenced,
- Where a point has been made that improves the clarity of the content, these have been incorporated into the respective village proformas.

Post consultation changes made to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NEV Update)

5.60 In addition to points addressed above, the following other changes have been made to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NEV Update):

- Removal of the costs related to M4 J15 improvements as these relate to the Commonhead development.
- Reduction in the cost to deliver the District Centre due latest example from the delivery of a district centre at Tadpole Farm.
- Increase in the cost of delivering additional health care provision. This up to date information has been provided by Swindon CCG.
- Reduction in the cost of delivering a sports facility due to updated information.
- Removal of contributions to Central Area public realm, Children's Services and WFRS in line with CIL regulations.
- In light of comments made, as stated in para 1.16 of the SPD, it is considered that any changes to the cost variances detailed in the NEV IDP extract will be subject to public consultation for a minimum period of four weeks.
- It is likely that certain costs will evolve as new information becomes available and a commitment to review the IDP on an annual basis (unless any other significant changes are required otherwise) will ensure this is addressed in a clear and transparent way.

This document is available on the internet at www.swindon.gov.uk.

It can be produced in a range of languages and formats (such as large print, Braille or other accessible formats) by contacting the Customer Services Department.

Tel: 01793 445500 Fax: 01793 463331 E-mail: customerservices@swindon.gov.uk

FOI 4109/16