

NEV Planning Obligations Draft SPD consultation

Response from South Marston Parish Council, 17 August 2016

The SPD Main Document

There is now much more detail about process arrangements governing NEV S106 provision, which is welcome. We are also pleased to see the specific mention of the uncosted elements within the main SPD document, particularly the road safety and traffic management, early years provision at local and district centres, SuDs provision management and maintenance and open space management.

Table of overall costs is provided at paragraph 5.8

We note the changes that have been made to the table of overall costs and would raise the following issues.

1. Community Hubs - objection

In the previous consultation, we queried the costing of each of the village halls for the NEV which seemed far lower than our estimates. We were promised that these figures would be reviewed. There has been no change to the figures.

We believe that good place-making requires the growth of community activity, the basis for which is the local community hall. £.561 million is insufficient to construct an adequate building, never mind equip it for use. We cannot accept that, overall, £2.8million is offered to build essential social infrastructure across the NEV whilst Public Art benefits from £1.9 million and the Community Forest benefits from £5.5 million.

2. New link footpath 5 across the railway – query

We are pleased to see the inclusion of this, but note that the amount has reduced from £1.5 million in the original draft SPD to £1 million in the revision. It is possible that this is now showing the net figure above what Network Rail is already required to provide. However, if the revision puts the provision of this ramped footbridge in doubt, we would object to the reduction as this is an essential item of infrastructure to deliver sustainable modes of transport for parents with buggies, cyclists and pedestrian traffic. We note that it is the NEV development alone that has generated this requirement to contribute to an acceptable movement network.

Illustrative Masterplan

We welcome the corrections that have now been made to the Masterplan and we are pleased to see inclusion of road access through Oxleaze Farm land to Thornhill Road.

BUT

3. A Comprehensive Cycleway/ROW network - objection

We are disappointed that the Masterplan does not yet specify which Rights of Way are designated as cycleways. This is crucial for developers to deliver an adequate movement

network. We want a clear statement from SBC officers as to when the proposed 'addition overlay' we were promised will be produced and consulted upon.

4. Conflict with SM Neighbourhood Plan Cycle network - objection

We are even more disappointed that the PROW network has not reflected the draft SM Neighbourhood Plan, despite many requests to SBC officers. Your proposed PROW network is particularly inappropriate in places, given the impossibility of safe access through the Carpenters Arms tunnel and the difficulties inherent in crossing new and existing roads. We will continue to object strongly if the Masterplan is promoted above the network enshrined in the SM Neighbourhood Plan. We do not wish for two adopted/made development plan documents to be in conflict, as will be the case if this is not remedied now. Specifically:

- A ROW proposed in this document exits opposite Manor Cottages on Old Vicarage Lane. This is not on the SMNP ROW framework and is not appropriate in area of significant flooding (see preferred option below)
- As SBC officers were informed, we still require a cycleway route from north of South Marston Farm to cross Old Vicarage Lane so it can continue up Rowborough Lane and link to Bridleway 1. For road safety reasons, we do not want to encourage use of the alternative proposed in the Masterplan where a ROW from Rowborough is designed to reach the Carpenters Arms/Rowborough road junction.
- There is no plan for how cycleways at Bridleway 4 and Footpath 5 will safely co-exist with proposed new roads on the lane approaching Oxleaze Wood/SM Farm.

4. Safe crossing on foot/cycle of the A420 - query

We note that the Masterplan now includes PROW from Rowborough through existing tunnels to reach the A420 but no means identified of safe crossing of A420. How is this to be accomplished a) in the interim and b) in the longer term when the new Rowborough tunnel is built? Options could include temporary traffic lights at this point or roadside cycleway to reach the new junction at Old Vicarage Lane.

South Marston Village Proforma

We welcome the inclusion of traffic management and calming measures in line with policy RA3 and the expansion of the road network requirements elements, including new junctions at Carpenters Arms with controlled shuttle movements, and contribution to public transport services. We also welcome the inclusion of Community Forest onsite planting schemes and the inclusion of gas to the required utilities infrastructure services.

5. South Marston Neighbourhood Plan - objection

We note that the SM Neighbourhood Plan is mentioned as part of the evidence base at the end of the proforma. Nevertheless, we request insertion of text reference to the draft SMNP in the preamble after the sentence beginning '*alongside this village infrastructure proforma, please refer to the draft Illustrative Masterplan ...and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan*'.

This is the only NEV island that is covered by a draft NP and this is likely now to be 'made' well before any annual review of the SDP is undertaken. We believe this is important because the current Masterplan fails to reflect the SMNP cycleway network. This proposed SMNP cycleway network has received much support from statutory agencies and borough planning officers with its acknowledged contribution to promoting sustainable modes of transport. If the proforma does not reflect the SMNP, it implies the alternative (and unsatisfactory) Masterplan concept of PROW is the option preferred by the Borough. We will continue to object strongly if the Masterplan is promoted above the network enshrined in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

6. Integrated Village - objection

This is the only proforma that relates to expansion of an existing village, and is therefore a special case. Whereas integration is mentioned in the preamble, we want to see inclusion under 'design and form' of reference to the need for an integrated village. This is crucial to the design of detailed applications, particularly road linkages between development parcels.

7. Safe Crossing of the A420 - comment

We welcome the A420 footway/cycleway improvements providing for:

- footway and cycleway continuity and crossing facilities between Police Station access and Symmetry Park junction
- footway/cycleway improvements along the A420 between Symmetry park and the A420 eastern access to the Park and Ride.

However, for South Marston, the A420 safe crossing concept seems limited to the former shorter stretch. The Rowborough proforma covers the longer stretch identified in the second bullet point. There is an issue of phasing here and the overall PROW network needs to be phased in satisfactorily to ensure appropriate safety.

Shared Infrastructure needs:

8. Railway Footbridge - objection

We note that the contribution to footbridge 5 crossing the railway is mentioned, but ramped bridge is not specified. As previously discussed, we believe inclusion of the word 'ramped' is crucial to give clarity and ensure the integrity of the cycleway network.

Sylvia Brown
Vice Chair
South Marston Parish Council
17/8/2016