

Do you agree with the vision and development principles? What would you change or add? Why?

- Although there was general agreement with the vision and principles, they were considered to be very 'Motherhood and Apple Pie'. Essentially there is nothing there that can be disagreed with.
- The vision is not unique and could be referring to anywhere.
- Strong agreement with principle 2, that the development should be integrated into the existing town.
- There were general concerns over the future economic climate and whether the vision and principles are flexible enough to accommodate changing circumstances. The situation in five years time maybe very different to today.
- Front loading is a key issue, which should be reflected in the vision. Historically houses have come before the facilities, making it harder for a 'sense of community' to develop.
- This is also the case for public transport, which tends to be delivered once people have already established their transport habits.
- Concerns were raised in respect of the recreational space being located on the floodplain and whether this will restrict its use.

General Point – It is very difficult to comment meaningfully on the document if the delegates have not read it prior to the event.

Do you agree with our proposed approach to transport? Have enough links to Swindon been identified? (See Section 6 of the document)

- Rapid transit / priority bus service – This was considered a good option but it was acknowledged that needs to a critical mass for it to be successful and could be slightly inflexible. The scheme should include strategic stops, which serve a mixture of uses.
- Concerns whether there was adequate access into the centre of Swindon. Oxford Road is not sufficient to take the additional traffic that would be generated by the development. Is there any potential for an additional route into the centre or improvements to the existing routes?
- Concerns that there isn't enough employment on the site. Is there sufficient capacity in the town centre? SBC must acknowledge that residents will commute to nearby towns and appropriate infrastructure links should be provided.
- Implement a movement hierarchy, which identifies what should be provided in each area.
- Accessibility within the development is key. It is important to provide sufficient safe spaces for people to use.
- A variety of links to the facilities need to be considered. Cycle and pedestrian routes should be installed early to ensure people get into the habit of using them.
- SBC must learn from past mistakes – The provision of adequate transport infrastructure should be done up front and therefore more cost effective

Do you agree that we should be trying to integrate the EDA with Swindon or do you think we should separate it out as a stand alone community?

- The principle of integrating the development with Swindon was accepted but this must be done in such a way as to avoid 'dormitory towns'
- Swindon town centre should be distinguished from other areas and should include broader facilities i.e. the university rather than just more retail.
- Past experience has proved that phasing isn't always achievable. The communities should be developed one by so they are able to stand-alone and are not reliant on Swindon town centre. A balance must be struck between integrating the new communities and providing sufficient links but ensuring that places keep their separate identities and individuality
- Investment into the community is crucial – an agent should be funded by the developer to hear people's views and assist with the integration process.
- Integrating an isolated site will be a challenge but the overall message is that the development needs to be integrated into Swindon, to the surrounding villages and within itself.

How can we the EDA be delivered in a way that provides benefits for nearby communities in east Swindon and the villages?

- Imperative for local communities to be involved at an early stage in the planning. SBC should utilise the Parish Councils more as they are a direct link into the communities that will be affected by the development. Should involve specialists who can engage with the local communities particularly at South Marsden.
- Design for Cohesion. Any development near a village should be designed sympathetically in character. There should be integration with existing styles and local vernacular. This is difficult because there is no definitive character for Swindon. Possibly reflect the eastern development area.

Do you agree with the social facilities we have identified? Is there any infrastructure that you think we have missed? (See Section 11 of the document)

- There is a high demand for allotment space across the borough. The provision for land for such facilities should be included in the SPG and existing ones should be safeguarded.
- Urban and city farms should form part of the community facilities. Rowes Farm is a good example of this and should be kept as a facility for the public.
- Dual facilities have their benefits but are restricted to certain hours for public use. If the school is a Private Finance Initiative School any facilities will be let out to the highest bidder and may not allow a range of community groups to use them.
- Although the SPG includes the provision of sports facilities, consideration must be given to the type of facility included. A range of activity options should be provided that do not require residents to sign up to expensive monthly subscriptions.
- Additional household refuse sites must be included.
- There is an existing waste-water capacity issue. Land for additional treatment facilities should be identified.

Do you agree with proposed phasing, beginning development around White Hart and growing outwards? Have we missed anything on delivery? (See Page 86 of the document)

- There was general agreement with the overall phasing plan.
- The location of Phase 1 was considered to be appropriate because it relates well to the proposed district centre and existing facilities on the edge of Swindon. Existing infrastructure can be utilised allowing the provision of new facilities to be staggered.
- Clarification of which phase the secondary school was in was requested.
- The key to ensuring that phasing of the development is successful is to ensure that the provision of adequate facilities is implemented at the correct time.
- The triggers to meet the needs of the community – xx many houses = a school or a community hall should be clearly identified in the SPG. This would provide some reassurance to the community.

Are we doing enough to address climate change, the environment and ecology in the EDA? Is there anything else you think we should be doing? (See Sections 8 and 14 of the document)

- The group felt that this is a unique opportunity to include some innovative technologies. This development is of a critical mass that means such measures can be implemented.
- Consideration should be given to using a combined heat and power facility, to allow the new development to generate power from waste. This would help reduce the developments waste requirements and allow it to be more self-containing.
- Development should be designed to incorporate sustainable measures – orientation of housing, solar panels, insulation, rainwater harvesting and SUDS, water meters. These measures are easier to incorporate at the start rather than retro fit them at later date.
- Ground level lighting should be included for cyclists. Incorporate intelligent lighting schemes, which would reduce energy requirements and costs.
- Improve links to surrounding countryside and AONB – contact Sustran for cycling initiatives.

Do you think the proposals are affordable and deliverable? In particular, off-site infrastructure requirements (See Section 16 of the document).

- There was a general concern that too much depends on the assumption that funding will be given. There is no point pushing for the development if there is no money to provide supporting infrastructure, the development will fail. There will not be enough money in the S106 contributions, so there needs to be assured funding in advance of the project starting.
- The requirements outlined in the current plans are based on projections from 12 years of boom. The SPD should be reviewed after phase 1 or after defined periods to make sure it is still realistic and relevant.
- The group were not convinced that the same mistakes that were in Wichelstowe are not be made again. Lessons learnt should be clearly identified to give the community more reassurance.