WILTSHIRE COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (the LOCAL PLAN)

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION

EXAMINATION HEARINGS PROGRAMME & INSPECTOR’S ISSUES AND QUESTIONS
Update Note - Changes incorporated within the M&I 8th March 2013 (changes are identified by underlining)

Matter 1
New question 9 - To what extent has the spatial strategy of the submitted plan been influenced by the presence of protected landscapes, such as AONBs and the New Forest National Park?

Matter 3
Amended question 2 - Is the principle of its spatial distribution supported adequately by the evidence base with due regard to the needs of neighbouring authorities (including Swindon)?

Matter 4
Amend question 1 -
e. Is the evidence in support of the planned level of housing provision robust (with due regard to data relating to migration, population projections and alternative methodologies)? Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust? How has census data been used to inform the Core Strategy?
f. How does the Government’s potential relocation of armed service personnel influence the housing provision required for Wiltshire?

New question 4 – Will the Town and Country Planning (Modification and Discharge of Planning Obligations) (Amendment)(England) Regulations 2013 effect the delivery of affordable housing within the county over the plan period?

Matter 8
Amend question 6 - Is paragraph 4 and criteria ix) to xvii) of CP58 clear and consistent? Will it be effective in securing the policy objectives?

Matter 9
B) Bradford on Avon. Amend question 6 - How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS? Is the intended phasing for new housing clear and justified?

C) Chippenham. Amend question 15 - Will adequate transport and service infrastructure be available to accommodate the levels of development proposed in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy (including Strategic Objective 6)?

F) Devizes. Amend question 6 by relocating previous question 14 -
6. b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Are the housing requirements clear and justified, including affordable housing?

Q) Trowbridge. Amend question 10 - Does the CS make an adequate assessment of all modes of transport infrastructure (eg, B3105 and the HGV network)? How will necessary transport infrastructure provisions be delivered in a timely fashion consistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy (including Strategic Objective 6)?

S) Delete question 10 (repetition)
INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (the Local Plan)

Venue: The hearing sessions will normally be held within the Civic Centre, St. Stephen’s Place, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 8AH. Sessions will commence on Tuesday 7th May 2013 at 10.00am and are anticipated to take place over a nine week period.

Council: Wiltshire Council will be participating in all hearing sessions.

Participants: Participation at the Hearing Sessions will evolve over time. You are welcome to participate in the discussions at the hearing sessions provided you are seeking a change to the Core Strategy and the Issues for discussion bear direct relation to the Issues raised through your representations. If you are interested in participating in the debate at any session please let the Programme Officer know by the **21st March 2013**. If numbers at specific sessions become too large in order to have a helpful debate you may be encouraged to appoint a spokesperson or join with others with similar views. The Inspector will be keen to avoid the repetition of points at the Hearings. A good point is a good point, if the same point is made 10 times, it does not become a better point.

Statement deadlines:

All Statements, for the Hearing Sessions should be sent to the Programme Officer by 5pm on Wednesday 3rd April 2013. This deadline relates to the receipt of the both paper and electronic copies.

Statements:

The Inspector will expect written responses from the Council to all the matters raised.

As stated in the Briefing Note, the representations already made at submission stage should include all the points, documents and evidence to substantiate representors’ cases. It should not therefore be necessary to submit any further material based on the original representations. If Representors feel a statement is warranted they should only seek to answer the Inspector’s Questions as far as they relate to their original representations.

The examination starts from the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound Plan. The hearings will therefore be concerned only with considerations relating to the soundness or otherwise of the document, and all submissions should address that issue.

The Briefing Notes provided set out the requirements for the presentation of all Statements. Its provisions should be thoroughly read and implemented as otherwise Statements could be returned. Please note the 3,000 word limit.

In the Statements from respondents it would be very helpful for the Inspector to have a brief concluding section stating:

What part of the Core Strategy is unsound.
Which soundness criterion it fails.
Independent Examination of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations).
How the Core Strategy can be made sound.
The precise change and/or wording that you are seeking.

The Inspector will give equal weight to views put orally or in writing.

**If you have any queries – please contact the Programme Officer, Ian Kemp, on 07723 009166 or via idkemp@sky.com**

The Examination Programme is regularly updated. Please ensure you check the latest position if you wish to attend a particular hearing by contacting the Programme Officer or viewing it on the website at


**HEARINGS**

Please remind yourself of the Inspector’s guidance concerning the format of hearings at this Examination, contained in the Guidance Note.

This is an initial Schedule of Matters and Issues which form the basis for the Hearings stage of the Examination.

It is likely that additional issues and questions will arise in advance of the Hearings whilst others may be resolved or refined. As a consequence, the Schedule is subject to alteration. Any updated Schedule will be available on the Council’s web site.

The structure of the Matters and Issues which informs the Hearings Programme is broadly based upon the format of the submitted Core Strategy. Matters 1 and 2 address some of the procedural and legal compliance issues whilst analysing the principles of the underlying strategy contained within the Plan. The Strategic Objectives and related policies are then tackled prior to an examination of the Community Areas identified by the Plan. Matters of infrastructure provision and plan delivery are dealt with at the end of the process.

Please note that the Matters and Issues have been arranged to enable a Hearing Programme that makes efficient use of time. More than one Matter may be discussed at some Hearing sessions. Particularly with regard to the Community Areas, it is not possible to fix a time when individual settlements may be discussed and flexibility from participants will likely be required. Gaps which emerge in the Hearings process will be used by the Inspector for site inspections.

**PLEASE NOTE – The Hearings programme may change. Flexibility from participants may be required.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7th May 2013</td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>10.00 – 10.15</td>
<td>Opening Announcements</td>
<td>Inspector &amp; Wiltshire Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.15 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 1: Procedural Matters, Legal Compliance and Vision (Whole Document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 1 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8th May 2013</td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 1 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 1 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15th May 2013</td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>10.00 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 5: Resilient Communities (CP2, CP48 &amp; CP 49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 5 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 16th May 2013</td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 6: Climate Change (CP41 &amp; CP42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 6 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 21st May 2013</td>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 7: Natural Environment (CP50 – 56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 7 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22nd May 2013</td>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 8: Built Environment (CP57 – 59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 11th June 2013 Day 7 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 2: Settlement Hierarchy and Delivery (CP1 &amp; CP2)</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 2 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12th June 2013 Day 8 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 3: Economy (CP2 &amp; CP 34-40)</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 3 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 13th June 2013 Day 9 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 4: Housing Questions 1 - 14 (CP2 &amp; CP43 – 47)</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 4 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 14th June 2013 Day 10 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 4 Housing Questions 15 – 29</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 4 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25th June 2013 Day 12 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – Chippenham (Section C of Matter 9)</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 9: Chippenham Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26th June 2013 Day 13 09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Chippenham Continued</td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30 Matter 9: Chippenham Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas - Corsham (Section D of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Chippenham Reserve Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – Marlborough, Melksham and Mere (Sections H, I &amp; J of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 9: Marlborough, Melksham and Mere Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – Salisbury and Pewsey (Sections K &amp; L of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 9: Salisbury and Pewsey Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – Royal Wootton Basset and Cricklade (Section M of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 9: Royal Wooton Basset and Cricklade Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – South Wiltshire, Tidworth, Tisbury and Wilton (Sections N, O, P &amp; T of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 9: South Wiltshire, Tidworth, Tisbury and Wilton Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; July 2013</td>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Matter 9: Community Areas – Trowbridge (Section Q of Matter 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00 – 17.30</td>
<td>Matter 9: Trowbridge Continued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Independent Examination of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

## Matter 1: Procedural Matters, Legal Compliance and Vision (Whole Document)

### Tuesday 7th & Wednesday 8th May 2013

**Does the Core Strategy have a robust vision for Wiltshire and has it been positively prepared in compliance with all relevant legal requirements?**

1. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the associated regulations\(^1\), including in respect of the publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification?

---

\(^1\) Particularly, The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Local Plan)

Programme for Hearing Sessions – Version 26 as at 12th July 2013
2. Does the Plan acknowledge adequately cross border issues, particularly with regard to the
Duty to Cooperate on strategic matters? Have there been timely, effective and conclusive
discussions with key stakeholders and prescribed bodies (including the Wiltshire Local Nature
Partnership) on what the CS should contain?
3. Does the CS recognise adequately the influences of key settlements such as Bath, Bristol and
Swindon upon the needs of Wiltshire (e.g. employment, housing and transportation)?
4. Has the production of the Plan followed the Statement of Community Involvement? Has the
consultation on the submitted plan and its changes been adequate?
5. To what extent has the production of the Plan followed the Local Development Scheme?
6. Is the Equalities Impact Assessment adequate and robust in terms of its methodology and
conclusions?
7. Has the Plan been prepared to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework
(NPPF)? Is the timeframe of the CS adequate and should review mechanisms be inbuilt?
8. Has adequate consideration been given to the Habitats Directive and associated Regulations?
What evidence, with due regard to Topic Paper 5, the HRA and the Sustainability Appraisal
(including SEA), indicates adequately that the Plan, alone or in combination, will not affect
adversely any Natura 2000 sites? Is the strategy of the Plan towards mitigation justified and
will it be effective? Is Natural England satisfied with the content of the Plan?
9. To what extent has the spatial strategy of the submitted plan been influenced by the
presence of protected landscapes, such as AONBs and the New Forest National Park?
10. To what extent has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the Plan?
   a. Has the SA been prepared in an adequately inclusive and iterative manner?
   b. Has the SA considered reasonable alternatives to the submitted content of the CS
      adequately?
   c. Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that
      were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and
      that those reasons are still valid)?
   d. Has the SA considered the effect of not identifying contingency sites? (for example, in
      relation to land west of Swindon and in key settlements).
11. How are changes to the policies map intended to be collated and shown within the CS
    adequately? Are the changes proposed to the map currently sufficiently clear and
    comprehensive?
12. How will any ‘saved’ policies be addressed clearly?
13. Does the Plan contain a positively prepared, clear and justified vision for Wiltshire? How
    have reasonable alternatives been considered and discounted? Is the Vision too limiting and
does it adequately encompass considerations of health and education?
14. How have the Strategic Objectives been derived, are these adequate and linked to specific
    policy provision? Should transport infrastructure be explicitly referenced?
15. What evidence supports the CS assumptions in relation to employment patterns and out
    commuting? Is this robust?
16. What evidence indicates that the housing and employment requirements are justified? Can
    they be delivered in a suitably phased manner to realise the aspiration of the plan?
17. Does the ambition of the CS balance suitably the three strands of sustainable development –
is there an undue emphasis on the economy? Is the plan clear as to what is meant by
    ‘sustainable’ development?
18. Has the Plan been prepared to be consistent with any relevant community strategies?

Participants (24)

Barton Willmore for Bloor Homes
Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area
Chippenham Community Voice
Colliers for MacTaggart and Mickel
CPRE

---
2 Detailed discussion upon alternative approaches/allocations will be undertaken at subsequent and relevant hearing sessions,
for example focussing on the individual Community Areas/settlements
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Cranborne Chase AONB
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
DPDS for Primegate Properties / Redcliffe Homes
Etchilhampton Parish Council
Gladman Developments
Home Builders Federation
Jacques Partnership
Mr K J McCall (Campaign for a Better Trowbridge)
Natural England
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
North Wessex Downs AONB
Pegasus Planning for Ashton Park / Persimmon Homes / Barratt Strategic
Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport
Savills for Hallam Land Management / Oxford University Endowment Management (OUEM)
Smithgore for the Sealy Farm Partnership / D J Raker Ltd & Cooper Estates Ltd
Swindon Borough Council
Terence O’Rourke for MJ Gleeson
White Horse Alliance
Wednesday 15th May 2013

Matter 5: Resilient Communities (Policies CP2, CP48 & 49)

Does the Plan take a balanced and justified approach to the rural communities of Wiltshire? Will the Plan be effective in securing its objectives?

1. With due regard to Topic Paper 14, what evidence base supports the approach of the CS towards rural communities? Is there a robust baseline of evidence clarifying issues faced by such communities and how progress may be assessed?
2. Does the Plan incorporate adequate flexibility to accommodate appropriate development outside of established settlements?
3. Is the approach of the Plan towards the re-use of redundant buildings consistent with national policy? Has Policy CP48 been positively prepared and what is the justification for its criteria?
4. Should the Policy refer to the potential mis-use of permitted development rights in relation to rural buildings (e.g. agriculture)?
5. How will the approach to ‘community ownership’ be effective in delivering the desired outcomes? Should Policy CP48/49 enable cross subsidy from development to support other community facilities?
6. Is Policy CP49 justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in protecting, as necessary, services and community facilities? Does the Policy relate to sports facilities?
7. Does the CS make an evidence based assessment of the retail needs of rural communities?
8. Does the Policy address adequately faith premises? Is it consistent with the Framework in such regards?
9. Should the policy incorporate specific engagement with affected communities and bodies (e.g. parish councils)?
10. Does CP 49 apply only to rural areas?

Participants (7)

CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
Etchilhampton Parish Council
Land Development Planning Consultants
Jacques Partnership
Melksham Without Parish Council
Pegasus Group
R.A.D.A.R.
Thursday 16th May 2013

Matter 6: Climate Change (Policies CP41 & 42)

Does the CS promote an adequate and evidence based approach to climate change considerations that are consistent with national planning policy and will be effective in its implementation?

Sustainable Construction and Low Carbon Energy (Policy CP 41)

1. What is the evidence base which underpins Policy CP 41? How have alternative approaches been considered and discounted?
2. Is the Policy precise as to what is required yet sufficiently flexible to be effective in operation?
3. Are the requirements in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes justified? How does the Policy relate to the Building Regulations?
4. Should the Policy make explicit reference to the issue of water resources and water recycling? Are these issues referenced suitably within the IDP?
5. What evidence supports the 500 home threshold within Policy CP 41?
6. What evidence indicates the extent to which the requirements of CP 41 may impact on development viability? Is this robust?
7. Should Policy CP 41 reference the role of woodlands in the potential mitigation of climate change effects?

Standalone Renewable Energy Installations

8. Is Policy CP 42 positively prepared and justified by the evidence base, including Topic Papers 1 & 12, with due regard to the consideration of reasonable alternatives?
9. Has the Council’s preferred policy been subject to adequate public consultation in accordance with, amongst other matters, the Statement of Community Involvement?
10. How has the potential effect of standalone renewable energy installations upon the landscape and other environmental assets been assessed?
11. Is the approach of the CS consistent with national planning policy?
12. What is the justification for the Policy approach to wind turbines, particularly in relation to separation distances? Is this robust?
13. How will CP 42 positively deliver Strategic Objective 2?

Participants (9)

CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
Dr Chris Gillham
Duncan Hames MP
Home Builders Federation
Melksham Without Parish Council
Pegasus Planning for Persimmon Homes
The Avebury Society / CPRE
Wiltshire Clean Energy Alliance
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
Tuesday 21st May 2013

Matter 7: Natural Environment (Policies CP50 – 56)

Does the Plan take a justified approach towards the Natural Environment that is based on adequate robust evidence and is consistent with national planning policy? Will it be effective in operation?

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

1. What evidence base underpins Policy CP50 in relation to both bio and geo diversity? Does the evidence demonstrate effective partnership working across county boundaries where necessary?

2. Is Natural England satisfied with the approach and content of the Plan?

3. Should the Water Framework Directive be referenced specifically?

4. Should Policy CP50 make appropriate reference to all protected sites (eg SSSI, SPA, SAC)?

5. Is Policy CP50 justified in its approach towards mitigation?

6. Is it reasonable to require development proposals affecting local sites to contribute to their favourable management in the long term?

Landscape

7. What evidence, with due regard to Topic Paper 5, underpins Policy CP51? Is it robust?

8. Has the Plan and Policy CP51 been positively prepared? Are the criteria of Policy CP51 justified?

9. Is the reference to ‘other relevant assessments’ too vague to be effective?

10. Is Natural England satisfied with the content of the Plan?

11. Is there adequate and justified reference to AONBs and the New Forest National Park?

Green Infrastructure

12. With due regard to Topic Paper 11, what evidence underpins Policy CP 52? What is the baseline for the Green Infrastructure network of the county? How does the approach to Green Infrastructure complement other strategies within the county, eg AONB management plans; canal management projects etc?

13. Is the Plan clear as to what is meant by Green Infrastructure and is this approach justified?

14. Is the requirement for an audit of green infrastructure around major development sites justified?

15. How have open space needs been assessed and what evidence supports the Wilts Open Space standards? Is the approach consistent with national planning policy?

16. How has the Council considered the loss of (and the need for a replacement for) Rural Buffer Zones contained in the North Wiltshire Local Plan?

17. Does CP 52 relate to all scale of proposals including for example, the loss of hedgerow at a domestic level?

Canals and Cotswold Water Park

18. What is the evidence base underpinning Policy CP 53?

19. Should towpaths be recognised as a sustainable transport route?

20. Is the role and protection of the Kennet and Avon Canal recognised adequately by the Plan?

21. Should reference be made to the different users of canals and the tensions which may exist and may require resolution?

22. How has the potential for development at Forest Farm been considered in relation to the objectives of Policy CP53? (rep1189)

23. Is there a need for Policy CP54 and is it supported by a robust evidence base in relation to its criteria?
Air Quality and Contaminated Land

24. What is the evidence base which justifies Policy CP55?
25. Is the policy clear as to when it will apply and how it will be effective in its outcomes?
26. Should there be a reference to an Air Quality Action Plan?
27. What evidence underpins Policy CP56? Are the criteria of the policy justified?

Participants (15)

Canal and Rivers Trust
CPRE
Cranborne Chase AONB
Dr Chris Gillham
ECOS (East of Chippenham Open Space)
Etchilhampton Parish Council
Home Builders Federation
Melksham Without Parish Council
Natural England
North Wessex Downs AONB
Pegasus Planning for Ashton Park / Persimmon Homes / Barratt Strategic
R.A.D.A.R.
Salisbury Campaign for Better Transport
White Horse Alliance
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
Wednesday 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 2013

AM Matter 8 Built Environment (Policies CP57 – 59)

PM Site Visits

Does the Plan take a suitably evidence based approach towards the built environment? Is the Plan consistent with national policy in such regards?

1. With due regard to Topic Paper 9, what baseline evidence supports the approach of the Plan towards the built environment, for example characterisation and view management?
2. How has the Historic Landscape Assessment been considered in the production of the CS? Does the CS consider the scope of mitigation of effects adequately?
3. Is the detail of Policy CP 57 justified and will it be effective in operation?
4. Is there any requirement for a reference in relation to how the Council will respond to tall or taller buildings?
5. Is the approach of the Plan towards the historic environment consistent with national planning policy? Is English Heritage in agreement with the objectives and content of the Plan?
6. Is paragraph 4 and criteria ix) to xvii) of CP58 clear and consistent? Will it be effective in securing the policy objectives?
7. Is there adequate reference to heritage assets at risk? Should the Plan include reference to Historic Landscape Characterisations?
8. What evidence justifies the content of Policy CP59?
9. Does the Plan contain adequate reference to World Heritage Assets?
10. Is the Plan and Policy CP59 clear as to what is meant by Outstanding Universal Value? Should any reference be made to the ‘setting’ of a World Heritage Site? If so, should there be a reference to the enhancement of ‘setting’?

Participants (4)

Etchilhampton Parish Council
Melksham Without Parish Council
PJ Planning
The Avebury Society / CPRE
**Tuesday 11th June 2013**

**Matter 2: Settlement Hierarchy and Delivery (Polices CP1 & 2)**

**Is the settlement strategy justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in realising the objectives and vision of the CS?**

**Settlement Strategy CP1**

1. Is the settlement hierarchy, with due regard to Topic Paper 3, of the CS justified?
   a. Are the Principal Settlements justified robustly? Should Chippenham be a Strategically Significant Town as envisaged by the draft RSS?
   b. Are market towns identified robustly, e.g. Tidworth/Ludgershall? Should Pewsey be a market town? Should Devizes be a Strategic Market Town?
   c. Are local service centres justified robustly? Should Purton be a Local Service Centre?
   d. Are large/small villages identified robustly? (Yarnbrook, Burton Hill, Easterton, Grittleton, Great Hinton, Minety, Etchilhampton)

2. Are defined limits for any settlement necessary? Is the identification of defined limits for relevant settlements based on robust evidence; how has the SHLAA been taken into account? Should small villages have such defined limits?

3. Does the settlement hierarchy and Policy CP1 provide sufficient flexibility for the effective delivery of necessary new development in settlements? Is the approach of CP1 consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework? Is the Plan unduly restrictive? Why should developments be limited to 10 houses in large villages?

4. Is CP1 clear and consistent as to its approach to Market Towns and their capacity to accommodate significant development?

5. Does the settlement hierarchy have due regard to the Habitats Directive and potential environmental constraints upon growth?

6. Should CP1 recognise explicitly the influence of settlements outside of Wiltshire, e.g. Swindon?

**Delivery Strategy CP2**

(Discussion on the amounts of employment land and housing contained in the Core Strategy will be discussed at Hearings 3 and 4 respectively. This will include discussion upon the SA and upon reasonable alternatives. The Hearing sessions upon each Community Area will enable discussion on specific Strategic Development Sites as necessary)

7. Is the principle of the delivery strategy justified and robust?

8. Is the job alignment methodology robust? How will the phasing of development be effectively managed to ensure the delivery of the CS objectives and vision?

9. Is it clear how existing commitments for employment land and housing are to be calculated? Are the volumes of intended development over the plan period expressed appropriately?

10. Is the approach of CP2 towards previously developed land (inc 35%) justified and consistent with national planning policy?

11. Is the requirement for development outside of defined limits to be ‘plan led’ inflexible and contrary to the principle of sustainable development? Should such an approach apply to ‘small villages’?

12. Is the CS focus on key strategic development sites too inflexible to ensure the effective delivery of required levels of housing and employment land?

13. Is a Sites Allocation DPD necessary and programmed? How will an effective supply of non strategic sites be brought forward over the plan period? What evidence supports the likely effectiveness of neighbourhood planning in bringing forward necessary levels of development? Is the change to para 4.28 consistent with national policy?

14. How have strategic development sites been selected? Is the approach robust?

15. Is the referencing to maximising community benefits within CP2 justified and consistent with national policy?
16. Is the approach of CP2 towards small villages worded precisely and effectively? Can a village be elongated if only infill permitted?
17. Does CP2 make adequate provision for community requirements such as faith premises?

Participants (26)

Amec for Crown Estates
Barton Willmore for Bloor Homes
Carter Jonas for Sir D S Wills
CGMS for Robert Hitchins Ltd
Chippenham Community Voice
CPRE
Cranborne Chase AONB
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
DPDS for Primegate Properties
ECOS (East of Chippenham Open Space)
Emery Planning for Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd
Etchilhampton Parish Council
GL Hearn for Various Clients
Home Builders Federation
Kemp & Kemp for The Bowerman Discretionary Trust and Leda Properties
Land Development Planning Consultants
Melksham Without Parish Council
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
Pegasus Planning for Barratt Strategic / Persimmon Homes
Pro Vision for Hills UK
RPS for MacTaggart and Mickel
Savills for Hallam Land Management / Oxford University Endowment Management (OUEM)
Smithsgore for the Sealy Farm Partnership / D J Raker Ltd & Cooper Estates Ltd
Terence O’Rourke for MJ Gleeson
Turley Associates for North Chippenham Consortium / Taylor Wimpey
Wednesday 12th June 2013

Matter 3: Economy (Policies CP2 & CP34 – 40)

Does the CS provide the most appropriate and robust strategy towards the economy with due regard to cross border issues? Is the approach evidenced adequately and consistent with national policy? Will the approach be effective?

1. With due regard to Topic Paper 7, is the strategy within the CS justified by the evidence base? Is the overall amount of new employment land proposed over the plan period, as identified in Policy CP 2, justified robustly?

2. Is the principle of its spatial distribution supported adequately by the evidence base with due regard to the needs of neighbouring authorities (including Swindon)?

Employment Land

3. With particular reference to the Council’s Employment Land Review, is the employment land strategy embodied in Policy CP34 supported by adequately robust evidence?

4. Is Policy CP34 sufficiently precise so as to be effective in delivery?
   a. Should non B class employment generating uses be referenced?
   b. Should reference be made to ‘exceptional’ circumstances?
   c. What is meant by ‘adjacent’ to settlements?
   d. What is a ‘rural based’ business?
   e. Is CP34 viii reasonable?
   f. Does the Policy acknowledge adequately considerations such as the AONB?

Existing Employment Sites

5. With regard to B class and other uses which create employment, is the retention of Principal Employment Areas justified by the evidence base?

6. What alternative approaches have been considered?

7. Is Policy CP35 sufficiently flexible so as to be effective in operation?

Economic Regeneration

8. Is Policy CP36 justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Is it precise and clear in its meaning, particularly as regards what forms of development may be acceptable?

9. Does the Policy complement or potentially compromise the role and function of existing town centres?

10. Is the Plan clear as to the intended approach to be taken in relation to the economic regeneration of brownfield sites in the rural area or in villages?

Military Establishments

11. Is Policy CP37 justified by the evidence base?

12. Is it clear, with particular regard to redundant sites/buildings, as to what forms of development may be acceptable where?

13. Does the policy acknowledge adequately the principles of sustainable development?

Retail and Leisure

14. With due regard to Topic Paper 6, is the CS and Policy CP38 justified by an adequate and up to date evidence base and is it consistent with national planning policy?

15. Is the Plan clear, with regard to quantitative and qualitative needs, as to what level and type of retail development is required where?

16. Is the requirement for an ‘impact assessment’ reasonable, justified and consistent with national planning policy?
17. Does the Plan take an evidence based approach to the identification of primary and secondary retail frontages which is robust?
18. Does the Plan provide adequate clarity to retail and leisure considerations in the rural areas?
19. Should Policy CP38 reference the issue of car parking?
20. Should the Plan make explicit reference to the provision of theatres?

Tourist Development and Accommodation

21. Are policies CP39 and 40 based upon an adequate evidence base?
22. Is the reference to a ‘sequential assessment’ clear as to its meaning and justified?
23. Does CP 39 support established tourist development and its expansion outside of main settlements?
24. Are the criteria of CP39 warranted and will they be effective in contributing to the Policy objectives?
25. Are the criteria of CP 40 warranted and sufficiently flexible so as to be effective in operation?

Participants (10)

Berkeley Strategic
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
GL Hearn for HPH
GVA for Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd
Land Development Planning Consultants
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
Pegasus Planning for Ashton Park / Persimmon Homes / Barratt Strategic
Savills for Oxford University Endowment Management (OUEM)
Smithsgore for the Sealy Farm Partnership
Thursday 13\textsuperscript{th} June 2013

PLEASE NOTE, IN A CHANGE TO THE PREVIOUS PROGRAMME MATTER 4 IS NOW BEING DISCUSSED OVER TWO DAYS. SHOULD ANY OF THE PARTICIPANTS IDENTIFIED ONLY HAVE AN INTEREST ON A PARTICULAR DAY PLEASE LET THE PROGRAMME OFFICER KNOW SO THAT NUMBERS CAN BE MANAGED.

Matter 4: Housing (Policies CP2 & CP43 – 47) Questions 1 - 14

Is the Core Strategy’s approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy? With particular regard to deliverability, has the Core Strategy been positively prepared and will it be effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the county over the plan period?

1. Is the overall amount of housing proposed over the plan period justified robustly with due regard to the National Planning Policy Framework\textsuperscript{3}?
   a. Will the CS provide for sufficient housing to meet the objectively assessed needs of the relevant housing market area(s)? What evidence supports the approach of the CS to Community Planning Areas?
   b. How have the relevant housing market areas been derived? Are these justified?
   c. Is the SHMA\textsuperscript{4} robust?
   d. Has the Duty to Cooperate been undertaken effectively?
   e. Is the evidence in support of the planned level of housing provision robust (with due regard to data relating to migration, population projections and alternative methodologies)? Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust? How has census data been used to inform the Core Strategy?
   f. How does the Government’s potential relocation of armed service personnel influence the housing provisions required for Wiltshire?
   g. Does the SA support, robustly, the approach of the CS towards housing provision? How have reasonable alternatives been considered and discounted?
   h. Should the distribution of the intended housing to meet HMA needs be more clearly shown within Policy CP2?
   i. What evidence supports the approach of the CS towards the housing land supply for Wiltshire? How will the 5 year land supply be disaggregated and how does this relate to the objectively assessed needs of the HMAs?
   j. How have the housing trajectories been derived and are they robust?
   k. How has the CS been informed by, and is consistent with, the Council’s Housing Strategy?

Affordable Housing

2. What are the affordable housing needs? Does the Plan provide sufficient detail and adequate flexibility on how these will be met?
3. How does the Plan consider matters such as the New Homes Bonus in affecting the delivery of affordable housing?
4. Will the Town and Country Planning (Modification and Discharge of Planning Obligations) (Amendment)(England) Regulations 2013 effect the delivery of affordable housing within the county over the plan period?
5. Are the assumptions on the affordability of housing within Wiltshire well founded?
6. Is 40% affordable housing provision on schemes of 5 homes or more in Policy CP 43 justified with due regard to alternatives? Are the figures for housing expressed appropriately and effectively? Is it appropriate to have county wide figures?
7. Is the approach of Policy CP43 towards tenure justified and effective? Should Policy CP 43 provide greater clarity on the tenure and size of housing to be provided to ensure needs are met?

\textsuperscript{3} Particularly paragraph 47
\textsuperscript{4} Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Local Plan)
Programme for Hearing Sessions – Version 26 as at 12th July 2013
8. Is the approach of Policy CP 43 to site distribution justified by the evidence base?
9. Does the evidence support the requirement of financial contributions towards affordable housing on sites of 4 or fewer new homes? Is the Plan sufficiently precise as to what will be required on smaller sites?
10. Is policy CP43 deliverable with due regard to viability considerations? Is the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment robust with due regard to the assumptions it contains?
11. Should the Plan reference self build opportunities for affordable housing?

Exceptions Housing

12. What evidence supports the CS approach to rural exceptions sites and is this consistent with national planning policy?
13. Is the Policy CP 44 sufficiently precise so as to be effective in operation?
14. Are the criteria of CP 44 justified? (For example - What is meant by ‘clear support from the local community’? What is meant by ‘well related’? What is the justification for a 10 dwelling limit? How will occupation of market housing be controlled?)

Participants (25)

Barton Willmore for Bloor Homes
Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area
CGMS for Robert Hitchens Ltd
Chippenham Community Voice
CPRE
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
Emery Planning for Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd
Etchilhampton Parish Council
Gladman Developments
Home Builders Federation
Kemp & Kemp for The Bowerman Discretionary Trust and Leda Properties
Meksham Without Parish Council
Murdoch Planning
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for Redrow Homes
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
North Wessex Downs AONB
Pegasus Planning for Ashton Park / Persimmon Homes / Barratt Strategic
RPS for MacTaggart and Mickel
Savills for Hallam Land Management / Oxford University Endowment Management (OUEM)
Smithsgore for D J Raker Ltd & Cooper Estates Ltd
Swindon Borough Council
Terence O’Rourke for MJ Gleeson
Turley Associates for North Chippenham Consortium / Taylor Wimpey
West Ashton Parish Council
Friday 14th June 2013

Matter 4: Housing (Policies CP2 & CP43 – 47) Questions 15 - 29

Is the Core Strategy’s approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy? With particular regard to deliverability, has the Core Strategy been positively prepared and will it be effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the county over the plan period?

Meeting Needs

15. What evidence underpins Policy CP 45 and is the policy consistent with national planning policy?
16. Is the policy sufficiently precise as to what will be required so as to be effective in implementation?
17. How is the Policy intended to operate with due regard to housing market areas and key settlements?
18. Should the policy encompass considerations of viability?

Vulnerable and Older People

19. What robust evidence underpins the approach of the Plan towards the housing needs of vulnerable and older people? Does this encompass the need for retirement properties adequately?
20. Does the Core Strategy link and cross reference other evidence sources such as the Older People’s Accommodation Strategy?
21. How have the criteria within Policy CP 46 been derived and is the approach justified and effective?
22. How have matters of development viability been considered?

Gypsies and Travellers

23. With due regard to Topic Paper 16, what evidence supports the approach of the Core Strategy towards gypsies and travellers and is this sufficiently up to date and robust? What engagement with relevant communities has been undertaken?
24. How has the duty to cooperate sought to address gypsy and traveller accommodation effectively?
25. Is the approach consistent with national planning policy?
26. How have alternatives been considered and discounted? Has consideration been given to accommodating needs as a proportion of large site allocations?
27. Is the needs assessment adequate for the plan period? How will this issue be addressed effectively?
28. Does the CS identify adequate sites and broad locations for growth for 5, 10 and 15 year periods in accord with national policy?
29. Is the relationship between the Core Strategy and intended Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocation DPD consistent and clear? Will they be effective?

Participants (24)

Barton Willmore for Bloor Homes
Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area
CGMS for Robert Hitchens Ltd
Chippenham Community Voice
CPRE
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
Emery Planning for Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd
Etchilhampton Parish Council
Gladman Developments
Home Builders Federation
Kemp & Kemp for The Bowerman Discretionary Trust and Leda Properties
Melksham Without Parish Council
Murdoch Planning
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for Redrow Homes
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
North Wessex Downs AONB
Pegasus Planning for Ashton Park / Persimmon Homes / Barratt Strategic
RPS for MacTaggart and Mickel
Savills for Hallam Land Management / Oxford University Endowment Management (OUEM)
Smithsgore for D J Raker Ltd & Cooper Estates Ltd
Terence O’Rourke for MJ Gleson
Turley Associates for North Chippenham Consortium / Taylor Wimpey
West Ashton Parish Council
Wednesday 19\textsuperscript{th} June 2013

Matter 9: Community Areas – Amesbury and Bradford on Avon

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

A) **Amesbury Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Amesbury Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP4?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land warranted and deliverable? Is the quantum a minimum?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation at Kings Gate justified?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of non strategic housing?
   c. Is the policies map to be updated appropriately (is it consistent with the extant Local Plan?)
5. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
6. Is the approach to Porton Down justified by the evidence base? What is the timescale for the IBEMS SPD?
7. Is the approach towards Stonehenge (CP6) justified by the evidence base and consistent with national policy? Does CP6 fulfil the statutory obligations applicable to a World Heritage Site?
8. Is Gomeldon (east/west) referenced clearly and correctly?

**Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A**

9. What evidence supports the development template for the land at Kings Gate? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
10. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

B) **Bradford on Avon Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Bradford on Avon Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP7?
2. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?
3. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? Should it be indicated by floorspace?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation justified and deliverable with due regard to site constraints and the availability of alternatives?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing?
   c. Is the transport infrastructure adequate to accommodate the development proposed?
   d. Is the policies map to be updated appropriately?
6. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS? Is the intended phasing for new housing clear and justified?

7. Is the Holt ‘area of opportunity’ justified by the evidence base with due regard to the consideration of alternatives?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

8. What evidence supports the development template for land at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?

9. Does the template consider adequately heritage considerations?

10. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

11. Should the employment requirement be expressed in terms of floorspace?

Participants (12)

Amesbury Town Council
Avebury Society / CPRE
Bradford on Avon Preservation Trust
Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area
D2 Planning for Barratt Homes
DPDS for Redcliffe Homes
Friends of Woolley
GL Hearn for Various Clients
Holt Parish Council
Martin Valatin
Network Against Wiltshire Sprawl
White Horse Alliance
Tuesday 25th & Wednesday 26th June 2013

Matter 9: Community Areas – Chippenham

C) Chippenham Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Chippenham Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP9 and 10? Are the assumptions on seeking to reduce out commuting justified?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Does the strategy for Chippenham and the intended distribution of development reflect environmental constraints adequately, particularly in relation to the Habitats Directive?

CP9

4. Is the approach to the Central Areas of Opportunity, justified by the evidence base? How have the retained saved policies of the North Wiltshire Local Plan been assessed with due regard to reasonable alternatives?
5. Is Policy CP9 sufficiently clear as to what amount of specific types of development would be acceptable where and when? Does the CS make an evidence based assessment of the retail needs of Chippenham and where and when additional floorspace may be specifically accommodated (evidence)?
6. How is the evening economy to be addressed?

CP10

7. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? Does the CS place sufficient emphasis on the employment needs of the town? Should the CS place a greater emphasis on employment provision within the town centre?
8. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
9. Is the volume of intended development adequate to meet the identified needs for the plan period?
10. Are the strategic site allocations for North Chippenham, Rawlings Green and South West Chippenham justified by an adequate evidence base? How has the SA informed the content of the CS, with specific regard to options, in these regards? How have reasonable alternatives been considered and discounted? Has the process of site selection been robust?
11. Does the evidence base make an adequate assessment of potential effects, including environmental, arising from the proposed new developments?
12. What evidence indicates that the strategic sites are deliverable?
13. How have reasonable alternatives been assessed and discounted?
14. Why does CP10 reference Abbeyfield School as a non strategic site? Is it correctly referenced within the volumes of housing in Table 5.4?
15. Will adequate transport and service infrastructure be available to accommodate the levels of development proposed in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy (including Strategic Objective 6)?
16. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
17. Should the housing targets of CP10 be expressed as explicit minimums?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

North Chippenham

Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Local Plan)
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18. What evidence supports the development template for the North Chippenham Strategic Site? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
19. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
20. Can environmental impacts be mitigated adequately?
21. Are the transportation requirements warranted?

**East Chippenham**

22. What evidence supports the development template for the East Chippenham Strategic Site? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
23. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
24. Are the transportation requirements warranted?
25. Are the housing requirements clear and justified, including affordable housing?
26. Has adequate consideration been given to archaeological interests?

**SW Chippenham**

27. What evidence supports the development template for the SW Chippenham Strategic Site? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
28. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
29. Are the housing requirements clear and justified, including affordable housing?
30. Does the template acknowledge heritage impacts adequately?
31. Does the Environment Agency or Natural England maintain outstanding concerns in relation to this site?

**Participants (18)**

Barton Willmore for Bloor Homes  
Bell Cornwell for Gleeson Strategic  
Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area  
CGMS for Robert Hitchens Ltd  
Chippenham Community Voice  
Chris Caswill  
Corsham Civic Society  
CSJ Planning for Chippenham 2020  
D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes  
Dr Nick Murry for Monkton Park Residents Group  
Duncan Hames MP  
ECOS (East of Chippenham Open Space)  
GVA for Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd  
Jacques Partnership  
Pegasus Planning for Barratt Strategic  
Provision for Wessex Water  
Showell Protection Group  
Smithsgore for the Sealy Farm Partnership  
Turley Associates for North Chippenham Consortium
Thursday 27th June 2013 June 2013 (AM – Corsham / PM Chippenham Reserve)

D) **Corsham Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Corsham Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP11, should it accommodate strategic growth?
2. Is the CS clear as to the relationship between Corsham and Chippenham? Does the CS provide adequate protection of the separation between Corsham and the strategic growth of Chippenham (should the SW Chippenham extension be acknowledged in the Corsham strategy)?
3. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
4. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?
5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered (eg Sands Quarry)?
6. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing?
   b. Should there be an urban extension between the A4 and Bradford Road?
   c. Does the amount of the houses remaining to be identified (Table 5.5) take account of all existing commitments (eg application 10/4093/FUL)?
   d. Is the transport infrastructure adequate to accommodate the development proposed?
7. Does the CS make an evidence based assessment of the retail needs of Corsham in qualitative and quantitative terms? Is the approach consistent with national policy?
8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

**Participants (7)**

- Corsham Civic Society
- CMS for Putney Investments
- D2 Planning for Crest Strategic / Redcliffe Homes
- Land Development Planning Consultants
- Showell Protection Group
- White Horse Alliance
- Woolf Bond Planning for De Vernon Trustees
Tuesday 2nd July 2013

Matter 9: Community Areas – Marlborough, Melksham and Mere

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

H) Marlborough Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Marlborough Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP14?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive? Has the effect of the plan’s contents upon the River Kennet been assessed adequately?
4. Does the CS reflect adequately the N Wessex Downs AONB and its statutory purposes? Has adequate consideration been given to the potential effects of development upon the value of Savernake Plateau and with regards to water abstraction?
5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met?
6. Does the CS recognise adequately the role of tourism and its contribution towards the economy within the community area?
7. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation justified and consistent with the objectives of the remainder of the CS (e.g. Policies CP50, 51 et al)? How have alternatives been considered? Is the CS clear as to how the masterplanning process will work?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing?
   c. Should the CS reference affordable housing issues within the community area?
8. Is the infrastructure, including public transport, adequate to accommodate the development proposed? Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area?
9. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
10. Is air quality an issue to be addressed within the community area?
11. Is the approach to the World Heritage Site (para 5.75(8)) consistent with national policy?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

12. What evidence supports the development template for the land at Salisbury Road? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
13. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

I) Melksham Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Melksham Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP15 and CP16?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for Melksham? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?
5. Does the CS provide adequate clarity as to how retail development within the town centre will be considered?
6. Is the transport infrastructure, including public transport, adequate to accommodate the development proposed? Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area?
7. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
8. Are the villages of Seend, Bowerhill and Great Hinton designated appropriately?

J) **Mere Community Area**

**With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Mere Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?**

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP17?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? How have alternatives been considered? Should specific sites be allocated?
   b. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?
5. Is the transport infrastructure, including public transport, adequate to accommodate the development proposed? Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area?
6. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

**Participants (12)**

*Amec for Crown Estates*
*Avebury Society*
*CPRE*
*Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area*
*GL Hearn for the Doric Group*
*Melksham Without Parish Council*
*Natural England*
*North Wessex Downs AONB*
*Pegasus Planning for Persimmon Homes*
*Savernake Parish Council*
*Savills for Hallam Land Management / Bloor Homes*
*Wiltshire Wildlife Trust*
Wednesday 3rd July 2013

Matter 9: Community Areas – Salisbury and Pewsey

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

K) Salisbury Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Salisbury Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP20-23? Is the evidence base sufficiently up to date and robust? Does it include reference to the ‘Salisbury Transport Strategy’?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area? Does the CS have appropriate regard to the ‘Salisbury Vision’?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Are the strategic allocations for the town justified by the evidence base? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?
5. Are the CS and Policies CP20 and CP21 based on a robust retail assessment? Is the plan clear as to the retail requirements of the city and what will be provided where and when?
6. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed? Is the CS up to date in relation to the educational needs of the area?
7. Does the CS identify suitably the transport issues facing the city, of all modes, and will the plan be effective in addressing them to support the development proposed?
8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
9. Is Policy CP22 justified?
10. Is Policy CP23 justified by the evidence base? Is adequate account taken of the heritage value of the site?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

11. What evidence supports the development templates for allocations affecting Salisbury? How will these sites be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
12. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

L) Pewsey Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Pewsey Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP18?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Does the CS reflect adequately the N Wessex Downs AONB and its statutory purposes?
4. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?

5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?

6. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for Pewsey? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?

7. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?

8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
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Matter 9: Community Areas – Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

M) Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP19?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Does the CS reflect adequately the N Wessex Downs AONB and its statutory purposes?
4. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?
5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
6. Are the CS and Policies CP19 based on a robust retail assessment which includes ‘qualitative’ considerations? Is the plan clear as to the retail requirements of the community area?
7. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives, the Duty to Cooperate, the proximity of Swindon and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for Royal Wooton Basset? How have alternatives been considered and discounted?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Should the CS make provision for contingency sites within the community area?
   d. Is the CS approach to development upon land to the west of Swindon justified by the evidence base? Is a contingency provision for development to the west of Swindon warranted by the evidence base? Does the CS take a justified approach to accounting for the 200 homes at Morden Bridge?
   e. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?
8. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
9. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of all modes of transport infrastructure (eg, rail, M4, HGV network)? How will necessary transport infrastructure provisions be delivered?
10. Should there be a specific reference to HGV traffic management issues relating to Cricklade?
11. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
12. Is the settlement hierarchy supported by robust evidence? Is Bradenstoke justifiably identified as a large village?
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Matter 9: Community Areas – South Wiltshire, Tidworth, Tisbury & Wilton

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

N) South Wiltshire Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the South Wiltshire Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP24 and 25?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for South Wiltshire? How have alternatives been considered and discounted?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Does the CS take a justified and flexible approach to the delivery of adequate housing within the wider community area?
   d. Is table 5.14 up to date?
6. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
7. With due regard to the Duty to Cooperate, is the approach of the CS to the New Forest National Park justified by the evidence base?
8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

O) Tidworth Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Tidworth Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 26?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive, particularly in relation to the River Avon SAC and the Salisbury Plain SPA?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation for the area justified by the evidence base? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
   c. Are the housing intentions deliverable with due regard to past completion rates?
   d. Should the needs generated by the military be addressed separately?
6. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
7. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
8. What evidence indicates land contamination is not a fundamental constraint to the effective delivery of the strategy for the Tidworth CA?

**Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A**

9. What evidence supports the development template for the land at Drummond Park Depot? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?

10. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

**P) Tisbury Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Tisbury Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 27?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? How have alternatives been considered?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is a strategic allocation for the area warranted? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
5. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
6. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

**T) Wilton Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Wilton Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 33?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive, particularly in relation to the SAC?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
6. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
7. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

**Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A**

8. What evidence supports the development template for the UK Land Forces HQ at Wilton? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?

9. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Local Plan)
Programme for Hearing Sessions – Version 26 as at 12th July 2013

36
Participants (3)

CPRE
Cranborne Chase AONB
Savills for Primetower Properties / Charles Church
Wednesday 10th July 2013

Matter 9: Community Areas – Trowbridge

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

Q) Trowbridge Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Trowbridge Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 28, 29 and 30?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive? Does the CS acknowledge adequately the role of natural assets such as Biss Woods?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation for the area justified by the evidence base? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the plan sufficiently clear as to the infrastructure implications and requirements of the strategic allocation?
   c. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated? Should the site at the Staverton Triangle be saved from the West Wiltshire Local Plan?
6. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area to support the development proposed?
7. Is the CS clear as to the need and broad location for a new secondary school site to the south of the town?
8. Are the requirements of the CS and Policies CP28-29 based on a robust retail assessment which includes ‘qualitative’ considerations? Is the plan clear as to the retail requirements of the community area? Should there be a clearly defined town centre boundary for Trowbridge? Is the relationship to the Town Centre Master Plan clear and will the CS be effective in delivering the objectives for the town?
9. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
10. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of all modes of transport infrastructure (eg, B3105 and the HGV network)? How will necessary transport infrastructure provisions be delivered in a timely fashion consistent with the objectives of the Core Strategy (including Strategic Objective 6)?
11. Is CP30 justified by the evidence and sufficiently precise as to be effective in delivering the objectives?
12. Should Yarnbrook be a small village?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

13. What evidence supports the development template for the land at Ashton Park Urban Extension? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
14. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
15. Does Natural England have any outstanding concerns in relation to this site (e.g. buffers)? Is the ancient woodland protected and referenced adequately?
Participants (10)

Campaign for Better Transport, Bristol and Bath Travel to Work Area
CPRE
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Matter 9: Community Areas – Warminster and Westbury

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

R) Warminster Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Warminster Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 31?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive, particularly in relation to the River Avon SAC and the Salisbury Plain SPA? Does the urban extension take into account its potential effect upon the AONB?
4. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?
5. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation for the area justified by the evidence base and of an appropriately defined size and location? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non-strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?
6. Is the town boundary defined appropriately with regard to 44 and 48 Bath Road?
7. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure, including water supply, education and the emergency services, needs of the area to support the development proposed?
8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
9. Is Chapmanslade justified as a large village?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

10. What evidence supports the development template for the land at West Warminster Urban Extension? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
11. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
12. Are the housing requirements clear and justified, including affordable housing?
13. Does the template acknowledge effects upon heritage assets adequately?
14. Do Natural England and the Environment Agency have any outstanding concerns in relation to this site?

S) Westbury Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach towards the Westbury Community Area? Will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP 32?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the CS clear as to the intentions for the Wellhead Valley? Is the landscape value protected adequately?
4. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive, particularly in relation to the Bath and Bradford on Avon SAC?
5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land clear, justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met? How have alternatives been considered?

6. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Is the strategic allocation for the area justified by the evidence base and of an appropriately defined size and location? Is it deliverable? Should additional land be included to ensure deliverability? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. How has the location of Hawkeridge Farm been considered in the process of plan production?
   c. Should the plan include a direction for future growth?
   d. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non-strategic housing? Should specific sites be allocated?

7. Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure, needs of the area to support the development proposed (including transport, water supply, education and the emergency services)? What is the Council’s position in relation to the ‘eastern Westbury bypass’ and how should this be reflected within the CS?

8. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

9. Is the LaFarge Cement works site referenced adequately and effectively within the CS? Is a more flexible approach warranted? Should the existing rail sidings be referenced for retention/review?

Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A

10. What evidence supports the development template for the Westbury allocations? How will these sites be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?

11. Do the templates provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?

12. Can adequate Green Infrastructure be provided at Station Road?

Participants (16)
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Matter 9: Community Areas – Calne, Malmesbury and Devizes

Please note this session will start at 9.00am

Does the CS take a robust approach to the identified community areas of Wiltshire and key settlements? Is the approach consistent with national policy and will the objectives of the plan be capable of effective delivery?

E) Calne Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Calne Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP8?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for the town? What consideration has been given to an ‘area of growth’ to accommodate necessary housing?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the consequent deliverability of the intended housing? Should substantial sites be identified within the CS?
   c. Is the transport infrastructure adequate to accommodate the levels of development proposed?
   d. Is the policies map to be updated appropriately?
5. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?

5.

G) Malmesbury Community Area

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Malmesbury Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP13?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable? Are needs to be met?
4. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for Malmesbury? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non strategic housing? Is the plan clear as to what will go where?
   c. Is the plan sufficiently flexible to enable adequate housing to be delivered in rural settlements? Is the plan sufficiently flexible to deliver housing in large villages outside of any neighbourhood planning process?
5. Is the transport infrastructure, including public transport, adequate to accommodate the development proposed? Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area?
6. Does the CS make an evidence based assessment of the retail needs of Malmesbury? How will provision be accommodated as necessary?
7. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
F) **Devizes Community Area**

With due regard to the consideration of alternatives, does the CS take a justified approach the Devizes Community Area and will it be effective in terms of delivery?

1. What is the justification for the strategy embodied in CP12? Does the strategy place an undue focus upon the town rather than the area as a whole?
2. Does the CS reflect adequately the community strategy for the area?
3. Is the approach of the CS supported by adequate evidence pertaining to the Habitats Directive?
4. Does the CS reflect adequately the N Wessex Downs AONB?
5. Is the distribution and amount of employment land justified and deliverable (e.g. land between A361 and Horton Road)? Will the masterplan approach be effective? Are needs to be met?
6. Is the level and distribution of housing justified adequately with due regard to alternatives and the demands upon infrastructure?
   a. Should there be a strategic housing allocation for Devizes? How have alternatives been considered?
   b. Is the CS clear as to the deliverability of the non-strategic housing? Are the housing requirements clear and justified, including affordable housing?
   c. Is the plan sufficiently flexible to enable adequate housing to be delivered in rural settlements?
7. Is the transport infrastructure adequate to accommodate the development proposed? Does the CS make an adequate assessment of the infrastructure needs of the area?
8. Does the CS make an evidence based assessment of the retail needs of Devizes and where will the additional floorspace be accommodated (evidence)? Should this be reflected in Policy CP12?
9. How will the housing and employment land be phased to deliver the strategic intentions of the CS?
10. Should St Mary’s church be recognised in para 5.65 as a potential regeneration site? Should the reference to a rail link be cross referenced in Policy CP66?
11. Is Worton a large village?

**Strategic Allocations – Development Template Appendix A**

13. What evidence supports the development template for the land at Horton Road? How will this site be reflected adequately on the Policies Map?
14. Does the template provide adequate information in relation to likely infrastructure requirements and implications? Are these justified and deliverable with due regard to the viability of development?
15. Does Natural England have any outstanding concerns in relation to this site?
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Matter 10: Infrastructure, Monitoring and Delivery (Whole Document, IDP, CP3 and CP60 – 69)

Matter 10: Does the CS address adequately the provision of necessary infrastructure to support the delivery of the strategic objectives and the vision? Are the Core Strategy’s monitoring targets justified adequately and of a level of detail that is appropriate to a Core Strategy? How will the effectiveness of the CS be managed?

General

1. With due regard to all infrastructure (transport, resources, services etc) is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan up to date? Does it specify clearly what is required, where, when and how it may be funded and delivered?
2. Is the prioritisation of infrastructure within CP3 justified?
3. How will the Community Infrastructure Levy be managed within Wiltshire and what implications does it have for the delivery of the Core Strategy?
4. Is the CS supported by a robust and transparent understanding of how S106 may support the delivery of the plan’s objectives?
5. Should the timing of financial contributions be linked to the phased delivery of any development?
6. Is the plan underpinned by an awareness of the capacity and requirements of emergency services?
7. How are matters relating to waste intended to be resolved?
8. Do the changes to the policies map reflect the CS adequately? Are the changes proposed to the Policies Map sufficiently clear and comprehensive?
9. Are the arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the Plan clear and will they be effective?
10. Are the targets and monitoring proposed related adequately to the Policy objectives? How will the effectiveness of the CS and its individual policies be measured/assessed? What are the monitoring indicators for each policy; do these relate to the policy content and objectives? How will the effective delivery of the CS be managed?
11. Should the CS include clearer timescales to assist monitoring, thereby providing milestones to assess policy effectiveness?
12. Are issues of development viability recognised adequately by the CS and its evidence base? Is the requirement for a ‘viability assessment’ justified in all cases?
13. How have risks and contingency been robustly addressed in the production of the Plan? Where is the supporting evidence?
14. Where can be found a comprehensive list of development plan policies following Plan adoption?

Plan Specific (and with regard to Topic Paper 10)

CP 60 Sustainable Transport

15. With due regard to Topic Paper 10 and the Local Transport Plan, what evidence supports the approach of the CS towards transportation and Policy CP60 in particular? How will it be implemented?
16. Is it clear precisely what the Policy will require?
17. Is the Local Transport Plan complete and up to date?
18. Does the aim of improving journey times conflict with the objective to reduce car dependency?
19. Does the CS recognise adequately the role and requirements of rail infrastructure?
20. Is the Policy clear as to what modal forms of transport are to be promoted over others?
21. Does the Policy recognise adequately the demands of rural business, for example tourism which is not always well served with sustainable forms of transport (public)?

**CP 61 Transport and Development**

22. What evidence underpins Policy CP 61 and its criteria? Should it be combined with CP 60?
23. Is the transport user hierarchy justified? Should rail transport be specifically referenced?
24. Does the policy apply to all forms of development or only new build?
25. Is the policy sufficiently flexible so as to be effective in operation?
26. Is the final paragraph of CP 61 clear as to how and when contributions would be sought and subsequently spent?
27. Should the policy seek to influence traffic and parking management of, for example, village roads?

**CP 62 Development Impacts on the Transport Network**

28. What is the justification for Policy CP 62 and is it robust?
29. How will the policy be implemented effectively?
30. Is the policy clear what constitutes the primary route network? Is the policy justified in these respects?

**CP 63 Transport Strategies**

31. Is Policy CP 63 justified by the available evidence? Is it clear precisely what the Policy seeks to achieve?
32. How and when will it be delivered? Will it be effective?
33. Should there be a clear reference to the Salisbury Transport Strategy?
34. What evidence supports the need for strategies for other towns?

**CP 64 Demand Management**

35. What is the evidence base for Policy CP 64?
36. How will parking standards (including cycling) be set and managed?
37. Is criterion ‘c’ justified and reasonable?
38. How and when will Policy CP 64 be implemented and will it be effective? What are the monitoring and management arrangements?
39. What evidence supports the presumption that unallocated communal parking will be provided for residential development schemes? Is the approach justified and sufficiently flexible so as to be effective in operation?

**CP 65 Movement of Goods**

40. What evidence underpins Policy CP 65?
41. How has the ‘duty to cooperate’ been discharged in relation to the movement of goods? Will the Policy be effective?
42. What evidence specifically supports criterion ‘iv’? Is this aspirational rather than deliverable?
43. Does the CS give adequate regard to the potential movement of goods by rail (and water)?

**CP 66 Strategic Transport Network**

44. What evidence supports the content of Policy CP 66? How have alternatives been considered and, as necessary, discounted?
45. Should the policy be supported by a Strategic Transport Diagram?
46. Should the references to the rail network incorporate specific mention of Westbury and a trans Wiltshire rail link through Melksham?
47. Is reference to the A350 justified adequately?
48. Should the policy acknowledge the implications of links between the M4 and Southampton? Should there be specific reference to junction improvements on the M4 (e.g. J 16)?

**CP67 Flood Risk**

49. Is the approach of the CS towards flood risk supported by an adequate evidence base and consistent with national policy?
50. Is the Environment Agency content with the content of Policy CP 67?
51. Should the Policies Map reflect issues of flood risk?
52. How will the provision of SUDs be monitored to ensure effectiveness?
53. Are the monitoring targets reasonable and adequate?

**CP 68 Water Resources**

54. Is the approach of the CS towards water resources supported by an adequate evidence base and consistent with national policy?
55. Does the CS provide adequate clarity upon the issue of water and wastewater infrastructure capacity, improvements and delivery? Should this be explicitly referenced in Policy CP3?
56. Is the Environment Agency content with the content of Policy CP 68?
57. Is the Policy sufficiently clear as to its requirements so as to be effective in operation? What is meant by 'water efficiency measures' and what details are required to be submitted by developers?

**CP 69 River Avon SAC**

58. What evidence supports the approach of the CS towards the River Avon SAC?
59. Are the Environment Agency and Natural England content with the content of Policy CP 69?
60. Should the Policy reference the Habitats Directive and associated regulations?
61. Should the River Kennet be referenced in a similar way to the River Avon?
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*The Highways Agency will be present on the day should any clarification be required on Highway matters but they will not be participating in the discussions.*

**Closing Remarks**
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