

North Wiltshire Local Development Framework

Core Strategy – Second Issues and Options May 2007

Consultation Comments– Questionnaire Results & Council’s Responses

The following results to the questionnaire represent the comments received within the consultation period, 18th May 2007 until 13th July 2007.

There were 119 responses.

Detailed in this document is a summary of the comments received.

Additionally 6 consultation forums were run and the reports from each can be found online:

(http://www.northwilts.gov.uk/index/env/planning/localplans/ldf/core_strategy.htm)

It was intended that, where appropriate, a response would be detailed or an indication given of the intention that North Wiltshire District Council has for the Preferred Options document. However, work has now ceased on the North Wiltshire Local Development Framework owing to Wiltshire becoming a unitary authority from April 2009. All comments made will instead be submitted into the evidence base for the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Section 3. A "Spatial Portrait" of North Wiltshire

The Council received 6 representations concerning the 'Spatial Portrait' for North Wiltshire. A range of points sought clarification or for additional description to be introduced. These included:

- (Paragraph 3.7 & Appendix 2) This could also usefully include the number of scheduled monuments in the District to improve the context for the historic environment.
- Include references to sources of data.
- The document provides a useful brief description of the district's main features from which flow a set of main issues. The issues should be described as they particularly affect the area. For example, economic development might identify particular declining or vulnerable sectors of the local economy and what places may be most influenced by their future.
- (Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.15) do not contain any reference to the critical need to improve rural and rural/urban public transport and means of travel other than the car. The wording fails to make clear that the district is predominantly rural despite much recent house building both in the villages and market towns, and at the main town at Chippenham. There is reference to rural isolation, without describing the rurality of the district.
- (Paragraph 3.16) What are North Wiltshire's assets? They should be the natural environment, the locality, the historic market towns and buildings. These must be articulated for clarity and indication of the district's identity.
- (Paragraph 3.16) Gives no indication of the serious shortage of affordable housing that the district is suffering and is not a robust statement of future intent.
- The portrait is downbeat on environmental and historic uses. It is dominated by everything to do with economic issues and growth.
- (Paragraph 3.7) Makes no mention of County Wildlife Sites and RIGs. The South West Nature Map also appears to have been excluded.
- It is important that Chippenham is recognised as the largest town in North Wiltshire and agree that its role is as the District's main centre. The designation of Chippenham as an SSCT should be outlined more explicitly within the Core Strategy in order to reflect the regional importance of the town.
- The Spatial Strategy presents little in terms of diversity which is clearly evidence between the main centre of Chippenham, the market towns, and the remainder of the District. The area is of considerable diversity, and planning for the needs of the rural area must be a key priority for the District.

Section 4. The Main Issues

The Council received 4 representations concerning the 'Main Issues' for North Wiltshire.

The comments were supportive of the main issues raised. However, a range of points sought clarification or for additional description to be introduced.

For example:

- The general policy direction regarding the road network should be to make the best use of the infrastructure and only make selective improvements where appropriate.
- (Main Issue 1) The final sentence needs to refer to change in living and working patterns rather than lifestyles.
- (Main Issue 4) Change the word 'interest' to 'importance'. As it stands this sentence does nothing to improve the settlements.
- (Main Issue 5) Change the word 'enhance' to 'protect and enhance'.
- Whilst water resource management has been mentioned, there has been no reference made to protecting floodplains and watercourses from developmental

impacts (such as culverting and the need for intrusive flood defences), which is of crucial importance for conserving biodiversity, and in promoting sustainable use of resources.

- The recognition that retailing is a main issue for the District is welcomed. The delivery of sufficient additional retail floorspace within the District and in particular Chippenham will be an important component of growth. It is considered that in order for Chippenham to improve its retail offer and reduce the leakage of expenditure to other retail centres outside of the District, it must seek to attract high profile occupiers.
- The key objective is to secure the right employment floorspace within the most appropriate locations, which may mean that some existing employment sites, within the town, would be more suitably redeveloped for alternative uses.
- There is a need for NWDC to conduct a review of the boundaries of the existing Conservation Areas in order to reflect the changing built environment.
- It is acknowledged that public transport and cycle/pedestrian linkages need to be improved within Chippenham in order to deliver the scale and type of development required to create a self contained community.

Section 5. Spatial Vision

The Council received 4 representations concerning the Spatial Vision for North Wiltshire.

1 representation was supportive of the vision.

The remaining 3 representations expressed concerns that the vision lacks a sense of local distinctiveness and should be developed to say a little more about the future role and functions of settlements; it is not discernable; and the vision lacks reference to green infrastructure and climate change.

Section 6. Strategic Objectives

Question 1: Do you have any views on the Strategic Objectives?

The Council received 67 representations.

In total 18 representations supported all of the Strategic Objectives presented in the Core Strategy.

The remaining representations supported and objected to a mix of individual Strategic Objectives.

The number of supporting statements for each Strategic Objective is as follows: SO1 (4), SO2 (9), SO3 (4), SO4 (5), SO5 (8), SO6 (3), SO7 (8), SO9 (6), SO10 (7), SO11 (7), SO12 (12).

The number of objections to each of the Strategic Objectives is as follows: SO1 (4), SO2 (3), SO3 (7), SO4 (10), SO5 (6), SO6 (11), SO7 (5), SO9 (2), SO10 (7), SO11 (4), SO12 (7).

Most objections to the strategic objectives related not to the principal of the objective but to wording changes.

There were a number of suggestions for additional strategic objectives including the Cotswold Water Park, Worship, Western Swindon, Affordable Housing, Local Schools, Local Services & Facilities, Culture & Entertainment and Efficient Use of Land.

Section 7. The Spatial Strategy

The Council received 6 representations. 1 representation supported the proposed strategy in its entirety.

The remaining 5 representations supported elements of the strategy, but also raised concerns.

There was support for Chippenham, particularly as it is identified as an SSCT in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

However there were concerns that concentrating development at Chippenham should not be at the expense of seeking to limit development in the rural areas. The wording 'proportionate to the size of the settlement' could be misleading and open to misinterpretation. It was suggested that the emphasis on where residential allocations should be made should be in accordance with the role of the settlement, not in proportion to its size.

Question 2: Do you have any views on the Vision for Chippenham?

The Council received 41 representations.
11 representations (27%) fully supported the Vision for Chippenham presented in the Core Strategy.
The remaining 30 representations (73%) stated that generally the Vision was fine but that some wording changes were necessary.
Suggestions included referring to the towns green spaces, sustainable transport infrastructure, its river setting, identifying the town's unique features and wording the Vision more positively.

Question 3: Do you have any views on the Visions set out above? (Calne, Corsham, Malmesbury, Wootton Bassett)

The Council received 46 representations.. Each market town received the following number of comments:
Calne (12), Corsham (8), Malmesbury (8) and Wootton Bassett (9).

Comments include the following:

Calne

- Potential opportunity for long term provision of eastern distributor road;
- The quality of the town needs to be improved to make it more attractive to all;
- More focus on alternative modes of transport such as walking and cycling.

Corsham

- Expand to include railway station/rail services, accommodation for the older generation; post office, leisure centre, hotel, safe environment/effective policing, high quality public spaces, new cemetery, good schools, decent health care, regular market and cultural activities.
- The aspiration should be for core material recycling collection facilities to be in every settlement.
- It is essential a use is found for the ex MOD sites.

Malmesbury

- More focus on alternative modes of transport such as walking and cycling.
- Malmesbury's natural and historical assets form a vital part of the community and their protection is of prime importance.
- Malmesbury already supports one large business. Should this employer leave, the town's prosperity will suffer.
- Future development outside the town centre should not be allowed to swamp the heart of this important historic settlement or destroy its character.
- Should identify that additional housing will be provided to meet local needs and to ensure that there are housing opportunities to allow for inward migration and the change in our household demographics.
- Parking is a problem, which drives residents to the out of town facilities of the largest towns.

Wootton Bassett

- It is difficult to see how the Core Strategy can deliver ‘care’ for the vulnerable.
- The reference to a sports hub at Ballards Ash is welcomed.
- Twenty years is far too long to achieve these objectives. The small market town qualities need to be enhanced now if the town wants to protect its identity in the face of an expanding and encroaching Swindon.
- The vision is dynamic; however it is in conflict with s8.206 which appears to rule out any growth other than small scale to meet local needs. Wootton Bassett will fall behind other settlements if it is left to be a dormitory town to Swindon.

In addition four representations requested a vision for Cricklade, stating that Cricklade is also a market town.

One representation requested a vision for the West of Swindon stating that this should refer to development of a community with a sense of identity and be integrated into Swindon.

Question 4: Should there be a single vision for all the Tier 3 settlements, or should we define individual Visions for each settlement?

The Council received 43 representations.

There was equal support for either a single vision or individual visions. Each had 16 representations of support.

The remaining 11 representations requested topics such as transport to be incorporated into all visions.

There was also concern that the rest of the District outside the tiered settlements including the Cotswold Water Park did not have a vision.

8. Core Policies

Issue: Is it necessary or indeed possible to have a North Wiltshire specific Core Policy regarding sustainable development?

Question 5: Considering the question set out in the issue above, which of the options do you believe best addresses it?

Option 1: Provide a context to the other core policies by cross-referencing them with National and Regional policy regarding sustainable development, but not to introduce a specific policy.

Option 2: Introduce a North Wiltshire specific core policy dealing with sustainable development.

Option 3: Not to introduce a policy or cross-referencing.

There were 57 responses.

Of these nearly half (26) stated that Option 1 was their preferred approach. The second most popular option was Option 2 (16).

Most felt that it would be difficult to set out a position within a Core Policy that would do more than replicate existing policies at a National and Regional level.

Core Policy on the Location of Development

Question 6: Which Option do you favour?

Option 1: Tier 1 – Chippenham; Tier 2 – Calne, Corsham, Malmesbury and Wootton Bassett; Tier 3 – Ashton Keynes, Box, Bradenstoke, Christian Malford, Colerne, Cricklade, Crudwell, Derry Hill, Great Somerford, Hullavington, Kington St Michael, Luckington, Lyneham, Oaksey, Purton, Sherston, Sutton Benger and Yatton Keynell.

Option 2: Tier 1 – Chippenham; Tier 2 – Calne,; Tier 3 – Corsham, Malmesbury and Wootton Bassett, Ashton Keynes, Box, Bradenstoke, Christian Malford, Colerne,

Cricklade, Crudwell, Derry Hill, Great Somerford, Hullavington, Kington St Michael, Luckington, Lyneham, Oaksey, Purton, Sherston, Sutton Benger and Yatton Keynell.

Option 3: Tier 1 – Chippenham; Tier 2 – Calne, Corsham, Malmesbury and Wootton Bassett; Tier 3 – Ashton Keynes, Box, Colerne, Cricklade, Derry Hill, Hullavington, Lyneham, Purton, Sherston,

Option 4: Within the limitations set out below we welcome any alternative you wish to suggest.

In favour of: Option 1 = 15 representations

Option 2 = 23

Option 3 = 8

Option 4 = 8

Options 1 or 3 = 7

The most popular option was Option 2.

The responses highlighted concern over the future of those settlements that would have their framework boundaries removed and the appropriateness of inclusion of specific settlements within a tier, whilst excluding others.

The methodology was questioned as to whether the assessment of tier 3 settlement concurs with the Draft RSS criterion.

Scale of Housing Development

Question 7: Which option do you favour?

Option 1: Based on Options 1 and 3 presented in the Location of Development Core Policy;

Option 2: Based upon Option 2 in the Location of Development Core Policy;

Option 3: We welcome suggestions, within the limitations set out in Option 4 Location Of Development Core Policy;

In favour of: Option 1= 18 representations (of which 2 requested Lyneham be a Tier 2 settlement)

Option 2= 20

Option 3= 1 - Any RSS additional requirement to be built at Chippenham
1 – Provision should be made for the villages

The most popular option was Option 2.

Comments have been made on the future of RSS housing figure and potential increases, how these should be accommodated. There have been comments made on the 5 year supply of deliverable sites and 15 year land supply. Issues surrounding the 1000 dwellings on the west side of the Swindon have also been highlighted.

Question 7 A. Do you have any comments on our approach to housing Land supply and windfall sites?

The Council received 44 representations.

The comments centred on the need to comply with National guidance contained within PPS3 and in particular that allowances for windfalls should not be included within the first 10 years of land supply unless specific sites cannot be identified.

Question 7B. What approach should be taken to housing sites in Calne, Corsham, Malmesbury and WB?

The Council received 42 representations.

General Comments

- An allowance for windfall sites should be taken into account.
- Existing allocations should be retained where delivery is likely.
- The Draft RSS must be the lead document regarding the approach for allocation of housing. The numbers for each settlement must be linked to a sound evidence base.
- It is not appropriate to specify housing numbers for each settlement.
- Depends on what infrastructure and employment will support.
- The approach taken should ensure that development caters for local needs and provides a mix of development, so moving towards increased self sufficiency.
- Equal distribution of the requirement, after taking into account that the Tier 3 settlements require a proportion.
- Corsham is very close to and has good accessibility to Chippenham (and Bath); Wootton Bassett acts as a dormitory town to Swindon. Therefore the majority should be focused at Calne and Malmesbury.
- 6 representations suggested the following distribution: Chippenham (4500); Calne (1500); Wootton Bassett (1000); Malmesbury and Corsham (1000); Windfall (1000).

Calne

- Calne has already seen large scale development. The infrastructure has not followed the developments and the centre does not respond to the needs. The Town centre needs redeveloping.
- In allocating housing sites in Calne, the large number of houses that have been built in and around the town with little or no improvement to facilities should be given due weight.
- If the majority is to be built at Calne under Option 2, then its average annual build rate should be at least 113 dpa (more than 50%).

Corsham

- The majority of extra housing should be in towns other than Corsham due to the limited availability of suitable land and the amount of housing built recently.
- Corsham has already seen large scale development. The infrastructure has not followed the developments and the centre does not respond to the needs.
- Corsham should be recognised as one of the key settlements.

Malmesbury

- Bearing in mind the size of Malmesbury relative to the other Tier 2 towns and the restrictions of the hill top town centre, Malmesbury should expect no more than 400 new homes averaging 20 per year.
- Future development should be strictly limited and contained within the existing development boundaries. No development within the river valleys and existing green corridors.
-

Wootton Bassett

- Ensure Wootton Bassett and Swindon does not coalesce.

- The purpose of the rural buffer should be recognised and respected.
- Wootton Bassett needs to have housing which meets the need in respect of local employment sites not out commuters.

Question 7 C. Our approach to housing at the Tier 3 settlements will be to seek to allocate affordable housing sites and thus reduce the overall housing requirement. All further developments will be viewed as windfalls and will be taken into account when reviewing the future housing land supply. Do you have any comments on this approach?

The Council received 36 representations.

These were evenly split in favour for and against this approach.

Issues highlighted included:

- Ensuring a mixed/balanced approach;
- Directing affordable – low cost homes to Tier 3 settlements;
- The size of the property is important; control extensions and keep the properties affordable in the future; and
- allocate more land, build more homes and affect affordability that way (as highlighted by Government as the National approach).

Phasing Policy

Question 8: Which option do you favour? If you favour Option 2 are there other influences (in addition to transport, education and health), which the phasing policy should consider?

Option 1: Not to introduce a phasing policy;

Option 2: Introduce a phasing policy, taking account of transport, education, health requirements in order to ensure funding is available for such work and that impact is minimised on existing services and facilities.

Option 3: Introduce a phasing policy that would phase a larger proportion of housing supply in the early years of the Core Strategy and a small proportion in the later years.

The Council received 57 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 – 14 Representations

Option 2 – 18

Option 3 – 9

Mix of Option 2 & 3 – 9

Other Comments – 9

The most popular option was Option 2. Suggestions of other influences the phasing policy should consider included open space, amenities, employment, leisure, strategic road network, and water supply and sewage disposal.

Affordable Housing Provision

Question 9: Which option do you favour?

Option 1: Continue the North Wiltshire Local Plan policy, where the threshold is 15 or more dwellings then there is a requirement that 30% of the homes must be affordable.

Option 2: To consider the site size threshold for affordable housing and the percentage requirement for affordable housing from such sites;

A – Threshold

B – Percentage

Option 3: Suggestions are welcome.

The Council received 49 representations.

In favour of Option 1 = 19 representations

Option 2 = 15

Option 3 = 4

The most popular option was Option 1.

Under option 2, 3 respondents suggested the threshold to be set at 10+ dwellings, with 33% being affordable. 1 response stated that the threshold should be lower at 6 or more but retaining the existing 30% requirement.

Others commented on the fact that the existing policy position allows for negotiated percentage that takes account of the site specific characteristics.

Question 9: Paragraph 8.42 There is a need to establish an approach to affordable housing in areas where residential development would be for local needs only.

Option 1: To allow all sites in Tier 3 settlements to come forward for market housing. Financial contributions will then be sought from any developments, and used to fund affordable housing in the main settlements (Tiers 1 and 2).

Option 2: To continue to apply the current North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 requirement of seeking an element of affordable housing on all developments on the basis that about 50% of the dwellings permitted will be affordable.

Option 3: To allocate affordable housing exception sites on the edge of the framework boundary and would entirely comprise of affordable housing. All other development within the framework boundary would be developed on the basis that 50% would be affordable.

Option 4: Suggestions are welcome.

The Council received 19 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 - 1 representation

Option 2 - 2

Option 3 - 7

Option 4 - 1 = to ensure local needs are met; allocations should not

comprise of wholly affordable housing, but also mixed market housing.

Mix of Option 2 and Option 3 = 3 i.e. The provision of affordable housing on all housing development sites subject to criteria, and the provision of exceptions affordable housing sites.

Other comments made included:

- An approach which considers allocation of sites for 100% affordable housing should be treated with caution.
- Affordable housing provision at Chippenham should be secured as part of planned inclusive communities through urban extensions and not through an exceptions sites strategy.
- We need to exert downward pressure on the price of low market cost housing in parallel with building more affordable housing.

Question 10: Do you agree with or have any comment about the Affordable Housing "Site Search Criteria" set out in Appendix 4A of this document?

The Council received 17 representations.

7 representations supported the site search criteria as presented in Appendix 4A.

The remaining 10 representations disagreed, with some providing suggestions for amendments. These included:

- It would not be appropriate to develop sites on rural buffer land or protected land such as 'wedges or gaps'. We would like to see this included in the checklist.
- Whilst Appendix 4A is an excellent "wish list" a clearer policy should be shown with regard to a "scoring mechanism". It will not

be possible to deliver sites which meet the green status on all of the site criteria listed under basic services - a site should be given serious consideration if it meets a given number, say 6 of the 8 criteria listed.

- Proximity to a surgery should be included (a hospital is not front-line provision).

Question 11: We would welcome your views on what the Core Strategy should say about the types and sizes of affordable housing?

The Council received 35 representations.

The comments included:

- Agree with current Local Plan 2011/SPD requirements.
- There should be flexibility in types and sizes to be sought.
- Core Strategy should require consideration of results of local housing need survey and justification where intention to depart from identified need.
- Concerns about the use of the Fordham Housing Needs Assessment and the low percentage of intermediate housing proposed.
- This is a matter for negotiation rather than prescriptive policy.
- The proportion of affordable housing within a scheme needs to be reduced to make brownfield schemes viable and deliver affordable housing.
- The level and location of affordable housing needs to be informed by a housing needs assessment.
- Support the need to define split between low cost and rented. However, size should be an issue to be agreed on a site by site basis subject to demand and agreement between Council and affordable housing provider.

Question 12: Do you agree with the Gypsy and Traveller "Site Search Criteria" set out in Appendix 4B of this document?

The Council received 27 representations.

8 representations (29%) fully supported the presented criteria;

4 representations (15%) made no comment ;

15 representations (56%) stated that the criteria required some fine-tuning.

Question 13: Are there relevant issues in North Wiltshire that would require a specific Core Policy on the Natural Environment?

The Council received 43 representations.

No = 12 (28%)

Yes = 31 (72%)

Suggested topics for a natural environment core policy include:

- South West Nature Map,
- Local Biodiversity Action Plan,
- Green Infrastructure,
- Designated sites (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites, SSSIs etc),
- Monitoring biodiversity or other environmental outcomes,
- Promotes the creation of new areas for nature conservation,
- Cotswold Water Park,
- Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal restoration proposals,
- Water Framework Directive,
- Climate Change

Suggested Designations for a natural environment core policy include:

- High Hills (Purton)
- Blakehill Farm Nature Reserve (Cricklade)

Question 14: Are there relevant issues in North Wiltshire that would require a specific Core Policy on the Historic Environment?

The Council received 33 responses to this question.
19 responses (58%) stated that they felt it was unnecessary to have a specific Core Policy on the Historic Environment, while 4 (12%) supported such a policy given the special characteristics of North Wiltshire.
Other comments received stated that there should be a review of the Conservation Areas, detailing the specific nature of the conservation features of that area.

Question 15: Which option is appropriate for North Wiltshire? How should North Wiltshire ensure policies are up to date?

Percentage	What constitutes a large scale development		
	10 Dwellings / 1,000m ²	5 Dwellings / 750m ²	1 Dwellings / 500m ²
20	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
15	Option 2	Option 5	Option 8
10	Option 1	Option 4	Option 7

The Council received 49 responses.
Few respondents selected one of the 9 options presented, instead they commented on the topic of climate change and their desire to include a comprehensive policy approach to deal with all aspects of climate change. Comments ranged from the need to assess the environmental footprint not just the CO₂ emissions, more environmental improvements, to requests for a wider policy remit to include sustainable design and construction – including issues of biodiversity, water management and energy efficiency. Other suggested 20% for all, as high as practical or a stepped approach.

Employment and Economic Development

Question 16: Do you agree that these 6 employment and economic development issues are the ones that this Core Strategy should tackle?

Issue 1: That there is a need to provide for the infrastructure, premises and land necessary to promote the process of moving North Wiltshire from its low skilled manufacturing employment base to one based on high value service industries, modern research activities and high growth manufacturing.

Issue 2: That there is a need to protect the employment areas that are the nurseries for those new businesses that require economical premises.

Issue 3: That there is a need to protect the employment areas and to identify new land that allows already established small to medium sized firms to grow into larger premises without the need to move outside the District.

Issue 4: That North Wiltshire can attract substantial inward investment if it provides sufficient amounts of high quality and highly accessible employment sites but that there is a risk that this will lead to increased sustainability problems unless we ensure that...

Issue 5: That North Wiltshire District Council and other public authorities are willing to be flexible and to act rapidly to take advantage of new opportunities for appropriate employment growth and new industries.

Issue 6: That there are particular sectors of employment generation that should have specific assistance due to their reliance upon local unique features. This includes those sectors that support the tourist industry; canal restoration and what might be described as the 'environmental' industries connected with energy conservation and generation.

The Council received 48 representations.
Most supported the issues identified, but asked for additional detail on certain issues.
For example:

- Suitable employment sites should be considered for release to other uses;
- Would like to have seen the recognition over the future of MOD sites;
- Other business, particularly rural, uses should be highlighted;
- Good practise in design and construction. Call for increased use of travel plans.

Issue 1: That there is a need to provide for the infrastructure, premises and land necessary to promote the process of moving North Wiltshire from its low skilled manufacturing employment base to one based on high value service industries, modern research and high growth manufacturing.

Question 17: Which of the options do you favour?

Option 1: The growth or decline of employment sectors is allowed to take its course without intervention by the Core Strategy. This is not in accordance with the Draft RSS and therefore is not a realistic option.

Option 2: Continue to allocate land for employment purposes without regard to the employment sectors that occupy it.

Option 3: Identify prime sites to protect existing or encourage new strategic business development.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

A total of 36 responses were received.

In favour of Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 2

Option 3 = 13

Option 4 = 1

Option 4a = 1

Option 4b = 1

Option 3 is the most popular option. However, 18 responses (50%) didn't specify an option. Instead they said that North Wiltshire cannot influence the growth or decline of employment sectors.

Issue 2: That there is a need to protect the employment areas that are the nurseries for those new businesses that require economical premises.

Question 18: Which of the options do you favour?

Option 1: The growth or decline of existing employment areas are allowed to take their course without intervention by the Core Strategy.

Option 2: Keep the existing North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 Policy that protects employment areas from conversion to other uses unless:

- *there are current traffic, environmental or amenity problems,*
- *where the benefits of conversion are considered to be greater,*
- *there is no obvious economic need.*

Option 3: Develop new policies to tackle this issue drawing from the Employment Land Review research. This has identified the criteria that would be used to create "employment protection areas"

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 35 responses.

In favour of Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 12
Option 3= 15
Option 4a= 1
The favoured option is Option 3.

Issue 3: That there is a need to protect the employment areas and to identify new land that allows already established small to medium sized firms to grow into larger premises without the need to move outside the District.

Question 19: Which of the options do you favour?

Option 1: This is a “free market” option to the extent that there are no current planning policies that seek specifically to allocate land for expansion to small and medium firms. Reducing the need to obtain planning permission for minor alterations and extensions to existing premises could enhance the free operation of the market and there are various techniques that the North Wiltshire District Council, as local planning authority, could take to do so.

Option 2: This position may be described as one where the existing employment land allocation policy is not addressing this issue. The conclusion may be that keeping silent on this issue is not a realistic option.

Option 3: Allocate sufficient quantities of land suitable for small to medium firms to use, in places where they wish to go, at a price they can afford and with the co-operation of a landowner willing to bring them forward.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 28 representations.

In favour of Option 1: 4 representations

Option 2: 0

Option 3: 16

Option 4: 2

The most popular option is Option 3.

Issue 4: That North Wiltshire can attract substantial inward investment if it provides sufficient amounts of high quality and highly accessible employment sites but that there is a risk that this will lead to increased sustainability problems..

Question 20: Which of the options do you favour?

Option 1: It is considered that this “no policy” option is not realistic. Substantial inward investment is required to ensure that the District and especially the Chippenham Area can accommodate the proposed and expected growth as set out the current Draft Regional Spatial Strategy. Only through the promotion of high quality employment land in sufficient quantities will allow this to happen.

Option 2: Keeping to the present allocation of employment land is also not a realistic option to deal with this issue as there is insufficient scope in terms of the quantity or location of land to apply an enhanced inward investment strategy.

Option 3: In the light of the emerging Draft Regional Spatial Strategy, it can be expected that about 6300 new jobs will need to be created in the Chippenham Travel to Work Area (TTWA) over the 2006 – 2026 period and many of these created in the inward investment key sectors...

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 35 representations.

In favour of Option 1: 1 representation

Option 3: 23

Option 4: 2

Option 4b: 2

The most popular option is Option 3.

Issue 5: That North Wiltshire District Council and other public authorities are willing to be flexible and to act rapidly to take advantage of new opportunities for appropriate employment growth and new industries.

Question 21: Which of the options do you favour?

Option 1: This would involve continued non-intervention by the Council and given the extent of change that can be forecast over the 2006 – 2026 period, it is not considered to be a viable option.

Option 2: To continue under the present development plan position would effectively be the same as Option 1.

Option 3: To support the implementation of the North Wiltshire Economic Regeneration Strategy 2005 – 2008 in dealing with this issue.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 28 representations.

In favour of Option 1: 0 representations

Option 2: 0

Option 3: 18

Option 4: 10

Option 3 was the most popular. Responses to Option 4 suggested that control and encouragement needed to be in place but that market forces should still be allowed to operate and the Council should not seek to micro-manage.

Issue 6: That there are particular sectors of employment generation that should have specific assistance due to their reliance upon local unique features....That there are employment sectors that exist only due to their unique geographical circumstances...

Question 22: Which of the options do you favour? If you have chosen Option 4, describe your option and list any sources you have used to justify why you think this would be a better approach.

Option 1: There are no specific policies that deal directly with this area of economic activity. Existing premises are left to develop (or not) on a case by case basis.

Option 2: The creation, expansion or re-development of such employment areas could remain subject to the general employment policies that are contained within the current Development Plan.¹

Option 3: This option would be to recognise the opportunities that may exist for the expansion and development of existing facilities taking into account the unique attributes or constraints of that particular site. In addition, there would be a general policy that would seek to establish the criteria by which new employment generating uses and facilities would be considered appropriate.

Option 4: There is considerable scope for variation to the above to construct an option that you may consider to be worth promoting.

The Council received 29 representations

In favour of Option 1: 4 representations

Option 2: 2

Option 3: 10

Option 4: 7

Option 4b: 1

Option 3 was the most favoured.

Retail and Town Centre Uses

Question 23: Which option do you think is the best approach to improve the retail offer and address the high levels of expenditure that is lost to centres outside of the District?

Option 1: The 'do nothing' approach and allow market forces to dictate the direction of retail growth.

Option 2: Plan for expansion in available floorspace to stabilise the level of leakage of comparison expenditure out of the District.

Option 3: Actively plan to retain a higher proportion of expenditure within Chippenham and District, particularly in respect to comparison goods by giving more emphasis to edge-of-centre or out-of-centres developments.

Option 4: What do you think?

The Council received 35 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 2 representations

Option 2 = 5

Option 3 = 5

Option 4 = 1

Mix of Options 2 and 3 = 5 i.e. seeking to concentrate retail development at Chippenham while expanding floorspace to stabilise the level of leakage has been suggested by a number of people.

Comments made included that options remain limited - especially when other uses are also desirable in the town centres (leisure and cultural uses). There is recognised need to improve the retail offer at Chippenham. Others felt that there were options for providing retailing, in the form of a District Centre, in association with the growth of Chippenham.

Question 24 A. Should we plan for large out-of-centre developments to provide the floorspace requirements set out in Issue 1? This could then allow town centres to cater for other uses.

Yes: 6 responses

No: 14 responses

Comments included:

- There is a desire to understand what shopping/retailing in North Wiltshire should offer. Each town's needs should be explored.
- Out of town retailing does address issue of lack of sites – but this would encourage more car trips and does not follow the sequential approach.
- Certain types of retailing do suit out of centre locations, but that they should be easily accessible by a walking, cycling and public transport.

Question 24 B. What role/purpose should the town centres of the future have?

A total of 34 responses were received to this question.

Comments referred to creating a place to live, work and socialise. Specific words mentioned included: diverse; heart; hub; community; range; and identity

Question 24 C. Should town centres be centres for leisure?

31 representations were made.

Yes = 13

The majority (17 responses (55%)) felt leisure was one of a mix of uses for town centres,

Question 24 D. Should certain towns specialise in specific sectors?

Yes: 8

No: 14

6 responses felt that this was beyond control of the planning authority.

Whilst some saw the benefits of not all centres offering the same, others felt that this could lead to more trips to the different centres.

Question 24 E. What will be the implications of changing our town centres to accommodate the demand for greater diversification of uses?

The Council received 22 representations.

The comments included:

- Possible destruction of the older fabric of traditional styles.
- Diversity should make it more vibrant and viable.
- A multi-agency approach will be required to co-ordinate, manage and develop the demands that will be placed on town centres in the future.
- One of the biggest challenges will be balancing parking/property.
- None will bring about the much needed revival required.

Question 25: Which option do you believe best addresses the issue?

Option 1: Continue to rely on the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 policies, which caters for a high proportion of retail uses within the core of town centres.

Option 2: Disregarding the approach set down in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 will put the future of our town centres at an important crossroads. What we expect from our town centres is a vital question for the future characteristics of our centres.

Option 3: What do you think?

The Council received 29 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 2 representations

Option 2 = 8

Option 3 = 10

Options 2 and 3 have the most support with respondents saying that more should be done to support the town centres. Another comment made was that a careful planned approach to Chippenham is needed if the centre is to support the additional housing growth.

Question 26 A. Which option do you believe will provide the best opportunity to maintain enhance viability of rural facilities?

Option 1: Develop specific policies within the Local Development Framework to protect and increase the provision of services available in rural areas where appropriate?

Option 2: Maintain the Status quo.

Option 3: Do nothing and let market forces prevail.

The Council received 30 representations.

In favour of Option 1 = 11 representations

Option 2 = 10

Option 3 = 2

Options 1 and 2 are the most popular. Respondents questioned the need for such a detail policy approach in the Core strategy. Others highlighted that market forces are difficult to control, while others believed that there was a need to try and increase or at least maintain the current levels.

Question 26 B. Are there any other approaches that you believe could achieve this?

The council received 19 responses.

The most popular suggestion was the encouragement of farmers markets (6 responses) followed by the suggestion of a reduction in rents and business rates (4 responses).

Question 27 A: Which of the options do you believe provides the best direction for dealing with the issue of the impact of the internet on traditional town centres and shopping?

Option 1: The 'do nothing' approach and let market forces prevail.

Option 2: Introduce a process to actively monitor and assess the impact of the Internet in order to plan and develop policies to embrace or even counter, when necessary, the growth of the Internet.

Option 3: This is where you can have the opportunity to outline any approaches you may have in order to develop an approach to deal with the unpredictable impact of the continued expansion of the Internet.

The Council received 22 representations.

There was equal support for options 1 and 2, with each having 5 representations (23%). The remaining representations discuss internet shopping more generally and its potential future.

Question 27 B. Are there any other approaches that you believe could assist in planning for the expansion of the internet?

The Council received 12 representations.

6 representations (50%) made suggestions including :

- Market research on shopping trends,
- Promote tourist web sites and help businesses develop E-commerce.
- Improve speed and accessibility of Council web sites to encourage greater involvement in the Planning process.
- Should actively encourage Internet businesses to relocate to North Wiltshire, combined with incentives to encourage home working to assist with sustainability and 'green' issues.
- Need a policy which allows conversion of redundant buildings for internet based distribution businesses.

The remaining 50% of the representations received stated that a policy approach to planning for the internet was not necessary.

Health and Education

Question 28: Do you agree that these issues are the ones that this Core Strategy should tackle? Are there other issues that you consider should be tackled?

Issue 1: The effect of "Pathways for Change" in North Wiltshire. Will the proposals lead to better local access to healthcare facilities? Is there a role for the Core Strategy to help the establishment of these new health facilities?

Issue 2: Is there a need to ensure health facilities are provided in a timely manner to provide for the increase in population in the District to 2026.

Issue 3: Should the location of health facilities be planning led or do we locate housing near to existing facilities – should the District Planning Authority be reactive or proactive?

The Council received 29 representations.

20 (70%) representations supported the Core Strategy document developing a policy position for health care, with several commenting that this was essential to embody the true meaning of Spatial Planning.

2 representations disagreed with the issues around health care, suggesting that health provision was beyond the control of planning policy.
6 representations highlighted the need to liaise closely with the Primary Care Trust (PCT) while one representation believed that the issue of older people was an important issue that was missing.

Issue 1 The effect of ‘Pathways to Change’ in North Wiltshire.

Question 29: Which option do you prefer?

Option 1: Do nothing – No pro-active approach by the Core Strategy to deal with the changes in health provision.

Option 2: The building of planned new facilities and redevelopment of existing facilities to be dealt with by the current development control policies. Again, the PCT would approach the District Council with its development proposals for individual sites and its own timetable.

Option 3: This option would allow NWDC to work closely with the PCT to identify opportunities for the redevelopment of sites and the provision/location of new sites. This would be a two way process, firstly to inform the PCT where new development is likely to occur in the District, so they can plan their provision and location of health facilities and secondly, by taking into account their plans so that new development can be located near these facilities. It may allow the PCT to develop a better timetable for the provision of new sites and have advice on the likely redevelopment value of its redundant sites or part of existing sites and budget accordingly.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based on your views

The Council received 25 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 1

Option 3 = 13

Option 4 = 2

Option 3 is the most favoured option.

Issue 2: Is there a need to ensure health facilities are provided in a timely manner to provide for the increase in population in the District to 2026?

Question 30: Which option do you prefer?

Option 1: The do-nothing approach would be similar to that discussed in Issue 1 with similar risks identified. In addition, the provision of healthcare from other providers, such as private practitioners would be dealt with in an ad hoc manner.

This would not be in accordance with the Draft RSS.

Option 2: This is similar to Option 2 of Issue 1. The building of planned new facilities and redevelopment of existing facilities to be dealt with by the current development control policies. Health providers, such as the PCT and private companies would approach the District Council with development proposals for individual sites and their own timetable. This has been the approach in the past but the danger of this is that the development of new health facilities and the redevelopment of old sites may not be planned in a cohesive, District-wide approach.

This would not be in accordance with Draft RSS.

Option 3: The Core Strategy could address the issue of planning for the timely provision of health services where and when they are needed by liaising with the PCT to undertake a health needs assessment, but also with private health providers.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based on your views.

The Council received 25 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 0

Option 3 = 13

Option 4 = 3

Option 3 is the most favoured option.

Issue 3: Should the location of health facilities be planning led or do we locate housing near to existing facilities – should the District Planning Authority be reactive or proactive?

Question 31: Which option do you prefer?

Option 1: Do nothing.

Option 2: The building of planned new facilities and redevelopment of existing facilities to be dealt with by the current development control policies. This would not be in accordance with the Draft RSS.

Option 3: That the LDF require health facilities be planned into every new development of a certain size or contributions on a pro rata basis are sought to expand existing ones, based on a health impact assessment.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based on your views.

The Council received 22 representations. Option 3 is the most favoured option.

In favour of Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 0

Option 3 = 10

Option 4 = 2

Education and Training

Question 32: Do you agree that these issues are the ones that this Core Strategy should tackle?

The Council received 24 representations.

9 (38%) representations agreed with the issues presented in the Core Strategy.

The remaining representations suggested that transport issues should be considered, that site characteristics are important and that these issues should be considered by the Education Authority.

Issue 1: How far should primary and secondary education needs influence the location of development?

Question 33: Which option do you prefer?

Option 1: Do nothing, no proactive approach by the Core Strategy to deal with education provision. Would not be in accordance with Draft Regional Spatial Strategy Development Policy.

Option 2: Continue to use the North Wiltshire Local Plan to deal with planning applications for new schools and colleges.

Option 3: Work closely with the education providers to plan for new schools or colleges where the need arises or to locate development where best opportunities for the funding of facilities exist.

Option 4: These could include:

(a) Central Government should build schools

(b) Building of new schools should only be done by Private Finance Initiatives.

The Council received 37 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 1

Option 3 = 25

Option 4 = 0

Option 3 is the most favoured option.

Issue 2: Should more development be located in rural areas to support village schools and would this be effective?

Question 34: Is there a need for planning policy to address or expand on this issue?

The Council received 19 representations.

Yes = 11

No = 4

Issue 3: Changes in National Education Policy allowing the 14-16 year age group to attend college courses – what will be the effects of this on Wiltshire College and on secondary schools?

Question 35: Is there a need for planning policy to address or expand on this issue?

Yes = 7

No = 10

Issue 4: Provision of adult education facilities / e-learning. National Policy is to focus funding subsidy from recreational type courses to those that are qualification and training based, which help with employment opportunities.

Question 36: Is there a need for planning policy to address this issue?

Yes = 5

No = 12

Question 37: Do you agree that these are the issues that should be tackled?

Issue 1: Forecast population growth is increasing demand on leisure provision. This growing population will increase demand on the District's established leisure facilities.

Issue 2: Limited funding for leisure facilities. It is recognised that there are population thresholds below which facilities become unviable, the level of support means that running costs associated with the facilities is greater than any income achieved. In some circumstances these facilities require some form of subsidy.

Issue 3: Need to consider the implications of exceptional leisure facilities.

Issue 4: Is there a need to raise sports standards in North Wiltshire Schools to meet government standards?

Issue 5: The District is lacking a range of high quality leisure facilities. Access to leisure facilities should not just be a matter of distance but about ensuring that a range of facilities are available, to provide residents with a choice of venues and activities.

The Council received 31 representations.

18 representations fully agreed with the list of leisure issues presented in the Second Issues and Options Core Strategy.

The remaining representations were split with 7 suggesting additional leisure issues not already considered and 6 representations indicating that these issues should be dealt with in a Leisure Facilities Strategy.

The additional leisure issues suggested included Natural Environment, Rural Facilities, Cultural Facilities, Spectator Sports, Transport, Allotments and the Cotswold Water Park.

Issue 1: Forecast population growth is increasing demand on leisure provision. This growing population will increase demand on the District's established leisure facilities.

Question 38: Which option do you consider would be the best approach to tackle

the District's increased leisure demand?

Option 1&2: Continue to use the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 Policy which lets market supply leisure provision to meet increasing demand. This would allow for new or replacement leisure facilities within or adjoining the framework boundary of settlements. This approach would still be subject to policies within the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).

Option 3a: Introduce a policy that concentrates new Leisure Facilities within Tier 1 settlements, to only meet demand.

Option 3b: Introduce a policy that encourages new Leisure Facilities within Tier 1 and 2 settlements to meet demand.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 28 representations.

In favour of Option 1&2 = 1 representation

Option 3a = 2

Option 3b = 11

Option 4 = 5

Option 3b is the most favoured option.

Issue 2: Limited funding for leisure facilities.

Question 39: Which option do you consider to be the most appropriate to resolve the District's limited funding for leisure?

Option 1: Let market supply leisure provision to meet increasing demand. This approach would be subject to the policies of the Draft RSS.

Option 2: Continue to use North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 policies to secure funding for the provision for public open space, leisure, sport and recreation.

Option 3: Introduce a new planning policy that makes leisure provision a higher priority for funding and more explicitly sets out how the Council can work more closely with others to bid for funding.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 24 representations.

In favour of Option 1 = 3 representations

Option 2 = 3

Option 3 = 4

Option 4 = 9

Question 40: Which Option do you favour?

Option 1&2: Let market supply exceptional leisure facilities. Rely on guidance set out within PPG17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation to make decisions on the provision of exceptional leisure facilities. This approach would still be subject to the policies in the Draft RSS.

Option 3: Introduce a policy that promotes and safeguards exceptional leisure facilities.

Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.

The Council received 26 representations.

In favour of Option 1 = 10 representations

Option 2 = 0

Option 3 = 12

Option 4 = 0

Question 41: Is there a need to raise sports standards in schools to meet government standards? If yes, which option do you consider best supports this approach?

Option 1: Let schools develop as they wish. This approach would still be subject to the policies of the Draft RSS.

Option 2: Not an option as there is no adopted Local plan policy on this subject.
Option 3: Introduce a new policy that promotes and safeguards schools designated as sports colleges.
Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.
The Council received 21 representations.
In favour of Option 1 = 6
Option 2 = 0
Option 3 = 4
Option 4 = 0

Issue 5: The District is lacking a range of high quality leisure facilities
Question 42: Which option do you consider would be best suited to provide the District with the best range and quality of leisure facilities?
Option 1: Let the market supply a range of high quality leisure facilities. This approach would still be subject to policies in the Draft RSS policy.
Option 2: Not an option as there is no adopted Local Plan policy on this subject.
Option 3: Introduce a new policy that promotes a range of high quality leisure facilities. This policy would actively encourage the refurbishment of new and replacement leisure facilities.
Option 4: Ideas for an alternative option based upon your views.
The Council received 41 representations.

In favour of Option 1 = 2 representations
Option 2 = 0
Option 3 = 19
Option 4 = 0
Option 3 was the most favoured.

Question 43: Do you agree that North Wiltshire does not require a specific policy on tourism and that the authority can rely on National and Regional guidance?
The Council received 39 representations.
13 representations stated that they agreed with the question and that regional and national guidance on tourism adequately addresses tourism development.
24 representations disagreed with this statement, maintaining that North Wiltshire does have a unique set of tourism issues that do require a strategic approach. Of these 16 representations specifically refer to the Cotswold Water Park as an asset that would benefit from a more strategic policy position.

Question 44 A: Do you have any views on the need for a Core Policy on developer contribution or the PGS?
The Council received 46 representations.
36 representations agreed that a Core Policy on developer contributions was necessary, stating that a detailed policy would provide more certainty.
However 7 representations felt that a Core Policy on developer contributions was not needed. These representations argued that as the Planning Gain Supplement (PGS) has not been released it would be inappropriate to assume its content, that the currently proposed Development Control Policy already adequately covers this issue and finally that the current section 106 agreement already works well and doesn't need changing.
A number of representations also noted that Green Infrastructure contributions referred to in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) had not been mentioned in the Core Strategy.

Question 44 B. What kind of policy could North Wiltshire adopt in relation to the Planning Gain Supplement?

The Council received 28 representations.
Respondents had significant concerns about the implementation of the Planning Gain Supplement (PGS) with many suggesting that a flexible approach should be taken.

Special Policy Areas

Question 45 A. Do you feel that it is necessary to include such a Core Policy?

The Council received 38 representations.
26 representations agreed with including such a policy, stating that it was useful to put all designations together in one place.
9 representations disagreed with this proposed Core Policy stating that there was no need to repeat National or Regional policy.

Question 45 B. Does the policy provide clarity, is the policy appropriate in relation to the desire not to merely repeat national and regional policies and to ensure the policies presented in the LDF are specific to North Wiltshire.

The Council received 21 representations.
13 (62%) representations agreed that the proposed Core Policy provides clarity while 3 representations disagreed.

Question 46: Which of the options do you believe to be the correct approach for the future development of Chippenham?

Option 1: Rely upon the existing allocations of land at Chippenham as promoted in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011, supplemented by further windfalls and Previously Developed Land (PDL) allocations within the urban area as identified from a new Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Option 2: Bring forward all of the large promoted sites, appropriately phased without bias in the direction of growth, and restricted only by reason of specified natural constraints such as flood risk and topography. This would include all necessary new roads such as an eastern distributor road and a southern distributor road or link road across the River Avon.

Option 3: Concentrate the promotion of growth in the southern direction. Restricted only by reason of specified natural constraints such as flood risk and topography. This would include the prospect of either a southern distributor road or link road across the River Avon.

Option 4: Concentrate the promotion of growth in the eastern direction. Restricted only by reason of specified natural constraints such as flood risk and topography. This would include the prospect of a northern and eastern distributor road linking the Malmesbury Road to the Langley Burrell Road and then to the London Road.

Option 5: Incremental growth of a small scale in numerous locations. This would result in pockets of development linked into existing infrastructure with no major road schemes proposed.

Option 6: This is your opportunity to propose an alternative option. You may wish to consider the following points in your thoughts.

The Council received 48 representations.

In favour of: Option 1 = 0 representations

Option 2 = 6

Option 3 = 12

Option 4 = 1

Option 5 = 1

Option 6 = 4

Although Option 3 was considered the best option for growth by the most number of individuals, this list fails to reflect the detail submitted in many competing representations.

In addition many other representations indicated that they could not adequately

respond without the necessary study work being completed including for example the Chippenham Transport model.

Question 47: Are there particular directions of growth for Corsham that you consider would be preferable, bearing in mind that such growth over the period to 2026 is likely to be limited?

The Council received 27 representations.

12 representations stated that Corsham should only receive limited growth, with barriers for growth of Corsham including the A4 road and the environmental designations to the East and West.

Suggestions for areas of growth centre on Ministry of Defence (MOD) land and include Copenacre, Rudloe Manor, Box Hill Technology Park and the Basil Hill site.

Non-MOD promoted land includes; Land off Ladbrook Lane and Land South of Leafield.

Question 48: Are there particular directions of the growth for Malmesbury that you consider would be preferable, bearing in mind that such growth over the period to 2026 is likely to be limited?

The Council received 31 representations.

2 representations said that Malmesbury shouldn't grow.

Suggestions for directions of growth included:

Limited Growth of Malmesbury = 3 representations

Filands School/ Reeds Farm = 3

Burton Hill School = 8

West of Malmesbury = 2

North of Malmesbury = 2

North & West of Malmesbury = 1

Question 49: Are there particular direction of growth particular directions of the growth for Wootton Bassett that you consider would be preferable, bearing in mind that such growth over the period to 2026 is likely to be limited?

The Council received 28 representations.

1 representation said that Wootton Bassett shouldn't grow.

Suggestions for directions of growth included:

No Growth of Wootton Bassett = 1 representation

No Growth to the East / Lydiard Tregoze = 3

Limited growth of Wootton Bassett = 1

North of Wootton Bassett = 2

North West of Wootton Bassett = 1

South West of Wootton Bassett = 1

South of Wootton Bassett = 2

West of Wootton Basset = 1

Woodshaw Farm = 1

Whitehall Land and West of Maple Drive = 1

Rylands Lane = 1

Brynarads Hill = 1

Question 50: Are there particular directions of the growth for Calne that you consider would be preferable, bearing in mind that such growth over the period to 2026 could be second only to Chippenham?

The Council received 26 representations

1 representation said growth of Calne should be limited.

West of Calne = 1

North East of Calne = 2

East of Calne = 5
South East of Calne = 1
Adjacent Porte Marsh Industrial Estate = 1
Silver Street = 1
Marden Farm = 1

Question 51 A. We welcome your views and comments about the policies presented?

Number of responses:

DC1= 7	DC11= 4	DC21= 1	DC31= 5
DC2= 12	DC12= 1	DC22= 2	DC32= 8
DC3= 1	DC13= 1	DC23= 1	DC33= 7
DC4= 5	DC14= 6	DC24= 2	DC34= 6
DC5= 8	DC15= 7	DC25= 3	DC35= 3
DC6= 1	DC16= 4	DC26= 4	DC36= 2
DC7= 2	DC17= 7	DC27= 3	DC37= 1
DC8= 3	DC18= 2	DC28= 1	Appendix 3= 1
DC9= 3	DC19= 6	DC29= 2	
DC10= 8	DC20= 2	DC30= 3	

Other points raised:

- It is too early to state what policies are needed as the RSS has not yet been published.
- Cricklade should have its only dedicated vision.
- Policy DC36 is site specific in nature and should not be included within this section of the Core Strategy.
- Fully reflect PPS9.
- Cross-referencing of policies should be consistent.
- The DC policy section is overly detailed and too long.
- There was general question regarding the validity of including Development control policies within the Core Strategy, as it was felt more appropriate to reach a more advanced stage of the Core Strategy before developing the Development Control policies.
- Night clubs (and theatres) are Sui Generis.

Question 51 B. Do you consider it necessary to introduce other policies?

There were 17 responses made.

New policy suggestions include:

- Specific Cotswold AONB Policy
- Specific Cotswold Water Park
- Climate Change management
- Renewable Energy (Macro and Micro)
- Sustainable development – particularly the use of water.
- Ground Source protection zones
- Street Lighting
- Public Transport (integration)
- Education and training and related sports facilities
- Community Centre development (inc health, farmers markets, e-education and training)
- Cultural Development
- Cricklade's Vision
- Policy regarding the future of Tier 3 settlements and the protection of them.
- Strong rural buffer policy

- Residential extensions
- Strategic Road Network = policy on assessing the impact of any development upon the network.
- Rural diversification and conservation of traditional buildings.
- Functions of all types of settlements should be undertaken, positive approach for small towns and villages.

Other comments

The Council received 50 other comments.