Responses to Question 1 – Settlement Strategy – Core Policy 1
Please note that this document should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Statement January 2012 Report and the User Guide for the Record of Comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The decision (?) to grow the principal settlements on average at a rate faster than the rest of the county (double?) seems to favour the standard of living of the rural and smaller communities at the expense of the towns (principal settlements). These towns have contributed more than their fair share of housing development to date with accompanying strains on community cohesion. Further strains from over extended development is more strain and unfair. The evidence for such strains is the association of people with their housing development (in my area: Pewsham, Cepen Park North, Cepen Park South) rather than with the town they are in, and also the growth of protest at new developments despite the impact on the local economy. Back filling, in all communities and small developments is the fairest way to apportion the strains of required new housing rather than the slow development of sink estates. The rural areas and villages must take their share.</td>
<td>CP3</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Reps from Keevil Parish Council will be used to update the assessment of Keevil and the appropriate designation of Keevil will be included in the next draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principle Setslements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>YES I AGREE WITH THE PROPOSALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 sets out the different tiers of the settlement strategy and in broad terms defines the type and scale of development that is appropriate at each tier. The settlement hierarchy distinguishes between: strategically significant towns (namely, Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury); market towns (e.g. Warminster); local service centres, &quot;... defined as smaller towns and larger villages which serve a surrounding rural hinterland and possess a level of facilities and services that, together with improved local employment, provide the best opportunities outside the Market Towns for greater self containment &quot;; large and small villages – with Sutton Veny is identified in Core Policy 18 as a large village; and settlements other than those identified in the hierarchy – in which &quot;... new development will be restricted and will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances &quot;. With regard to large villages, the Policy states that the majority of development will take the form of small sites within existing settlement boundaries and that some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries. We welcome the flexibility that the Policy provides to accommodate development. We do not agree that the remaining villages and other settlements should be subject of a policy of development constraint. The proposed approach of tightly controlling development in the remaining villages and other settlements will not serve to assist the Council to meet its Spatial Vision (whereby, among other things, &quot; employment, housing and other development will have been provided in sustainable location in response to local needs &quot;) and strategic objectives, in particular that of providing everyone with access to a decent, affordable home (Strategic Objective 3). There therefore needs to be some flexibility to enable some scope for development in these areas; whilst we recognise that development will be permitted in &quot;exceptional circumstances &quot;, Core Policy 1 and the text supporting the Policy are silent as to whether meeting housing need would constitute such exceptional circumstances. Similarly, with regard to large villages, it is not clear to us as to when limited development will be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries. We therefore promote a settlement hierarchy that is sufficiently flexible to enable the Council to tailor its approach, having</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. In terms of exceptional circumstances CP28 sets out policy on exception sites in terms of housing again this will be updated following the consultation.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>I have concerns that the focus is on the larger towns, they are already struggling to remain vibrant with shops and businesses closing. People commute out because they cannot afford to live in the areas they work, not necessarily because of lack of jobs in their local area. To assume that providing more space for industry will bring it here may be unrealistic. More thought needs to be given to infrastructure such as schools shops and entertainment. Lack of these drive people away and increase dissatisfaction with the area.</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>I agree with the strategy.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>In general Yes. In particular I strongly support Paras 4.14, 4.15, and 4.16 provided there is real engagement with a community and a real intention to implement the findings of any consultation. Sustainability objectives have their limitations. Businesses come and go. And some market towns such as Malmesbury need more local businesses and small industrial parks before more housing. Also given that Wiltshire is a rural county perhaps more emphasis should be placed on increasing our support for agriculture and farming ie, making the most of what we are good at. I am puzzled as to why there is no mention of using tourism as a tool for encouraging sustainability. Surely higher tourist numbers would help villages and market towns gain income and thereby improve their survival? It ought to provide local jobs as well. But for this to happen there has to be recognition on the part of the County that much improved access to town centres such as for Malmesbury and cheaper parking fees are essential. I see this as being a combination of introducing innovative local public transport associated with increased and much cheaper car park provision.</td>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>Support Noted. Issues such as types of business development and tourism are addressed under the strategic objective 1 on economic development. Comments specific to Malmesbury and on the economy will be passed to the relevant officer.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>The overall settlement hierarchy approach is corrected but there is no consideration that some settlements have specific environmental constraints. In particular Marlborough and Pewsey together with a wide range of villages fall within the protected landscape of the North Wessex Downs AONB. National guidance now places AONBs at the highest level of landscape protection equal with National Parks. National guidance therefore supports an alternative approach to settlements within AONBs with housing and employment provision based on &quot;local need&quot; and being of a &quot;small scale&quot;. The ability of AONB settlements to expand, particularly on greenfield sites, is very limited, should be strictly controlled to ensure the overall aims of designation to “conserve and enhance natural beauty” are adhered to. Core Policy 1 should therefore specifically refer to a more sensitive approach to settlements in the AONBs.</td>
<td>Noted. AONB's and other important landscapes in Wiltshire are protected through CP34 of the draft WCS. This policy also directly references the AONB's management plans. Consideration will be given to referencing CP34 in CP1 together with other ways of ensure Wiltshire's important landscapes are protected.</td>
<td>AONB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>As a general guide for future development, I agree with Core Policy 1 but, considering the large amount of government owned or managed land in Wiltshire and the current scrutiny of Defence spending, I wonder whether there should be explicit mention of a strategic intent for ex-military brownfield sites that may become available, such as: Hullavington, Lyneham and, on a smaller scale, Copenacre.</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Support Noted. Use of ex-military sites is considered in CP24. This policy is being updated as future changes on MoD sites are understood and specific sites that become available will be considered for development.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Trowbridge Town Council agrees with the proposed settlement strategy, supporting the settlement of Trowbridge as being one of the three Principal Settlements in Wiltshire.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>The strategy to focus development at towns (such as Melksham) is unfair: levels of development should be evenly distributed amongst towns and villages, so that each town/village increases in size by a fixed percentage (e.g., if a 3% increase in homes is needed across Wiltshire, then this should translate to a 3% increase in the number of homes in Melksham and a 3% increase in the number of homes in the villages as well). The council has not provided a good reason for focussing development at the towns. Focusing development at towns in an attempt to reduce levels of car travel (by locating development close to facilities, services and jobs) will not work. People will continue to use cars unless legal restrictions are put in place to prevent them from doing so, or fuel prices rise to such an extent as to make car travel unaffordable.</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>I do not agree with the need to grow Principal Settlements to safeguard their role. It is noted elsewhere in this document that Chippenham suffers from a substantial commuting population. There has been a slow take-up of new business premises and many retail premises, small and large are unoccupied. Growth in homes will increase the dormitory nature of the town, encourage more commuting and dilute the population's commitment to the town. For the town to grow as a community, local business must be grown and used as the driver for any increase in homes. So the focus must be on increasing the town's wealth generation and prosperity instead of increasing its size.</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Principle Settlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>I agree with the aims of the strategy, namely: * to achieve a better balance between jobs and homes ..., which does not exacerbate commuting* However I do not believe that the proposed strategy addresses the existing imbalance between housing development and infrastructure/employment which has been created by previous council and national government policies. These policies have seen towns like Chippenham grow out of all proportion to the facilities needed to support these high levels of population. Further housing development will not be able to redress the balance or improve the quality of life for residents.</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. Levels of housing are dealt with as part of Core Policy 2 and Topic paper 17 which outlines how levels of growth were identified.</td>
<td>Principle Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>I find some ambiguity in the paragraphs about Small Villages on p 24. If future development will only consist of limited infill how can that not consolidate an existing, sporadic, loose knit area of development? If we have somewhere specific in mind then it might make sense. As a generalisation it doesn't to me. Similarly I don't understand why (para 4.15) At Small Villages and those not listed in the strategy, settlement boundaries will be removed. * In our village, Luckington, the settlement boundaries do a good job, excluding fields which might be defined by would-be developers as infill sites, and setting out the limits of the village which might otherwise be stretched to cause a ribbon-like development. This is why our Parish Council (I am a member) has queried this policy. I would like to suggest that emphasis is laid on paragraph 4.12 At Small Villages development of limited sites will help meet the housing needs of the local community and can offer potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities. As a school governor I would ask that the sustainability of the school is particularly taken into consideration when considering future development too.</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>Noted. National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>By Swallowcliffe Parish Council In general, we are content with the proposed Spatial Strategy. However, we are concerned at the approach to Large and Small Village in the the &quot;Strategy Box&quot; highlighted in blue. First, it would be helpful to include a clearer definition of Large and Small either here or in the Glossary - size, population and so on are part of this. Second, and more importantly, the Strategy conveys an uneasy impression that in Small Villages nothing will be allowed to change. The specific planning restrictions offered cover exactly the sort of minor development which may make or break the viability of a small community. Matters are a touch relieved by the detail below the box. Some contradictions are also apparent elsewhere, for example, between this and the aspirations for the preservation of services such as Public Houses. There is a risk that, in practice, small villages will turn into museums if this proposal is not modified: this is unlikely to be the intention of the policy. Whilst acknowledging that Wiltshire is fortunate to have a large number of historic and beautiful small villages, there must be the capacity for sensible development to ensure their continuing vibrancy as communities. The capacity to allow for this should be firmly locked into the strategy: Area Boards and Neighbourhood Plans are fundamental to this. Their role must be referred to in the policy box and the present constraints revised to reflect the need for tailoring principles to local needs. Graham A Ewer Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Current policies are designed to allow development to come forward at small villages without compromising their environmental and built quality. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Yes. Downton Parish Council agrees with the proposed settlement strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Proposed Core Policy 1 puts forward a 'settlement strategy' with Trowbridge, Salisbury and Chippenham at the top. This is based on their local facilities and therefore their capacity for 'self containment' However, Trowbridge has no cinema, no leisure centre, no town hall or community facilities for music or other performances to match its size, no large hospital, crumbling (albeit historic) buildings, no large tourist attraction, no bus station, a run-down railway station area, and the larger shops are in Bath. It has for example no Marks and Spencer's! Some might argue that Devizes, classed as a secondary 'Market Town' in the same policy has much more going for it terms of facilities. A separate 'Trowbridge Regeneration Policy' is needed. Just making Trowbridge bigger in the past has not worked. It cannot be in the same category as say, Salisbury. We are concerned about the statement: ' Market Towns will be the focus of locally significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance their services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable sustainable communities '. Without more attention to the type of jobs and the local workforce, this generalisation is not evidence based and presents too simple a model. There is a risk that the distributed model of development will lead to increased need to travel. Is is unclear why some market towns such as Westbury are the location of 'strategic' employment. what kind of jobs? Who for? What is the definition of a 'Local Service Centre'?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. Trowbridge is subject of an individual regeneration policy in Core Policy 6 which deals with the deficiencies identified.</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>In principle we agree but in reality we do not see a coherent policy so far being in place. To avoid travel out of County/area, Malmesbury needs more employment. If more houses built before jobs, then you get unsustainable travel to employment. For more housing you need more infrastructure and an historic town like Malmesbury cannot cope with more traffic. If more housing then you need more school places and already children are being forced to commute to schools out of town, which undermines localism, travel reduction and anti global warming policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. CP2 specifies the relationship of employment and housing in the plan and the need to phase housing. CP13 deals specifically with issue regarding infrastructure in Malmesbury and issues to do with phasing of development and schools.</td>
<td>CP2 &amp; Malmesbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Yes. The proposed settlement strategy for Wiltshire is supported, in particular the level of growth to be accommodated in the Principal Settlements, such as Trowbridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Support the settlement hierarchy set out in Core policy 1. Support majority of development in large &amp; small villages taking the form of small sites within or adjacent to settlement boundaries, and role of development in helping to retain vitality of communities. However, with proviso that &quot;small sites&quot; be changed to &quot;modest sites in proportion to the size of the settlement&quot; to bring into line with the wording of Strategic objective 3. &quot;Modest&quot; is used consistently in this context throughout the Consultation document and in the Housing Topic paper. Also support identification of specific land allocations in smaller villages to be identified in local Neighbourhood, or Development Plan Documents. However, the explanation of the role of settlement boundaries in larger villages is confusing. The case for retaining settlement boundaries, (particularly if they are considered an aid to public understanding), is clearly undermined by the para 4.14, and by the fact that settlement boundaries for small villages are to be discontinued. (As an owner of land in a larger village I am very uncomfortable with the concept of seeking release of land outside a boundary which has been mapped by the LPA and subject to public consultation. It gives the impression of double dealing; I would much rather put the land forward as part of the plan process in an open manner so that people are aware of the proposal &amp; have a recognisable &amp; well publicised route to bring forward their views.) Could the present situation vis a vis boundaries be clarified by inclusion of a table listing the larger villages identified &amp; brief statement of whether a settlement boundary has been identified in a plan, whether the plan has been adopted, and the timescale of the plan? Suggest that paras 4.14- 5 could be be amended. Preparation of new Neighbourhood, DPDs should provide an opportunity to: review the need for settlement boundaries in villages identify land which may be positively allocated for development, either within the plan period, or as a long term land bank identify land which will be positively protected from development in the plan period and beyond</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. The suggested revisions will be taken into account during the revising of this policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Aster supports the principal that the larger settlements should provide the most housing as they are the most sustainable. However we are concerned that the ‘Principal Settlements’ (Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham) all have large strategic allocations and to ensure delivery we would recommend there are contingency plans in place in case these sites are not brought forward. The strategy states that limited infill development can occur in the ‘smaller villages’ but it later adds that settlement boundaries will be abolished in the ‘small villages’ and those not listed in the strategy which will make it hard to promote any development. The policy notes that development in other settlements may only occur in ‘exceptional circumstances’, but it does not indicate what these are, for example, is an ‘exception site’ classed as an ‘exceptional circumstance’. This causes us concern as the delivery of affordable housing through exception sites is the key method of delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. Many of the other settlements are as large in terms of population as the designated ‘small villages’ and are chiefly distinguished from them by the fact that they do not have a shop or a school. However, they may have pubs, be on bus routes, have thriving village halls (which increasingly provide a range of public services) and other community facilities and have local employment in farms and workshops. Aster recommends altering the settlement strategy to allow a flexible approach to small scale development in all villages to ensure the delivery of affordable housing.</td>
<td>Support noted. The core strategy is likely to have contingency built into the allocations in line with the draft NPPF. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed as are the proper definitions of exceptional development although some of these already appear in the document such as CP28 on housing.</td>
<td>Strategic Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 - particularly in relation to small villages. Councillors support the principle of restricting building because of lack of facilities and trust that the policy of preventing ribbon development will be enforced and upheld by the Planning department.</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Why is Hilperton not included in the list of Large Villages?</td>
<td>The importance of protecting the separate identity of Hilperton is highlighted within the consultation document (para 5.3.3). It is recognised that the most appropriate policy approach should be identified to protect Hilperton from inappropriate development. This could include it being classified as a large village and this option will be reviewed before the submission document is completed.</td>
<td>Hilperton</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>I do not agree with the whole of this policy. The category 'market town' should be sub-divided. A category is required to identify towns, which would lose their cohesion and change their character if there is significant development. Malmesbury is such a town.</td>
<td>The market town category does cover a range of different towns. The towns identified in this category have been identified for varying ranges of development of both employment and housing that reflects their role.</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 - Settlement Strategy. We agree with the proposed settlement strategy and are pleased to see that Ramsbury has now been classified as a 'Larger Village'. We note that consultation policy CP1. 'Large and Small Villages' now states &quot;Some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries.&quot;. Draft Topic Paper 17. (Housing Requirement Technical Paper - June 2011) tells us that 240 additional dwellings will be required outside Marlborough. In our submission, taking into account data set out in Draft Topic Paper 3. (Settlement Strategy - Appendices), it is clear that Ramsbury is the most likely candidate village to accommodate the bulk of these 240 additional dwellings. We are told that there are sites with a total area of 24.42ha considered suitable and available in and around Ramsbury. In the light of this information it seems to us that CP1 is over-restrictive and in order to allow Ramsbury to accommodate the appropriate scale of development the wording should be changed to &quot;Some limited development appropriate in scale to the characteristics of the village may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries.&quot;. Draft Topic Paper 3. (Settlement Strategy - Appendices) tells us that Ramsbury contains 644 dwellings, that there has been only 1 completion since 2006 and that there are no current commitments. It seems to us that this suggests that if there is any proposed phasing of development then Ramsbury should be at the head of the queue with site reference 1087 identified for early release.</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. In terms of release of sites it is likely that a plan led approach will be followed.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>I disagree with the statement that 'locally significant development' is being put in market towns 'in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance their... facilities and services.' Developers propose development because it is profitable for them, not because they wish communities to benefit. Similar justification was made regarding previous developments. Despite local plan policies suggesting a beneficial outcome, the result of imposing hundreds of houses on the market town where I live has been increased traffic, pressure on services and environment, loss of high grade agricultural land all of which outweigh any gain.</td>
<td>The statement regarding development at market towns describes their role and the type of development expected to take place. However, each town has its own individual targets in terms of jobs and homes with detailed work about the necessary accompanying services and facilities in the infrastructure delivery plan. The factors listed have been considered as part of these designations.</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>As a classification method for the wide variety of settlements in the County it serves as well as any. Malmesbury however, as the smallest settlement classified as a Market Town, suffers from development constraints that mere statistics do not show. This will be developed in the answers to Questions 2 &amp; 13. [comment nos. 486 &amp; 488]</td>
<td>Support Noted. More detailed policy about Malmesbury is included in CP13.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Question 1 – The Parish Council do not agree with certain aspects of the proposed settlement strategy, in particular the classification of ‘West Ashton’ as a 'large village'. Referring to the methodology used to classify the settlement categories (Topic Paper 3 – Settlement Strategy) there are several significant incorrect factors input for West Ashton. Page 10 of the Settlement Strategy, paragraph 2.25 defines a large village as having 'more green score than red scores' in the traffic light system used to score the settlements. In the appendices for the Trowbridge Community Area West Ashton has 1 green score, and 4 amber scores. The green score was obtained under the ‘basic analysis’ definition in the methodology, where it is incorrectly noted that West Ashton has a ‘food shop’ – With this factor corrected the score would drop to ‘amber’ and overall the village would have no green scores. In addition to this error, under the ‘Transport and Communications’ definition West Ashton is incorrectly recorded as having a daily bus service and a community mini-bus – both of which do not exist in the village and are a vital consideration when planning any future proposed development. Also under the ‘Leisure, Recreational &amp; Other Facilities’ definition West Ashton is incorrectly recorded as having a sports pitch and a public house – both of which do not exist in the village. It should also be noted that although the village does have a primary school, an extremely high proportion of the children attending the school do not live in the village. Based on these significant inconsistencies the Parish Council strongly believes that West Ashton, with its non existing services and very limited facilities should be classified as a ‘small village’, and as such only be appropriate for very limited infill development.</td>
<td>North Bradley</td>
<td>Information about a settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Report appears to take no account of the likely trends in shopping habits over the next few decades. Therefore there is no underpinning of strategic plans for urban commercial development. There is no real discussion of the likely changes in where people want to live, work and shop. Easy access to Bristol and Swindon makes it likely that is where people will get the widest range of goods apart from the internet. This poses real issues about the commercial development of Chippenham. Out commuting depends on what happens outside Wiltshire.

In order to achieve ‘sustainable’ and ‘deliverable’ development as defined both in national planning policy guidance and this document and ensure that the plan is sound, development should be focused on the identified settlements and not on community areas. It is suggested that CP1 is amended to make clear that any development that might be identified in subsequent DPD’s or Neighbourhood Plans within Local Service Centres, should be in addition to the quantum of development currently identified for community areas. The latter development should be delivered in the principal settlements and market towns.

We note that whilst Policy CP2 identifies Calne as a location for strategic employment growth to reflect its economic potential, the proposed level of residential growth (Policy CP10 refer s) identified for the town is not commensurate with that status. We believe that this approach is unsound. Strategic sites are not simply based on size but whether they contribute to the overall delivery of the plan.

As a small very rural parish, Lydiard Tregoz Parish Council is pleased to see in the Proposed Spatial Strategy for Wiltshire that "Small villages - only limited infill to reflect very limited jobs and services available." But we are very concerned that Settlement boundaries are proposed to be removed. We are also concerned that there is no mention of the retention of Rural Buffer Zones. We have approximately 450 dwellings spread out over a large area, without some control it can be envisaged that new houses will spring in the countryside without settlement boundaries or rural buffer zone we can expect applications to build at inappropriate locations. It is imperative, in our opinion, that the Rural Buffer Zone be retained at least as it is now, if not preferably revert to the level of the previous local plan. Our parish is bounded by Swindon Borough Council and we have very real fears that Swindon have our parish in its sights. Without a rural buffer between us and Swindon coalescence cannot be maintained.

CS1 Settlement Strategy - Chapter 4, Question 1 We support the settlement strategy and hierarchy identified with Chippenham as a Principal Settlement. We consider that provision should be made across the hierarchy for affordable housing in rural communities in accordance with PPS3, para 3. See accompanying submission document for more detail.

Christian Malford Parish Council would agree that it falls within the definition of a large village and, as such, agree with the proposed settlement strategy. There are no changes that we would wish to make.
604 Melksham is only designated as a market town within the settlement strategy. Melksham Town Council believes that the town is the fourth biggest by population in Wiltshire and that it has a vibrant and robust commercial and community infrastructure that has readily survived the economic downturn and is well positioned to exploit future opportunities.

608 Support the designation of Oaksey as a "Large Village". It allows some limited development over the next 15 years. The approach follows best planning practice and allows modest growth which helps support and maintain local businesses such as the post office/shop and pub and maintain it's vitality and resilience as a community service centre for the immediate group of villages of Eastcourt, Crudwell, Lower Minety, Upper Minety and Somerford Keynes (Glos). Support the option (para 5.18 Topic Paper 3) for reviewing the village framework boundary to include the land off The Street at the east of the Village (behind the Village Pond). This has previously been identified as the most suitable site in Oaksey for new development. The Roger Tym & Partners report 'Joint Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment', March 2008, indicated that this site could yield new dwellings on a Priority 1 allocated site within 5 years. The site would allow for some affordable development and a small group of housing would aid self-containment and ensure the site and pond is brought into beneficial use.

609 No, I don't agree with the proposed settlement strategy. I don't recall the residents of this area [Trowbridge community area] ever being asked their opinion on being a 'Principal Settlement' as against being a 'market town'. Trowbridge has such awful transport links (both road and rail) it should not be a 'Principal Settlement' unless the transport problems can be solved. Logically, Chippenham (especially) and Salisbury should be the designated as the 'Principal Settlements'. Both have far better transport links and the ability to absorb an increased population. What evidence have you to substantiate your claim that Trowbridge is an 'employment and service centre'? Trowbridge is the county town in name only. I would suggest that it should be regarded as a market town.

623 (Core Policy 1) I disagree with Chippenham becoming a "Principal Settlement". Having chosen to live in a market town when I first moved here in 1976, I have already seen it grow substantially and do not wish it to become a primary focus of development in Wiltshire. The entrance signs into Chippenham describe it as an "historic market town" - why can't it be kept as such? (Para 4.2 & 4.3) These paragraphs appear to state that Wiltshire employment/housing will be increased as much as possible. Does the national planning policy mandate this level of growth and, if not, from where has this requirement been derived? The glossary states "PPS - Guidance Documents ... are being reviewed and updated". If the national planning policy is not yet fully stated, is it too soon to be preparing a core strategy document for Wiltshire?
I would question Chippenham’s status as a Principal settlement, rather than as a Market Town. Because Chippenham has expanded more quickly than other towns in the past, it is assumed that it is a candidate for further substantial expansion in the future. This is not so. I believe Chippenham has reached the limit of its rapid expansion. Its road system could not cope and its general environment would deteriorate, making it a less attractive place for residents and businesses. I believe major development should be spread more evenly and in places which can cope with the additional housing. In the current plan for Chippenham, there appears to be at least 1000 of the 4500 additional houses for which sites are not yet identified.

National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 & PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of Chippenham allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.

Comment No 649 by Mrs C Spickernell (ID – 402713)
Please see website below for full comment.
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011

Overall support noted. There are a number of specific changes to wording in the response which will be considered as part of the review of core policy one for the next draft of the Core Strategy.

We support the proposed settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1. In particular the definition and role of Local Service Areas (including Market Lavington, as identified in Topic Paper 3: Settlement Strategy): Core Policy 1: “Local Service Centres are defined as smaller towns and larger villages which serve a surrounding rural hinterland and possess a level of facilities and services that, together with improved local employment, provide the best opportunities outside the Market Towns for greater self containment. Local Service Centres will provide for modest levels of development in order to safeguard their role and to deliver affordable housing. Development will consist predominantly of sites within current settlement boundaries. However, development well related to settlement boundaries that supports wider community aims, is of the correct scale, character and function, will be appropriate.” In particular, we support the flexibility of this policy approach, in particular the provision for development which is outside but well related to settlement boundaries that supports wider community aims. The need for this is evidenced by Topic Paper 3 Settlement Strategy, in order to safeguard the role of Local Service Centres of providing for a significant rural hinterland (e.g. in terms of affordable housing, employment opportunities, and community facilities) (Topic Paper 3, para. 3.31-32). Also, in Topic Paper 3 para. 3.37-40 in relation to Settlement Boundaries which notes: “At all other settlements [including Market Lavington] where existing boundaries are to be retained they serve as a useful point of reference as development is expected to take place beyond the current boundary. Where these are reviewed by a subsequent DPD or neighbourhood plan it is expected that the review would then provide for development beyond the current settlement and the new boundary would again form the limit of development.” (para. 3.40). We are not sure what is meant by ‘correct’ in the last line of the section of Core Policy 1 quoted above, and it would be helpful to understand this better. At this stage we are not objecting to the retention of settlement boundaries around the larger settlements (including Local Service Centres such as Market Lavington) because the expectation is clearly stated in Core Strategy that these will be reviewed through later Development Plan Documents / Neighbourhood Plans, and the Core Strategy notes that development is expected to take place beyond current settlement boundaries (Core Policy 1 and para. 4.14-15; Topic Paper 3.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 711 | Comment No 649 by Miss Phillippa Read, Chief Executive, Community First (ID – 394588) 
Please see website below for full comment. 
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011 | | Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. Consideration will be given to the status of settlements outside those identified and the nature of the policies at small villages. | Approach to Villages |
<p>| 723 | I disagree that Westbury should be classed as a market town alongside the likes of Devizes; it clearly does not have the same facilities and opportunities as the other market towns. It certainly cannot cope with 'locally significant development'. There has been far too much housing development already. I would have thought it should be classed as a service centre. I support the implication that current boundaries should be maintained; I would like a more positive statement that town limits for development are to remain as currently defined. | Westbury | The statement regarding development at market towns describes their role and the type of development expected to take place. However, each town has its own individual target in terms of jobs and homes with detailed work about the necessary accompanying services and facilities in the infrastructure delivery plan. | Specific comments about a settlement |
| 725 | Corsham Town Council supports the settlement strategy in particular the inclusion of Corsham as a Market Town which would be the focus of some locally significant development. | | Support Noted | Support |
| 742 | May I express my general support for the strategy, and make 3 specific observations? 1. Minety Parish has lost all its shops over the past years (Lower Minety: PO, mini-supermarket grocer and general store, builders merchant, ladies shop, etc. Upper Minety: PO, grocer and general store). I am therefore reliant on the excellent grocer and general store in Oaksey for all immediate needs. The alternative is a time-consuming, petrol-consuming drive to Cirencester. Oaksey has a population probably only just able to support this store. I therefore support modest and intelligent additional housing in Oaksey, to help maintain the Oaksey population at a level to ensure that this store remains viable. The store is very friendly and has become an established communal meeting point for villagers; its loss must be avoided. 2. Unlike Oaksey, most of the new (last 30 years) developments of both Upper and Lower Minety have not improved the villages. There is a mix, or indeed a mess, of styles, some singularly unattractive - with the ineptitude and inconsistency of Wiltshire planners much to blame. As a consequence, both villages have lost architectural coherence, and their character has suffered seriously and visibly. Lower Minety has fared particularly badly. 3. I therefore advocate close attention to planning and architectural coherence in each separate village, Oaksey, Upper Minety and Lower Minety. This can be achieved only through the well-considered implementation of the core strategy for each of these villages, with the necessary careful attention to the villages' appearance and long-term well-being. | SO6 | Support Noted. The design polices within the Core Strategy can be found in chapter six under Core Policies 37, 38 &amp; 39. Comments about design will be passed on to the relevant party. | Support with issues |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>Chippenham is a market town - but one that has grown considerably over the last 30 years. As such its character and infrastructure have already been challenged and to take this significantly further would seriously damage the character of the community as a rural town with a clear identity. The corollary of the proposed development would also be that huge and damaging change to the environment would be essential - road building in particular.</td>
<td>CP2, Chippenham</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>In principle most of the the settlement strategy at the top three levels is acceptable, however, brown field sites should be considered first before Greenfield development and a hierarchy as such should be developed. 1. Huish which is a small village within the Wilcot and Huish Parish has been omitted from the list of villages. 2. Point 4.12 states that&quot; Development at Small Villages will be limited to infill and well consist of new and replacement or redevelopment of small sites only&quot;. However, 4.15 states that &quot;Small Villages settlement boundaries will be removed&quot;. Why? The settlement boundaries define the small villages more than any other level of settlement in your document. If development is to be restricted to infill and yet there are no boundaries how will 'infill' be defined? Infill should only be considered when new housing sites have been fully explored since infill can blight small villages as it has done in many urban areas in the south. Infill leads to overcrowding, overloading of local facilities; e.g. road networks, water, sewerage and especially telecommunications, reduces green spaces through loss of gardens and removes the 'village feel'. Also the nature of current infill development is completely at odds with the traditional building styles and materials in many of the villages and once permitted future developments piggy back on this. Presumably if community led Neighbourhood Plans wish to maintain the settlement boundaries this will be accommodated (point 4.15)? 3. Parish Councils should be consulted on any new housing developments before they proceed. 4. The focus on development and housing in the West of the County will do very little to prevent 'out commuting' from the East to the neighbouring Counties, and there is currently too much reliance on Tourism in the East, since this is largely seasonal and individual businesses in Marlborough and Pewsey cannot be sustained in this manner alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>The title of Principal Settlements ascribed to Salisbury, Trowbridge and Chippenham seems to imply that, over time, Chippenham will lose the title and, more importantly, the characteristics of a Market Town. I strongly believe that the characteristics of market town should be preserved for Chippenham. I moved here in 1977 and because of huge developments in housing it has already lost a lot of its former character, which attracted me to settle here instead of in a surrounding village. I believe that Chippenham should have a lower increase in housing than is planned. Because of its proximity to the M4, building more houses in Chippenham than is essential will certainly increase workers commuting from the town to other centres of employment. This is the opposite effect of that which is stated elsewhere in the proposal.</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of Chippenham allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Hilperton should definitely be classified as a village in its own right, separate from the principal settlement of Trowbridge.</td>
<td>Hilperton</td>
<td>The importance of protecting the separate identity of Hilperton is highlighted within the consultation document (para 5.3.3). It is recognised that the most appropriate policy approach should be identified to protect Hilperton from inappropriate development. This could include it being classified as a large village and this option will be reviewed before the submission document is completed.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>The Core Policy seems to assert a hierarchy. As such one can see how Devizes and Marlborough, for example, are largely self-sustainable entities with strong characters and identities and worthy of tourist visiting, but which are not obviously of wider significance than their rural market town catchments. In this respect they clearly sit in a functional hierarchy below Salisbury or Chippenham. But what are we to make of Trowbridge? It has a local government role it is true, which presumably with impending retrenchment in local government, will decline. It has a neglected station on a neglected railway line. It has some nice buildings and clearly once had a coherent structure, but has been hideously damaged by the road builders, so that the general impression is of a town of roundabouts and roads going nowhere - the Wiltshire Basingstoke without the economic prosperity. This is a town brutally assaulted by planners and neglected by its burghers over decades and visitors to Wiltshire are uniformly astonished that this dreary place is the County Town. If it is to be near the top of Wiltshire’s spatial hierarchy it will remain a potent symbol of how badly the County is governed. Unless there are some urgent measures taken to regenerate this place. Unfortunately the Core Strategy is intent on depressing the area even more, probably to the point of ruin. In which case it should be taken out of the hierarchy altogether.</td>
<td>Trowbridge</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>I think that the Settlement Strategy is fundamentally flawed in that Chippenham has been chosen as one of only 3 Principal Settlements, thus continuing with the previous strategy of giving it a disproportionate level of growth. In all consultations led by Chippenham Vision and Wiltshire Council, residents saw their town as a Market Town. I understand that the North Wilts District Council asked for Principal Settlement Status in 2007. They did this without public consultation as far as I am aware.</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of Chippenham allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>Yes, overall I agree with the proposed settlement strategy. However, it should make clear in 4.15 why settlement boundaries for Small Villages will be removed. I presume it is because development in Small Villages is already strictly constrained by 4.12 and therefore settlement boundaries become redundant.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The statement is correct. However, the approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>Settlement strategy - principal settlements, market towns, local service centres (smaller towns and larger villages) and large and small villages I do not agree with the proposed settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1 insofar as plans for one category do not take account of their knock-on effect on other categories in the surrounding area. For example, significantly increasing jobs in Trowbridge will have a massive impact on traffic and therefore the health and well-being of market towns and villages close to by e.g. Bradford-on-Avon, Westwood. Thus, the plans can not be treated in isolation in the way the document currently does.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. A number of comments have highlighted that the document does not adequately address the interrelationship of community areas. Consideration will be given to how this can be strengthened.</td>
<td>Overall Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>Proposed settlement strategy agreed subject to an explanation of what is meant by the phrase 'some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries' under Large and Small Villages. Urchfont is classed as a large village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>The proposed settlement strategy, as set out in Core Policy 1, is broadly supported. In particular, the recognition that 'large villages' are an appropriate location for development of an appropriate scale on small sites, including sites adjacent to settlement boundaries, is supported. The further detail set out in supporting paragraph 4.11 is also generally supported, including the statement that development in large villages will normally take the form of small housing and employment schemes. However, the suggestion that the delivery of sites adjacent to the settlement boundaries of large villages will only be acceptable if achieved through a defined 'appropriate mechanism' and developed in conjunction with the local community appears to be at odds with the more clear-cut support for such development as expressed in the body of Core Policy 1. This approach could unnecessarily delay development on appropriately located brownfield sites adjacent to settlement boundaries because ‘appropriate mechanisms’ (as defined in paragraph 4.14) for development outside but well related to settlement boundaries will be through a community led Neighbourhood Plan or Site Allocations DPD. Furthermore, the implication of paragraph 4.14, is that ‘appropriate mechanisms’ would only be required for 'larger developments' (defined in Topic Paper 1 as sites for 15 or more dwellings or employment sites of 0.25ha or more). Given that development in or adjacent to larger villages is envisaged under Core Policy 1 to take the form of ‘small housing and employment sites’, it is assumed that sites for small development adjacent to the settlement boundaries of large villages would not need to be brought forward by an ‘appropriate mechanism’ but could be considered on their own planning merits. This is particularly the case where the site in question constitutes previously developed land (PDL). The criteria relating to the form of appropriate development, as set out in paragraph 4.13, are broadly supported although the ability of a site to deliver affordable housing will need to be assessed against national policy including consideration of the viability of such delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>We are in agreement with the proposed settlement strategy and make no suggested amendments to the strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>A statement clearly defining Hilperton as a Large Village is required. It has in the past been designated as such but this is no longer clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>Agree The approach seems appropriate provided it can be modified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. This policy is likely to promote plan led development in proportion to that settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. It is likely that development beyond settlement boundaries will most likely be identified through subsequent development documents unless there are other specific reasons such as PDL sites, exceptional circumstances will be covered by a number of policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Noted</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific comments about a settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The importance of protecting the separate identity of Hilperton is highlighted within the consultation document (para 5.3.3). It is recognised that the most appropriate policy approach should be identified to protect Hilperton from inappropriate development. This could include it being classified as a large village and this option will be reviewed before the submission document is completed.
The plan proposes that the larger settlements should provide the most housing and we support this principal as they are the most sustainable. The strategy states that limited infill development can occur in the ‘smaller villages’ but it later adds that settlement boundaries will be abolished in the ‘smaller villages’ which will make it hard to promote any development. The document states that development in other settlements (those not classified) may only occur in ‘exceptional circumstances’, but it does not indicate what these are, for example, is an ‘exception site’ classed as an ‘exceptional circumstance’? Further clarification is required as the delivery of affordable housing through exception sites is the key method of delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. Many of the other settlements are as large in terms of population as the designated ‘small villages’ and are chiefly distinguished from them by the fact that they do not have a shop or a school. However, they may have pubs, be on bus routes, have thriving village halls (which increasingly provide a range of public services) and other community facilities and have local employment in farms and workshops. Preventing any development in these villages’ contrasts with the past position where limited infilling was allowed. The effect of this settlement policy is to impose a blanket restraint on communities where some sustainable growth may still be desirable in order to maintain village life. Our view is that this may cause some of these villages to stagnate and even decline and little or no affordable housing will be provided in these areas when in most cases there is inherent need. Modest development can lead to them becoming more sustainable and provide improvements to village facilities through S106 Agreements. WRIP strongly believes that the settlement strategy needs to be altered to allow flexibility for small scale development in all villages to ensure the delivery of affordable housing.

The notes below are explored further in our main submission available as a separate document The Showell Protection Group supports the concept of a strategic plan for managing the growth of Chippenham to become a vibrant festival/market town. New housing will be required to accommodate changing demographics and employment opportunities will be needed to provide jobs for local people. The Showell Protection Group does not however accept the need for Chippenham to be classified as a ‘Principal Settlement’ where growth is targeted over and above the needs of the local population. In keeping with the vast majority of local people, the Showell Protection Group believes Chippenham should be classed as a Market Town with development focussed on local, not sub-regional needs. The designation of Chippenham as a ‘Principal settlement’ is a political decision on the part of Wiltshire Council, not based on economic or social needs. Furthermore the decision is in direct contradiction with one of the main technical reports (DTZ Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy, Final Strategy Document, August 2009) commissioned by the Council that recommended less intensive development should be spread over seven main towns in Wiltshire. In our full submission we point out the inconsistencies in the current proposals and, in particular, the Showell Protection Group will argue: The current proposals are based on out-commuting data that is significantly out of date and contradicted by other studies The proposal to allocate approximately 90% of the proposed strategic land allocation to Showell Farm is misguided and will not best serve the business development of Chippenham There needs to be a more creative approach to the use of brownfield and previously allocated land The location of large scale housing and employment land allocation to the south west of Chippenham will not support the much needed regeneration of the town centre; rather it will damage it.

The notes below are explored further in our main submission available as a separate document The Showell Protection Group supports the concept of a strategic plan for managing the growth of Chippenham to become a vibrant festival/market town. New housing will be required to accommodate changing demographics and employment opportunities will be needed to provide jobs for local people. The Showell Protection Group does not however accept the need for Chippenham to be classified as a ‘Principal Settlement’ where growth is targeted over and above the needs of the local population. In keeping with the vast majority of local people, the Showell Protection Group believes Chippenham should be classed as a Market Town with development focussed on local, not sub-regional needs. The designation of Chippenham as a ‘Principal settlement’ is a political decision on the part of Wiltshire Council, not based on economic or social needs. Furthermore the decision is in direct contradiction with one of the main technical reports (DTZ Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy, Final Strategy Document, August 2009) commissioned by the Council that recommended less intensive development should be spread over seven main towns in Wiltshire. In our full submission we point out the inconsistencies in the current proposals and, in particular, the Showell Protection Group will argue: The current proposals are based on out-commuting data that is significantly out of date and contradicted by other studies The proposal to allocate approximately 90% of the proposed strategic land allocation to Showell Farm is misguided and will not best serve the business development of Chippenham There needs to be a more creative approach to the use of brownfield and previously allocated land The location of large scale housing and employment land allocation to the south west of Chippenham will not support the much needed regeneration of the town centre; rather it will damage it. Reference DTZ Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy, Final Strategy Document, August 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>The Crown Estate supports the identification of Marlborough and Devizes as Market Towns in Wiltshire which will be the focus of locally significant development. In addition, the recognition given to the role of ‘larger villages’ such as Bromham, Great Bedwyn and Burbage in delivering development necessary to help retain the vitality of these communities is supported. Greater clarity is required regarding the approach to delivering development in all settlements however. As set out in The Crown Estate’s response to Core Policy 2, the Council needs to give much more detailed consideration to the identification and allocation of further strategic sites to plan for growth in rural communities and ensure a deliverable Core Strategy. Relying on future policy documents (be it a Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan) as the mechanism to plan for growth provides uncertainty and risks delaying the early delivery of sites which may otherwise have local support. The terminology regarding the scale of growth appropriate to large and small villages is confusing. For example it is stated that the majority of development within large villages will take the form of ‘small sites’ within existing settlement boundaries, with limited development appropriate on the edge of settlements where identified through the ‘appropriate mechanism’ defined in paragraph 4.14 - however paragraph 4.14 appears to apply to ‘larger developments’ (note also that footnote 7 is linked to Core Policy 22 which relates solely to existing employment sites). In addition, the justification for proposed developments within existing settlement boundaries as being dealt with via the planning application process and development adjacent to settlement boundaries having to go through Neighbourhood Plans/Site Allocations DPD is unclear. Suggested changes: Greater clarity is required regarding the scale of growth appropriate to large and small villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Why has Hilperton not been listed as a Large Village - will Hilperton be afforded the ‘protection’ quoted in 4.11 and 4.15.</td>
<td>Hilperton</td>
<td>The importance of protecting the separate identity of Hilperton is highlighted within the consultation document (para 5.3.3). It is recognised that the most appropriate policy approach should be identified to protect Hilperton from inappropriate development. This could include it being classified as a large village and this option will be reviewed before the submission document is completed.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>There is a very bland sentence that says some limited development may be appropriate adjacent to settlement boundaries. Such a statement would allow a developer scope to submit any number of green field development proposals outside of a village settlement boundary. This is unacceptable as it makes village settlement boundaries meaningless by definition. The policy should also restrict the change of use of rural brown field sites to housing where they have been used for employment or other community or recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. Development outside of boundaries is likely to be plan unless there are other exceptional circumstances such as those detailed in CP28.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>There is an inconsistency in that Wilton is not a listed market town in CP1, but is shown as one of the map on page 28.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilton is local service centre and this error will be rectified.</td>
<td>Factual Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>Comment No 1132 by Dr Richard Pagett, Chairs Ps and Qs, (ID – 389605)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The method of land assembly through the SHLAA is set out in national policy and Wiltshire Council has followed regulations and best practice.</td>
<td>Overall Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>Agree in general but how much will community input actually influence any decisions? Boundaries of settlements should be respected to avoid sprawling development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>The aspirations and needs of rural people for jobs, housing, transport, services and leisure are similar to those of their urban counterparts. However many rural communities in the countryside feel that they do not enjoy the benefits of national economic growth, that their particular needs are not being met, and that interdependence between rural businesses, rural life and the environment are not appreciated by Government. The core strategy must enable all communities to pursue their legitimate aspirations for jobs, incomes, housing, transport, services, recreation and leisure. The CLA commends the core strategies recognition of the role that rural diversification and diverse rural businesses can make to a diverse rural economy. (Core Policy 25). However this policy should not be limited to ‘villages’, but include farmsteads in the open countryside, providing access is suitable and the proposals are sustainable. The Core strategy should, through positive planning policies, encourage a mix of economic development in rural areas. The particular circumstances of the countryside can be respected by promoting well designed and suitably (including for use) scaled developments, not by arbitrary restrictions on the type of development that can take place in rural areas.</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. Comments concerning the economy and CP25 will be passed on to the relevant officer.</td>
<td>Overall Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>There is no definition in the document of the size of &quot;small sites&quot; which, it is proposed, will form the majority of developments in large villages. I would like to suggest that small sites should comprise no more than six dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. A better definition is likely to be included in the next draft.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>Comment No 1322 by Dom Verschoyle (ID – 550122)</td>
<td></td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Comments about Trowbridge have been passed to the relevant officer for consideration</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see website below for full comment.
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>I agree with the Settlements Strategy provided there is a review of settlement boundaries in the future. Although the settlement boundaries have been beneficial in many places, in some such as Purton it has resulted in a lot of in filling over the past few years which is now becoming detrimental and changing the character of the village. Many gardens have been built on taking away valuable living space for children to play and adults to generally enjoy and not least space for food to be grown. Over the past few years the demand for allotments has grown significantly because so many properties are built on such small parcels of land. There are some small sites that have been identified as available for development adjacent to Purton's development line which would alleviate the need for further infilling and should be included in the development line of the village.</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. Sites outside boundaries are likely to be brought forward in DPDs or through exceptional circumstances such as PDL.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>Whilst the assessment of North Bradley is basically correct, the Village does not have a shop or post office.</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Bradley Noted. This information will be used to update the assessment of North Bradley and the appropriate designation of North Bradley will be included in the next draft.</td>
<td>Information about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1437</td>
<td>Chapter 4 - Delivering the vision. Under Settlement Strategy, we agree with the definition of Holt as a Large Village and the need to retain the settlement boundary as defined in the current District Local Plan. In exceptional circumstances, development outside the boundary should be permitted where this is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan and the majority of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Trowbridge is unsuitable as a principal settlement for these reasons: It has poor overcrowded road access It has poor infrastructure In the current economic situation it will not easily attract jobs Many millions would be needed to supply GP surgeries, new schools, road improvements etc etc! Who will pay?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trowbridge National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Comment about Trowbridge have been passed to the relevant officer for consideration</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Question 1 Para 4.7 - Have increased petrol prices being taken into account when referring to 'Ease of travel'? CORE POLICY 1 Insert at the beginning of the third sentence 'Sequential development will ensure that' they will provide (delete significant) levels of jobs. It should be pointed out that although the phrasing sounds nice we should have moved on and recognised that to date the large developments in Swindon have not led to successful sustainable communities, but to a rise in crime and a dead centre. Now it seems that there is a swing to recognition that a lively town centre is the basis for economic growth. Does the five-year land supply compromise such a move? Should regeneration come first, followed by other areas, after the centre has been regenerated? It is good to see that the sequential approach is used in Policy 41 for retail and leisure and in 6.7.5 for flooding. Market Towns - Delete 'locally significant' and replace with 'development will be appropriate to safeguard their role in a rural area and deliver affordable housing that meets an identified need' Question: What infrastructure could accompany rapid development; would character be lost? Local Service Centres - In para 2 'modest' is not defined. Suggest after 'supports the community aims, as voiced through the Neighbourhood Plan or a Referendum'. Suggest need for this to be in a policy. Supporting paras: Second para, second sentence: Replace 'significant' with 'all' - This could set a pattern for significant developments in rural areas if it only applies to significant developments in rural areas; small development opportunities could be lost. Third para, last sentence: Delete 'where possible' if kept in it could enable change to housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable and alternative transport options formed part of the assessment of settlements in the strategy. Changes to wording are noted and will be considered in the preparation of the submission draft.</td>
<td>Overall Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>This Council supports the settlement strategy as set out in Core Policy 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td><strong>Core Policy 1 – Settlement strategy</strong> There should be a greater reference and reliance on the principals of sustainable development to guide the location and quantum of new development over the plan period. Using sustainable development as the key policy driver for the location of new development will negate the need for the imposition of artificial and arbitrary boundaries to settlements which contradict the principles of sustainable locations for development. Removal of artificial development framework boundaries to settlements that have been identified as ‘sustainable locations for development’ will enable development in appropriate locations controlled through the development management policies and those that protect the open countryside from sporadic development. References to ‘infilling’ particularly in the village context should be deleted. Use of infilling in the rural planning policies of successive previous Local Plans means that it is no longer a viable element of the potential housing land within the rural settlements of the community areas. Greater clarity of the settlement hierarchy is required, particularly the division between Local Service Centre and Large Village. Further comment can only be made upon sight of the evidence base and topic papers. Supporting paragraphs 4.14 &amp; 4.16 appear to provide the ability to oppose sustainable development proposals which would otherwise conform to national policy and sustainable development objectives. Paragraph 4.16 appears to seek to prevent the development and evolution of settlements in the plan area. Within rural areas the paragraph will support arguments that seek to prevent development that protects the ongoing vitality and natural development of settlements. No special justification should be required if the principles of sustainable development underpin development that enables a given settlement to move up the settlement hierarchy. There is no reference to either the protection of the open countryside or to dwellings essential to rural activities; the tone of the document et al fails to account for the significant rural land area that makes up the majority of the county. The above comments are based on the information provided with the consultation document; further comment is reserved pending the release of the supporting evidence base and topic papers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td><strong>While the categories of Large Village, Small Village and ‘other’ may be understandable at first glance, the further definition of the consequences of these categories is confusing and contradictory.</strong> How can a village with a tight settlement boundary qualify as a Large Village if there are no ‘small sites’ within the existing boundary? If the mechanism for developing ‘adjacent to’ boundaries is a Neighbourhood Plan or DPD, does this mean that the extension of the boundary is or isn’t in the control of the community? Why do Large Villages, who seem already to be able to sustain minimum facilities, acquire the planning momentum to add more housing? Surely the communities that need more housing are those which do not have a large enough catchment to support facilities, in order that they can improve their situation? If Small Villages are content to add no or little new housing, why remove the settlement boundary which is the principal source of community control on ad-hoc development? What is the definition of ‘infill’ which may be permitted in Small Villages - when this is subject to considerable interpretation and consequences vary enormously from site to site? If ‘infill’ is how development is scaled in planning terms, this encourages the ‘enclosing’ of the village, loss of gardens, gaps/views/natural breaks between the built structures? If the settlement boundaries are removed from Small Villages, what control does the community have which is proof against future changes of planning policy/central government policy? We approve of the requirement to consult robustly the local community if substantial change is to be made to land use in the parish, but the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the mechanisms proposed in the Localism Bill presuppose that the community will be taking initiatives to develop sites, not that they wish to be protected from development. If this is the overall priority of the community, how do these settlement categories as defined provide the community with that protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Bradford on Avon Town Council agrees with this strategy and does not wish to suggest any changes.</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross Reference**
- SO1, SO2 & SO5

**Officer Comments**
- Comments are noted, especially those regarding settlement boundaries and development in rural areas. The approach and definition to non-strategic settlements is being revised. A number of the issues mentioned are dealt with in other policies in the Core Strategy such as CP28 on housing, CP25 on economy and CP34 on landscape. These observations will be passed on to the relevant officers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Comment No 1564 by Mr E East, Trust for Devizes (ID – 390622) &lt;br&gt;Please see website below for full comment. &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a></td>
<td>Devizes, CP3</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Comments about Devizes have been passed to the relevant officer for consideration</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>It is stated within this policy that within large and small villages, 'the majority of development will take the form of small sites within existing settlement boundaries'. Defining a settlement boundary creates an unnecessary restriction upon the development of sites that lie outside of such areas. Each site should be assessed on its own merits in terms of suitability of development for either housing or employment uses. The necessary requirements for suitability should be adequately defined by other policies and any site that does not meet these requirements would be dismissed. Location inside or outside of a settlement boundary does not in itself either reduce or increase the suitability of any site for development. It is the collated impact of specific policies that should do this. In this context, defined settlement boundaries are not needed. Changing circumstances and/or policies may dictate that a site outside of the boundary is now suitable for development. The existence of the settlement boundary could prevent or delay such sites from making a contribution to new housing or employment requirements, for no other reason than their position outside of a previously defined area. Core Policy 1 should be altered to remove any references to settlement boundaries in relation to large and small villages. The policy should instead encourage each and every potential site in and around such communities to be considered in its own right, in the context of a positive attitude to encourage sustainable development wherever suitable and possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The approach and definition of development at Large and Small Villages is being reviewed. Consideration will be given to the comments about development outside villages and the relationship with boundaries.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Colin Horwood opposes the lack of flexibility in Core Policies 1, 25 and in the Core Strategy generally which fails to provide adequately for sustainable development opportunities that are available through the reuse of existing buildings and previously developed land for alternative uses, as appropriate to the circumstances. Existing and emerging National Planning Policy clearly establishes a comprehensive and suitably flexible regime of Policy, which confirms a preference for re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land. The Core Strategy currently fails to comply with these provisions. PPS4 Policy EC12 states that &quot;Re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations and for some types of building.&quot; A comprehensive set of criteria is then specified to ensure that development is sustainable, such as identifying sites suitable for business activity. Similarly draft National Planning Policy Framework Policy 113 requires enabling the residential reuse of redundant or disused buildings, provided this leads to an enhancement to the immediate setting. Core Policy 24 proposes different policies for the re-use of former military establishments. While this CP24 is not opposed, the same enabling provisions should apply to land that was formerly used for alternative purposes. A new Core Policy should be introduced which is fully consistent with National Policy by expressly providing for redevelopment of previously developed land and existing buildings as an appropriate guiding principle for delivering sustainable development, including acknowledgement in Core Spatial Strategy (CP1) and Chapter 3.</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>The core strategy does advocate a PDL policy in CP2 and a number of other policies such are designed to affect a brownfield first policy. In terms of rural development the approach to large and small villages will be reviewed and this will include a review of exception circumstances.</td>
<td>Not Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>The Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document is a comprehensive piece of work, providing a sound strategic framework on which to develop resilient communities and create stronger local economies throughout the county. In response to Questions 1, 2 and 3, the Everleigh Parish Council concurs with: Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy Core Policy 2 - Delivery Strategy Core Policy 3 – Infrastructure Requirements</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We agree with the proposed settlement strategy which accepts that some limited development should take place on the edge of the larger villages (such as Oaksey) in order to help meet the housing needs of the existing local community and provide potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities. However we do not agree with the restrictive description of where development in small villages should take place - if development sites on the edge of small villages are available and can help meet the housing needs of the community then we believe their development should be supported.

We agree with the proposed settlement strategy which accepts that some limited development should take place on the edge of the larger villages (such as Colerne) in order to help meet the housing needs of the existing local community and can offer potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities. We suggest the following change to the text which relates to the location of development in large villages. The last sentence in paragraph 8 should be amended to read "some limited development may be appropriate on sites that are adjacent or well related to settlement boundaries”. Sites that are well related to an existing settlement, could be defined as sites that (whilst not immediately adjacent to a settlement) are still within walking distance to the services within the nearby village. By amending the wording of the policy to take into account sustainable sites on the edge of villages it gives more scope and flexibility to ensure that development comes forward that will support existing village and community services and amenities.

The general description of the settlement hierarchy is reasonable. However the methodology for choosing the list of Market Towns only takes account of the facilities in a settlement but fails to take into account its size or the geographical constraints on growth. Malmesbury is significantly smaller than the other towns and by placing it in this category raises an expectation of significant growth. Unfortunately due to the geography of the town any growth must take place on the outskirts which will be disconnected from the town centre by the river valleys which surround it. Table 1 Town 2006 Total Dwellings Housing requirement Growth % 2006-26 Community Area % Population 2006-26 Amesbury 8161 2100 25.7 15.7 Bradford-upon-Avon 4396 510 11.6 11.3 Calne 6914 1240 17.9 22.2 Corsham 4015 1050 26.2 19.0 Devizes 7381 1730 23.4 11.7 Malmesbury 2347 760 32.4 12.9 Marlborough 3280 610 18.6 4.2 Melksham 8309 1930 23.2 13.6 Tidworth & Ludgershall 4121 1750 42.5 50.4 Warminster 7820 1650 21.1 10.2 Westbury 5994 1290 21.5 24.2 Wootton Bassett 4859 920 18.9 10.3 All Market Towns 67597 15540 23.0 50.4

Appendices Sheet H2 Housing, Sheet P2 Population Topic Paper 17 Housing Requirement Technical Paper Table ES1 Proposed Housing Requirements From Table 1 it can be seen that Market Towns are expected to grow at significantly different rates and this will be dealt with in Questions 9 to 20. CORE POLICY 1 - SETTLEMENT STRATEGY Barratt Bristol fully support the identification of Bradford on A von as a Market Town, which will be the focus for locally significant growth in the period up to 2026. It is however, important to ensure that the level of growth for Bradford on Avon is sufficient to meet its future needs. At present the proposed level of growth is insufficient to meet the needs of the town both in terms of open market housing and affordable housing. Recommendation Continue to identify Bradford on Avon as a Market Town and focus for growth.

Support Noted

Noted. The approach and definition of development at Large and Small Villages is being reviewed. Consideration will be given to the comments about small villages.

Noted. The approach and definition of development at Large and Small Villages is being reviewed. Consideration will be given to the comments about development outside large villages. There are a number of exceptional circumstances where PDL development and other development will be acceptable away from settlements and these are in other policies such as CP28 on housing.

Support Noted. This comment has been passed on to the relevant officer. The size of residential allocations has relied on a number of different factors, not simply current population.

BRADFORD, CP2

Support Noted. The level of development at each settlement has been dictated by a number of factors. Comments specific to BoA have been passed to the relevant officers for consideration going forward.

Bradford, CP2

Specific comments about a settlement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Chapter 4 3.1. Paras 4.4 The settlement strategy, particularly as it relates to Corsham, has clearly been developed on a misunderstanding of role and function, and a misunderstanding of what is necessary in the way of planning policies to achieve the spatial vision for market towns set out in Chapter 3. 3.2. Core Policy 1 3.2.1. Market Towns 3.2.1.1. These are defined as &quot;settlements that have the ability to Support sustainable patterns of living through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities. Market Towns will be the focus of locally significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to ... promote better levels of self-containment and viable sustainable communities. &quot; 3.2.1.2. The Market Towns listed are diverse in size and character, and diverse in their respective potentials for expansion or consolidation to Support/promote sustainable patterns of living. Corsham's current employment opportunities are insufficient to cater for more than 30% of its working population. 70% work migrate to work outside Corsham. That is not a &quot;sustainable pattern of living&quot;. 3.3. Question 1. 3.3.1. Corsham Chamber of Commerce disagrees with the proposed settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1. In relation to Market Towns, in the first para., the word &quot;ability&quot; should be replaced by &quot;potential&quot;; and the words &quot;their current&quot; should be replaced by &quot;the provision of appropriate&quot;.</td>
<td>The statement regarding development at market towns describes their role and the type of development expected to take place. However, each town has its own individual target in terms of jobs and homes with detailed work about the necessary accompanying services and facilities in the infrastructure delivery plan. Consideration will be given to wording proposed in the comment</td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>The Industrial Property Investment Fund (IPIF) is the freehold owner of the West Wilts Trading Estate at Westbury. The Fund submitted representations to the Wiltshire 2026 – Planning for Wiltshire’s Future document in October 2009. The Fund indicated its general support for the ‘Proposed Vision’ and the proposed ‘Strategic Objectives’, but expressed a regret that the settlement hierarchy failed to identify Westbury as a ‘Principal Settlement’. For the same reasons, as set out in 2009, the Fund considers that the Council is missing an opportunity in that Westbury is one of the least constrained settlements (in terms of statutory and non-statutory designations) and could accommodate a greater level of development with minimum harm being caused to planning and environmental designations.</td>
<td>The allocation of Westbury as a market town is felt consistent with the overall process in looking at the most sustainable patterns for Wiltshire. Westbury does not have the facilities or strategic importance to act as a principle settlements for Wiltshire.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>The Parish Council does NOT support the proposed settlement strategy.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Bishopstone Parish Council does not support Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy, for the reasons set out in the attached paper. The key points are that: the policy amounts to a blanket ban on all development in the smaller villages in Wiltshire, this will lead to stagnation and the stifling of organic change, will remove any prospect that those villages might be made more sustainable and will unnecessarily limit a potential contribution to meeting the needs of rural areas; the policy is not consistent with national policy, as set out in PPS3 (June 2011) and the draft NPPF (July 2011); the suggestion that this ban might be overcome by the adoption of locally produced &quot;Neighbourhood Plans&quot; is completely unrealistic; and the policy therefore needs to be changed to allow more flexibility for very limited, small scale, developments in the smaller villages. See Attached Reps</td>
<td>Noted. The current draft polices allow for small villages to amend their status to become a large village where that community can utilise development to become more sustainable. The approach and definition of development at villages is being reviewed. Consideration will be given to issues raised.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>The settlement strategy as set out in Core Policy 1 is supported. In particular the identification of Chippenham as a Principal Settlement and Calne, Tidworth and Westbury as Market Towns.</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>This introductory element of the strategy, clearly to be welcomed as an intent, but lacks substance. At the Devizes forum it was made clear that this strategy is about ‘land/planning’ for the future. Yet how can ‘needs’ for land be considered if the economic strategy is not reviewed at the same time. The risk is that this document despite its size and ‘good intent’ delivers nothing, but an outline of where dwellings should be constructed so as to meet the Government set targets. Given this plan reaches as far forward as 2026, one would hope that with the same conviction that is clear when stating ‘2040’ dwellings will be constructed, that Wiltshire Council would be able to state and the A350, rail link, x number of employment units, will also be constructed, upgraded etc. Without such a firm commitment to do something, rather than lots of positive words and intent, how can Wiltshire Council hope to meet its objective of building sustainable communities. The strategy at present is a hard commitment to build houses/homes, with a nice intent to try and perhaps get more employment. This is not a true sustainable model, it does not ensure economic growth in that area, nor does it address the climate sustainability requirements to increase employment within communities to reduce the outflow and ‘car commuting’.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan includes specific employment growth projections for each community area and these will be updated in the next draft. Where possible the infrastructure delivery plan and various policies indentify infrastructure vital to the delivery of plan. Full details of this are available in Topic Paper on infrastructure.</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Comment No 1826 by Ms Marilyn Mackay (ID – 439132)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please see website below for full comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>This comment represents the corporate views of the Parish Council and includes comments of local residents who attended a Parish meeting at which the strategy was discussed. Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy Concern was raised about possible erosion of the settlement boundary. (see 4.11&quot; some development adjacent to boundaries &quot;) Is the green belt safe?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The removal of settlement boundaries should not cause extra pressure on green belt land. However, the approach and definition of development at villages is being revised.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Same as 1534</td>
<td>See 1534</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>This Council supports the settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1.</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 - Settlement Strategy - I agree with the Settlements Strategy provided there is a review of settlement boundaries in the future. Some small developments sites adjacent to the village development lines should be included within the boundary.</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>The other point I wish to raise concerns the matter of the special protection some villages gain through being designated as large villages. When you study the document Hilperton is not on the list of the villages, North Bradley, Sotuwick and West Ashton are quite rightly on the list but apparently Hilperton does not even seem to exist as a village it has simply disappeared into Trowbridge. I have lived in this house for over forty years, I chose it because it is a village and I did not want to live in a town. I strongly object to my village being wiped off the plannig may by some bureaucrat without a second thought. The planners could by simply giving us the stats of a large village (which afterall is what we are now) ensure we have the protection of our existing village policy. Thereby ensuring the next generation, which includes my grandchildren are able to enjoy the special environment of this village and not just the outskirts of a town.</td>
<td>Hilperton</td>
<td>The importance of protecting the separate identity of Hilperton is highlighted within the consultation document (para 5.3.3). It is recognised that the most appropriate policy approach should be identified to protect Hilperton from inappropriate development. This could include it being classified as a large village and this option will be reviewed before the submission document is completed.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Core Strategy 1: We support the retention of settlement boundaries in market towns and large villages, but have concerns about the removal on boundaries for small villages. It assumes that all these will have a Neighbourhood plan, which may not be the case. The villages will be open to ad-hoc development in this case, or if there is a void.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The removal of settlement boundaries should not cause ad-hoc development as policies within the core strategy are designed to ensure in the absence of Neighbourhood plans the correct development locations would be indentified. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being revised</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Core Policy 1: Settlement strategy a. In respect of the Storrige ward of Heywood Parish, the Parish Council considers that the settlement boundary as defined by the Westbury Town Policy Limit should be retained unchanged. b. In respect of the Heywood Village ward of Heywood Parish, the Parish Council wishes that there should be no defined settlement boundaries at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Comment No 1907 by Mrs G Shell, Director Wiltshire Rural Housing (ID – 398298): Please see website below for full comment. <a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Comments regarding the development at smaller settlements will be taken into account. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being revised and thought is being given to how best to allow some sustainable development at villages within environmental limits. Restrictive policies that bring forward plan led development with some notable exceptions is felt the best way to achieve these aims.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>I fully support James’ Gray’s comments in the Wiltshire Gazette. If the proposals described in the Core Strategy are carried out we will in effect loose the present characteristics of Wiltshire. Much agricultural land will be lost and Wiltshire will be less able to produce their proportion of food for the rising population in this country and help towards the self sufficiency that is going to be increasingly important as the world moves towards a risk of serious food shortages. I do hope you will reconsider the number of houses you propose.</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>The broad policy and accompanying statements of CP 1 make it difficult not to agree with the question as posed - statements such as: “Development at Small Villages will be limited to infill and will consist of new and replacement or redevelopment of small sites only. At Small Villages development of limited sites will help meet the housing needs of the existing local community and can offer potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities” Seem to imply that economic considerations will be the main driver determining whether or not new etc housing will be needed. What consideration is being given to the refreshment of current housing stock? How many unoccupied houses are there available that may be useable on refurbishment and fully compliant with energy etc requirements? This has been very successfully done in Salford and Newcastle - where admittedly there is/was a larger number of vacant Victorian houses The categorisation of settlements is logical.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed. There are specific policies on housing and climate change that look at promoting better use of existing and new housing stock.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy  We do not agree with the proposed settlement strategy. The market towns have received a large amount of development in the form of housing and economic development over the past decades and have not been able to meet the infrastructure requirements resulting from this high volume. The market towns should be allowed to assimilate and profit from the previous developments in terms of infrastructure including the expansion of small businesses, independent retailers and vibrant town centres. To facilitate this there should be rent reviews carried out in order to offer lower rates and stimulate new small businesses. Development should be focussed towards the end of the plan period following assessments of both economic growth in the towns and regeneration of their centres in order to allow organic growth not a forced pace. Large and Small Villages: Development in the large and small villages hinges on the provision of alternative transport, all means other than the car, and the views of the local communities as set out in any neighbourhood plan.

National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 & PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Sustainable and alternative transport has been taken into account when assessing villages; some development is may to take place in advance of neighbourhood plans.

The classification of market towns covers a broad range of settlements. A number of the settlements have a wider more strategic foundation (like Melksham), and the settlement strategy should recognise this. The larger, strategic settlements should be identified and their ability to contribute to larger scale sustainable development, both housing and employment, set out in the consequent policy.

Tanya Owen Bines opposes the lack of flexibility in Core Policies 1, 25 and in the Core Strategy generally which fails to provide adequately for sustainable development opportunities that are available through the reuse of existing buildings and previously developed land for alternative uses, as appropriate to the circumstances. Existing and emerging National Planning Policy clearly establishes a comprehensive and suitably flexible regime of Policy, which confirms a preference for re-use of existing buildings and previously developed land. The Core Strategy currently fails to comply with these provisions. PPS4 Policy EC12.1 states that "Re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations and for some types of building." A comprehensive set of criteria is then specified to ensure that development is sustainable, such as identifying sites suitable for business activity. Similarly draft National Planning Policy Framework Policy 113 requires enabling the residential reuse of redundant or disused buildings, provided this leads to an enhancement to the immediate setting. Core Policy 24 proposes different policies for the re-use of former military establishments. While this CP24 is not opposed, the same enabling provisions should apply to land that was formerly used for alternative purposes. The option of retaining and modifying existing relevant policies of the North Wiltshire Local Plan does not appear to have been considered. A new Core Policy should be introduced which is fully consistent with National Policy by expressly providing for redevelopment of previously developed land and existing buildings, including acknowledgement of residential reuse potential.

Noted. A number of policies promote the use of brownfield land in the strategy and further refinement of these policies will be undertaken following assessment of the NPPF.
2044

It is agreed that the role of Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury should be strengthened and supported in terms of employment and services, but this may threaten the viability and vitality of other towns in the county. The concentration of employment and residential development in these 3 centres would be more likely to increase the need to travel. This would not be sustainable. Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury are very different places. The character and appearance of these 3 areas is quite different. Development should only be allowed if the character and appearance of the towns is protected and enhanced. The settlement strategy should not be detrimental to Wiltshire’s identity as a largely rural area with beautiful landscapes, market towns and villages. It is the market towns within the county as a whole that are of critical importance to the economy of Wiltshire. Focusing development on just 3 towns and strictly limiting development in smaller towns and villages will not address the need for affordable rural housing and rural employment, protecting the viability of rural communities and addressing the day to day needs of local residents. There should be a strategy for MOD land. There are large MOD sites that may become available for redevelopment and these sites should be considered as a part of this Strategy. These sites are brownfield and should be developed in advance of green field land.

Reference Officer Comments Issue

No. Comments Cross Reference Officer Comments Issue

2054

Although the Core Strategy has responded to previous calls for a modest increase in levels of development in the smaller villages, now designated by Large and Small Villages, any development in settlements not included in these designations is still severely restricted. We would wish to see a more flexible approach which acknowledges that the sustainability of rural settlements is related to many complex indicators other than population size and the range of services (important as those are), and which builds on the more positive approaches to rural development promoted by the Taylor Report (Living Working Countryside, 2008) and the work of the current national Rural Coalition (eg The Rural Challenge 2010). These wider indicators include the potential for local employment (eg home working), community support (eg help with transport and shopping), and a growing range of land-based activities (eg recycling wind and water energy). A more positive policy on these lines will also be required to match the aspirations of local communities expressed through the provisions of the Localism Bill, such as the Right to Build, and Neighbourhood Plans. We expand on this point in Q2 below. We also note that this point is also critical to the policies put forward in the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, currently the subject of an Examination in Public, but which should surely bring about an alignment with the Wiltshire Core Strategy when the latter is finalised. We are concerned that the two core strategies are in danger of becoming seriously inconsistent.

Reference Officer Comments Issue

National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 & PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer homes and jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Sustainable and alternative transport has been taken into account when assessing villages; some development is may to take place in advance of neighbourhood plans.

Reference Officer Comments Issue

Wiltshire Association of Local Councils (WALC) is a membership organisation for town, parish and city councils in Wiltshire & Swindon. We work in partnership with these local councils at the grassroots of communities in the county, supporting them in law, procedure, roles and responsibilities and by representation. With regards to the proposed settlement strategy set out in the Core Strategy, a particular concern of WALC is the "limited level of development", proposed for smaller villages will prevent these communities from being sustainable. There are proposals that practically all development will be in the market towns in order to improve and maintain their vitality, but the restriction of improvement and maintenance of vitality in smaller villages. Again with regards to the proposals for market towns comes the concern of the infrastructure being in place to support this development. This comes in the form of facilities and services as well as traffic expansion and the cutting of public transport. The increase in traffic in towns will have to be seriously considered with the level of air pollutants in mind as some towns have poor air quality due to congestion. The council has a legal obligation to keep pollution levels below legal limits. Facilities and services such as health services will both be impacted by and will impact growth in towns and the level of such facilities will need to be high enough to meet the demands of residents. In reference to the concerns about congestion, a way of preventing some congestion would be to reduce the amount of commuting away from Wiltshire's towns and villages. This means that the creation of employment will need serious focus, as well as ensuring that as well as housing, work spaces are provided within towns.

Reference Officer Comments Issue

National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 & PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer homes and jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The designation of the principle settlements and market towns allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. The policies regarding villages have been designed to give flexibility in order to maintain the vitality of villages. However, the approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>These representations have been prepared by MJ Gleeson Group plc as part of our continued promotion of land of land owned by Gleeson at pewsey. Gleeson has promoted the land at the former Pewsey Hospital site through the Local Development Framework process and Core Strategy process to the present date. Accordingly we have promoted the land throughout the stages that have been consulted upon, and the site has been submitted to the SHLAA for residential development. Gleeson supports the progression of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and have prepared comments within this representation relating to our landholdings at Pewsey. It can be noted from our previous rounds of representation that we support residential growth at Pewsey to support and enhance the existing services and employment provision within the settlement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>Section 4.2 sets out the general strategy however there is little indication here or throughout the document as to what sorts of jobs will lead to 'job growth'. Surely this is a key issue as this is likely to influence the amount and location of land needed for employment purposes? Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy The AONB notes that there is no reference to AONBs nor respect for these important national landscapes in this primary policy and recommends that it is corrected.</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Noted. AONB’s and other important landscapes in Wiltshire are protected through CP34 of the draft WCS. This policy also directly references the AONB’s management plans. Consideration will be given to referencing CP34 in CP1 together with other ways of ensure Wiltshire's important landscapes are protected. In terms of job growth, employment land projections have taken into account which types of jobs are being planned for and this appears in a technical paper available online. More consideration will be given to jobs and location following further work.</td>
<td>AONB - Job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110</td>
<td>An analysis of settlement role and function shows that neither Tidworth nor Ludgershall qualify as a market town. Core Policy 1 of the Core Strategy defines market towns as ‘settlements that have the ability to support sustainable patterns of living in Wiltshire through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities’. Tidworth and Ludgershall are poorly served by facilities, services and employment and do not have the ability to support sustainable patterns of living in Wiltshire. Tidworth should be identified as a local service centre and Ludgershall a village. See supplementary report.</td>
<td>Tidworth</td>
<td>Analysis of Tidworth and Ludgershall show that they have the services and facilities to support being designated as a market town. The settlements are being planned for jointly to address specific issues at them.</td>
<td>Specific comments about a settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>We support designation of Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury as highest order principal settlements in Wiltshire, and also support the allocation of the settlements identified in Core Policy 1 as second-tier market towns. Core Policy 1 states that ‘Market Towns are defined as settlements that have the ability to support sustainable patterns of living in Wiltshire through their current levels of facilities, services and employment opportunities’ (our emphasis). This implies that there will be no potential for the development of new facilities, services and employment opportunities, and contradicts the following paragraph of the policy which states that ‘Market Towns will be the focus of locally significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance their services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable sustainable communities’ (our emphasis). The policy should be clear that an appropriate level of growth in facilities to meet the needs of the enlarged populations of the principal settlements and Market Towns will be supported, as this reflects the aims and ambitions of other Core Policies and Strategic Objectives as set out in the draft Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>Comment No 2133 by Paul and Kirsty Martin (ID – 556234) Please see website below for full comment. <a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a></td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. The</td>
<td>Strategic Settlements and Housing Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>However, I do object to the overall scale of development envisaged in the strategy, which I consider to be too great - especially in and around Chippenham in my constituency and the neighbouring parishes. In my view, the key organising principle of a local development plan such as this should be sustainability. This should encompass the impact of policies permitting development on carbon emissions, travel to work journeys, the conservation of wildlife and preservation of our countryside. I do not accept the premise that large numbers of homes need to be built for people currently residing outside the county in order for new employers to be attracted. The high level of out-commuting by a skilled local workforce here stands as evidence to the contrary. I would therefore urge you to plan for a level of housing development throughout this plan period that is based entirely on the currently unmet needs of the local population, and their future needs arising from understood demographic changes. I accept that some settlements in the county should grow faster than others, because of either the need to sustain minimum demand for existing services - for example, village schools - or the presence of suitable infrastructure, such as the railway. However, I object to the degree to which future housing development is focussed on just Chippenham, Trowbridge and Salisbury, and I consider that a more equal rate of housing growth in other towns would be better suited to meeting local housing needs. I therefore believe we should still be looking for a substantially lower level of housing growth in the Chippenham area than suggested in the Core Strategy, and that it should not be so front-loaded: some development should be saved specifically for the final five years of the plan. I am confident that Neighbourhood Plans, for which Members of Parliament are currently legislating in the Localism Bill, would quickly be seized by my constituents in Chippenham in order to secure additional protection for cherished open spaces such as Birds Marsh and the Avon river corridor, using a new Green Area designation. It would be an affront to the democratic processes that the Bill will establish if the Core Strategy was so specific as to prevent the possibility of alternative options to development in these areas being in “general conformity” with the Core Strategy. I refer you to my remarks in the House of Commons Adjournment debate of 19th July on this subject.</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best opportunity to offer jobs and homes in the most sustainable manner. There is a focus in the strategy on all of the strategic settlements both principle settlements and market towns and this allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil its requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. The recent publication of the NPPF shows that national policy will continue to support this approach. The areas referred to in Chippenham have been protected as part of the detailed strategic site allocations and this is detailed in CP5 on Chippenham.</td>
<td>Overall Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2194</td>
<td>We have no objections to the proposed settlement strategy set out within Core Policy 1, which seeks to direct the largest amount of growth to the principal settlements with proportionate growth allocated to the market towns and smaller settlements. Whilst not specifically referenced within the WCSCD, this follows the growth hierarchy set out within the draft RSS and therefore provides a sound basis on which to formulate the plan. We note that Malmesbury is classified as a Market Town which will be a focus for locally significant growth to promote self containment and viable sustainable communities. We have no objection to such provision with the WCSCD.</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2206</td>
<td>Yes, provided that CHANGES to the settlement structure are backed by a process of genuine and timely community planning</td>
<td>Support noted. The approach and definition of development at large and small villages is being reviewed.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2219 | Comment No 2219 by Mike Beese, Gallagher Estates & Heron Land Dev. (ID – 556368)  
Please see website below for full comment.  
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011 | CP2 | Topic paper 17 outlines the process undertaken to identify the housing numbers required for Wiltshire. It is felt that the new numbers for Wiltshire reflect the ambitions of the NPPF whilst having regard to Localism Bill which will abolish the South West RSS and the housing numbers contained within that document | Housing Numbers |
| 2230 | The classification of Chippenham as a Principal Settlement, and Hullevington as a Large Village in the settlement hierarchy is supported. However, the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous. | | Support Noted. A number of comments have highlighted that the document does not adequately address the interrelationship of community areas. Consideration will be given to how this can be strengthened | Support with issues |
| 2251 | The classification of Warminster as a Market Town is supported. However, the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous. | | Support Noted. A number of comments have highlighted that the document does not adequately address the interrelationship of community areas. Consideration will be given to how this can be strengthened | Support with issues |
| 2266 | 1.5 aims to reduce levels of out-commuting which is due to a complex range of factors - not just the quality and availability of local employment. Whilst it is useful to base a settlement hierarchy on public transport access another important factor is the interface between settlements and their rural or less developed hinterlands. The ring roads, large roundabouts and A roads at these locations can inhibit walk and cycle trips that would otherwise be possible. A tenet of urban extension and enlargement is that the edges to existing towns are softened in terms of quiet ways through for the non-car trip. | SO8 | Transport policies outlined in Chapter 6 look to promote sustainable transport and better access to all settlements. | Transport |
| 2277 | We represent a landowner in Chapmanslade. This settlement is identified as a large village and we agree with this definition. We do believe, though, that large villages can, if they contribute to local infrastructure, take significant residential, commercial and potentially local facilities. Meeting the affordable housing needs of rural communities should be given the highest priority. As an example my client’s land (totalling some 2 hectares) could potentially provide private and much needed affordable housing, as well as employment opportunities, road improvements and village shop. We believe that, with appropriate development briefs, sites in large villages could take development that would otherwise be allocated to Local Service Centres, especially where a range of facilities can be provided. | | Support Noted. Decisions on individual sites will depend on a number of different circumstances. Comments have been passed to relevant officer | Support with issues |
| 2288 | Comment No 2288 by Mr Duncan Hartley, Rural Solutions Consulting (ID – 55420)  
Please see website below for full comment.  
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011 | | There has been detailed analysis of all the villages in Wiltshire that has taken account of the all factors of sustainability. This has led to a policy framework which advocates more development at larger villages due to the services and facilities that exist at these villages without obvious measurable environmental constraints. The policy allows the flexibility for all villages to amend their status where development will help bring facilities and services as well as housing and employment to a village. | Approach to Villages |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2296</td>
<td>Object. A survey has been carried out in the Parish of Great Hinton. The results indicated that, of those responding: 63% want the existing settlement boundary to be retained 9% wish to see the boundary extended slightly to allow some limited development 14% object to any infill taking place 14% want the boundary to be removed On this basis, it is recommended that the existing settlement boundary be retained, allowing limited controlled infill to be undertaken if required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Consideration will be given to the desire to keep settlement boundaries.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2303</td>
<td>Comment No 2303 by Mr Anthony Aitken, Colliers International on behalf of MacTaggart &amp; Mickel (ID – 556438) Please see website below for full comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation of homes at the West of Swindon is to provide for the population of Swindon. As such Wiltshire Council has continued to work with Swindon BC to help them identify the best locations for the proposed housing development for Swindon. Currently there are better sites that can accommodate the growth in housing in and around Swindon as detailed in the Swindon Core strategy.</td>
<td>Swindon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2323</td>
<td>Core Policy CP 1 - Settlement strategy 3.2 We support the statement that Wiltshire’s Principal Settlements are strategically important centres and the primary focus for development. We also support the statement that they will provide significant levels of jobs and homes to support better self-containment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2349</td>
<td>Comment No 2349 by Mr Cliff Lane, Savills Planning on behalf of Persimmons Homes (ID – 556590) Please see website below for full comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Further consideration will be given to the NPPF in the next draft of the Core Strategy particularly in relation to delivery of housing at local service centres.</td>
<td>Local Service Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 - Settlement strategy 5.2 The project team support the Settlement Strategy and agree that Holt is appropriately designated as a ‘large village’. However, the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. A number of comments have highlighted that the document does not adequately address the interrelationship of community areas. Consideration will be given to how this can be strengthened</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2351</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.14 currently states that: “The appropriate mechanisms for bringing forward larger developments within settlements will generally be through applications that are supported by a robust Statement of Community Engagement.” Persimmon would suggest the need for much more clarity on this issue, particularly in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is fair to say that in many areas there is little or no support for development of the magnitude proposed by the Core Strategy, and as a result there is a significant risk that overall targets will not be met if the only developments consented are those proactively put forward by Neighbourhood Plans - or explicitly endorsed by existing residents in an area, rather than those who might require the new housing. We would support the requirement for full community engagement in all major applications, and the principle that all reasonable measures must taken to respond to local concerns, and resolve objections. However the Core Strategy should also be clear that Wiltshire Council will, in principle, support any planning application which accords with the requirements of the Core Strategy and NPPF. This would confirm with the NPPF principle (paragraph 14) that “Local planning authorities should plan positively for new development, and approve all individual proposals wherever possible”, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The NPPF will need to be considered in the next draft of the Core Strategy and a new focus on villages will be produced.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that consent should be granted for developments that would meet "objectively assessed development needs". We realise that the current Core Strategy was drafted prior to the draft NPPF, and thus Wiltshire Council will not have had the opportunity to fully respond and reflect. In the current review and consultation process however, we would stress the need for the Core Strategy to adopt the proactive role envisaged by the draft NPPF, so that the delivery of its own targets is not unduly reliant on Neighbourhood Plans. These, it should be emphasised, remain a highly uncertain and untested means of bringing necessary development sites to fruition.

Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy 2.1 The proposed role of Devizes as a Market Town and "second tier" settlement in the overall hierarchy in Wiltshire identified in this policy is supported. This is consistent with the historic approach to the town in planning policy terms and underpins the general scale of additional development appropriate for the town. 2.2 It is noted that the policy states in relation to Market Towns that they: "……………… Will be the focus of locally significant development that will increase the jobs and homes in each town in order to help sustain and where necessary enhance these services and facilities and promote better levels of self containment and viable communities" (RPS emphasis). 2.3 As explained below in more detail in relation to the relevant Community Area based policy (Core Policy 12), the approach to Devizes in the Consultation Document does not currently appropriately reflect this key principle. Specifically, it does not provide for a strategic housing site having regard to the fact that a new, strategic employment allocation of 8.4Ha (21 acres) is proposed off Horton Road close to the Coate Bridge site. 2.4 One of the fundamental principles behind the Wiltshire Core Strategy is achieving a close relationship between employment and housing. The Coate Bridge site is extremely well related to the Horton Road proposed allocation and other major existing employment sites in north east Devizes and thus ideally located to achieve an appropriate balance between strategic housing and employment provision. The attached report contains details of the site.

Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy The settlement strategy is generally supported and the classification of settlements is appropriate. It is however important in the light of the emphasis in the Core Strategy on the individual Community Areas to make clear at this stage that these community areas do not function in isolation but also have inter-relationships which need to be fostered. This is particularly true for employment development which will draw employees from a wide geographical area. A sustainable balance is necessary but the boundaries cannot be too tightly drawn. HPH Ltd therefore welcome the emphasis placed in the Strategy on the development of the A35 corridor and the allocation of the land at Hawkeridge Westbury as this will enhance the profile of this area of opportunity which is well located to provide employment to serve the whole Trowbridge Travel to Work Area. HPH Ltd support the approach in the Core Strategy which seeks to balance jobs and housing looking not just at new housing areas but also locations where housing has already taken place without the necessary new employment land being promoted. Paragraph 4.15 states that settlement boundaries will be retained and reviewed through a subsequent development plan document. Where strategic allocations are proposed in the Core Strategy the settlement boundary should be extended as a result of the Core Strategy to encompass the allocation. Question 1 The Settlement Strategy is supported but it is requested that, for clarity and consistency, the development boundary of Westbury should be extended to encompass the allocated employment site at Mill Lane. HPH Ltd support the proposed settlement strategy but the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the Strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2399</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 should be amended to allow a modest level of new homes to be provided in the Smaller Villages. The planning system needs to increase the supply of housing and stop being a barrier to sustainable development. A key Government policy is to increase the supply of new homes in the UK to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent home which they can afford the community they want to live in (PPS3 Paragraph 9). Achieving a step change in housing supply remains at the heart of Government policy, as reflected in the recent Budget Statements and the Draft National Planning Policy Framework. There is still a requirement for new homes within the Smaller Villages, such as Chilton Foliat, to meet the needs of the village/surrounding area, particularly regarding affordable homes, and to support and sustain local services and facilities. Paragraph 4.12 in the supporting text seems to recognise this need but this is somewhat at odds with the policy itself which only allows limited infill development. The opportunity for infill development within the built-up part of these Smaller Villages is diminishing. The supply from these sources is very likely to dry up, especially as most of the settlements have significant constraints, such as conservation areas, landscape and flooding. The final part of Core Policy 1 should be amended to allow limited development in order to meet local needs. 'In order to contribute to the present and future economic, environmental and social sustainability of the Smaller Villages, housing will be allowed on sites of up to 0.3 hectares adjoining the built-up area, where the scale and nature of the development is appropriate and where it accords with other policies in the development plan.' This will open up opportunities for smaller-scale housing sites to come forward, delivering both market housing and affordable housing, which cannot be delivered through smaller infill schemes. Details would be determined in the Site Allocations DPD or a Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>We do agree with the proposed settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1. We support, in particular, the role of Local Service Centres in serving the surrounding rural hinterland and ensuring the appropriate levels of development are provided in these areas to ensure the protection of local facilities and services along with employment and housing, including affordable provision. We also support the Council's intentions to allow development which is appropriate in terms of scale, character and function and which is well related to settlement boundaries to ensure the wider communities are supported. We also agree with Mere's designation as a Local Service Centre and the Council's intentions to provide 290 new homes and 3ha employment land within the Mere Community Area. We consider that land to the South of Castle Street (B3095) provides for an appropriate location for a proportion of its residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>WE FOCUS HERE ON THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF CHIPPENHAM. WE SUPPORT THE RECOGNITION IN THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT STRATEGY SET OUT IN CORE POLICY 1 OF CHIPPENHAM AS A PRINCIPAL SETTLEMENT AND A PRIMARY FOCUS FOR GROWTH. THIS IS ENTIRELY APPROPRIATE GIVEN ITS ROLE AS A STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATION IN WILTS, WITH AN ESTABLISHED RECORD OF RETAINING INTERNATIONAL EMPLOYERS IN THE MANUFACTURING AND SERVICE SECTORS. WITH THIS ESTABLISHED BASE AND THE STRENGTH OF ITS LOCATION, CHIPPENHAM HAS STRONG POTENTIAL TO ATTRACT INWARD INVESTMENT INTO WILTS. WE AGREE WITH THE FOCUS OF THE STRATEGY WHICH SEeks TO DELIVER SUSTAINABLE GROWTH, WHICH DOES NOT EXACERBATE COMMUTING AND ENCOURAGES A GREATER LEVEL OF SELF CONTAINMENT OVER THE LIFETIME OF THE PLAN. THE DRAFT CORE STRATEGY ILLUSTRATES THE SCOPE OF CHIPPENHAM TO DELIVER COMPLEMENTARY SITES TO DELIVER EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING WITH ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY FACILITIES.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The approach to development at large and small villages is being developed. Nevertheless there is a clear mechanism for small villages to amend their status if infill is not providing sufficient housing sites at the village.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mere Support Noted. Comments on the site in Mere have been passed to the relevant officer</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 This policy fails to adequately address the issue of the role of Swindon within this area and the need to work co-operatively and in concert with the neighbouring local Planning Authority in order to deliver a sound and cogent spatial planning approach. The failure to properly recognise the role of Swindon and the inter-relationship between Wiltshire (especially the Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area) and the town of Swindon on its border is a serious omission. This is clearly a sustainable option that has been ignored. The objectives within the Localism Bill and the policies set out within the Draft National Planning Policy Framework clearly require cross-boundary planning and co-ordination. The Settlement Strategy should positively promote development within that part of the County that abuts the town of Swindon on its western side. [see attached full submission for detail and clarification on this point. This forms the complete submission that should be taken into account] [appendix A submitted in hard copy only]</td>
<td>The Council has continued to work collaboratively with Swindon Borough Council particularly in regard to development at the west side of Swindon. This will continue with the submission draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2418</td>
<td>Comment No 2349 by Mr Cliff Lane, Savills Planning on behalf of Persimmons Homes (ID – 556590) Please see website below for full comment. [<a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a>]</td>
<td>The statement regarding development at market towns describes their role and the type of development expected to take place. However, each town has its own individual target in terms of jobs and homes with detailed work about the necessary accompanying services and facilities in the infrastructure delivery plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2420</td>
<td>We agree with the proposed settlement strategy in that Chippenham is identified as one of the three Principal Settlements.</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2429</td>
<td>Comment No 2429 by Rohan Torkildsen, English Heritage (ID – 403792) Please see website below for full comment. [<a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a>]</td>
<td>Noted. The evidence that accompanied Wiltshire 2026 had more detailed information regarding the role and function of each town and this should be read in conjunction with the topic paper on the settlement strategy. Further work will be carried on environmental capacity where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2444</td>
<td>Comment No 2444 by Alistair Macdonald, DPDS Consulting Group on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (ID – 556595) Please see website below for full comment. [<a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a>]</td>
<td>The allocation of homes at the West of Swindon is to provide for the population of Swindon. As such Wiltshire Council has continued to work with Swindon BC to help them identify the best locations for the proposed housing development for Swindon. Currently there are better sites that can accommodate the growth in housing in and around Swindon as detailed in the Swindon Core strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2456</td>
<td>We broadly welcome the settlement strategy and the hierarchy of towns as identified in this policy. However developments within the hierarchy should be carefully considered to ensure that the infrastructure, both transport or otherwise are in place to accommodate the proposed development.</td>
<td>Support Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>The above point is important when we come to the proposed settlement strategy. A focus on main towns is understandable, but Wiltshire is described in the draft as being a largely rural area encompassing many natural and historic features which make it distinctive, including three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, part of the New Forest National Park, more than 16,000 listed buildings, more than 240 conservation areas and the Avebury and Stonehenge World Heritage Site (Core Strategy, 2011, Para. 2.2). The potential tension that an urban focus presents in this context is clear and is compounded to some extent by the proposal to retain all existing settlement limits. Core Policy 1 (and its associated text) makes a solid attempt to reflect this settlement pattern (and the challenges and opportunities it presents). In particular the ability (no matter how infrequent this may be exercised) to approve proposals beyond the main towns and villages is welcome. We think that this provision could, however, be improved by: a) referring to “places” rather than “settlements” (at the end of the Policy) b) considering a reference in the policy similar to that found in paragraph 4.14 (which highlights the potential for development outside of settlements but well related to them) c) making some reference to the exceptional circumstances (although we recognise that any attempt will be difficult).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2486</td>
<td>The settlement strategy has a sensible structure and relies on the performance of its key towns and villages to deliver sustainable development. The main issue that we can see is with the continued reliance on quite narrowly define settlement limits (which the strategy states will remain unchanged from current - and generally historic local planning exercises). On the face of it, some form of control is needed to decide where development should go. However, the setting of specific limits can install a very artificial break on growth which sees some development projects needing special justification when a special welcome would be more appropriate. This is particularly the case for projects that are well related to a main town. To overcome this, three options are available to the Council: a) a clear statement in Policy CP1 about the principle of settlement limits and their application b) a clearer statement (at paragraphs 3.39 - 3.40) in Topic Paper 3 on the scope for well related growth beyond settlement limits. This is implied but needs to be clearer c) a clearer commitment to delegate settlement limits (or the approach to them) to the towns and organisations responsible for them. A combination of these approaches could provide the best solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2517</td>
<td>In order to achieve ‘sustainable’ and ‘deliverable’ development as defined both in national planning policy guidance and this document and ensure that the plan is sound, development should be focused on the identified settlements and not on community areas. (i.e. in order to ensure the policy is justified and effective). <a href="http://www.wyg.com">www.wyg.com</a> creative minds safe hands It is suggested that CP1 is amended to make clear that any development that might be identified in subsequent DPD’s or neighbourhood Plans within Local Service Centres, should be in addition to the quantum of development currently identified for community areas. The latter development should be delivered in the principal settlements and market towns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have noted in our comments on CP1 that we consider that the levels of residential growth proposed for the community areas should be accommodated in the principal settlements and Local Service Centres. Within this community area, that means Calne. We have also previously noted in our comments in respect of policy CP2 that there is an inconsistency in identifying Calne as a location suitable for strategic employment growth, but then severely limiting the overall scale of residential growth proposed. We note that the proposed average annual level of residential development, (less completions and commitments) for the whole of the Calne Community Area amounts to approximately 23 additional dwellings per annum over the plan period. This compares to annual average completions over the last 4 years, (ignoring any planning permissions granted in the period) of approximately 118 dwellings. It should also be borne in mind that the last four years has been a period significantly effected by the recent recession. We question whether this dramatic reduction in the planned level of residential growth is sound, (i.e. not justified, effective or consistent with national policy). We propose that as a minimum (and for reasons previously stated), the whole of the identified housing requirement should be steered towards Calne and that this figure should be indentified as the minimum level of residential growth that is required. We further propose the policy makes clear that further residential development could be provided within the villages and that these sites could be identified in community led plans. The Core Strategy could potentially provide a guide to the scale of any such development so that unsustainably large sites are not advanced.

We do agree with the proposed settlement strategy set out in Core Policy 1. We support, in particular, the role of Local Service Centres in serving the surrounding rural hinterland and ensuring that appropriate levels of development are provided in these areas to ensure the protection of local facilities and services along with employment and housing, including affordable provision. We also support the Council's intentions to allow development which is appropriate in terms of scale, character and function and which is well related to settlement boundaries to ensure that wider communities are supported. We also agree with Mere's designation as a Local Service Centre and the Council's intentions to provide 290 new homes and 3ha of employment land within Mere Community Area. We consider that land to the south of Castle Street (B3095) provides an appropriate location for a proportion of this residential development. Further information regarding this sites suitability is provided within the submitted covering letter.

Core Policy 1 – Settlement Strategy Overall the Consortium supports the general strategy proposed by Core Policy 1, which identifies a settlement hierarchy (based on an understanding of the role and function of settlements) and includes Chippenham as one of three Principal settlements at the top of that hierarchy. The recognition that these settlements will provide significant levels of jobs and homes is also supported; however, there are concerns about the expectation (as written) that this is only to support better self containment. Whilst improved facilities and infrastructure and the opportunity for people to live and work locally will occur (and this will naturally improve the containment and self sufficiency of places), self containment as an overarching policy objective does correlate with the specific social, demographic and geographical issues identified by the evidence base. This strategy will impede necessary overall growth. Various factors including fuel costs, advances in technology and flexible working practices (including home working) will all be relevant over the plan period and influence the relative containment of settlements. Core Policy 1 should be amended to make clear the Council’s overall approach to delivering sustainable growth, Overall Chippenham is strategically well placed to deliver sustainable growth and provide for the new jobs and homes that Wiltshire need as part of Core Policy 1.
We are in broad agreement with the settlement hierarchy set out in section 4 of the Core Strategy document. However, further work will need to be undertaken by the Council to distinguish between some of the smaller towns and villages as some are bigger than others and are therefore more capable of accommodating further growth. Moreover, it should be recognised that some settlements will significantly benefit from further growth to sustain them, help their economy and that of the wider rural hinterland as well as supporting local shops and services and stemming out-commuting. Careful consideration will also need to be given to the types of development that will be accommodated in some of the smaller towns and villages to help achieve self-containment.

Support Noted. Limitations in this assessment and methodology of smaller settlements are expected to be resolved by community led neighbourhood plans.

The information provided will be used to update the assessment of Etchilhampton in line with the methodology set out in topic paper 3. Limitations in this assessment and methodology of smaller settlements are expected to be resolved by community led neighbourhood plans.

The allocation of Melksham as a market town is felt consistent with the overall process in looking at the most sustainable patterns for Wiltshire. Melksham does not have the facilities or strategic importance to act as a principle settlements for Wiltshire.

We support the Settlement Strategy and the indentification of the settlement hierarchy. We agree with the identification of Malmesbury as a market town for the following reasons: The town currently has a good level of facilities, services and employment opportunities. The town is a suitable location for the focus of locally significant development to increased the availability of jobs and homes in the area.

Planning regs are clear that through DPDs LPAs should make it clear where development is appropriate. Settlements not listed in the hierarchy represent hamlets and other sporadic rural farmsteads etc...

The Industrial Property Investment Fund (IPIF) is the freehold owner of the West Wilts Trading Estate at Westbury. The Fund submitted representations to the Wiltshire 2026 - Planning for Wiltshire’s Future document in October 2009. The Fund indicated its general support for the ’Proposed Vision’ and the proposed ’Strategic Objectives’, but expressed a regret that the settlement heirarchy failed to identify Westbury as a ’Principal Settlement’. For the same reasons, as set out in 2009, the Fund considers that the Council is missing an opportunity in that Westbury is one of the least constrained settlements (in terms of statutory and non-statutory designations) and could accommodate a greater level of development with minimum harm being caused to planning and environmental designations.

Same as 1769
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2676</td>
<td>Comment No 2676 by Mrs Kate Freeman (ID – 466722)</td>
<td></td>
<td>National policy, particularly in the form of PPS3 &amp; PPS4, states that through the Core Strategy the council should promote greater levels of development at settlements with the facilities and infrastructure to support that development and provide the best. This has led to a policy framework which advocates development at larger villages due to the services and facilities that exist at these villages without obvious measurable environmental constraints. The policy allows the flexibility for all villages to amend their status where development will help bring facilities and services as well as housing and employment to a village and thus should deliver development in rural areas.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2686</td>
<td>OBJECT Small villages not listed in the strategy should retain their settlement boundaries and these should not be removed. These villages will continue to allow for limited infill.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See 2618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2730</td>
<td>The Cotswold Conservatin Board is supportive of this policy, however the following comment is made: Examples in the supporting text of 'exceptional circumstances' for development in 'settlements other than those identified in the hierarchy' would be helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The type of development that is described as exceptional will be redrafted in the next version.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2740</td>
<td>Same as 1826</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2742</td>
<td>Comment No 2742 by Ms Marilyn Mackay (ID – 439132)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. It is acknowledged that the relationship between some community areas is not well described in this document and this will be rectified in the next draft. It is important that the development of Chippenham is planned with all those that are affected in mind. Development at Junction 17 could serve Wiltshire but would not be related physically to Chippenham and would not help the town develop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2754</td>
<td>Comment No 2754 by Ms Karen Jones, Administration Manager, Wiltshire Archaeology and Natural History Society (ID – 557610)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self containment and providing the right jobs in the right locations is central to this plan. Nevertheless it is acknowledged that modern lifestyles mean that this is likely to remain a goal that the plan should work towards. The strategy, through specific transport polices under strategic objective 8 in chapter 6, defines ways to improve all types of transport and detailed infrastructure requirements are included to improve public transport in all the strategic settlements in Wiltshire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2778</td>
<td>Whilst the initial response to the proposed removal of settlement boundaries for smaller villages seemed ominous, the Parish Council considered that it could also be deemed an advantage whereby it will allow for those communities to decide where and when development comes forward without artificially imposed boundaries. Development in small villages will have the restriction of purely meeting local needs and will take the form of limited infill on small sites. The use of community-led Neighbourhood Plans is considered to be vital to ensure that local councils retain a certain amount of control over planned development in its community and decides on the type, location and size etc of its community development and power to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan is not handed over to a small group of independent individuals/organisations etc such as private developers that can prepare a Neighbourhood Plan if an existing one is not present and operational.</td>
<td>Support Noted. The government is clear that Neighbourhood Plans are to be community led and Wiltshire Council supports this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2786</td>
<td>I write on behalf of my Parish, Lydiard Millicent in the north of Wiltshire - too close to Swindon for our comfort. We are very concerned that we have been classified as a ‘Large Village’ in the WCS documents. I have studied the criteria, and whilst I can follow some of the scoring, some are a matter of judgement. We have approximately 1300 residents, a church, independent Parish Hall, and a few small businesses, but no Post Office, or shop. We have a Recreation Field that supports football and cricket, with associated Clubhouse and play area, but little else. Too many villagers work away, and take no part in village life, and we have many retired residents. West Swindon is only one or two fields away, most of which are owned by developers. We are an independant village in North Wiltts and 98% of responses in our recent Parish Plan Update want it to stay that way. The classification of a ‘small village’ would give us a much better chance to prevent coalescence with Swindon, and I would therefore ask if there is any way the details of our classification could be reviewed by ourselves, or if we can appeal against the classification. Your help and guidance would be much appreciated.</td>
<td>This information will be used to update the assessment of Lydiard Millicent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2793</td>
<td>Core Policy 1 - Settlement strategy (page 24) I wish to maintain the objection to the application of the strategy below the size of market town set out in detail in my letter dated 31 December 2009 in response to the earlier consultation. In particular, I support the objection of West Ashton Parish Council to its classification in Core Policy 7 and that of Hilperton Parish Council to its non-classification in that policy.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2799</td>
<td>Comment No 2799 by Mr S Chambers, LPC (Trull) Ltd (ID – 391676) Please see website below for full comment. <a href="http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011">http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approach to Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2809</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes and BRB (Residuary) Ltd support, in principal, the identification of Westbury as a Market Town in Core Policy 1. This is a logical policy evolution from the Adopted Structure Plan Policy D3 and emerging Regional Strategy Development Policy B. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2814</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes and Mr B Hocken support, in principal, the identification of Warminster as a Market Town in Core Policy 1. This is a logical policy evolution from the Adopted Structure Plan Policy D3 and emerging Regional Strategy Development Policy B. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2820</td>
<td>David Wilson Homes supports, in principal, the identification of Westbury as a Market Town in Core Policy 1. This is a logical policy evolution from the Adopted Structure Plan Policy DP3 and emerging Regional Strategy Development Policy B. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2826</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Archer broadly support Core Policy 1, in principal. However, the draft policy would benefit from further amendment to aid clarity and achieve more effective development management in Wiltshire during the remainder of the plan period. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2833</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes broadly support Core Policy 1, in principal. However, the draft policy would benefit from further amendment to aid clarity and achieve more effective development management in Wiltshire during the remainder of the plan period. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2851</td>
<td>Ashton Park broadly supports Core Policy 1, in principle. However, the draft policy would benefit from further amendment to aid clarity and achieve more effective development management in Wiltshire during the remainder of the plan period. Ashton Park considers that a revised more effective Core Policy 1 should be a key part of the delivery of sustainable development in Wiltshire, as sought by the Draft National Planning Policy Framework and the interim and emerging Regional Strategy. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2857</td>
<td>Barratt Developments broadly support Core Policy 1, in principle. However, the draft policy would benefit from further amendment to aid clarity and achieve more effective development management in Wiltshire. Barratt Developments consider that a revised more effective Core Policy 1 should be a key part of the delivery of sustainable development in Wiltshire, as sought by the Draft National Planning Policy Framework and the interim and emerging Regional Strategy. [further details provided in hard copy report]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. Specific comments will be taken into account when redrafting policy.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2862</td>
<td>Crest and Redcliffe fully support the identification of Chippenham as a Principal Settlement, which are strategic important centres and the primary focus for growth in the period up to 2026. Chippenham is strongly influenced by its position close to the M4 and performs a dormitory role with regards Swindon/Bath/Bristol. It also, however, performs as an important employment and service centre to a growing population and a wide rural hinterland. Its location and connections to the M4 and the mainline rail route to Bath/Bristol and London will assist it to build on inward investment and growth. In addition, it has an established retail centre which serves its wide hinterland. The draft RSS for the South West identified Chippenham as a Strategic Significant Town and sought to establish a level of housing and employment development commensurate with the objective of reducing the growth in out commuting from the town and enhancing its functional relationships with the various towns surrounding it e.g. Trowbridge, Bath etc. In view of the above, support is given to Chippenham’s identification as a Principal Settlement which should be the focus of growth. Recommendation Continue to identify Chippenham as a Principal Settlement and focus for growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2871</td>
<td>The settlement strategy is supported. Bradford on Avon has been appropriately designated as a ‘Market Town’ for the purposes of the settlement strategy. However, the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted. A number of comments have indicated that the relationship between community areas is not adequately addressed and this will looked at for the next draft.</td>
<td>Support with issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2882</td>
<td>Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy: Question 1: We agree with part of the proposed settlement strategy which accepts that some limited development should take place on the edge of larger villages in order to help meet the housing needs of the existing local community and create the potential to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cross Reference</td>
<td>Officer Comments</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2890 | Comment No 2890 by Friends of the Earth (North Wiltshire) (ID – 559287)  
Please see website below for full comment.  
http://consult.wiltshire.gov.uk/portal/spatial_planning/wcs/wcsconsult2011 | SO7 | The town centre first sequential approach is a key concept of both national policy and the core strategy. There is a focus on regeneration at the principle settlements with development of vision boards and specific town centre regeneration focused policies. The population forecasts and employment growth scenarios are outlined in respective topic papers. These are based Government forecasts. | Town Centre Policies |
| 2895 | The classification of Melksham as a Market Town is supported. However, the interrelationship of the community areas associated with each settlement needs to be more clearly explained in this section of the strategy. It should be explained that the housing market areas and employment catchments associated with each settlement overlap and the community areas are not autonomous. | Support Noted. A number of comments have indicated that the relationship between community areas is not adequately addressed and this will looked at for the next draft. | Support with issues |
| 2905 | Purton Parish Council agrees with the sentiment in paragraph 4.13 where it states that development at local service centres and large and small villages must be in character with the scale and appearance of the settlement though unfortunately that can be open to interpretation. Further we whole heartedly support 4.11 where is says a limited level development at large and small villages will be supported in order to help retain the vitality of these communities and will meet the housing of the local community. The parish councils notes that development at large villages will predominately take place within existing settlement boundaries and will take the form of small housing and employment sites. However we query as to what is meant by existing settlement boundaries. Is this the “natural” boundary of the village or the Framework Boundary as defined in the existing LDF. We believe there needs to be clarity here to ensure developers do not abuse the intention of the Core Strategy. Whilst the Framework boundary has served Purton well, it has nevertheless created much high density infill development. Our other query is what is meant by small housing developments as it is a very relative term. Would a development of 50 dwellings be considered as small for a large village such as Purton? Amendment required o Clarification regarding the settlement boundary, how it will be defined and changed as appropriate to meet changing circumstances, and o What is meant by a small housing development for large villages and how would this be defined. | Wootton Bassett & Cricklade  
Support Noted. The settlement boundaries being referred to are the ones that currently exist in the local plan | Support with issues. |
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