Responses to Question 16 – Pewsey Community Area - Core Policy 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Following comments made in respect of Marlborough, there needs to be more specific consideration to the fact that this area sits within the protected landscape of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Although no strategic housing allocations have been proposed into the AONB, which supports national guidance, further comment should be provided on how the 318 houses will be provided without damaging and lasting impact on the AONB through the need for greenfield site releases. For example has the Council assessed its SHLAA and is confident that the 318 figure can be met without the need for greenfield site releases? If so this should be confirmed in the Core Strategy. Alternatively if this is not the case how is the Council going to reconcile the potential release of greenfield sites whilst not impacting on national guidance that seeks to conserve and enhance the AONB. This is particularly important in the Pewsey and Marlborough areas as there are little or no greenfield sites left that if released for housing would not cause lasting damage to the AONB.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted - See comment 147</td>
<td>AONB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>2 nd Bullet.. Replace &quot;town&quot; with &quot;village&quot; To correct a typo.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text will be amended appropriately.</td>
<td>Typo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>A345 and Wiltshire Councils Core Strategy on Transport 2011-2026. The Durrington Town Council are concerned that the A345 does not come into the Wiltshire Council Core Strategy as any kind or type of highly used Highway North to South through Wiltshire County. As the Core Strategy covers the next 15 years the Council feel that this is a serious omission. All the Town and Parish Councils named below are affected by this problem of through traffic North to South from the A303/M3 through to the A4/M4. There are great concerns by all these Councils (listed below) along the A345 through the Pewsey and Avon Valleys, in that Wiltshire Council has omitted the A345 from every part of this New Core Strategy regarding Highway Transportation across Wiltshire. The Question is WHY? The Councils who have very great concerns are: Durrington Town Council. Figheldean Parish Council. Netheravon Parish Council. Enford Parish Council. Upavon Parish Council. Manningford Parish Council. Pewsey Parish Council. Wilcot/Huish/Charlton Parish Council Marlborough Town Council. There is firm evidence that the A345 is being used by ALL SORTS of vehicular and Heavy Goods traffic along this small fragile unsuitable Drovers Road as a short cut North to South across Wiltshire. The Council must either recognise this situation or declassify this “A” road to a “B” road and remove the large HGVs signs (Going North) at Manningford and Sharcott which are at present directing all Heavy Goods Vehicles through Pewsey Village up to the A4 at Marlborough and beyond. Then they should Re-sign the Road at the A303 Countess Roundabout Amesbury and the A4 at Marlborough as being Unsuitable for LARGE Heavy Goods Vehicle use. Durrington Town Council is additionally concerned that the signposts at the Solstice Park roundabout in Amesbury encourage people to take the A3028 which is now being used as a rat run for HGVs and cars through to the A345 or on through Larkhill to miss the Countess Roundabout.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted - See comment 707</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</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>762</td>
<td>Huish has been omitted from the list of Villages. 2. The A345: We fully support the collective reply regarding this road given by the other Parishes along its length. In addition we would point out that the Marlborough to Pewsey section is extremely narrow in places and with many dangerous bends and blind corners. There have been a number of fatal accidents on this stretch of the road and many non injury accidents which may well have been serious or fatal but for good fortune. The size and number of HGV's on this road coupled with its narrowness mean that cars are frequently faced with oncoming HGV's on the wrong side of the road cutting corners or avoiding hedges. Where HGV's pass one another they regularly have to stop and edge past on another, using the soft verges causing considerable damage and in the winter dumping large quantities of mud on the road, making it unsafe for long periods of time. In Oare specifically, there is a bottleneck formed by a Hollow Way at the North end of the village where it is not possible for two heavy goods vehicles to pass, forcing the North bound vehicle to cut in to Huish Lane. This lane is a busy residential and farm access route but even more importantly this is the access to Oare Primary School, the vast majority of whose pupils travel by car. The A345 constitutes a major hazard in three ways at this point; the corner is virtually blind, the approach speed of many vehicles is well above the 30 miles an hour speed limit (local Community Speed watch clearly demonstrates almost 100% of vehicles passing through Oare are doing over 40 miles an hour). This means that cars trying to turn on to the A345 are at serious risk of being hit by speeding vehicles. HGV's cutting in to the road end frequently do so with no regard for vehicles waiting at its end to turn on to the A345. Many vehicles especially HGV's are carrying far too much speed as they enter the village from the North and are unable to slow down sufficiently when they reach the bottle neck. Two such incidents in recent years have led to the deployment of the air ambulance. Fortunately no serious injuries were sustained however, it is only a matter of time before an incident occurs where this is not the case. This junction is highlighted because of its heavy use by children in the age group 0 to 11 but there are many similar junctions along this road with poor visibility, narrow carriage width and badly damaged verges. Elsewhere is this consultation there is a stated requirement that ribbon development will not be allowed, for those villages along the A345 that are divided by the road the highly undesirable consequences of ribbon development are already felt especially for those that have no pavements. Given all of the above this road should not be designated as an A road and certainly not as a signed and preferred route. 3. Infrastructure Requirements: This looks like a cosy rural idyll for the development of the Vale. However, to rely on Tourism is to deny the continual erosion of local services such as pubs and shops. The withdrawal of minor injuries from Marlborough without increasing services offered by Doctors local surgeries now means travel distances of at least 40 minutes for this service. The loss of other medical services such as the stroke unit means a poor service in an area with a rapidly aging population. There is no mention of the provision of high speed broad band nor support for increased and more diverse public transport links out of the Vale. Instead there is considerable emphasis on the rail link to London which cannot be greatly expanded because of the low frequency of trains, the poor bus service to surrounding villages and the already full and extremely expensive car park. 4. The provision of 318 homes with no designated sights and reliance on Neighbourhood Plans or as yet unspecified DPD's is to beg the question how will they be provided without damaging and lasting impact on the North Wessex Downs AONB and without the need for greenfield site releases or inappropriate infill. More specific information on likely sights should be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement strategy / transport / infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>Enhancement of the wildlife habitat of the Kennet &amp; Avon Canal and improved facilities for boaters and visitors.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</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>936</td>
<td>Answer: Yes, on several counts, namely: 1. The inclusion of “designated recreation areas” within the planning process for new housing. These should include, but not be limited to: playgrounds, community gardens (including flowers, fruit &amp; vegetables), open “breathing” spaces. New housing estates do not make a community, shared interests do. The provision of communal recreational areas should encourage interaction, shared activity and promote a sense of ownership and wellbeing. 2. For a number of years there has been an aspiration to provide a skateboarding park for the youth of Pewsey. We would like to see this become a reality. The continued support for youth programmes in the area is key to ensuring young people continue to grow, be supported and are acknowledged as valuable members of our community. They are the future employers, employees, voters and tax payers of Wiltshire. 3. We also wholly endorse the provision of better pedestrian access to Pewsey Railway Station. The current access from Pewsey village along the A345 road is potentially lethal.</td>
<td>Noted – CP3 seeks to provide infrastructure requirements for Wiltshire’s communities. This includes ‘place shaping requirements’ such as leisure and recreation provision. The council will also work with providers, local communities and other key stakeholders to develop a community infrastructure levy (CIL), as a further source of funding for improvements in local and strategic infrastructure. Elements of support noted.</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>The Crown Estate supports the identification of Burbage and Great Bedwyn as large villages. The Crown Estate has site opportunities in both settlements which can be brought forward via engagement with Wiltshire Council, respective Parish Councils, local communities and key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Settlement strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>There is no mention in the Core Policy of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Any development must have due regard to the AONB, including an assessment of the likely impact of proposed development on the AONB.</td>
<td>Noted - the Pewsey Community Area Strategy makes specific reference to the AONB and the need to protect and enhance the valued local landscape of the area. Officers will consider the suitability of changing the core policy wording to include reference to the AONB.</td>
<td>AONB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Pewsey. We note that there is an allocation of 600 homes within Pewsey community area but no strategic sites are allocated. There is no assessment as to whether it is viable to deliver this housing growth in a way which has an acceptable impact on the AONB, and consequently the strategy may be unsound in that this policy is unjustified, not having had due regard to the AONB.</td>
<td>Noted - the Pewsey Community Area Strategy makes specific reference to the AONB and the need to protect and enhance the valued local landscape of the area.</td>
<td>AONB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Rural employment area-reference the Manningford Bohune Estate industrial units/employment area. It should be states in the consultation document or plan that this employment area is confined to its existing boundaries in order to maintain the amenity of the residential. Areas/does not detract from the amenity of the residential area including visual intrusion, character/appearance and landscape impact, traffic or access implications, noise, disturbance, and other environmental effects, only the re-use of suitable existing rural buildings permitted (eg existing footprint only). With modest extensions (limited ancillary, eg minor extensions in terms of scale and impact to existing buildings). Use in this industrial area should be restrict to light industrial (as as present) and only during normal working hours.</td>
<td>SO1 Covered in the employment section.</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>Pewsey will benefit from additional development which will provide employment and housing to meet market demand. Promotion of suitable sites located adjacent to the existing urban area is supported. It is suggested that 100-150 new homes be realistic at Pewsey within the plan period. Land at Milton Road/Dursden lane could provide a suitable location for this. (See attached plan)</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1432</td>
<td>Support identification of Hullavington as large village suitable for further development. Explanation at para 4.11 should encourage development adjacent to existing built up area where services and access are readily available.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Please find below Pewsey Parish Council's comments on the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document, which the council would say is acceptable in all other respects. Para. 1.16 states that there are 18 community areas on Map 1.1 when in fact there are 19 plus Salisbury. The paragraphs concerning Pewsey (5, 13-15.14) use the term 'town'; this should be 'village'. Para 6.7.3 This shows Pewsey as not having a 'defined town centre'. Pewsey Parish Council considers that the Market Place, High Street, River Street and North Street make up a clear centre of the village.

Comments noted. Amendments to descriptive text will be made where appropriate and errors corrected.

Drafting errors

Upavon Parish Council would make the following observations which need to be incorporated in any strategy going forward which would affect this area. Transport a) - Speed and volumes of traffic need addressing on the A36 north of Upavon. Please refer to the notes and survey from Enford Parish Council included in the Paper 3: Settlement Strategy Appendices. It supports the idea of limited additional housing in this area. b) - The bus route from Down View/Watson Close to the village centre needs re-instating. There are 200 houses in this area with a large proportion being occupied by retired people, many of whom have no other form of transport and are faced with a long climb up a steep rise from the village centre. c) - There is no east - west bus service to the major employment and services centres of Devizes and Andover. Planning a) - Planning guidelines suggest that between 1/3 and 1/2 of all houses need to be affordable, social or sheltered, which would suggest they would be occupied by low income residents. There is a site in our community requiring development involving 20+ houses - in this case the above presumption is unsustainable and unrealistic, as affordable, social or sheltered housing infers low household income. There is no sensible rationale for planning social housing at these levels where a family on an income of £16000 or less p.a. will spend possibly 20% of their income on transport to work and social amenities, especially where there is no east - west bus service. b) - There is going to be a housing need in our area for returning Service personnel under the SDSR initiatives from Germany and other areas. Not many of these will be low income families but the impact on our area is as yet unknown. It is our consideration that to address the above needs social, affordable and sheltered housing should be retained but in the proportion of 1/3 affordable, 1/3 working families and 1/3 sheltered. Any such development must then support any of the amenities within this community and adjoining villages. We hope this is of assistance to you in your deliberations.

Comments on transport noted see comment 707. The consultation document notes that Burbage lacks allotments. The Parish Council has been served with a notice by six residents under the Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908 and is now under a legal obligation to provide allotments. Any development plan should therefore zone an area for this purpose. The Parish Council has views as to appropriate areas within or on the edge of the village that might be suitable. The infrastructure is developed to cope with the growth in population. This issue is addressed later in the response. In making an assessment of the ability of Burbage to absorb additional housing it is important that the data Wiltshire Council utilises is correct and up to date. Unfortunately this is not the case as numerous errors have been identified as is indicated below and analysed more fully in the accompanying appendices. The planners are also not in possession of important local knowledge. The errors in the view of the Parish Council are of a magnitude that requires the whole assessment to be redrawn. Underlying Statistics 1. The documentation states that Burbage has 617 dwellings. The current figure (Based on 2010 Council Tax data of 772 Band D equivalents) is 749 - a figure between 1/3 and 1/2 of all houses need to be affordable, social or sheltered, which would suggest they would be occupied by low income residents. There is a site in our community requiring development involving 20+ houses - in this case the above presumption is unsustainable and unrealistic, as affordable, social or sheltered housing infers low household income. There is no sensible rationale for planning social housing at these levels where a family on an income of £16000 or less p.a. will spend possibly 20% of their income on transport to work and social amenities, especially where there is no east - west bus service. b) - There is going to be a housing need in our area for returning Service personnel under the SDSR initiatives from Germany and other areas. Not many of these will be low income families but the impact on our area is as yet unknown. It is our consideration that to address the above needs social, affordable and sheltered housing should be retained but in the proportion of 1/3 affordable, 1/3 working families and 1/3 sheltered. Any such development must then support any of the amenities within this community and adjoining villages. We hope this is of assistance to you in your deliberations.

Comments noted. Amendments to descriptive text will be made where appropriate and errors corrected.

Drafting errors

Burbage Parish Council wishes to respond to the Wiltshire Settlement Strategy. It does not feel itself competent to comment on the wider strategy for the Pewsey area and will restrict its response to the analysis in relation to Burbage. This response is in respect of questions 16 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document (June 2011) and also considers the data contained within the Wiltshire Core Strategy Draft Topic Paper 3: Settlement Strategy Appendices. It supports the idea of limited additional housing within the Parish of Burbage providing the following conditions are met 1. Any development is contained within the existing settlement boundaries of the village. The Council's local knowledge suggests that there are sufficient suitable sites and infill opportunities to allow the housing requirements to be met in this manner. The area surrounding the village is prime agricultural land and no development on it should be permitted as it would conflict with the Governments stated objective of improving food security. The scale of any individual development should be consistent with the character and size of the existing village. Large scale development would, in the Council's opinion, be entirely inappropriate. 4. It should be noted that Burbage lacks allotments. The Parish Council has been served with a notice by six residents under the Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908 and is now under a legal obligation to provide allotments. Any development plan should therefore zone an area for this purpose. The Parish Council has views as to appropriate areas within or on the edge of the village that might be suitable. The infrastructure is developed to cope with the growth in population. This issue is addressed later in the response. In making an assessment of the ability of Burbage to absorb additional housing it is important that the data Wiltshire Council utilises is correct and up to date. Unfortunately this is not the case as numerous errors have been identified as is indicated below and analysed more fully in the accompanying appendices. The planners are also not in possession of important local knowledge. The errors in the view of the Parish Council are of a magnitude that requires the whole assessment to be redrawn. Underlying Statistics 1. The documentation states that Burbage has 617 dwellings. The current figure (Based on 2010 Council Tax data of 772 Band D equivalents) is 749 - a figure between 1/3 and 1/2 of all houses need to be affordable, social or sheltered, which would suggest they would be occupied by low income residents. There is a site in our community requiring development involving 20+ houses - in this case the above presumption is unsustainable and unrealistic, as affordable, social or sheltered housing infers low household income. There is no sensible rationale for planning social housing at these levels where a family on an income of £16000 or less p.a. will spend possibly 20% of their income on transport to work and social amenities, especially where there is no east - west bus service. b) - There is going to be a housing need in our area for returning Service personnel under the SDSR initiatives from Germany and other areas. Not many of these will be low income families but the impact on our area is as yet unknown. It is our consideration that to address the above needs social, affordable and sheltered housing should be retained but in the proportion of 1/3 affordable, 1/3 working families and 1/3 sheltered. Any such development must then support any of the amenities within this community and adjoining villages. We hope this is of assistance to you in your deliberations.

Comments noted. Amendments to descriptive text will be made where appropriate and errors corrected.

Drafting errors

Burbage is identified within the document as a large village with a limited range of employment opportunities and services. The majority of development within large villages will take the form of small sites within the existing settlement boundary. The consultation document also seeks to deliver a proportion of development on previously developed land safeguarding green field sites. Draft core policy 37 seeks to ensure that development responds to the character and size of existing development in line with the parish council's proposals. The consultation document makes provision for place shaping infrastructure to be provided including open space and green infrastructure. The council will also work with providers, local communities and other key stakeholders to develop a community infrastructure levy (CIL), as a further source of funding for improvements in local and strategic infrastructure. Points identified relating to important local knowledge. The errors in the view of the Parish Council are of a magnitude that requires the whole assessment to be redrawn. Underlying Statistics 1. The documentation states that Burbage has 617 dwellings. The current figure (Based on 2010 Council Tax data of 772 Band D equivalents) is 749 - a figure between 1/3 and 1/2 of all houses need to be affordable, social or sheltered, which would suggest they would be occupied by low income residents. There is a site in our community requiring development involving 20+ houses - in this case the above presumption is unsustainable and unrealistic, as affordable, social or sheltered housing infers low household income. There is no sensible rationale for planning social housing at these levels where a family on an income of £16000 or less p.a. will spend possibly 20% of their income on transport to work and social amenities, especially where there is no east - west bus service. b) - There is going to be a housing need in our area for returning Service personnel under the SDSR initiatives from Germany and other areas. Not many of these will be low income families but the impact on our area is as yet unknown. It is our consideration that to address the above needs social, affordable and sheltered housing should be retained but in the proportion of 1/3 affordable, 1/3 working families and 1/3 sheltered. Any such development must then support any of the amenities within this community and adjoining villages. We hope this is of assistance to you in your deliberations.

Comments noted. Amendments to descriptive text will be made where appropriate and errors corrected.

Drafting errors
21% greater than that shown. This is felt to reflect multiple residential developments within the village since the underlying data was captured. 2. It is incorrect to say that there have been no completions since 2006. Many examples are evident such as the significant Manor Farm Manor Gardens development, Comb Manor development and the conversion of the old Savemake Hotel. A full list of developments known to the Council which totals 31 properties is shown in appendix 1. These are just the ones that come to mind and it may be that if the planners consult the records of approved planning applications/building control certificates more will be identified. 3. From the 2001 census, the mean number of occupants per dwelling is 2.36. This indicates a population figure for Burbage of 749 x 2.36 = 1,768. This figure is 22% greater than that shown - and provides both consistency and a strong correlation with the figures shown in point 1. above. The quoted total population of Burbage is 1,450 - whereas in 2010, the number of people just on the Electoral Register alone was higher at 1,454. 4. The Parish Council disputes the quoted figure of 284 jobs within the village. From informed empiricism, it believes the actual figure is only some one-third of this - circa 100. Also disputed is the stated number of residents who both live and work in the village - 194 or 29% of the entire working population. This is, again, much higher than actual observation suggests. As far as the Council is aware the only authoritative source of data on employment for such a small geographic area is the National Census 2001. This gives no information on either the number of people employed within the village nor how many of these jobs are held by local residents. The Council would be interested to know the source of this Wiltshire Council's information. Services The services available in the village are less extensive than the analysis suggests and regrettably are likely to deteriorate over the coming years. Here the local knowledge of the Council becomes important. 1. Whilst the village is showing as having a Post Office, it seems almost certain that this facility will be permanently lost at an early stage in the Core Strategy's timeframe. Indeed the Council in conjunction with the local magazine, the Burbage News, has recently run a campaign to increase usage in a last ditch attempt to secure its future. 2. Contrary to the information strategy document analysis there is no Community Minibus. Wiltshire Council rightly places emphasis on the importance of people utilizing public transport to go to work. In the case of Burbage this is effectively impractical as is demonstrated in the analysis given in appendix 2. In this respect Burbage fares badly in comparison with Pewsey and Great Bedwyn where the existence of railway stations opens up the opportunity of commuting to a number of key centres of employment such as Newbury, Reading and indeed London. 4. Access to high speed broadband will be increasingly important for any community. While the potential speed of 6.4Mb is probably correct for the centre of the village it needs to be recognised that specific areas such as Stibbs Green are around 1.5km from the exchange while even the end of Eastsands is a kilometre away. As a consequence many residents face much slower speeds. Developments to the infrastructure To support additional housing and indeed to strengthen the existing community the following improvements to the infrastructure are required. 1. Improved public transport services and changes to timetables to allow them to be used for journeys to work. In particular the following changes are desirable a. Buses at times that allow commuting to Marlborough, Pewsey and Hungerford b. A bus service linking with trains from either Great Bedwyn or Pewsey that allows commuting to Newbury and Reading c. Ideally a bus timetable that makes commuting to Swindon and Andover a realistic option. 2. Broadband speeds of at least 20Mb. For the community to participate fully in the information society a broadband speed at least at this level is essential. To suggest a speed of 6.4Mb is a positive feature of Burbage in a paper considering housing needs through to 2026 would suggest a lack of awareness of developing trends. 3. Within the village itself a mobile phone signal strength of five. This recognises that increasingly mobile phones are replacing landlines. 4. Natural gas supplies. Currently residents of Burbage face disproportionately high energy bills when compared with other comparable villages slightly further north. The extensive use of oil as a heating fuel also contributes adversely to carbon dioxide levels. Development since 2006 The Burbage Parish Council are aware of the following developments that have taken place since 2006 Location Number of Dwellings Manor Farm and Manor Gardens 14 Old Savemake Hotel 6 Comb Manor 4 Garden of the Three Horseshoes Public House 1 Grafton Road Eastcourt Rd junction 1 Burrows Drove 1 Old Malt House, High St 1 Savemake Farm 1 Eastcourt/Eastsands junction 1 Eastcourt Rd 1 Total 31 Commuting from Burbage As is illustrated in the table below because of its lack of a railway station and the poor bus services commuting by public transport is largely unrealistic (*). In contrast Great Bedwyn and Pewsey have much better public transport options because of their railway stations Destination Out
Return Comment Marlborough 8.01 8.18 17.52 18.06 Arrive 42 mins too early Pewsey 7.22 8.28 18.30 19.31 An hours journey for what by car takes 10 mms 45 min wait in evening Hungerford 8.01 8.55 18.16 19.01 A long day due to poor bus connections to the trains for what is a 20 min drive Swindon 7.32 8.49 18.40 19.31 An hours wait in the evening Andover 7.11 8.14 18.59 45 min too early in morning Reading 7.20 8.50 17.56 19.31 A very long day because of the poor bus train connections Newbury 7.20 8.14 18.02 19.01 Arrive 45 mins too early London Not possible No buses early enough to either Great Bedwyn or Pewsey to allow a commuter train to be caught to London (*) Analysis assumes a normal working day of 09.00 to 17.30 hrs

This representation is being made on behalf of Mrs Giulietta Horner in relation to land at Black Mikes, Pewsey. A Planning Brief was submitted to the Local Planning Authority in June 2009, highlighting the site’s suitability for development compared with other sites in Pewsey that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. We can confirm that the site remains to be available, suitable and achievable. The Government's key Housing Policy objective is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home which they can afford in the community they want to live in (PPS3 Paragraph 9). The planning system for the last 30 years has failed to achieve this goal which has resulted in an ever deepening housing crisis. This crisis has been caused by a lack of housing supply and, in particular, a lack of affordable homes. The housing crisis has been exasperated by the recent recession which has made it even more difficult for people to access the housing market and has reduced the supply of the open market and affordable homes. Kate Barker's review (March 2004) which highlighted the economic harm caused by an under supply of housing, identified the need to increase supply by 120,000 homes per annum to bring house price inflation in line with the European average. This has been referred to by Government as a "step change" in housing delivery. Achieving this step change in housing supply remains at the heart of the new Coalition Government's emerging planning policies stemming from the Plan for Growth (March 2011) and as proposed to be set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The emerging NPPF makes it clear that Governments key housing objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. Local Planning Authorities should, drawing on a proportionate evidence base, address the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and cater for housing demand. Considered against this backdrop we are concerned to see that the total housing provision for Wiltshire has been reduced since the publication of ‘Wiltshire 2026’ in October 2009. However we are pleased to see that the housing requirement for the Pewsey Community Area, identified under Core Policy 16, has actually increased, albeit modestly. The main justification for this increase appears to be to allow additional limited growth in the larger/smaller villages, which is a requirement identified by the community consultation events. Whilst we are supportive of such an approach there must be a greater emphasis that the large majority of the housing requirement identified for Pewsey Community Area (600 dwellings) should be at Pewsey, which is widely recognised as the most suitable location for future development. The current uncertainty as to how this requirement should be distributed amongst the Pewsey Community Area means the policy is unsound. The Pewsey Community Area differs from the other Community Areas on the draft Core Strategy because it does not have a Principal Settlement of Market Town. This should not affect the principles adopted by all the other Community Areas.

Comments relating to national and local housing supply noted. The consultation document defines a settlement strategy. Within the Pewsey Community Area Pewsey Village is defined as a service centre followed by a series of large and small villages. No strategic sites are identified within the community area as such it is anticipated that Community led neighbourhood plans, or a subsequent development plan document, will identify specific sites to deliver this growth within the plan period. Consideration will be given to the prioritisation of Pewsey in development terms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cross Reference</th>
<th>Officer Comments</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 16 - Pewsey Community Area (Core Policy 16)</strong> Provided any proposed development in this community area would be within Flood Zone 1 both now and in the future, an SFRA Level 2 would not be required. All sources of flood risk need to be considered and appropriate surface water drainage schemes would need to be incorporated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Agency has no comments to make on this policy. We note that no strategic housing or employment allocations are identified for Pewsey and only local housing need will be accommodated to support existing service and retail provision.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>General comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2166</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes object to the proposed strategy for the Pewsey Community Area. Persimmon Homes support the identification of Pewsey as a Local Service Centre and Burbage as a Large Village. These settlements have greater potential to accommodate growth during the plan period. Persimmon Homes object to the scale of housing proposed for the community area, particularly having regard to the inadequacy of the remainder of dwellings to be provided in the plan area. [further details provided in hard copy report]</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. The designation of the principal settlements allows the best opportunity for Wiltshire to fulfil it's requirement for jobs and homes within environmental limits. Topic paper 17 paper sets out the progress made in determining an appropriate requirement and distribution of housing for Wiltshire from 2006 to 2026 to inform the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. This process considers the strategic objectives for the county as well as taking into account local factors and aspirations for growth identified through community consultation.</td>
<td>Settlement strategy / housing delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 16

Comment No. 148
Mr Andrew Lord
Planning Advisor North Wessex Downs AONB

Comment No. 656
Mrs C Spickernell

Comment No. 706
Mrs M A Towle
Durrington Town Council

Comment No. 762
Dr Deirdre Marrable
Parish Councillor Wilcot and Huish Parish Council
Wilcot and Huish Parish Council

Comment No. 876
Mr Ken Oliver
Canal Officer Wiltshire Council

Comment No. 936
Mrs Amanda Burch
Member nominated to respond on behalf of Pewsey WI Pewsey Women's Institute

Comment No. 977
Mr David Fovargue
Principal Consultant AMEC

Comment No. 1031
Ms Jenny Hawley
Environmental Intelligence Officer Wiltshire Wildlife Trust

Comment No. 1101
Charles Routh
Planning and Local Government Natural England

Comment No. 1116
Mr T Woodard

Comment No. 1429
Mrs Sarah Foster
SF Planning Link Ltd
Sarah Foster

Comment No. 1432
R Hawker
Sarah Foster
SF Planning Link Ltd

Comment No. 1618
Alison Keers
Clerk Pewsey Parish Council

Comment No. 1778
paul cowan
Upavon Parish Council

Comment No. 1893
Mr J Ritchie
Clerk Ritchie Parish Council

Comment No. 2094
Mr Kevin Ayrton
Carter Jonas
Mrs Giulietta Horner

Comment No. 2166
Miss Katherine Burt
Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency (Wessex Area)

Comment No. 2470
Ms Meghann Downing
Asset Manager Highways Agency

Comment No. 2841
Mr Mark Fox
Pegasus Planning Group

Unknown
Unknown
Unknown

Unknown
The Crown Estate