



South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Topic Paper 4 Addendum 2:

Supporting Communities

July 2009

WILTSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

TOPIC PAPER 4 ADDENDUM 2

SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES

JULY 2009

CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2 ISSUES AND OPTIONS**
- 3 PREFERRED OPTIONS**

APPENDIX ONE: SUGGESTED POLICIES AND MONITORING

**APPENDIX TWO: MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN SUBSEQUENT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS**

**APPENDIX THREE: CHANGES AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY
APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING
REFINEMENT**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In June 2007 Salisbury District Council published Local Development Framework Topic Paper 4 'Supporting Communities' ("The Topic Paper"). In February 2008, following consultation on options put forward within The Topic Paper, the Council published an Addendum to the Topic Paper ("The Addendum").
- 1.2 This second addendum should be read in conjunction with both The Topic Paper and The Addendum and it is not therefore considered necessary to repeat background information, national and regional policy, examples of best practice and community aspirations contained therein in detail.
- 1.3 The Council's desired outcomes for this topic are the creation and maintenance of attractive and liveable communities, both urban and rural.
- 1.4 The Topic Paper noted that at a local level, a range of pressures is being exerted that are undermining the ability of communities to maintain appropriate balances of housing, employment, services and amenities. Supporting communities is irrevocably bound up with the wider aim of delivering sustainable communities, and a balance of all these aspects contributes to securing long-term vitality and viability, a theme which has emerged strongly from the Community Planning process.
- 1.5 Examples of how development proposals might support communities were explored and as a result The Topic Paper recommended that the following options should be put forward for further consideration:
 - Working with the South Wiltshire Strategic Alliance and other relevant bodies to ensure any funding achieved from commuted payments is directed, where applicable, to addressing localised areas of deprivation, especially in providing access to services and social activities.
 - Promoting location and criteria based policies to ensure geographically equal provision of community facilities for all Salisbury residents, with good transport links. Nurturing, through land allocations, a central place theory based around community hubs.
 - Promoting key settlements as main service providers and focusing new development upon them in a sustainable manner, to ensure the service centres chosen give all reasonable access to a range of important services within a relatively short trip.
 - Identifying spatially the most deprived areas and focusing redevelopment proposals and planning gain on them as a priority.
 - Planning for new development needs to demonstrate how they have taken account of those with characteristics that might inhibit their ability to fully partake in society, such as the mobility impaired, hard of hearing, visually impaired, immigrants with limited English, stroke victims.
 - Should health facilities be concentrated in accessible locations where a number of health facilities are provided together in one location?
 - Should new development be expected to make a contribution towards the provision of healthcare facilities, for which they are adding to the demand?

- Should the LDF take account of the ageing population by enabling the provision of new large-scale residential care facilities in the district or should the emphasis be on smaller scale provision for local needs dispersed around the district?
- Should all new development take account of use by those with disabilities or barriers to inclusion?
- Should we promote key settlements as main service providers and focus new development upon them in a sustainable manner, to ensure the service centres chosen give all reasonable access to a range of important services within a relatively short trip?
- Should the LDF aim to support vulnerable village shops, post offices and public houses?
- Should we seek policies that prevent change of use unless it has been convincingly proved that they are no longer viable as businesses?
- Should the LDF aim to promote cultural facilities in key settlements as main service centres, to ensure that all have reasonable access to a range of such facilities?
- Are there any cultural facilities we lack?
- Should developers be expected to make contributions to providing cultural opportunities for which their building will help create a demand?
- In order to help fight social exclusion and to reduce the need to travel by car, should the LDF direct future development to locations accessible by public transport?
- Should the LDF seek to encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling as alternatives to car travel where practical?
- Should the LDF include policies which try and help break down access barriers to services by requiring major developments to include access plans, which include providing adequate public transport choices and cater for physical, language and cultural issues some of our citizens may have?
- Should we have a policy requiring developers to pay towards public and community transport, walking and cycling improvements?
- Would using appropriate design measures (“designing out crime”) be effective in reducing crime and the fear of crime? Should the LDF allow planning gain money to be put towards preventative measures as prioritised in partnership with the police, such as CCTV, lighting and community policing?
- Should development be expected to make a contribution towards the provision of sport, leisure and open space facilities, for which they are adding to the demand, and should this also include commercial development likely to attract people to the district?
- Should the identified shortfall and opportunities to enhance sports, leisure and open spaces be reflected through the policies of the LDF?
- Should the LDF promote greater accessibility to dual use facilities such as school playing fields?

2 ISSUES AND OPTIONS

- 2.1 The issue of Supporting Communities was included within the Council's 'Our Place In The Future' Issues and Options consultation carried out in the summer of 2007.
- 2.2 Providing education and learning opportunities was a priority with nearly a quarter of respondents and, whilst there was some satisfaction, there is room for improvement in the facilities provided.
- 2.3 There was agreement with the principle of finding ways to help alleviate social exclusion, and with the suggestion that new development should contribute towards providing access to local social facilities.
- 2.4 Health and welfare was also a key issue, especially in the more rural parts of the district. There was overwhelming support for the suggestions that new development should contribute to healthcare facilities, that facilities should be located in accessible locations and that large scale residential care facilities should be provided.
- 2.5 There was a high level of support for providing services in larger settlements, and the suggestion that developers should contribute towards social deprivation. There was however a fine balance of opinion over the proposal to target development in areas of greatest need.
- 2.6 There was overwhelming support for the protection of the key facilities of village shops, post offices and public houses.
- 2.7 There was also overwhelming support for cultural facilities to be located in key settlements, but the majority of respondents disagreed that there are a lack of cultural facilities in the district. However, a number of comments were received about the need for a larger entertainment venue.
- 2.8 On the issue of crime and safety, the principle of developers contributing towards preventative measures was explored and generally supported, as was the notion of buildings and places being designed to help reduce crime and the fear of crime.
- 2.9 The majority of respondents supported the suggestion that developers should contribute towards sport, leisure and recreation facilities and that community access to public and private facilities should be encouraged.
- 2.10 The Addendum reviewed The Topic Paper, analysed the results of the public consultation and examined relevant individual comments to ascertain if there were any additional areas that required investigation prior to the preparation of Preferred Options for this topic.

3 **PREFERRED OPTIONS**

3.1 The proposals arising from the Issues and Options stage were subjected to a number of tests including sustainability appraisal, deliverability and conformity with national and regional policy. As a result The Addendum identified the following as options that should be considered further:

- Identify key settlements that will act as local service centres to provide a range of facilities, to help break down the barriers to social exclusion by allowing easy access to services by a range of transport modes and help protect and support the existing facilities for all.
- Development of health and welfare facilities and accommodation for the elderly should be encouraged, providing it is in scale with the settlement.
- Development should be targeted to the areas of greatest need to help address the problems faced by low-income families; or
- Development should not be targeted to the areas of greatest need to help address the problems faced by low-income families as the level of development required might overwhelm some smaller communities.
- Salisbury and the rest of the district are well served by cultural facilities but existing facilities should be protected and enhanced. A larger entertainment venue/concert hall is needed in Salisbury to attract bigger productions.
- New development will be provided in locations that are accessible by a range of transport modes, including public transport, in order to reduce the need to travel.
- New development should contribute to improved public transport provision between settlements.
- The Council will encourage a modal shift away from private cars and promote more sustainable and healthy modes of travel, by ensuring that they are woven into the fabric of all development. This will be achieved by ensuring that: New development promotes safe pedestrian, cycle and road movement; New development provides measures and facilities to support sustainable transport modes and actively promotes green travel plans, and; New development is laid out in such a way that buildings, public spaces and roads are accessible to all.
- That a policy on developer contributions be worded to enable the money to be spent on local social facilities and services to include the following areas: Affordable housing; Education; Community facilities, meeting places (community halls); Health services; Recreation provision, including public open space, play areas and sports provision; Allotments; Highway infrastructure; Pedestrian, cycleway and public transport initiatives; Nature conservation, wildlife and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures; Town centre improvements; CCTV and security measures; Library, museum and theatre funding; Public art; Public realm; Local labour and training initiatives; Flood risk management schemes; Waste management; Community waste and energy projects; and Tourism.
- We should support and protect facilities in villages and larger settlements such as shops, post offices, public houses and other community facilities

and resist the change of use of such facilities unless it has been clearly proven that they are no longer viable.

- Allowing combined uses, such as a post office within a pub, should be encouraged where facilities might otherwise be lost.
- Buildings and places should be designed in a way that helps reduce crime and the fear of crime. Developments that are designed around the principles of Homezones can help reduce crime and the fear of crime, and should be encouraged.
- Community access to public and private facilities - such as schools, sport, leisure and recreation facilities and greenspace – should be encouraged and facilitated, with appropriate standards established where appropriate in the planning obligations SPD.
- Development including new/extensions/redevelopment of all education facilities will be permitted on suitable sites either within or adjoining the settlements providing there is good access to public transport.

3.2 The Council carried out consultation on a wide range of Core Strategy Preferred Options in the spring of 2008, of which those referred to below were of relevance to this topic.

3.3 The Golden Threads listed under Preferred Option PO1 included ‘Ensuring that transport and infrastructure are provided to support a high quality of life’.

3.4 The Prized Assets listed under Preferred Option PO2 included ‘A certain rural way of life, which appears to be under pressure, but one treasured and based on close-knit, caring communities and the keeping of traditions’.

3.5 The Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives listed under Preferred Option PO3 included Objective E: ‘Where ongoing liaison through the Community Strategy tells us that people feel much safer and have good access to a range of services and leisure opportunities’ and Objective J: ‘Where developers accept a transparent and equitable means of making a contribution to a ‘Community Chest’, which helps them pay their fair share for the additional demands their development will place on infrastructure and services’.

3.6 Preferred Option PO16 proposed that health and welfare facilities should be concentrated in accessible locations and provided together in the same location where possible. It was also proposed that developers should make a contribution towards the provision or improvement of healthcare facilities, where the development increases demand for such services.

3.7 Preferred Option PO17 proposed the following measures:

- To ensure everyone has a good range of services within easy reach, services should be provided in larger settlements, such as Salisbury, Amesbury, Downton, Wilton, Mere and Tisbury.
- Requiring developers to make a contribution towards the provision of local social facilities and services, particularly where this will help to improve access to services for those living on lower incomes. Contributions of this

kind should be targeted to settlements where such services are available, even where this is some distance from the development site.

- 3.8 Preferred Option PO18 proposed support and protection for village shops, post offices and public houses and resisting the change of use of such facilities unless it has been clearly proven that they are no longer viable. Policies that allow combined uses, such as a post office within a pub, should be encouraged where facilities might otherwise be lost and consideration given to some limited new housing in smaller settlements which could help local pubs and shops to stay viable.
- 3.9 Preferred Option PO19 proposed that arts, entertainment and cultural activities be located in key settlements to ensure that everyone has reasonable access to a range of such facilities.
- 3.10 Preferred Option PO20 proposed that buildings and places should be designed in a way that helps to reduce crime and the fear of crime and improve the quality of the urban environment. Developers should contribute toward preventative measures such as CCTV, lighting and community policing. The retrofitting of measures such as “homezones” will be encouraged.
- 3.11 Preferred Option PO21 proposed that sports and leisure facilities be protected and enhanced, including the safeguarding of existing valuable sports fields from development. Developers will contribute towards the provision of local sport, leisure and open space facilities, particularly where they are contributing to the demand for such facilities. Community access to sports, leisure and recreation facilities and green space, both public and private (for example schools), should be encouraged and facilitated.
- 3.12 Preferred Option PO25 proposed the following options for delivering planning gain in south Wiltshire:
 - We should set up a ‘community chest’ and target funding on the six main areas of Amesbury, Downton, Mere, Salisbury, Tisbury and Wilton. We should identify the things that development will be expected to contribute towards in consultation with local communities.
 - We will introduce a tariff system so that developers can work out in advance the requisite sums involved. We will publish a detailed SPD to explain this system in detail, set out the tariffs applicable, and identify contributions towards the following:

Affordable housing; Education; Community facilities; Meeting places (community halls); Health services; Recreation provision, including public open space, play and sports provision; Allotments; Highway infrastructure; Pedestrian, cycleway and public transport initiatives; Nature conservation, wildlife and biodiversity mitigation measures; Town centre improvements; CCTV and security measures; Library, museum and theatre funding; Public art; Public realm; Local labour and training initiatives; Flood risk

management schemes; Waste management; Community waste and energy projects; Tourism; Cemeteries.

3.13 Preferred Option PO32 set out the following options for supporting communities in the Salisbury and Four Rivers Community Areas:

- We will target managed growth at Salisbury and Wilton to safeguard and enhance their roles as major providers of homes, jobs, shops and services.
- We want to deliver first-class education based on an enhanced or relocated centre of excellence in the Salisbury College and a new secondary school located away from Laverstock to provide a more equitable distribution of education facilities.
- We will ensure that new development is designed to minimise crime and we will seek measures to improve the feeling of safety in our existing communities. Specific to the area will be measures, such as CCTV, to ensure that Wilton Market Place feels a safe place to be and to minimise late night disturbance in the heart of Salisbury.
- Ensure that new development provides good access to health care facilities and is planned to take full account of the needs of older people. This will include specific elderly care facilities in Salisbury, conveniently located to the city centre.
- Ensuring that managed growth contributes to the improvement of recreational and leisure facilities, especially for young adults.
- Although Salisbury and Wilton are considered to deliver good cultural facilities there is the need for a larger entertainment venue in Salisbury to attract bigger events and concerts.
- We will plan, within the Salisbury and Wilton Area Action Plan, to ensure that open space is provided to make up the shortfall identified and to provide the required standards detailed within the Open Space Audit.

3.14 Preferred Option PO37 set out the following options for using the 'Community Chest' in the following area specific initiatives in the Salisbury and Four Rivers Community Area (in addition to those identified in Preferred Option 25):

- City and town centre enhancements.
- Promotion of tourism and encouragement of longer stays in the city.
- Provision of new, primary and secondary education within Salisbury and Wilton.
- Contribution to the implementation of the Salisbury Transport Plan.
- The "greening" of the City as detailed in the Salisbury Vision.
- A priority bus lane in Wilton Road.
- Measures to make Wilton Market Place and Salisbury city centre feel safer.
- Leisure facilities, especially for young adults.
- Access to and provision of healthcare.
- Provision of a cemetery.
- Open space provision as detailed within the Open Space Audit.

3.15 Preferred Option PO43 set out the following options for supporting communities in the Stonehenge Community Area:

- To ensure that everyone has good access to services, arts, sports and cultural activities, they should be provided in the larger settlements, such as Amesbury and to a lesser extent Durrington and Bulford.
- Consider modest and sympathetic growth in villages such as Shrewton where this will support the viability of the existing services and facilities.
- To counter social exclusion we must put in place measures to ensure that there is a choice of access between our northern settlements, including improved public transport.
- New footpaths and cycleways are needed to connect Gomeldon to Porton, Porton to Idmiston, and Durrington and Bulford to Amesbury.
- There is a priority to ensure that educational provision and standards keep pace with the growth in specialist employment in the area so that local young people can capitalise on the opportunities the investment delivers.
- We will ensure that new development is designed to minimise crime and that we seek measures to improve the feeling of safety in our existing communities. Specific areas such as CCTV could be used to ensure that Amesbury town centre feels a safe place to be, especially after dark.
- Ensure that the opportunities presented by inward investment in growth are used to address areas of need such as improving the range of community facilities, for example those requested in Shrewton.
- To work with parish and town councils to identify land that may be suitable for sport leisure and recreation use, where need is identified within the Open Space Audit

3.16 Preferred Option PO48 set out the following options for using the 'Community Chest' in the following area specific initiatives in the Stonehenge Community Area (in addition to those identified in Preferred Option 25):

- Promotion of tourism and raising the profile of Amesbury.
- Provision of new community facilities in the villages.
- Contribution to improved pedestrian, cycle and public transport links between the northern villages to improve access to services.
- Measures to improve safety and reduce criminal activity especially around Amesbury town centre.
- Leisure facilities especially for young adults.
- Access to and provision of healthcare.

3.17 Preferred Option PO54 set out the following options for supporting communities in the Mere Community Area:

- To ensure that everyone has good access to jobs, services, arts, sports and cultural activities, they should be provided in the larger settlement of Mere.
- In the smaller settlements such as Zeals and Maiden Bradley we should frame policies which seek to protect shops and pubs, resist their change of use unless it has been clearly proven that they are not viable. Where

practicable we will encourage combined service delivery such as a shop within a pub. We should consider modest and sympathetic growth in the “main village” of Zeals where this will support the viability of the existing services and facilities.

- To counter social exclusion we must put in place measures to ensure that there is a choice of access between our settlements, including improved public transport between the more remote settlements such as the Knoyles and the services in Mere. The benefits of managed growth should make a contribution to innovative solutions to tackling this serious problem of social exclusion.
- Improve the opportunities for recycling by introducing convenient local collection and recycling centres.

3.18 Preferred Option PO59 set out the following options for using the ‘Community Chest’ in the following area specific initiatives in the Mere Community Area (in addition to those identified in Preferred Option 25):

- Tackling social exclusion through making contributions to improved public transport between the villages and Mere.
- Access to and provision of healthcare.
- Promotion of tourism and raising the profile of Mere.
- Provision of new accessible recycling facilities.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Improved access to the countryside such as a nature walk and wildlife conservation area on Castle Hill in Mere.
- Measures to improve safety and reduce criminal activity especially around Mere town centre.
- Leisure facilities especially for young adults.

3.19 Preferred Option PO65 set out the following options for supporting communities in the Southern Community Area:

- To ensure that everyone has good access to jobs, services, arts, sports and cultural activities, they should be provided in the larger settlements of Alderbury and Downton as well as ensuring a range of convenient transport choices into Salisbury and Southampton.
- In the smaller settlements such as Whiteparish, Downton, Winterslow and Laverstock we will frame policies which seek to protect shops and pubs, resisting their change of use unless it has been clearly proven that they are not viable, and encourage combined uses. We should consider modest and sympathetic growth in these villages where this will support the viability of the existing services and facilities.
- To counter social exclusion we must put in place measures to ensure that there is a choice of access between our settlements, including improved public transport between the more remote settlements such as Coombe Bissett, Grimstead, Landford, Winterslow, West Dean and Redlynch into the service centres of Downton and Salisbury.
- Solutions need to be sought for tackling the traffic congestion that occurs at Alderbury during the commute to Salisbury. This should be based on

finding safe, sustainable alternatives to the private motorcar such as implementation of the Petersfinger Park and Ride and the Sustrans Connect 2 cycle link between Alderbury and Salisbury.

- Ensure that educational provision and standards keep pace with the growth in specialist employment in the area, so that local young people can capitalise on the opportunities the investment delivers.
- Ensure that new development is designed to minimise crime and that we seek measures to improve the feeling of safety in our existing communities. Specific area measures, such as CCTV, will ensure that the centres of Downton, Alderbury, Laverstock, Winterslow and Whiteparish feel safe places to be.
- Ensure that new development provides good access to health care facilities and is planned to take full account of the needs of older people. For example there is currently no GP surgery in Laverstock.
- There is a shortage of housing and care for the elderly in Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Downton, Laverstock, Pitton and Farley and Winterslow. There is a need to plan for the ageing population, including ensuring that affordable housing is matched to numbers of nursing staff required in expanded or new nursing home facilities.
- Ensuring that managed growth contributes to the improvement of community, recreational and leisure facilities, including the need to safeguard the long-term future of playing fields in Laverstock, Alderbury, Odstock and Downton and to improve or deliver new play areas in Downton, Charlton, Laverstock and Redlynch.
- Policies which safeguard and where possible contribute to the enhancement of community and village halls in Britford, Bodenham/Nunton, Coombe Bissett, Downton, Laverstock, Redlynch (including Morgan's Vale and Landford), West Dean, Winterslow and Whiteparish.

3.20 Preferred Option PO70 set out the following options for using the 'Community Chest' in the following area specific initiatives in the Southern Community Area (in addition to those identified in Preferred Option 25):

- Tackling social exclusion through making a contribution to improved public transport between the villages and Salisbury and Downton, including a demand-responsive service.
- Provision of new accessible recycling facilities.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Measures to improve safety and reduce criminal activity in communities throughout the Southern Area.
- Leisure facilities, especially for young adults, in Downton.
- Provision of a GP surgery in Laverstock.
- Improved street lighting in many villages, such as Redlynch.

3.21 Preferred Option PO76 set out the following options for supporting communities in the Nadder Community Area:

- To ensure that everyone has good access to jobs, services, arts, sports and cultural activities, they should be provided in the larger settlement of Tisbury.
- In the settlement of Hindon we should frame policies that seek to protect shops and pubs, resist their change of use unless it has been clearly proven that they are not viable, and to encourage combined uses. We should consider modest and sympathetic growth in Hindon where this will support the viability of the existing services and facilities.
- To counter social exclusion we must put in place measures to ensure that there is a choice of access between our settlements, including improved public transport between the more remote settlements and Tisbury. The benefits of managed growth should make a contribution to innovative solutions to tackling this serious problem of social exclusion.
- There is a priority to ensure access to education for all including the use of existing facilities to provide opportunities for all ages, ensure existing schools remain open and to try and deliver some pre-school facilities in Tisbury.
- Ensure that the communities own aspirations are met with regard to the provision of sports and recreation uses, such as Tisbury swimming pool.

3.22 Preferred Option PO81 set out the following options for using the 'Community Chest' in the following area specific initiatives in the Nadder Community Area (in addition to those identified in Preferred Option 25):

- Tackling social exclusion through making contribution to improved public transport between the villages and Tisbury.
- Access to and provision of healthcare.
- Promotion of tourism and raising the profile of the Nadder Valley area.
- Provision of new accessible recycling facilities.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Delivery of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Beauty Management Plan.
- Measures to improve the quality of local roads, including traffic calming, improved cycle and pedestrian facilities and improved street lighting.
- Safety and reducing criminal activity.
- Leisure facilities especially for young adults, such as the future of the Youth Club in Tisbury.
- Support for the police and fire station.

3.23 43% of respondents supported the list of Golden Threads identified under PO1. A further 33% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that ensuring that transport and infrastructure are provided to support a high quality of life formed part of a list and none of the 24% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with suggestions as to additional Golden Threads and how other Preferred Options would impact on those already identified.

3.24 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I oppose this option because it does not mention the protection of our green belt and strategic gap land that surrounds the city.
- I feel strongly that a comprehensive infrastructure plan needs to be in place before any housing decisions are made.
- The Golden Threads do not include climate change and adaptation to climate change.
- One vital Golden Thread has been missed out and MUST be added - that of Prime agricultural land.
- I recommend carrying out integrated studies on sustainable development principles balancing economic, environmental and social aspects.
- The [Parish] Council agrees that your policy work should be underpinned by the Golden Threads as listed.
- Need to assert the value of existing communities and provide protection and sustainability and assistance they require.
- We agree that the Golden Threads should underpin the Local Development Framework.
- Important to maintain core values in the evolution of policy.

3.25 46% of respondents supported the list of Prized Assets identified under PO2. A further 40% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that the asset of a certain rural way of life formed part of a list and none of the 14% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against this individual element in principle. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with the definition of the Prized Assets and how other Preferred Options would impact on them.

3.26 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I oppose this option because it does not specifically mention the protection of the current green belt and strategic gap land that forms a natural barrier between the city and surrounding villages and hamlets.
- The quality of the natural environment and the rural way of life are important to the people that live in the countryside and villages and to those that live in Salisbury for recreation. New development should be centred round these towns for the enjoyment of all.
- You identify 'a certain rural way of life' but do not specifically identify that it is by overdevelopment that destruction forever of this asset will be inevitable and hence villages must be protected from this ever occurring.
- Development must only be permitted in the villages that are sustainable and compatible with the needs of that settlement to maintain viability of the existing services and amenities and to be balanced with the employment in the village area.
- Salisbury should stand on its own two feet and provide its own attractions. Why for instance do we not have a water park? There's no lack of water!

- The Parish Council agrees that new planning should pay special attention to nurturing and protecting those prized assets, which are unique to our district.
- There is no evidence that communities are close-knit and caring.
- This strategy needs to be evaluated regularly, based on what is needed/projected to be needed based on accurate independent statistics.
- I endorse all the Prized Assets. However, some proposals give no consideration to a rural way of life and risk ruining part of the countryside, which is a Prized Asset.
- You have identified those aspects of living in south Wiltshire which it essential to protect.
- Of course prized assets must be safeguarded.

3.27 23% of respondents supported the list of Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives identified under PO3. A further 49% neither supported nor objected to the list, but rather made comment on its content. It should also be noted that the objectives relating to services and leisure opportunities and the 'Community Chest' formed part of a list, and none of the 28% of respondents who objected to this Preferred Option were against these individual elements in principle, although there was concern that the financial cost to developers would impact on viability and be passed on to house purchasers. Analysis of comments made by objectors indicates that they were mostly concerned with the wording of subsequent policies and the impact of major development in the south Wiltshire area.

3.28 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Ongoing liaison through community safety is essential to minimise crime and improve the perception of crime, also new developments being addressed at early stages to design out crime are essential to build sustainable, prosperous communities for the future.
- I support the objectives but I do not believe SDC has appropriate policies for achieving it. More of the same will worsen not improve the environment.
- I find that all the objectives are easy to completely agree with. I just hope that they prove to be achievable.
- This is all a lot of nonsense, my opinion will not matter, they will be done whatever us people say.
- I find it difficult to comprehend, as so much of this is a wish list with no supporting information.
- If you demand too much from developers, they will in turn pass the additional cost on to purchasers of houses, offices or whatever. This is inflationary and more than the current market can stand.
- Will this work? A good infrastructure would be a necessity for a successful development. To guarantee fulfilment by the developer, the money to cover infrastructure should be put up front.
- There is a huge amount of pressure to use a Development Tax to fund a wide variety of infrastructure benefits. Usually, there is difficulty in getting developers to contribute to items beyond the boundary of their site

except where schools, play-fields or sewage, for example, can only be accommodated at some distance. Developers, despite their profits, cannot fund everything or even contribute significantly to everything.

3.29 76% of respondents supported the proposals for health and welfare facilities suggested under PO16, the remaining 24% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them.

3.30 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- The Core Strategy should recognise that it is not housing developers' responsibility to manage healthcare facilities and that the need for new facilities should be confirmed with the local Primary Health Care Trust before they are sought through developer contributions.
- We agree that developers' contributions should be made towards the provision or improvement of healthcare facilities, where the development increases demand for such services.
- All new health and welfare developments should be constrained to the primary urban centres, where medical, care, shopping and transport facilities are readily available.
- No new health and welfare development should be permitted outside the primary urban centres where facilities are either not present or are likely to be vulnerable to closure.
- I agree. However, there will always be a need for travel to Salisbury District Hospital and beyond. Planners must therefore consider the availability of transport and the state of local roads.

3.31 39% of respondents supported the proposals for services and facilities suggested under PO17. A further 20% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of comments made by the 41% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicated that they were principally concerned with ensuring that developer contributions are relevant to the additional pressure caused by a development and are not seen as a general 'development tax'.

3.32 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Support provision of local services in all villages appropriate to existing needs before promoting massive growth. Simply building more houses does not automatically increase demand for local services.
- Needs to be more attention to providing some of these services in a distributed or mobile way - some could make use of new technologies - treat people in their homes etc.
- We support the delivery of services in larger settlements such as Amesbury.
- I totally agree that developers should contribute to funding infrastructure. It also ensures that they will plan housing more sensitively because they have to put into the context of the local area.

- Imposes another cost on development, which will by definition make the resulting houses less affordable.
- Developers should pay for all of the improvement of healthcare, sports and leisure and other facilities where development increases the demand for such services.
- Funding improvements to the basic infrastructure not directly linked to the approved development would seem to be the responsibility of central and local government and outside the development remit.
- In accordance with government guidance and objective J of the Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives, any developer contributions must be relevant to the added pressure which such development places on local services and infrastructure.
- We support the notion that developers pay towards the provision of local social facilities and services, but have some reservations that the money raised will be targeted away from the development area.
- This does not read as being helpful in any way to smaller villages. The repeated focus solely on ‘larger settlements’ of Salisbury, Amesbury, Downton, Wilton, Mere and Tisbury is not helpful although it is simple and easy-to-understand.

3.33 72% of respondents supported the proposals for shops, post offices and public houses suggested under PO18. A further 17% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of comments made by the 11% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicated that they were principally concerned with whether the planning system had any real control over third-party decisions to close businesses.

3.34 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Must resist the disappearance of traditional local services and not allow villages to simply become “housing estates in the country” with no cores or centres.
- Village shops, pubs, post offices are the centre and focus of a village, encouraging a local community feel. This is lost if these are lost.
- These are to a large extent unachievable wishes in the current climate! Post Office closures are not being resisted by Government and Local Authorities seem to have little impact on the decision making process up to now.
- Your intentions are clear and well meant but the option offers no protection whatsoever against the unwarranted closing of vital village services.
- We agree with this Preferred Option. The protection of our shop, post offices, hotels and public houses are of particular concern to the Parish Council and residents of Mere.
- This measure is very important if we are to try and minimise the numbers of car journeys being made.
- I would add that it should be easier to change a house into a business. It is a one-way street at present.

- These businesses are the backbone and hub of village life. It makes things very difficult for residents, especially the elderly and disabled if they are taken away. Combined use could help some problems.
- Good idea that may be difficult to implement.

3.35 55% of respondents supported the proposals for entertainment and cultural facilities suggested under PO19. A further 28% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of comments made by the 17% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option did not indicate any strong themes of concern.

3.36 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Your preferred route is to strategically select certain key settlements for socially engineered support. This is unfair and definitely not acceptable to all tax-paying villagers who do not give you authority to divert funding in this way.
- Public money should be spent on more important items such as housing, services, and not arts and entertainment. Leave the private sector to fund this - they are very good at it.
- In Mere we are fortunate in having a wealth of arts, entertainment and cultural activities but it all relies on volunteer commitment.
- Many semi-rural places - e.g. Bulford, Durrington, Amesbury and Shrewton - have desperate needs for meaningful youth/young adult centred entertainment centres focused on their needs.
- Local government has a poor track record of correctly identifying the artistic and entertainment tastes of the community. This is an area best left to the voluntary sector and market forces.
- Instead of taxing and providing grants and subsidies, allow individuals to choose how they spend their money on entertainment, the arts and leisure.
- Please specifically include places of religious worship as requiring provision for in this Preferred Option.

3.37 54% of respondents supported the proposals for reducing crime and the fear of crime suggested under PO20. A further 27% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the few comments made by the 19% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicated that they were principally concerned with a potential proliferation of CCTV cameras.

3.38 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Crime reduction should be an integral part of the planning process and incorporated as early as possible in the planning process.
- Very important not to overreact to perceptions. The need for a safer environment is reiterated all through the options, but your figures show that Salisbury district is less subject to crime etc than average (albeit with particular areas where crime etc is an issue).

- The living presence of a village Police Officer in a Police House was probably the best most cost effective way of reducing crime and vandalism in a village. Different solutions are required in larger urban or city communities.
- When we live in an area where the crime rate is the second lowest in England why waste precious and limited resources on addressing a totally unjustified fear, when what we desperately need is investment in transport?
- Rural communities don't necessarily want street lighting; one of the beauties of living in a small village is to be able to see the stars.
- Absolutely against more CCTV cameras. This country is becoming like George Orwell's vision. A reduction would be better.

3.39 73% of respondents supported the proposals for sports and leisure facilities suggested under PO21. A further 20% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the few comments made by the 7% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicated that they were principally concerned with clarification of the option and the detailed wording of subsequent policies.

3.40 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- The policy should be amended to state that the Council will support existing sport and leisure facilities and make provision for replacement and/or improved facilities where appropriate. The proposal to protect existing sports fields should be clarified as it is unclear whether this applies only to undeveloped greenfield playing fields or would also apply to built facilities incorporating a sports field, such as the football club.
- It's essential for the community to keep as many green areas as possible because they enhance the quality of the life for everyone.
- We strongly agree that developers should contribute towards the provision of local sport, leisure and open space facilities, particularly where they are contributing to the demand for such facilities.
- We strongly agree that community access to public and private facilities - such as school and commercial facilities - should be encouraged and facilitated.
- Encouraging a strategy for facilities to be based at the larger urban centres makes good sense - but only if the rural communities can access the facilities using public transport.
- Open green space is valuable to everyone whether for sport or relaxation.
- These aspects are extremely important in the fight to control crime and anti social behaviour amongst the younger generation.
- Do not ever build on open spaces or allotments!

3.41 45% of respondents supported the proposals suggested for planning gain under PO25. A further 35% neither supported nor objected to the proposals, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of comments made by the 20% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates that they were

principally concerned with ensuring developer contributions are relevant to the additional pressure caused by a development.

3.42 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Focussing spending on the identified settlements is considered to be an effective way of creating sustainable communities, as it will be the larger towns where the funding will be made.
- Some element of the community chest should be available to parish council control.
- A detailed Supplementary Planning Document is welcomed, setting out the tariffs that are to be applicable to developments, to provide certainty and clarity for new schemes that are being proposed.
- Developers are not charities. Any contributions to community chest by developers will ultimately be paid for somewhere, by someone.
- A policy is needed which outlines the requirements to provide developer certainty and avoid blight.
- I agree that this is a very good plan and will make developers consider their options very seriously.
- We agree with the principles of 'Community Chest' only on the condition that, by local consultation, it is the local communities that identify the benefits that new development will be expected to contribute towards.
- I support the idea of developer contributions going to a much wider range of infrastructure than the current policy. However, I am concerned that the 'Community Chest' option will mean that whilst houses are developed in a small village, the developer contributions will go to a community chest centred around a town.
- The proposals are too prescriptive. The level of any financial contributions and/or facilities provided by any development must be considered on the merits of that development, which would be compatible with Objective J of the Core Strategy Spatial Vision Objectives.
- This could lead to the situation where a development is approved simply in order to draw funding for a new school, road, cycleway or village hall even when that development may not be appropriate for the location.
- Planning gain should be placed where development is undertaken. Only where money cannot be spent should it be placed in a community chest.
- This is what those of us who have struggled with the current R2 system have been wanting for many years.

3.43 38% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO32 for supporting communities in the Salisbury and Four Rivers Community Areas. A further 40% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 22% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with the need to ensure the distinction between Wilton and Salisbury is retained, and with a potential proliferation of CCTV cameras.

3.44 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Fear of crime was a top concern of residents. Therefore we must address this area and fully support the local people in reducing their perception of crime and increasing their feeling of safety in their areas.
- Needs to place far greater emphasis on the provision of suitable tertiary education facilities to support major employer work force.
- Public open spaces are essential but do require monitoring, because acts of vandalism and dogs mess can cause damage and make it impossible for children to run about freely.
- To deliver an education service in Wilton and surrounding areas, in the middle school site, should be paramount.
- Salisbury deserves a proper college set on its own campus. A new secondary school, away from Laverstock, should be encouraged to distribute education facilities.
- Salisbury Civic Society supports these proposals. However, the site for the new secondary school needs to be designated because it has significant implications in terms of transport, roads, cycle paths etc.
- Wilton is a local centre suitable for modest growth. We do not consider that Wilton is a major provider of homes, jobs, shops and services. A distinction between the importance of Salisbury and Wilton must be made to avoid confusion and to support the proposed settlement strategy outlined in PO7.

3.45 38% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO37 for using the ‘Community Chest’ in the Salisbury and Four Rivers Community Areas. A further 36% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 26% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates that they were principally concerned with ensuring developer contributions are relevant to the additional pressure caused by a development, and that the financial cost to developers would impact on viability and be passed on to house purchasers.

3.46 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Developers need to make profits for shareholders. They will not be interested if they are expected to fund the public's needs overall.
- Keep the planning process clean from developer cash. If a project cannot be funded without resorting to that, then we can do without it.
- The Core Strategy spatial vision, if successful, will in itself breed success and generate funds to enable items sought within the ‘Community Chest’ to be delivered.
- If the obligations on landowners/developers become too onerous the rate of development and growth within the district will not be realised. In accordance with Objective J of the Core Strategy Spatial Vision objectives, any developer contributions for major development must be relevant to their development.
- The Community Chest should finance a much-needed safe cycle lane into Salisbury for Wilton people. This would be environmentally sound, inexpensive and exemplary.

- Salisbury Civic Society supports these proposals. Whether it will be possible to persuade developers to undertake all these seems unlikely. However why not try?
- 3.47 73% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO43 for supporting communities in the Stonehenge Community Area. A further 12% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the few comments made by the 15% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates a desire to de-prioritise new cycle paths in favour of repairing roads, and opposition to new CCTV cameras.
- 3.48 Comments made by respondents included the following:
- We support the provision of services, arts and cultural facilities in settlements such as Amesbury, as this will help to create balanced communities where economic, environmental and social objectives can be met.
 - This is vital for Shrewton because the majority of services and facilities are located in one small area.
 - Sounds good, but as a cyclist I find that many cycle paths are poorly implemented - often just a white line on a road or footpath. I would rather have the roads repaired quicker, particularly the rough areas near the kerb.
 - No to CCTV.
 - I strongly agree that new footpaths and cycleways are needed to connect the settlements.
- 3.49 57% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO48 for using the 'Community Chest' in the Stonehenge Community Area. A further 13% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 30% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates that they were almost exclusively concerned with ensuring developer contributions are relevant to the additional pressure caused by a development.
- 3.50 Comments made by respondents included the following:
- Tariff system would allow for extras or enhancements to be provided for, to ensure the appropriate level of security/safety in a particular area.
 - I would suggest that, additionally, money is spent on amenity issues such as historic walls, tree planting and street enhancement works.
 - Measures to improve safety around Amesbury town centre, leisure facilities for young adults and the provision of healthcare can be reasonably related to new residential development.
 - Area specific initiatives such as promotion of tourism, the provision of new community facilities in villages and improved and public transport links between the northern villages cannot be reasonably related to new residential development.
 - If the obligations on landowners/developers become too onerous the rate of development and growth within the district will not be realised. In

accordance with objective J of the Core Strategy Spatial Vision objectives, any developer contributions for major development must be relevant to their development.

3.51 57% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO54 for supporting communities in the Mere Community Area. A further 7% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the few comments made by the 36% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates a concern with the distinction between 'modest' and 'incremental' growth and whether there is any need for any new facilities in this area.

3.52 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- I agree with the laudable strategic aims of this Preferred Option but, particularly with respect to PO54a, I consider that 'good access to jobs, services, arts, sports and cultural activities' is overly optimistic - this comment will apply especially to the facilities for the younger newcomers.
- On the whole we agree with this Preferred Option. However, we are concerned that you intend to 'frame policies which seek to protect shops and pubs, resist their change of use unless it has been clearly proven that they are not viable' in smaller settlements such as Zeals and Maiden Bradley. We feel that these policies should encompass the town of Mere also, and although you state in PO58 that you will pursue a strategy to ensure that Mere's shops and services remain viable, you do not state that you will actively seek policies to protect these shops and resist their change of use.
- All the facilities mentioned in 54a already exist in Mere or in Gillingham, which is only 4 miles away.
- It is most unlikely that any reliable and frequent public transport to/from remote settlements will ever be made available. Who is going to pay for it?
- These POs are a mass of words with a wish list unrelated to reality.
- The current Local Plan settlement boundary around Zeals would only allow for very limited infill. PO51 suggests that Zeals should accommodate 'incremental' growth to help support the community and protect its viability; whilst PO54 suggests 'modest' growth should occur. Modest and incremental are two quite different proposals, and clarity is required here as to the level of anticipated growth.

3.53 55% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO59 for using the 'Community Chest' in the Mere Community Area. A further 28% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the few comments made by the 17% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option did not indicate any strong themes.

3.54 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- My view is that the 'Community Chest' needed for Mere will be a very large sum of money as it will need to finance the following major items: expansion of the existing facilities for public transport, healthcare, primary

education, crime prevention etc, plus investments for new roads/car parking, new secondary schooling and new leisure facilities.

- Access to provision of healthcare should not be merely the responsibility of developers. The responsibility for adequate provision should be recognised and provided for by those implementing the Core Strategy.
- Not based on any problems or needs analysis.
- Should encompass community transport as well as public transport.
- We feel that the Community Chest in the Western Area should also make some provision towards education, as further development will increase the burden on existing schools.
- We also feel that the Community Chest for the Western Area should include community facilities and meeting places.

3.55 42% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO65 for supporting communities in the Southern Community Area. A further 22% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 36% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with the implications of inappropriate levels of development in specific settlements.

3.56 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Fear of crime was a top concern of residents. Therefore we must address this area and fully support the local people in reducing their perception of crime and increasing their feeling of safety in their areas.
- Support the enhancement and protection of village facilities at Whiteparish. In particular the policy correctly recognises that residential development at villages can assist in the viability of such local community facilities.
- The option refers to all the key factors necessary for a viable society.
- The proposal of CCTV in Whiteparish as a means of reducing crime is absurd. Far more useful would be the return to Police Officers being resident and identifiable in the community.
- Village hall and pavilion facilities must be matched to community needs and supported vigorously.
- It will be good to see this policy of enhancement and safeguarding of the village communities becoming a reality over the target period.
- Support the philosophy behind PO65 in that it identifies a range in initiatives to be implemented so as to enhance the social and community facilities in communities.
- The issues and solutions highlighted in this option would enable the managed growth of the communities in the area whilst maintaining the existing character of the individual settlements.

3.57 39% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO70 for using the 'Community Chest' in the Southern Community Area. A further 26% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 35% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern with ensuring developer contributions are

relevant to the additional pressure caused by a development and with the impact of an excess of new street lighting in rural areas.

3.58 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Sounds too good to be true and it probably is.
- I fully support the idea of the Community Chest principle and am therefore disappointed that the proposals for the Southern Community Area are so limited.
- We have enough problems with light pollution from Salisbury, Bournemouth and Southampton without adding to it. Street lighting in rural areas is completely unnecessary.
- Many villages are not supported enough with new development to encourage and support local services. I support the concept of allowing development of villages.
- If the obligations on landowners/developers become too onerous the rate of development and growth within the district will not be realised. In accordance with Objective J of the Core Strategy Spatial Vision objectives, any developer contributions for major development must be relevant to their development.

3.59 39% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO76 for supporting communities in the Nadder Community Area. A further 55% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. No specific comments were made by the 6% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option.

3.60 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- There is good pre-school provision in Tisbury (also at Wardour).
- As far as Tisbury is concerned the road network, including access roads, a single road through the village centre and inadequate parking for both HGV and private cars preclude any thought of further expansion either of housing or employment areas.
- Agree, but how will this realistically be delivered?

3.61 39% of respondents supported the options suggested under PO81 for using the 'Community Chest' in the Nadder Community Area. A further 44% neither supported nor objected to the options, but rather made comment on them. Analysis of the comments made by the 17% of respondents objecting to this Preferred Option indicates concern over the implications of new development in the area.

3.62 Comments made by respondents included the following:

- Tisbury's road system cannot be changed (but repairs would be welcome - and long overdue).
- This smacks of third world corruption. Let the developers in if they make a pay-off!

- PO81 is supported in view of the benefits the Community Chest levy will have in supporting the local community.
- We fundamentally disagree with the 'Community Chest' concept and its allocation to areas that should be publicly funded out of general taxation.
- Funds for all this development would come from housing growth, which we fundamentally oppose.
- Priority should be given to support for leisure facilities for young adults, which then would help to reduce criminal activity and improve safety, and assist with tackling social exclusion.
- We don't need improved street lighting in this rural area except along the path to the station.
- [Parish] Councillors agreed in principle but felt there was potential for this initiative to generally increase house prices if contributions were not limited specifically to particular developments.

3.63 The Council undertook a second stage of Preferred Options consultation in the autumn of 2008. The consultation document noted that there is significant pressure on services in our rural settlements, with village shops and pubs finding it increasingly difficult to survive. Local communities have told us that they want the Council to take action to try and retain them where possible.

3.64 It was further noted that one of the ways we can help is to allow modest growth in settlements that currently provide a range of services. Such growth introduces new customers for businesses and helps them to remain viable. We can also work with house builders to use the development process to solve longstanding local problems, such as road junctions that need improving, rebuilding a village hall or upgrading flood defences, where new development would add to the burden on such facilities.

3.65 Although a specific question regarding this topic was not asked at this second stage of consultation, there was an opportunity for respondents to make additional comments, including on previous Preferred Options. These responses have been examined and it is considered that no new issues requiring further investigation have been raised in respect of this topic.

APPENDIX ONE: SUGGESTED POLICIES AND MONITORING

Taking into account the rigorous processes, consultation and analysis undertaken by the Council and outlined above, it is considered appropriate to include the following policies within the Core Strategy.

The draft policies do not include references to general design criteria such as impact on visual amenities, biodiversity, water resources, access and traffic generation as these should flow from the Design Topic Paper. It might however be considered appropriate to reiterate such criteria in the Core Strategy policies regarding this topic.

Policy A: Protection of Community Facilities and Services

Proposals involving the loss of a community service or facility will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the site/ building is no longer viable for an alternative community use.

Preference will be given to retaining the existing use in the first instance, then for an alternative community use. Where this is not possible, a mixed use, which still retains a substantial portion of the community facility/service, will be favoured.

Redevelopment for non-community service/ facility use will only be permitted as a last resort and where all other options have been exhausted.

In order for such proposals to be permitted, a comprehensive marketing plan will need to be undertaken and the details submitted with any planning application. Only where the Local Planning Authority is convinced that all preferable options have been exhausted will a change of use to a non -community use be considered. This marketing plan will, at the minimum:

- Be undertaken for at least six months.
- Be as open and as flexible as possible with respect of alternative community use.
- Establish appropriate prices for the sale or lease of the site or building, which reflect the current or new community use, condition of the premises and the location of the site.
- Demonstrate the marketing has taken into account the hierarchy of preferred uses stated above.
- Clearly record the marketing undertaken (cuttings, proactive meeting sessions, etc) and details of respondents, in a manner capable of verification if requested.
- Provide details of any advertisements including date of publication and length of time advertisement.
- Offer the lease of the site without restrictive rent review and tenancy conditions, or other restrictions that would prejudice the reuse as a community facility.
- Demonstrate contact with previously interested parties, whose interest may have been discouraged by onerous conditions previously set out.

TARGETS

No net loss of existing facilities and services

MONITORING AND REVIEW

AMR; Rural Facilities Survey

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council

Policy B: New Community Facilities and Services

The provision or extension of community facilities and services will be permitted provided they are within or well related to a sustainable settlement (as defined in the Sustainable Settlement Strategy).

The extension of existing facilities and services in smaller settlements and the countryside (as defined in the Sustainable Settlement Strategy) will be permitted where they are well related to existing buildings.

In exceptional circumstances, new community facilities and services will be permitted in smaller settlements and the countryside (as defined in the Sustainable Settlement Strategy), where it can be demonstrated that they cannot be accommodated within a more sustainable settlement and are in a location accessible by a range of transport modes.

TARGETS

No approvals as exception to policy

MONITORING AND REVIEW

AMR; Rural Facilities Survey

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers

Policy C: Protection of Sport, Leisure and Recreational Facilities

Development that would lead to the loss of public or private sports fields, school playing fields or other recreational facilities will only be permitted where:

- Facilities can be best retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; or
- Alternative equivalent provision is made available in the locality; or
- It can be demonstrated that there is an excess of provision in the area, taking account of the recreation and amenity value of such provision.

TARGETS

No net loss of Public Open Space

MONITORING AND REVIEW

AMR; Open Space Audit

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council

Policy D: New Sport, Leisure and Recreational Facilities

The provision or extension of sport, leisure and recreational facilities will be permitted in locations within or well related to Salisbury, The Northern Group or Local Service Centres (as defined in the Sustainable Settlement Strategy).

Elsewhere, the extension of existing sport, leisure and recreational facilities will be permitted where they are well related to existing facilities.

In exceptional circumstances, new sport, leisure and recreational facilities will be permitted elsewhere, where it can be demonstrated that there is a local need, they cannot be otherwise accommodated and are in a location accessible by a range of transport modes.

TARGETS

No approvals as exception to policy

MONITORING AND REVIEW

AMR; Rural Facilities Survey

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers

Policy E: Green Infrastructure

Proposals for development shall make provision for the retention and enhancement of the Green Infrastructure network. Where development is permitted the Local Planning Authority will require developers to:

- Contribute towards the objectives of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan;
- Put measures in place to ensure appropriate future management of Green Infrastructure;
- Create new or replacement Green Infrastructure equal to or above the current ecological value of the existing if damage or loss is unavoidable.

Development that would adversely affect the integrity and value of the existing Green Infrastructure Network, or prejudice the implementation of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan, will not be permitted

TARGETS

Contributions towards achievement of Wiltshire BAP targets (GAPT2-5);
Implementation of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Environmental and biodiversity audit; Post development review

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council, Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, BAP working groups; Developers

Policy F: Emergency Services and Healthcare

Proposals for new residential development will be permitted where the applicant has clearly demonstrated that they have taken into account the needs of the emergency services and access to healthcare facilities.

Developers will be required to demonstrate how their proposals are adequately supported by these essential services including, where necessary, making financial contributions for upgrading off-site facilities.

TARGETS

No detriment to emergency response times; Net increase in capacity of healthcare facilities.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Periodic meeting with emergency services and PCT

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Wiltshire Fire Service; Ambulance Service; Developers

Policy G: Education

Proposals for new residential development will be permitted where the applicant has clearly demonstrated how they will meet the demand for additional education spaces that the development will create, at both primary and secondary levels, as agreed in writing by the Local Education Authority.

TARGETS

Adequate school spaces for all new residents

MONITORING AND REVIEW

Education reports

DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITY

Wiltshire Council; Developers

APPENDIX TWO: MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS

The following matters are considered to be matters where the Council need to carry out more works, or that are area-specific, and should therefore be included in a Planning Obligations Development Plan Document, or Area Action Plans, as opposed to overarching Core Strategy policies.

Planning Obligations Development Plan Document

The idea of encouraging developers to accept a transparent and equitable means of making a contribution to a 'Community Chest' has been refined, as it was felt that it would not be appropriate to seek developer contributions for anything beyond the additional demands their development would place on infrastructure and services.

Therefore, a tariff system will be published, so that developers can work out in advance the requisite sums involved. This will identify required contributions towards matters such as:

- Affordable Housing;
- Education;
- Community Facilities and Services,
- Emergency Services and Healthcare;
- Sport, Leisure and Recreation Provision (including Public Open Space (see below));
- Cemeteries;
- Highway Infrastructure;
- Pedestrian, Cycleway and Public Transport Initiatives;
- Nature Conservation, Wildlife and Biodiversity Mitigation;
- Town Centre Improvements;
- Security Measures;
- Arts, Cultural and Tourist Facilities;
- Public Art;
- Public Realm;
- Local Labour and Training Initiatives;
- Flood Risk Management Schemes;
- Waste Management;
- Community Waste and Energy Projects;
- Delivery of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Beauty Management Plan.

A Public Open Space Study, undertaken on behalf of Council in 2007, identified areas where south Wiltshire is deficient in the provision of recreational open space, and recommended standards aimed at addressing this shortfall.

However, although the methodology of the study followed PPG 17 guidance, the reasoning for setting standards in some cases raises questions as to whether needs

have been properly quantified in a spatially distinctive manner. For instance some suggested standards have been set by taking the highest level of current provision in a settlement and applying it across all areas, while others have been set on a 'vote-counting' basis following public consultation. There also appear to be some anomalies as to how current provision of various typologies has been calculated.

It is therefore considered that the Open Space Study should be thoroughly reviewed and new standards set in the Planning Obligations DPD rather than through a Core Strategy policy. Current Local Plan standards for recreational open space have worked well (although limited in the type of Open Space that can be achieved) and there is not considered to be an urgent need to revise these standards.

Salisbury and Four Rivers Community Areas

- First-class education based on an enhanced or relocated centre of excellence at the Wiltshire College faculty in Salisbury.
- A new secondary school located away from Laverstock, to provide a more equitable distribution of education facilities.
- Measures to ensure that Wilton Market Place feels safe and to minimise late night disturbance in the heart of Salisbury.
- A larger entertainment venue in Salisbury to attract bigger events and concerts.

Stonehenge Community Area

- New footpaths and cycleways to connect smaller settlements with each other and with Amesbury, Bulford and Durrington.
- Measures to ensure that Amesbury Town Centre feels a safe place to be, especially after dark.

Southern Community Area

- A choice of access, including improved public transport, to connect smaller settlements with each other and with Downton and Salisbury.
- Tackling the traffic congestion that occurs at Alderbury during the commute to Salisbury.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Leisure facilities, especially for young adults.
- Provision of a GP surgery in Laverstock.
- Measures to ensure that Downton and other villages feel safe places to be.

Mere Community Area

- A choice of access, including improved public transport, to connect smaller settlements with each other and with Mere.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Introducing convenient local waste collection and recycling centres.
- Improved access to the countryside such as a nature walk and wildlife conservation area on Castle Hill in Mere.

Nadder Community Area

- A choice of access, including improved public transport, to connect smaller settlements with each other and with Tisbury.
- Traffic management measures to route HGVs away from village centres.
- Delivery of pre-school facilities in Tisbury.
- Leisure facilities, especially for young adults.

APPENDIX THREE

CHANGES AS A RESULT OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL, HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT AND EDITING REFINEMENT

This initial policy text was then subjected to Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment as well as editing refinement and advice from parties such as GOSW. As a result of this the following amendments were made to the text to ensure conformity with both European Directives as well as ensuing central and regional policy are not repeated and future editing ensured.

The issue of Protection of Services and Community Facilities was addressed in Core Policy 47 of Draft 3 of the Submission Document. Due to various iterations, Draft 7 of the Submission Document resulted in the policy being redrafted as Core Policy 24 as follows:

Protection of Services and Community Facilities

Proposals involving the loss of a community service or facility will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the site/ building is no longer viable for an alternative community use.

Preference will be given to retaining the existing use in the first instance, then for an alternative community use. Where this is not possible, a mixed use, which still retains a substantial portion of the community facility/service, will be favoured.

Redevelopment for non-community service/ facility use will only be permitted as a last resort and where all other options have been exhausted.

In order for such proposals to be permitted, a comprehensive marketing plan will need to be undertaken and the details submitted with any planning application. Only where the Local Planning Authority is convinced that all preferable options have been exhausted will a change of use to a non-community use be considered. This marketing plan will, at the very minimum:

- Be undertaken for at least 6 months.
- Be as open and as flexible as possible with respect of alternative community use.
- Establish appropriate prices for the sale or lease of the site or building, which reflect the current or new community use, condition of the premises and the location of the site.
- Demonstrate the marketing has taken into account the hierarchy of preferred uses stated above.
- Clearly record the marketing undertaken (cuttings, proactive meeting sessions, etc) and details of respondents, in a manner capable of verification if requested.
- Provide details of any advertisements including date of publication and length of time advertisement.
- Offer the lease of the site without restrictive rent review and tenancy conditions, or other restrictions, which would prejudice the reuse as a community facility.

- Demonstrate contact with previously interested parties, whose interest may have been discouraged by onerous conditions previously set out.

Targets: Retention of existing facilities and services

Monitoring and Review: AMR, Rural Facilities Survey

Delivery Responsibility: Wiltshire Council

Policies replaced: PS3

The SA noted that, although south Wiltshire is a predominantly wealthy area, there are still areas of urban and rural deprivation where access to facilities creates social exclusion. This policy set out a robust framework to protect existing facilities and would have long-term social benefits with more minor positive impacts for transport and climate change through reducing the need to travel.

No mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made and no requirement was identified for examination of this policy at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

Although there is a current Local Plan policy addressing this issue, it is in a less detailed form, particularly in terms of marketing criteria, and it is therefore considered that the above policy should be included in the Core Strategy.

The issue of Protection of Green Infrastructure and Habitat Networks was addressed in Core Policy 18 of Draft 3 of the Submission Document.

The SA noted that Core Policy 18 would have very positive benefits for biodiversity, landscape, open spaces and health objectives, and minor benefits for other social and environmental objectives. However, uncertainties remained as to the standards of provision to be required under this policy. The policy might increase costs for developers but would also be likely to improve the local environment of new developments, with potential for economic benefits as a result.

It was recommended that:

- Reference to specific standards of green infrastructure provision and/or;
- The role of green space provision and quality/accessibility improvements as avoidance and mitigation measures for potential recreational impacts on Natura 2000 sites;

should be included in the policy

No requirement was identified for examination of the policy at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

Following iteration, the policy was deleted from Draft 7 of the Core Strategy, as it was considered to represent a development management policy, which could be delivered through a Wiltshire-wide DPD.

It was also considered that some of the matters addressed by the policies might be better included in a DPD covering a wider range of planning obligation issues.

However, given the number of European protected nature sites and species where a significant effect might occur as a result of development proposals in the Core Strategy, it is considered that more immediate green infrastructure requirements are necessary to ensure that any impact is mitigated.

A policy should therefore be included in the Core Strategy as follows:

<p>Green Infrastructure and Habitat Networks</p> <p>Proposals for development shall make provision for the retention and enhancement of existing Green Infrastructure. Where development is permitted the Local Planning Authority will require developers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contribute towards the implementation of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan.• Provide for any suitable alternative natural green space provision, access or quality improvements as well as proving linkages between green spaces in order to deter increased public use of the New Forest and Salisbury Plain Natura 2000 sites, where appropriate.• Put measures in place to ensure appropriate future management of Green Infrastructure;• Retain and enhance existing on site Green Infrastructure and create new or replacement Green Infrastructure equal to or above the current ecological value of the existing if damage or loss is unavoidable.• Maintain the integrity of the existing Green Infrastructure network and prevent habitat fragmentation <p>Other measure that could also be considered include site habitat management measures and visitor access management measures at or around Natura 2000 sites, especially the New Forest and Salisbury Plain.</p> <p>Until such time as the Green Infrastructure Plan is produced a development that would adversely affect the integrity and value of the existing Green Infrastructure Network, or prejudice the implementation of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan will not be permitted.</p>
<p>Targets: Contributions towards achievement of Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets; Implementation of the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Plan</p>
<p>Monitoring and Review: Environmental and biodiversity audit. Post development review</p>
<p>Delivery Responsibility: Wiltshire Council, Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, BAP working groups (Built Environment & HAP Group)</p>
<p>Policies replaced: None</p>

The remaining Supporting Communities issues were addressed in a range of Core Policies of Draft 3 of the Submission Document, viz:

Core Policy 17: Emergency Services and Healthcare

Core Policy 19: Education

Core Policy 48: Provision of New Community Facilities and Services

Core Policy 49: Protection of Existing Sport, Leisure and Recreational Facilities

Core Policy 50: Proposals for New Sport, Leisure and Recreational Facilities

The SA noted that Core Policy 17 performed well and no adverse effects were identified. It was noted that the provision of emergency access is covered by the Building Regulations but this was not the main thrust of the policy, which actually required financial contributions and good accessibility to healthcare services.

Notwithstanding this, it was felt that the policy was difficult to understand and the requirements for future developers were not set out clearly. Phrases such as “the needs of the emergency services” could be taken to mean appropriate access arrangements but were not clear. Consideration should therefore be given to clarifying this policy by clearly setting out the provisions required from developers.

Policy 19 would have very positive social effects for education facilities and social inclusion, with long-term benefits. There would also be indirect benefits for transport and climate change issues, as local provision within walking and/or cycling distance would assist in reducing use of the private vehicle. No adverse effects were identified and no mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made.

Policy 48 would set a clear framework for the provision of new facilities and would have long-term social benefits with more minor positive impacts for transport and climate change through reducing the need to travel. No mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made.

Policies 49 and 50 set out a robust framework to protect existing sport and leisure facilities and a clear framework for the provision of new facilities. The policies would have long-term benefits for social inclusion and health with more minor positive impacts for transport and climate change through reducing the need to travel. Again no mitigation or enhancement recommendations were made.

No requirement was identified for examination of these policies at the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.

However, following iteration, these policies were deleted from Draft 7 of the document as they represented development management policies, which will be delivered through a Wiltshire-wide DPD. It was also considered that some of the matters addressed by the policies might be better included in a DPD covering a wider range of planning obligation issues.