

Purton Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Examiner's Further Questions

(Answers provided in bold by Purton Parish Council and Wiltshire Council)

1. I saw on the ground development taking place at Ridgeway Farm on the edge of the parish adjoining Swindon. Was this allocated in the Swindon Local Plan, and is there any other strategic allocation from Swindon in Purton Parish?

The development is not an allocation in either the Swindon or Wiltshire Local Plan. Core Policy 2 includes a minimum housing requirement of 900 homes to the West of Swindon. The reason for this is explained in paragraph 4.34 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. It is an allowance to acknowledge the existing commitments at Moredon Bridge and Ridgeway Farm.

2. Policy 1 suggests that both industrial areas are suitable for B1 use, although both sites appear to have B2 uses on them, and the Mopes Lane site (former Purton Brickworks site) has waste uses and no nearby residential. Could you please explain the reasoning here, and you may want to comment on the merits of this use class restriction on each of the sites separately.

A specific objective is to retain the land at both sites for employment as part the lower half of the Mope site Lane had also been identified in the SHLAA and the current SHELAA 2017 for housing (site 109).

Both the Mopes Lane and the Pen Farm Industrial Site adjoin the residential area at the western end of New Road where residents would be affected by the type of industrial use. Whilst Mopes Lane site covers 3.1 Ha, only 1.0 Ha is undeveloped and this is situated on the lower eastern edge directly adjoining New Road.

The need for small business units and incubator units for start-up enterprises including such activities as communication technologies, knowledge based and creative industries, environment, rural enterprises, accounting and financial services or similar was identified and in terms of size would be suitable adjoining the residential houses in New Road.

The difficult entrance to New Road limits access for larger vehicles more likely require to support for B2 use.

It may be relevant to amend wording in Policy 1 to clarify the closeness of these sites to the residential area in New Road.

3. Policy 1: The area designated for industrial use at the former Purton Brickworks Mopes Lane site has been criticised as not complying with the area designated in the NWLP2011, which as far as I can see in not correct, I would be grateful if the LPA could confirm that my reading of the NWLP is correct. However a Reg16 objection also states that an existing use and planning permission is not included within the designation, despite being on the boundary of the industrial area as designated in the NWLP (N/08/02474/FUL for a cylinder filling shed). The building states it is now occupied by SPi Performance Coatings, which would appear to be a B2 use and is presumably operating with planning permission? It is quite acceptable for the NP to alter the existing designation to account for recent additions on the boundary.

North Wiltshire Local Plan Policy BD1 is 'saved' through the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The extent of the area at Purton allocated by policy BD1 can be viewed on the Wiltshire Core

Strategy Policy Map for Royal Wootton Bassett Community Area, [here](#); or in greater detail on the Policy Map supporting the former North Wiltshire Local Plan, [here](#). The policy text for saved policy BD1 can be read [here](#).

You can also find a map at Appendix A to this document which shows saved policy BD1 and the Neighbourhood Plan allocation, overlaid with planning permission 14/10939/FUL (more up to date application than N/08/02474/FUL).

4. Policy 4 refers to Core Policy 51, but as it is dealing with biodiversity should this not be Core Policy 50 from the WCS2015? Also, is there a local list of ecological sites the NP policy would refer to, as well as its general aim?

The appropriate WCS policy is Core Policy 50 and should be amended. There is a list of ecological sites in Chapter 2 (2.12, page 13) followed by Map 3 showing their locations. This list could be copied to though the objective cited is “To identify and implement ecological enhancements wherever possible, such as part of proposed developments, in order to work towards a net gain for biodiversity rather than just to protect existing ecological features/sites.” An amendment to Policy 4 to make this clear may be appropriate.

5. Policy 12: The policy is dealing with the protection of open space, and to be clear it should identify that the sites are to be retained for this use, if that is what was intended?

Yes, the objective of Policy 12 is intended to ensure that the sites listed and identified on Map 9 (page 30) are retained as open areas but amendment to the Policy 12 to make this clear may be appropriate.

6. Policy 9 is requiring an existing development to remain as supported living accommodation. The land the development is on, is also allocated as a housing site in Policy 13. I have seen the Purton Parish Housing Needs Survey of 2012, which besides being rather out of date now, states that there is no need for affordable sheltered housing. Is there any more recent evidence of need for supported living accommodation – affordable or otherwise? The policy also mentions ‘elderly people who have an association with the Parish’. Is there any agreed definition of ‘an association with the Parish’?

There is a mistake on Map 7 which shows Hooks Hill as The Cedars, The Cedars is the next property to the left. A corrected Map 7 is attached at Appendix B.

The Cedars is Wiltshire Council owned but run by The Order of St John Care Trust. The purpose of Policy 9 was to protect care provision for the elderly in Purton as recently there were considerations that it be moved elsewhere out of the village which caused great consternation amongst many elderly residents who would have to move out of the village away from relatives and old friends in order to receive care elsewhere. It may be appropriate to amend the wording in Policy 9 to bring the terminology (care facilities) in line with the paragraph above.

It was decided to leave the phrase ‘... an association with the Parish ..’ deliberately loose as a tighter definition saying people who or had lived in the parish or had long term friends, relatives or partners may be too prescriptive for a care provider (OSJCT) with the current pressures on care provision.

7. Policy 11 is requiring any development on the allotment sites to provide 'an alternative and equivalent areas of land' – presumably for the provision of allotments? At present this is not quite clear enough.

The objective of policy 11 is to protect the existing allotments at Pavenhill, Poor Street and Church Path but that if any were to be put forward for development then an equivalent replacement would be required.

However as the demand for allotments in the village can vary over time, it could be argued by a developer that if there are vacant allotments at that time then providing a replacement site is not needed. This could affect future needs of the villagers being denied access to an allotment. It may be appropriate to amend the policy to include reference to a replacement for the existing allotments.



