



BERNARD E. COLE & PARTNER

CHARTERED BUILDING SURVEYORS

8 Love Lane, Romsey
Hampshire, SO51 8DE
Tel: 01794 512264
Fax: 01794 511919

QNS/2724/eg

1st February 2010

Mr Ian Kemp BSc (Hons) Programme Officer
South Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination
36 Campbell Street
Rugby
Warwickshire
CV12 2HY

Dear Sir

**Re: South Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination
Representor Reference 3029. Matter 2. Core Policy 1 Q. 2.5**

Further to our previous written representations in relation to the above we wish to reinforce our earlier comments by way of additional written simplified statements.

Our comments have always been made in relation to matter 2 Core Policy 1 Question 2.5 and we again write on this matter.

It is our and our Client's contention that matter 2 Question 2.5 is flawed in that the removal of housing policy boundaries will not allow the village to adapt.

Villages, as towns and cities, need to adapt, with villages needing to adapt and regenerate more than towns to survive. It should be appreciated that without new investment in villages such as Firsdawn, either in the form of housing; to supply an obvious housing need or more commercial or community based investment the village can stagnate.

The opportunity to assist in the long term planned survival and small scale expansion of villages should not be lost. It should be borne in mind that there is often a housing shortage in villages (rather than towns and cities), and that families established within a settlement can struggle to source their necessary housing needs. These needs are unlikely to be met if the housing policy boundary shrinks or is removed completely.

The opportunity for small scale development on sites, either windfall, obvious building plots must be maintained. Sensitive and necessary development requirements can be planned in to a village's planning needs as a whole. It is likely that a developing and evolving population will not want to live in nine new locations well away from villages such as Firsdawn. Further, it is likely that forcing development in these nine specific locations will involve the greater use of land and increase maximum density requirements, something that is quite at odds with village housing needs as a whole.

The removal of the housing policy boundaries may simplify the planning process for the Local Authority but it does not allow a village to adapt. It is contended that the use of windfall sites and small scale development

sites in villages must be maintained. In this way a sensible balance can be struck between village housing and commercial or community needs and planning for these needs and by utilising these sites correctly a Local Authority can achieve the obvious government goal of additional housing. Without this facility it would seem that centring development on the nine strategic sites will move populations to locations where it may not want to be.

In summary, we would therefore request that this part of the strategy is removed and with the planning opportunity take to retain village housing boundaries as they currently are.

Yours sincerely

G M Leffers-Smith MRICS
For and on behalf of
Bernard E Cole & Partner