

1.1 We believe that a more sustainable growth allocation would have been to lower the figures for Salisbury and to increase those for the Local Service Centres. This would have the effect of alleviating some of the problems that Salisbury and environs will inevitably suffer from the imposition of the current large housing and employment numbers. It would at the same time increase the self-sufficiency and viability of the Local Centres to act as focal points for surrounding villages. This could mean, if the range of facilities in each Local Centre were expanded in line with housing and employment, less need for journeys elsewhere to find such facilities.

Amesbury and Mere, both on the major route A303 would be such candidates for increased allocation. Tisbury, as a strategic Local Centre in the south west of the county, with its railway but poorer road connections, should also be considered.

1.2 The Core Strategy insists "New housing will not be permitted outside the settlements named in Core Policy 1" (CS 5.17 p.48). Apart from a possible breach of human rights, we would query the legality of a policy which thus deprives scores of villages of control of their own futures. Many villages are dying because of a loss of facilities. Surely we should be attempting to rejuvenate them by an influx of new blood, not assisting in their demise. And such developments, although small in nature would, at the same time, by reducing the numbers of the Salisbury allocation, relieve some of the over-development pressure threatened around Salisbury.

Revised wording

New housing will ~~not~~ be permitted outside the settlements named in Core Policy 1 **provided the community involved believes it to be warranted** (CS p.48)