

SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN DECISION STATEMENT (PROCEEDING TO REFERENDUM)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Pursuant to the Wiltshire Council constitution and in particular Part 3B, the Director for Economic Development and Planning within whose remit Spatial Planning falls is authorised to make decisions on Neighbourhood Plan proposals following the examination of a Neighbourhood Plan proposal in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and all other relevant legislation.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The designated area for the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan comprises the whole of the parish of Sherston. On 28th February 2013 Wiltshire Council formally approved that the Sherston Neighbourhood Area (i.e. the land within the parish of Sherston) be designated in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.2. Sherston Parish Council – the ‘qualifying body’, submitted the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan (Submission Plan September 2018), along with supporting documents, to Wiltshire Council in September 2018 for consultation, independent examination and the remaining stages of the draft Plan’s preparation in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.3. Following submission of the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan, Wiltshire Council publicised the Plan and supporting documents and invited representations during the consultation period 1st October to 12th November 2018.
- 2.4. In November 2018 Wiltshire Council appointed an independent examiner, Mr Nigel McGurk to examine the Plan and consider whether it should proceed to referendum.
- 2.5. The examiner’s report was received in February 2019 and concluded that subject to making the modifications recommended in the report, that the draft Plan meets the Basic Conditions and should proceed to referendum. The examiner also recommended that the Sherston Neighbourhood Area (the parish area) is an appropriate area within which to hold a referendum.
- 2.6. In accordance with legislation, Wiltshire Council must consider each of the recommendations made in the examiner’s report, decide what action to take in response to each recommendation and what modifications should be made to the draft Plan in order to be satisfied that it meets the Basic Conditions and is compatible

with Convention Rights. If the authority is satisfied then a referendum must be held. Consideration also needs to be given as to whether to extend the area to which the referendum is to take place.

3. DECISION AND REASONS

- 3.1. Having considered the examiner's recommendations and reasons for them, the Council concurs with the examiner's view and have decided to make modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that it meets legal requirements including the Basic Conditions as set out in legislation, and to correct errors. Appendix 1 sets out these modifications, together with the reasons for them.
- 3.2. The Council is satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan, as modified, complies with the legal requirements and can proceed to referendum.
- 3.3. The Council also agrees with the examiner that the referendum area should reflect the extent of the Sherston Neighbourhood Area.
- 3.4. I declare that I have no private interest in respect of this matter that would prevent me from making this decision.

Signed:



Alistair Cunningham
Corporate Director
Growth, Investment & Place
Wiltshire Council

Dated: 11th March 2019

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Guidance for using this document

The following table sets out the modifications that are required to be made to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026, together with an explanation and reason for the modifications. This should be read alongside the report (January 2019) of the Independent Examiner Nigel McGurk to Wiltshire Council on the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan.

Throughout the table, specific changes that are required are shown as follows:

- text in **bold and underlined** identifies new text to be added to the Plan.
- text that is shown as ~~strike through~~ identifies text to be deleted from the Plan.

The relevant paragraph, policy and page numbering relates to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 (hereafter referred to as the 'SNP'), as submitted to Wiltshire Council.

The final Sherston Neighbourhood Plan to be published for the purposes of the referendum, will need to renumber the policies and paragraphs as appropriate following the insertion of changes.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC1	N/A	Title Page	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - N/A <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update title page to reflect that the SNP is now a referendum version, with references as follows: <p><u>Referendum Version - March 2019</u></p>	Factual update in the interests of version control and clarity.
RC2	N/A	Contents page	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - N/A <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update any necessary page numbers or Contents to reflect any changes made as necessary: 	In the interests of accuracy.
RC3	Page 17	Page 5, Para 2.2	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 5, Para 2.2, change to "The Sherston Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) <i>covers the same plan period as the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, up to 2026.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend paragraph 2.2 to read as follows: <p>The Sherston Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) <u>covers the same plan period as</u>, in seeking to be in conformity with the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, <u>up</u> covers the period to 2026.</p>	In the interests of clarity.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC4	Page 17	Page 5, Para 2.5	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 5, Para 2.5, change to "The Steering Group first met in February 2012 <i>and work progressed on the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan until its submission for examination in 2018. The plan allocates development sites and seeks to complement the policies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend paragraphs 2.5 to read as follows: <p>The Steering Group first met in February 2012, and since that date work progressed has been progressing on the preparation of a the Neighbourhood Plan until its submission for examination in 2018. The plan allocates seeks to allocate development sites, where appropriate, and seeks to establish a range of local policies that are considered necessary to compliment these set out within the policies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Council development plan.</p>	In the interests of clarity, to reflect the passing of time.
RC5	Page 17	Page 5, Para 3.5	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Para 3.5 <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete paragraph 3.5, as follows: <p>The SNP will take forward the essence of the existing planning framework, providing for necessary or desired growth in a sustainable way. In the Sherston Neighbourhood Plan area this will mean adhering to both Core Strategy and accepted "local" requirements for development as set out in this plan.</p>	In the interests of accuracy.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC6	Page 17/18	Page 5/6 Para 3.6	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 5, Para 3.6, change from first line to "...Council has been to <i>support development within and around the village that it considers</i> to be appropriate in scale...community. Wherever..." - Page 6, Para 3.6, replace last three lines with "...affordable housing). <i>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to change the existing VDB, it is noted that Wiltshire Council is progressing a separate Housing Site Allocations Plan. This does not propose housing allocations in Sherston, but does propose changes to the settlement boundary.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend paragraph 3.6 as follows: <p>The longstanding policy of Sherston Parish Council has been to support seek to manage development within and around the village <u>that it considers to be</u> in a manner that is both appropriate in scale and location sufficient to meet the continuing and future needs of the community. Wherever possible this has been within the existing NWLP defined Village Development Boundary (VDB) – as shown on Map 2 (see below). It should be noted that in recent times however a number of exceptions have been made to this approach to meet identifiable and accepted exceptional needs (e.g. the construction of a new primary school and some affordable housing). <u>Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to</u> change Changes will in due course be needed to the existing VDB <u>it is noted that</u> to take account of those recent events and any proposals contained in the SNP. This will be dealt with by Wiltshire Council <u>is progressing</u> in a separate <u>Housing Site Allocation Plan. This does not propose housing allocations in Sherston, but does propose changes to the settlement boundary.</u> Development Plan Document.</p>	In the interests of accuracy and clarity to reflect that it is the responsibility of Wiltshire Council, rather than Sherston Parish Council, to manage development.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC7	Page 18	Page 9, Para 6.1	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 9, Para 6.1, add "A Neighbourhood Plan is a community-<i>driven</i> plan..." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend paragraph 6.1 as follows: <p>A Neighbourhood Plan is a community-<u>driven</u> plan and must derive its objective, actions and authority from the community.</p>	In the interests of clarity and avoid confusion.
RC8	Page 18	Page 11, Objective 2	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 11, Objective 2, insert new bullet point to begin the list "<i>Conserves or enhances Sherston's significant heritage assets.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insert new bullet point to list at Objective 2, as follows: <p>The Plan will ensure that all future development in the village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Conserves or enhances Sherston's significant heritage assets.</u> • Respects the high quality of the local environment by... 	In the interests of accuracy, and to address the need to preserve Sherston's nationally important heritage assets.
RC9	Page 18	Page 13, Policy 8.2	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 13, Para 8.2, insert space after full stop on line 4. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend to insert space after full stop on line 4, as follows: 	Typographical error.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner’s recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner’s report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>“...proposals without the need to any additional specific policy in the SNP._There are of course some other objectives...”</p>	
RC10	Page 21	Page 14-15, Policy 1	<p>EXAMINER’S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 1, change the Policy text to “<i>Facilities, services, shops and local businesses recognised as important to the local community are shown on Maps 5A and 5B and listed below. The loss of community facilities or services, or the change of use of businesses to non-business or non-community uses, will be resisted.</i> <p><i>Where a change of use that would result in the loss of a community asset or service, or the change of use of a business to a non-business or non-community use is proposed, this should demonstrate why the benefits arising from the proposal outweighs the harm to the community in respect of the loss of a local asset and must be supported by evidence to demonstrate that the existing use of the asset is no longer viable, including at least six months active marketing for an alternative community or business use, taking full account of local market conditions.</i> (LIST OF ASSETS HERE).”</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend Policy 1 as follows: <p>Proposals involving the loss of the following community services, facilities or business premises shown on Proposals Maps 1A and 1B will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the site/ building is no longer viable for an alternative community/ business use. Preference will be given to retaining the existing use in the first instance, then for an alternative community or</p>	<p>For clarity and to avoid repetition; to ensure that elements of the policy are not overly restrictive; and for wording consistency.</p>

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>business use. Where this is not possible, a mixed use, which still retains a substantial portion of the community facility/service or business use, will be supported. Redevelopment for non-community service/ facility or business use will only be permitted as a last resort and where all other options have been exhausted.</p> <p>In order for such proposals to be supported, a comprehensive marketing plan will need to be undertaken and the details submitted with any planning application.</p> <p>Only where it can be demonstrated 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. be undertaken for at least six months ii. be as open and as flexible as possible with respect to alternative community use iii. establish appropriate prices, reflecting local market value, 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 iv. demonstrate the marketing has taken into account the hierarchy of preferred uses stated above v. clearly record all the marketing undertaken and details of respondents, in a manner capable of verification vi. provide details of any advertisements including date of publication and periods of advertisement vii. 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 viii. demonstrate contact with previously interested parties, whose interest may have been discouraged by onerous conditions previously set out. <p><u>Facilities, services, shops and local businesses recognised as important to the local community are shown on Maps 5A</u></p>	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p><u>and 5B and listed below. The loss of community facilities or services, or the change of use of businesses to non-business or non-community uses, will be resisted.</u></p> <p><u>Where a change of use that would result in the loss of a community asset or service, or the change of use of a business to a non-business or non-community use is proposed, this should demonstrate why the benefits arising from the proposal outweighs the harm to the community in respect of the loss of a local asset and must be supported by evidence to demonstrate that the existing use of the asset is no longer viable, including at least six months active marketing for an alternative community or business use, taking full account of local market conditions.</u></p> <p>Facilities/premises to be protected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Village Hall B. Scout Hut C. British School Rooms D. The Methodist Chapel E. Carpenters Arms PH F. The Rattlebone PH G. The Angel (hotel and restaurant) H. Grays Garage I. The Old School (shops and offices) J. Tucks K. The Tolsey Surgery L. Apples and Pears M. The Wine Shop N. Stretchline premises O. Pinkney Park Business Units P. B & W Equine Vets at Willesley 	
RC11	Page 21	Pages 13, yellow text box	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 13, first bullet point in yellow box, add "...in and 	Typographical error.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>around <i>the</i> village..."</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend first bullet in yellow box, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a concern that development pressure could lead to the further loss of existing services and facilities in and around the village and damage the character and vitality of the existing community. 	
RC12	Page 21	Various	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NB, the Neighbourhood Plan refers to both "Proposals Maps" and "Maps." For consistency, I recommend that all Maps are simply entitled "<i>Map X</i>" ("X" being the relevant number) <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with Examiner's recommendation, consequential changes will also be required to the text of the Plan where cross references are made to these "Maps". <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revise titles of all maps and their references in text to be consistent with the title format 'Map X'. Update contents page to reflect any map title changes. 	For consistency and accuracy.
RC13	Page 23	Page 16, Policy 2 and Supporting text,	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change Policy 2 to "<i>The Village Hall field, the Recreation</i> 	For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions ensuring policy has regard to national policy and

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
		Paragraph 8.4.4	<p><i>Ground and the Allotments, shown on the plan below, are designated as Local Green Space, where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>Development must respect the character and appearance of the land identified on Map 6, at Avon river valleys, Manor Farm and Grove Wood."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change Map 6, removing the areas designated as Local Green Space - Provide a new plan, showing the three areas of Local Green Space as a scale such that all boundaries are clearly identifiable (removing any scope for confusion) <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <p>For consistency with the wording of other policies and consequential change to the Examiner's recommendation: replace the wording "on the plan below" in policy with "Map X" and insert number; undertake consequential renumbering of Maps and cross references throughout the plan; and the new map will need to be titled: 'Local Green Space'.</p> <p>In addition, as a consequential change to the Examiner's recommendation in the interest of clarity and accuracy paragraph 8.4.4 should also be modified.</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insert the following text at the end of paragraph 8.4.4: <p>...have been identified on a plan <u>in Policy 2. This designates three of the areas – the allotments, recreation ground and village hall – as Local Green</u></p>	<p>achieves sustainable development.</p> <p>Additional modifications identified by Wiltshire Council are consequential changes made in the interest of accuracy and consistency.</p>

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p><u>Spaces as they meet the criteria set out in national policy. In addition the Avon river valleys, Manor Farm and Grove Wood are identified as areas that make a positive contribution to local character.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend Policy 2 as follows: <p>Development will not be permitted if it erodes the distinctive character or integrity of any of the areas shown on Proposals Map 6 identified as being of local significance. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village Hall field 2. Recreation Ground 3. The Allotments 4. Avon river valleys 5. Earthworks at Manor Farm 6. Grove Wood <p><u>The Village Hall field, the Recreation Ground and the Allotments, shown on Map X, are designated as Local Green Space, where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances.</u></p> <p><u>Development must respect the character and appearance of the land identified on Map 6, at Avon river valleys, Manor Farm and Grove Wood.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change Map 6 to remove the areas designated as Local Green Space and insert new key. - Provide a new map (numbered to be consistent with policy modification), showing the three areas of Local Green Space at a scale so they are clearly identifiable and title the map as 'Local Green Space'. 	
RC14	Page 25	Page 17-18, Policy 3	EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:	In the interests of clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions. To

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 3, change to “<i>New development should, where appropriate, demonstrate how it will contribute to and be compatible with high quality communications including local fibre and internet connectivity. Where no internet provider...local access network; or a justified alternative location. The provision of additional ducting that contributes to a local access network for the wider community will be supported.</i>” <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove specific reference to the NPPF in the policy and replace with the subject of the policy reference (viability) as the 2012 NPPF has now been superseded. Although accurate for the purposes of the examination, it will not be accurate and clear for the decision-maker. This will also ensure consistency with the wording of the other policies of the plan that do not cross reference the NPPF. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend Policy 3, as follows: <p>New development should, where appropriate, demonstrate how it will contribute to and be compatible with high quality communications including local fibre or internet connectivity. This could be through a ‘Connectivity Statement’ provided with relevant planning applications. Such statements could consider such aspects as; the intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development, known nearby data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, fibre, satellite, microwave, etc), realistic assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks.</p> <p>This policy aims to see new development connect to the internet with a minimum symmetrical speed of 25Mbps and with realistic</p>	<p>ensure that policy effective, is not unduly onerous and meets the requirements set out in NPPF 2012, and text that reads as supporting text is removed from policy (see RC15 also).</p> <p>Additional modification identified by Wiltshire Council to achieve clarity and accuracy, as well as consistency in wording of policies within plan.</p>

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>future proof upgrades available. Where no internet provider is available, as a minimum and subject to NPPF 173 viability, suitable ducting that can accept fibre should be provided either to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the public highway; or • a community led local access network; or • another location that can be justified through the connectivity statement. <p>Where possible and desirable, additional ducting should be provided that also contributes to a local access network; or a justified alternative location. The provision of additional ducting that contributes to a local access network for the wider community will be supported. for the wider community. Costs associated with additional works can be considered alongside affordable housing, or any other contributions in a viability assessment, submitted to the Council. Major infrastructure development must provide ducting that is available for community owned local access or strategic fibre deployment.</p>	
RC 15	Page 25	Page 19, Para 8.4.8	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add new supporting text Para 8.4.8, "<i>Demonstration of compatibility could be through a Connectivity Statement, to include consideration of such matters as: the intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development; known nearby data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, 5G, fibre, satellite, microwave, etc); realistic assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p>	To reflect that this content should be set out in supporting text, rather than through a Policy requirement. See RC14 also.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add new paragraph of supporting text, below Para 8.4.7, as follows: <u>Demonstration of compatibility could be through a Connectivity Statement, to include consideration of such matters as: the intended land use and the anticipated connectivity requirements of the development; known nearby data networks and their anticipated speed (fixed copper, 3G, 4G, 5G, fibre, satellite, microwave, etc); realistic assessments of connection potential or contribution to any such networks.</u> 	
RC16	Page 25	Page 17, Para 8.4.6	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 8.4.6, last line, delete "all" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend the last line of para 8.4.6, as follows: <p>Currently fibre optic connections are the most robust and future-proof method of delivering high performance connectivity and this should be the aim for all new developments.</p>	Consequential change to RC14.
RC17		Page 21, Para 8.4.19	<p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 8.4.1, final sentence refers to a point in time. For consistency with the Examiner's Recommendation at PC5 the final paragraph should be modified. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <p>For accuracy change last sentence of paragraph 8.4.19 as follows:</p> <p>When work first started on preparing the SNP the overall residual</p>	In the interest of accuracy and consistency.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>requirement was quite significant. This has inevitably reduced over the last five years (including some new build housing in Sherston). At As it stands now <u>the time of drafting the Plan</u> the residual requirement was is about 90 dwellings (20% of which would be 16 units). But that is not the end of the story.</p>	
RC18	Page 29-30	Page 23-24, Policy 4	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 4, change first line to "...Map 7, is allocated for mixed use development..." - Policy 4, third bullet point, delete "(as required by Core Strategy Policy 43)" and change text to "...needs of which 40% <i>should comprise affordable housing.</i>" - Policy 4, add a new bullet point after the fourth bullet point, "<i>Development of the site should conserve and/or enhance heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</i>" - Policy 4, change bullet point 1. to "<i>Development must not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</i>" - Policy 4, change bullet point 3. to "...of the settlement and conserves the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB." - Policy 4, delete last paragraph ("All aspects...") and replace with "<i>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</i>" <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p>	<p>For clarity and to meet the Basic Condition including requirements of national policy and achievement of sustainable development; and to avoid repetition of existing development plan policy in the Wiltshire Core Strategy.</p> <p>Additional modification identified by Wiltshire Council for accuracy and consistency with other modifications to Policy 4.</p>

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For accuracy and as intended by the Examiner (paragraph 105) there is no need to refer to Core Policy 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy in bullet point 4. This is consistent with the modification to the affordable housing bullet point. - In the interest of accuracy and consistency with RC12 additional modification is required to remove reference to the Proposals Map. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend Policy 4, as follows: <p>Approximately 3.3 ha of land situated off Sopworth Lane (Site 1), as identified on Proposals Map 7, is allocated proposed for a mixed use development to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient land for the erection of a new enhanced GP surgery with associated parking and space for related mobile services. • Sufficient land to allow for the future expansion of the existing Sherston C of E Primary School and staff parking together with a site suitable for the erection of a new pre-school facility with associated parking. • Up to 45 dwellings to serve diverse residential needs of which 40% should comprise would be affordable housing. (as required by Core Strategy Policy 43). • Strategic landscaping and open space to retain and reinforce existing hedgerows, and to establish new areas of substantial planting and landscaping so as to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on both the existing PROW and the wider AONB. • <u>Development of the site should conserve and/or enhance heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</u> 	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>Development will be subject to the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Development must not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</u> Surface water management that can achieve less than current greenfield rates of run-off and decreases flood risks. 2. The provision of footpath and cycle links to both the proposed new surgery site and the western edge of the existing primary school as well as to the existing Parish playing fields to the north. 3. A design and layout that protects and preserves the character of the settlement and <u>conserves the landscape and scenic beauty of the</u> is consistent with the surrounding AONB. 4. A detailed Ecological and Mitigation Strategy that ensures that any future development of this site retains existing features and habitats of ecological value, minimises the impact on protected species and maximises the potential of retained habitats to enhance biodiversity. 5. An archaeological assessment. being undertaken in accordance with Policy CP 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. <p><u>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</u> All aspects of the development will take place in accordance with a Masterplan for the site which is to be approved by the Council prior to the submission of a detailed planning application and the Design Brief that has been prepared for the site (see copy at Appendix 1).</p>	
RC19	Page 29	Various paragraphs	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct typographical errors: Para 8.4.9 line 4; Para 8.4.10 ("Proposal" to "Policy"); Para 8.4.21, line 5; Para 	Typographical errors

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>8.4.26, line 1; and Para 8.4.30, line 1</p> <p>WILTSHIRE COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with these changes, checks should be made throughout the plan for similar typographical errors. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change first line of Para 8.4.8 as follows: <p>The existing GP surgery in the village is no longer considered to be fit for purpose over the long term. There...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change first line of Para 8.4.9 as follows: <p>The Steering Group spent almost two years exploring all of the possible ways of achieving this objective. The...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change fourth line of Para 8.4.9 as follows: <p>...- which would help overcome the anticipated high infrastructure costs of opening up the site. This is in fact the...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change third line of Para 8.4.10 as follows: <p>...flexibility over timing of sessions etc. The Group seeking to resurrect this important local service have concluded...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change sixth line of Para 8.4.10 as follows: <p>...of a new purpose-built facility somewhere in or around the village. This idea has received good support from the...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change last line of Para 8.4.10 as follows: 	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>The only site that is considered suitable and likely to be available for such a use is located adjoining the existing new Primary School. It is proposed therefore to allocate land for such a purpose on Site 1 – as part of a proposed mixed use allocation (Proposal Policy 4 below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change third line of Para 8.4.21 as follows: ...suggestion of Wiltshire Council, asked a local firm to undertake a series of Viability Assessments._Their finding was... - Change first line of Para 8.4.26 as follows: In addition to the above it is also proposed to make two further small housing allocations in the SNP._The... 	
RC20	Page 29	Page 22, Para 8.4.28	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Change Para 8.4.28 to “A “Development Brief” and a “Design Brief” are set out below each of the land allocation Policies. This sets out key issues that should be taken into account when considering how best to develop each site, along with recommendations in respect of design and layout.”</i> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend para 8.4.28, as follows: <u>A “Development Brief” and a “Design Brief” are set out below each of the land allocation Policies. These set out key issues that should be taken into account when considering how best to develop each site, along with recommendations in respect of design and layout.</u> A Design Brief has been prepared for each of the above mentioned proposed development sites setting out all of the identified key issues that 	For clarity and consistency with RC18, and to reflect changes to layout.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			will need to be taken into account when considering how best to develop each site and a set of detailed recommendations for the design and layout of each site. These are to be found at Appendices 1 to 3.	
RC21	Page 29-30	Pages 19-24, Policy 4 and Pages 30-34, Appendix 1	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 1 to below Policy 4 as paragraphs of supporting text <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 1 to below Policy 4 as paragraphs of supporting text 	For clarity and consistency with RC18.
RC22	Page 29	Appendix 1	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: The spacing of text, particularly after full stops appears as a typographical error in a number of places and should be corrected <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review and correct typographical errors, including the following: - E.g. First line of second bullet point under 'Site Description': The site, which is approximately 3.3 hectares in size, comprises an agricultural field currently in arable use, The... - E.g. First line of first bullet point under '1. Landscape:' 	To correct typographical errors.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			The site comprises an open agricultural field lying within the designated Cotswold AONB. The site has a strong...	
RC23	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: 1 Landscape, second bullet point, line 5, change to "...the site. This may entail heavily landscaping the western edge with additional...massing." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1. Landscape, second bullet point, line 5, amend as follows: <p>There is the potential for the north western edge of the site to become visible on the skyline, particularly when viewed from the west (Sopworth direction). Whilst the church tower and water tower are currently visible from this direction, the main body of housing of the village is not visible in these views. As such, in designing any scheme for this site, care will need to be taken over the design of development in the north western quadrant of the site, and This may entail heavily landscaping the western edge the western edge should be heavily landscaped with additional trees incorporated into the development parcels here to break down massing.</p>	For clarity to ensure the wording is not overly restrictive.
RC24	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: 2 Ecology, second bullet point, delete and replace with "Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement may include:" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p>	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2. Ecology, second bullet point, amend as follows: Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement will need to be secured through the completion of a detailed Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy, which could be conditioned to any consent for this site. Opportunities may include: 	
RC25	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: 3. Heritage Matters, fourth bullet point, delete "This is not considered...proposal site." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3. Heritage Matters, fourth bullet point, amend as follows: There are no listed buildings in close proximity to the proposal site. The nearest being Manor Farm some distance to the south off Court Street. This is not considered to be a significant constraint on any development on the proposal site. 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.
RC26	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: The fifth bullet point pre-determines how "no harm" might be achieved. Notwithstanding this, national policy does not require that "no harm" is achieved. This bullet point is confusing and fails to have regard to national policy. Delete all of the fifth bullet point under Heritage Matters <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the interests of accuracy, a change to the Examiner's recommendation is required to ensure that constraints 	<p>For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions including national policy.</p> <p>Additional modification identified by Wiltshire Council in the interest of accuracy.</p>

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>are identified.</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3. Heritage Matters, fifth bullet point, amend as follows: <p>The site is abutted to the south by the northern boundary of the designated Sherston Conservation Area <u>and as such development has the potential to affect the setting of the Conservation Area.</u> (N.B. This boundary was altered in 1996 to incorporate additional land to the south west of the village to protect views of the historic core from that direction. It should be noted however that the proposal site was not at that time considered to be worthy of similar protection). The "guidance recommendations" for this part of the Conservation Area as set out in the Sherston Conservation Area Statement it should be noted seek to prevent development to the south and west of Manor Farm with only limited infill development to the east. It does however allow for "possible development to the north of the Recreation Ground outside the Conservation Area". There is nevertheless a need to ensure that there is no harm to the setting or character of the Conservation Area (CA) arising from any development on this site. This can be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that the design, materials, layout and massing of any development is sympathetic to the CA. • Maintaining existing mature hedgerows and trees, and by encouraging new planting where appropriate. • Retaining the existing historic footpath link through the site. • Limiting the density of new build development on the site to maintain a "quiet residential area" and by siting the proposed new community facilities (GP surgery and educational uses) on the southern half of the site. 	
RC27	Page 30		EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: 4 Transport Issues, fourth bullet point, change to "...and <i>should</i> be retained." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 Transport Issues, fourth bullet point, amend as follows: <p>There is an existing public footpath along the western side of the site. This links to the wider footpath network and should must be retained.</p>	
RC28	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: 5. Other Matters, third bullet point, delete first sentence "There is...elsewhere." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5. Other Matters, third bullet point, amend as follows: <p>There is a need to ensure that surface water runoff is maintained at it's present (green field) level — so as to decrease the risk of flooding elsewhere. A SUDS drainage system should if possible be introduced.</p>	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.
RC29	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: Last bullet point under Other Matters, change to "<i>The new GP surgery and other forms of development on site should have access to advanced...</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p>	For clarity and consistency with RC18.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>- Last bullet point under Other Matters, amend as follows:</p> <p>There is a need to ensure that the proposed The new GP surgery and, as well as all other forms of development on the site, should have access to advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure.</p>	
RC30	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <p>- Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: Delete "Development Proposals" section, including title, intro and four bullet points</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <p>- Delete "Development Proposals" section, including title, intro and four bullet points, as follows:</p> <p>Development Proposals: See Policy 4 for full details. In summary it is proposed to allocate this site for the following combination of land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new GP surgery with associated parking and space for related mobile services; • Land to accommodate the future expansion of the existing Primary School and for the erection of a new pre-school facility with associated parking; • Up to 45 dwellings (including 40% affordable housing); • Strategic landscaping and open space. 	For clarity and consistency with RC18.
RC31	Page 30		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <p>- Change the content of Appendix 1 as follows: Design Brief, delete bullet point I</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p>	For clarity and consistency with RC18.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design Brief, delete bullet point I. as follows: <p>All aspects of the development of this site should take place in accordance with a Master Plan for the site which should be approved by Wiltshire Council prior to the submission of a detailed planning application;</p>	
RC32	Page 31	Page 24, Policy 5	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 5, change to "<i>Land at Site 2 (the Vicarage Site), as identified on Proposals Map 8, is allocated for mixed use development, to include.</i>" - Policy 5, change bullet point 2 to "<i>Development should conserve or enhance heritage assets, including the Sherston Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade I Listed church.</i>" - Policy 5, insert new bullet point "<i>3. Development should conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</i>" - Policy 5, delete last paragraph and replace with "<i>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</i>" <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the interest of accuracy and consistency with RC12 additional modification is required to remove reference to the Proposals Map. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 5, change text as follows: 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions; and to ensure consistency with RC18.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>Mixed Use development is proposed on Site 2 (the Vicarage Site), as identified on Proposals Map 8, to include: <u>Land at Site 2 (the Vicarage Site), as identified on Map 8, is allocated for mixed use development, to include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land for use as additional burial space. • About 3 dwellings (including new vicarage). <p>Development will be subject to the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The provision of a footpath link to the existing adjoining churchyard from the proposed new burial area. 2.A design and layout that protects and preserves the character and setting of the adjoining Grade 1 listed church. <u>Development should conserve or enhance heritage assets, including the Sherston Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade I Listed church.</u> 3.<u>Development should conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</u> <p>All aspects of the development will take place in accordance with the Design Brief that has been prepared for the site (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 2). <u>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</u></p>	
RC33	Page 32		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 2 to below Policy 5 <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 2 to below Policy 5 as paragraphs of supporting text 	For clarity and consistency with RC32.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC34	Page 32-33	Page 24, Policy 5 and Pages 35-39, Appendix 2	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 2 as follows: 1 Landscape. During my site visit I noted that the site is not "virtually invisible" from its surroundings and views of the Church are not "virtually invisible." It is not clear why the Development Brief appears to suggest that landscape issues are not a constraint – given the sensitivities of the site, landscaping is an essential consideration. It is noted that the content of this section appears to suggest that Leylandii trees "hide" the site, whilst the next section recognises trees as being species poor and they are recommended for removal in the supporting information. Such removal would have a significant impact in respect of opening up the site. <p>Delete second, third, fourth and last bullet points.</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1. Landscape, delete the second, third, fourth and last bullet points as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire village lies within the designated Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). • The proposal site is centrally located within the existing settlement but is currently virtually invisible from any public viewpoints beyond the immediate locality. • The western site boundary comprises a line of existing leylandii trees – all lying inside the present site boundary. These are well over 7 metres tall and totally obscure the site (and views into and beyond) when viewed from the west. • There are no public viewpoints from the south. Available views from the north are from Green Lane itself – but these 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>are confined to views of the existing dwellinghouse and not much further because of the placement of the existing dwelling and vegetation on the site frontage. The Holy Cross Church to the south of the site is virtually invisible except from viewpoints further eastwards along Green Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape issues are not considered to present a significant constraint in this context. There are however significant potential benefits deriving from the removal of the existing leylandii tree screen that runs along the entire western site boundary. • The site is visible from the adjoining churchyard to the east but is separated from such by a high rubble stone wall. • Landscape issues are not considered to present a significant constraint in this context. There are however significant potential benefits deriving from the removal of the existing leylandii tree screen that runs along the entire western site boundary. 	
RC35	Page 32		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 2 as follows: Much of the Heritage Section appears as a subjectively worded summary of a heritage appraisal and to some degree, also appears to pre-determine a detailed development proposal. Some of the commentary reads as though it comprises a supporting statement for a planning application, which would not be appropriate for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. I recommend instead that a number of bullet points in this Section are deleted and a simple reference is made to the heritage appraisal that has been undertaken. <p>Thus, following the third bullet point add a new bullet point "A heritage appraisal has been undertaken by Border Archaeology and this can be made available by</p>	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>the Parish Council.”</p> <p>Delete bullet points four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten and eleven (“The Heritage...this boundary.”)</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - III Heritage Matters, add new fourth bullet point, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A heritage appraisal has been undertaken by Border Archaeology and this can be made available by the Parish Council.</u> - III Heritage Matters, delete bullet points four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten and eleven as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Heritage Assessment that has been prepared by Border Archaeology notes that: “there is potential for groundworks within the site to reveal buried features and deposits associated with the large enclosure marked on historic mapping to the west of the church, including evidence for the northern arm of the enclosure ditch depicted on historic maps as extending within the SW corner of the site, as well as associated occupation features of possible Saxe Norman date.”This part of the site is proposed to be set aside for use as additional burial space. • The landowners have had prepared draft plans showing how the proposal site might be developed should it be allocated for development in the NP. These have been considered by Border Archaeology (BA) in their Heritage Assessment. • These plans show the proposed new Vicarage situated close to the western boundary wall of the churchyard in the southern half of the site. BA consider that this will inevitably feature as a peripheral element in views of the church as experienced 	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>looking south from within the western half of the adjoining churchyard. The oblique orientation of the new Vicarage as shown on the draft plan, however, and the introduction of new tree and hedge planting along the eastern boundary of the site adjoining the churchyard, should soften the visual impact on the setting of the church. To further reduce the potential visual impact, it has been suggested that the new Vicarage be set back further from the churchyard boundary and that additional tree and hedge planting should be carried out along the full length of this boundary (up to Green Lane).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BA are of the opinion that the proposed development on this site will not have a direct impact on any of the listed monuments within the adjoining churchyard. However, the settings of specific groups of funerary monuments, located in the W and SW portions of the churchyard could potentially be affected by these proposals. The new Vicarage, located close to the W boundary of the churchyard, will evidently feature to varying degrees in views of these groups of monuments looking NW and W across the churchyard. It will be particularly apparent in views looking across the churchyard from the group of five monuments situated NW of the nave and from the Estcourt-Cresswell enclosure and to a lesser degree from the clusters of monuments in the SW corner of the churchyard, from where views towards the new Vicarage will be largely obscured by existing tree cover. The potential visual impact will be lessened by the oblique orientation of the proposed Vicarage house and appropriate tree and hedge screening to further limit views of the new buildings from the churchyard. Particular attention will need to be given to the scale, massing and architectural detailing of both houses (and particularly the new Vicarage) to ensure that they respect the setting of the churchyard and its monuments. • The construction of two new houses on the proposal site will inevitably result in a marked change to the setting of the medieval village. The intention, however, is to allocate the 	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>southernmost portion of the site containing the monument as an extension to the churchyard. This will be separated from the curtilage of the two new houses by a 1.5m high stone boundary wall. The secluded character of the immediate setting of the cross will thus be maintained and it will also be accessible to public view. It is suggested that this could represent an opportunity to conserve the existing fabric of the cross which is in a heavily weathered condition and to insert an appropriate display board describing the history of the monument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BA do not consider that the proposed development will directly impact on views of the Old Vicarage as appreciated from Church Street or the southern portion of the churchyard. However, there is potential for views looking from and towards the rear of the house to be slightly changed as a result of these proposed new houses, in particular the new Vicarage which will be located closest to the rear (NW) boundary of the Old Vicarage garden. However, it should be noted that the new Vicarage will be clearly demarcated from the curtilage of the Old Vicarage by a new boundary wall (1.5m high) and tree screen and separated from such by the proposed churchyard extension. BA suggest that the existing tree and hedge cover along the boundary with the Old Vicarage should be retained and the orientation of the new house specifically designed to further reduce any potential visual impact on the Old Vicarage and its curtilage. ● The proposed removal of the tall Leylandii tree screen along the western boundary of the site will open up views of the church together with the new houses. Historic maps and aerial photographs confirm that the existing tree screen is a late 20th century addition, post 1971. While the opening up of views of the church, which have been concealed by this modern coniferous tree screen for about 40 years, is to be broadly welcomed, it is considered that there should be some replacement deciduous tree planting along this boundary to 	

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>ensure its leafy, secluded character is maintained and to soften views of the two new houses which will be discernible in views from the adjoining recreation ground and more distantly from Court Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal site is located within the historic core of Sherston, in close proximity to the Grade I listed parish church and churchyard, a highly picturesque and historically important locale which probably represents the site of the early medieval settlement of Sherston. However, while the new houses (in particular the new Vicarage) will clearly result in a discernible change to established views of these heritage assets, especially when viewed from the churchyard, it is considered that these impacts can be mitigated through sensitive design and appropriate landscaping measures to minimize the visual intrusion of the new properties. This to include enhanced tree and hedge planting along the boundary with the churchyard and moving the proposed new Vicarage further back from this boundary. 	
RC36	Page 32		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 2 as follows: III Heritage Matters - Delete last sentence of twelfth bullet point ("It should be noted...designation.") as it confuses characteristics with "designations" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - III Heritage Matters, amend twelfth bullet point, as follows: • The SCAS identifies a number of different "key areas of character" within the village. These include "specific key features" in and around the proposal site such as: the aforementioned listed buildings; the wall running down the eastern 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>site boundary of the vicarage; and certain individual trees. It also identifies certain "key areas" deemed worthy of particular consideration such as: the areas fronting the High Street and Court Street. Finally, it identifies a number of "key settings" such as: the Recreation Ground and the existing churchyard. It should be noted, however, that the proposal site is one of only a limited number of places within the defined Conservation Area without any such designation.</p>	
RC37	Page 32		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 2 as follows: Fourteenth bullet point, change fourth line, change to "...of this property <i>is considered to appear</i> more in..." <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - III Heritage Matters, amend fourteenth paragraph, as follows: • One new house (Summerstone) has been constructed on Green Lane since the creation of the CA. This is sited a short distance to the east of the proposal site – immediately opposite the cemetery. This large detached house is set back some distance from the road albeit a garage has been erected at right angles to the road close to the site entrance. <u>The design of this property is considered to appear more in keeping with it's setting and location adjoining the CA and within the AONB.</u> This property has a direct line of sight to the listed church. 	For accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions.
RC38	Page 32		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete last bullet point in the Heritage section, which 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>appears prescriptive</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - III Heritage, delete final paragraph, as follows: • All of the existing stone walls surrounding the site, including the one which forms the western site boundary which is currently partially hidden by the leylandii tree screen, should be retained and/or repaired as necessary. The wall along the western site boundary could be raised in height to the benefit of the CA. 	
RC39	Page 33		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete Development Proposals section <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete 'Development Proposals' section as follows: <p>Development Proposals:</p> <p>See Policy 5 for full details. In summary it is proposed to allocate this site for the following combination of land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land for use as additional burial space (approximately 0.08 hectares). • Land for the erection of up to three dwellings (including a replacement vicarage). 	For clarity and consistency with RC32.
RC40	Page 33		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change part I of Design Brief to "1. <i>The development</i> 	For clarity and consistency with RC32.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p><i>should conserve and where possible, enhance heritage assets. Given this, consideration should be given to the following:</i>"</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design Brief, amend Part I, as follows: <p>I. <u>The development should conserve and where possible, enhance heritage assets. Given this, consideration should be given to the following:</u> When considering the heritage issues relating to the future development of this site particular regard should be had to the need to:</p>	
RC41	Page 34	Page 25, Policy 6	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 6, change wording to "<i>Site 3 (Green Lane/Sandpits Junction), as identified on Proposals Map 9, is allocated for the development of around 4 dwellings. Development should conserve or enhance any heritage assets affected, including the setting of the Sherston Conservation Area. Development should also conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</i>" - Policy 6, delete last paragraph and replace with "<i>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</i>" <p>WILTSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the interest of accuracy and consistency with RC12 additional modification is required to remove reference to the Proposals Map. 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions; and to ensure consistency with RC18.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 6, change text as follows: <p>Housing development is proposed on Site 3 (Green Lane/Sandpits Lane junction), as identified on Proposals Map 9, to include: <u>Site 3 (Green Lane/Sandpits Junction), as identified on Map 9, is allocated for the development of around 4 dwellings. Development should conserve or enhance any heritage assets affected, including the setting of the Sherston Conservation Area. Development should also conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land for about 4 houses. <p>Development will be subject to the following requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A design and layout that protects and preserves the character of the settlement and is consistent with the adjoining Conservation Area and surrounding AONB. <p>All aspects of the development will take place in accordance with a Design Brief that has been prepared for the site (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 3). <u>Development proposals should be supported by a masterplan taking account of the "Development Brief" and the "Design Brief" information set out in the supporting text.</u></p>	
RC42	Page 34		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 3 to below Policy 6 <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the content of Appendix 3 to below Policy 6 as paragraphs of supporting text 	For clarity and consistency with RC41.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC43	Pages 35	Page 25, Policy 6 and Pages 40-43, Appendix 3	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 3 as follows: Delete last bullet point in the Landscape section <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.Landscape, delete the last bullet point as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape issues are not considered to present a significant constraint in this context. 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.
RC44	Page 35		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 3 as follows: 3. Heritage Matters: Delete penultimate bullet point in the Heritage section, which appears to pre-determine the impact of a proposal which has not yet been designed. Delete last bullet point in the Heritage section which appears to comprise a subjective assumption. <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3. Heritage Matters, delete the penultimate and last bullet points as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on the proposal site would not interrupt the existing "long views" of the church when viewed from Green Lane and would not impinge on the curtilage of the churchyard. • As noted above, this site has been allocated for housing development by the Local Planning Authority for several years. This allocation was made well after the first designation of the Conservation Area in 1973. It is 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>assumed therefore that there have not previously been any concerns about the impact of any new build housing development on this site on the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Council has of course recently permitted the erection of a single dwellinghouse and garage on the land immediately abutting the western site boundary of the proposal site. The design and siting of that house being a reasonable template for what might be permitted on this site.</p>	
RC45	Page 35		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 3 as follows: Delete the two Development Proposals sections, one of which refers to another Policy and delete the Other Matters section (which does not provide any clarity, but which refers to the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority) <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delete the two 'Development Proposals' and 'Other Matters' sections as follows: <p>Development Proposals: See Policy 5 for full details. In summary it is proposed to allocate this site for the following combination of land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land for use as additional burial space (approximately 0.08 hectares). • Land for the erection of up to three dwellings (including a replacement vicarage) <p>5. Other Matters: As noted above it is not clear whether this site will be developed by way of the retention of the existing dwelling and the erection of a number of</p>	For clarity and consistency with RC44.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>additional dwellings in the grounds or by way of a complete redevelopment. There is considered to be scope for both options. This is a matter for detailed consideration at a later date by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Development Proposals: See Policy 6 for full details. In summary it is proposed to allocate this site for the erection of up to 4 dwellings. This assumes that a complete redevelopment of the site would most likely take place.</p>	
RC46	Page 35		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the content of Appendix 3 as follows: Change the first part of part I of Design Brief to "<i>I. The development should conserve and where possible, enhance heritage assets. Given this, consideration should be given to the following:</i> TWO BULLET POINTS HERE" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design Brief - change text of 'I' as follows: <p>I. When considering the heritage issues relating to the future development of this site particular regard should be had to the need to: <u>I. The development should conserve and where possible, enhance heritage assets. Given this, consideration should be given to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the design, materials, layout and massing of any development is sympathetic to the adjoining Conservation Area; • Retain as many of the existing trees on the site as possible and encourage new planting where 	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			appropriate.	
RC47	Page 36	Page 25, Policy 7	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 7, change wording to "<i>Proposals to upgrade or replace the existing sheltered accommodation on Anthony Close with a purpose-built care or close care facility will be supported.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 7, change text as follows: <p>Support will be given to the upgrading or replacement of the existing sheltered accommodation on Anthony Close by a purpose-built care or close care facility. <u>Proposals to upgrade or replace the existing sheltered accommodation on Anthony Close with a purpose-built care or close care facility will be supported.</u></p>	For clarity and to meet the Basic Conditions.
RC48	Page 36		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct typo in title to "<i>Anthony Close</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 7, correct typographical error as follows: <p>Anthony Close <u>Close</u></p>	Typographic error.
RC49	Page 37	Pages 26, Policy 8	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 8, change to "<i>The enhancement of inclusive access and crossings...residential areas will be supported, so as to encourage all modes of non-</i> 	For clarity and to improve wording of the Policy.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>vehicular access to these facilities.”</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 8, change text as follows: <p>In line with “Places for Walking” support will be given to the the The enhancement of inclusive access and crossings between the proposed new GP surgery on Site 1, the Sherston Primary School and the Post Office/Stores on the high street as well as key residential areas will be supported, so as to encourage all modes of non-vehicular access to these facilities.</p>	
RC50	Page 37	Page 26, Para 8.4.33	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 8.4.33, line 6, change to “...other means. <i>The Parish Council considers this to comprise a local priority infrastructure project for the use of CIL receipts received by the Parish Council.</i>” <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 8.4.33, change text starting at line 5 as follows: <p>...The Steering Group felt nevertheless that it was still appropriate to seek to secure the provision of such improvements via other means, possibly by way of CIL payments deriving from the development of Site 1. The Parish Council considers this to comprise a local priority infrastructure project for the use of CIL receipts received by the Parish Council. In which case it was felt appropriate to incorporate the following policy in the SNP.</p>	For clarity and consistency with RC55.
RC51	Page 39	Page 27,	EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:	To meet Basic Conditions.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner’s recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner’s report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
		Policy 9	<p>- Policy 9, change wording to “<i>The loss of existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, will be resisted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the open space, buildings or land is surplus to requirements; or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss.</i>”</p> <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <p>- Policy 9, change text as follows:</p> <p><u>The loss of existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, will be resisted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the open space, buildings or land is surplus to requirements; or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss.</u> Planning permission will not be granted for development that would result in the loss of open-air sports facilities where there is a need for the facility to be retained in its current location, or the open area provides an important green space for local residents. Where this is not the case, planning permission will only be granted where there is no need at all for the facility for the purposes of open space, sport or recreation, or where:</p> <p>a. there is a need for the development; and b. there are no alternative non-greenfield sites; and c. the facility can be replaced by either:</p> <p>i. providing an equivalent or improved replacement facility;</p>	Detailed wording of Policy 9 conflicts with and fails to have regard to national policy.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<p>or ii. upgrading an existing facility.</p>	
RC52	Page 39		<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change title of Policy 9 to "<i>Protection of sports facilities</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 9, change title text as follows: Protection of existing open air sports facilities 	For clarity and consistency with RC51.
RC53	Page 40	Pages 28, Policy 10	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 10, change to "<i>The development of Site 4 adjoining the Football Field, as shown on Map 10, for the expansion of existing sports facilities, will be supported.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 10, change the wording as follows: Site 4 (adjoining the Football Field) will be safeguarded for the future expansion of the existing sports facilities. See Proposals Map 10. <u>The development of Site 4 adjoining the Football Field, as shown on Map 10, for the expansion of existing sports facilities, will be supported.</u> 	To meet the Basic Conditions and achieve sustainable development.

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
RC54	Page 41	Page 28, Policy 11	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 11, change to "<i>The development of new/replacement changing rooms and club facilities at the Football Field will be supported.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 11, change text as follows: <p>Support will be given to the erection of new/replacement changing rooms and related sports facilities on the Football Field. <u>The development of new/replacement changing rooms and club facilities at the Football Field will be supported.</u></p>	For clarity and to achieve sustainable development.
RC55	Page 42	Pages 29, Table	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 29, Table, change Comment to "<i>The Parish Council will prioritise such works when determining how to utilise CIL payments received.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 29, Table, change Comment to: <p>It is considered that the funding of such works should be given high priority by Wiltshire Council and the Parish Council when considering how to utilise the CIL payments that will be made for the development of Site I (Policy 4). <u>The Parish Council will prioritise such works when determining how to utilise CIL payments received.</u></p>	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot impose CIL requirements on the Local Planning Authority.
RC56	Page 42	Page 29, Para 8.4.46	<p>EXAMINER'S COMMENTS:</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan cannot impose CIL

APPENDIX 1

Modifications to the draft Sherston Neighbourhood Plan 2006 to 2026 in response to the Examiner's recommendations and to correct errors

Required Modifications Ref No.	Page in examiner's report	Related page / section in SNP	Recommendation and required modifications	Reason for Modifications
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 8.4.46, change to "...determining <i>how any CIL receipts received by the Parish Council should be utilised.</i>" <p>REQUIRED MODIFICATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Para 8.4.46, change text as follows: <p>The SNP has identified the following items as priorities when determining how any CIL receipts <u>received by the</u> should be utilised by either Wiltshire Council or Sherston Parish Council <u>should be utilised.</u></p>	<p>requirements on the Local Planning Authority.</p>