

Fovant Parish Council

3 Jays Folly
Fovant
Wilts SP3 5LG

Telephone: +44 (0)1722 714708

Mr Ian Kemp
Programme Officer
South Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination
36 Campbell Street
Rugby
Warwickshire. CV21 2HY.

Date: 24 July 2011

Dear Sir, **SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION**

Further to our previous submissions on 21 June 2010 and 25 May 2011 (see attached), Fovant Parish Council requests the opportunity to attend the appropriate Hearing Session to make the following representations based on our previous submissions relating to the following issues:

- 1) Designation of Fovant as a Secondary Village; and
- 2) Opportunity for sustainable development within Fovant.

Designation of Fovant as a Secondary Village

Contrary to the statement at Appendix Six of Topic Paper 3, Addendum 2: Sustainable Settlement Strategy, Fovant has just two Basic Facilities which are 1 General Shop and 1 Means of Journey to Work Public Transport. Fovant has no School, nor a separate Post Office.

3.35 of Topic Paper 3, Addendum 2: Sustainable Settlement Strategy, defines a Secondary Village as 'Other settlements with three or four Basic Facilities'.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Fovant fails to meet the stated definition of a Secondary Village and should instead be classified as a Small Village (as evidenced by Chilmark which is also in the Tisbury Community Area, which also has just two Basic Facilities and which is classified as a Small Village).

Opportunity for sustainable development within Fovant

Whilst it is acknowledged that every village must present difficulties for supporting sustainable development, it is submitted that Fovant has multiple limitations which significantly impair the opportunity to support sustainable development. It is submitted that defining Fovant as a Small Village better reflects the lack of opportunity for sustainable development for at least the following reasons:

Although Fovant is one of the larger villages in the Tisbury Community Area, it is submitted that the Core Strategy recognises that it is not size but the opportunity for sustainability that is the key consideration.

Fovant is in an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty, has two Conservation Areas, a Housing Restraint Area and an area of Important Open Space.

Fovant is a ribbon development generally running north-south along steep valleys of tributaries of the Nadder. The Core Strategy recognises that where settlements are linear or dispersed, further development would not necessarily contribute to sustainability objectives.

Historic development has occurred along the tributaries which are considered to be a flood risk. Areas to the north and west of Fovant are also identified as being adjacent an area of Localised Flooding Incidents by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Development to the east and west behind these dwellings on the valley sides has been consistently rejected by the Planning Office and Planning Inspectorate.

The area to the north and to the west of Fovant was identified in the Town and Landscape Analysis as providing an important open countryside separating Fovant from surrounding villages.

Furthermore, Fovant has areas in the Settlement Setting Assessment marked as County Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland.

The existing Housing Policy Boundary appears to recognise the limited opportunity for sustainable growth.

Planning applications for increasing the density of housing towards the centre of the village have also been rejected.

Sites examined for small scale development on the outskirts of the village have been rejected for being dislocated from the remaining basic facilities.

In terms of infrastructure, Fovant has no street lighting, no effective pedestrian walkway facilities, narrow (often single-track lanes), limited capacity to deal with additional sewerage and is often subject to instability in the power supply.

The public bus service provides limited opportunity to travel between Salisbury and Shaftesbury.

There are very few employment opportunities within the village with the vast majority of working residents commuting some distance for employment (both Salisbury and Shaftesbury being over 10 miles away).

There is no school and children normally attend one three schools, each in different Community Areas.

Fovant has a long-established traffic and parking problems within the village, presumably as a result of reliance on cars for transportation to schools, shopping and employment.

For these reasons, the opportunity to provide further significant housing into Fovant whilst maintaining its rural character, co-locating that housing close to the remaining basic facilities is significantly impaired. In particular, it is submitted that there is a real risk that development on the scale proposed would lead to falsely merging or urbanising the village and lead to an excessive reliance on the car, contrary to the objectives of the Core Strategy..

Summary

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the South Wiltshire Core Strategy be amended to correctly designate Fovant as a Small Village.

Yours faithfully,

Andrew Leppard
Chairman, Fovant Parish Council

Wiltshire Council
South West Wiltshire Core Strategy

Public Meeting
Fovant Village Hall
8pm, 26 July 2011

Future Housing Provision

Proposals for Tisbury

Houses proposed: 200

Houses already built or committed: 155

Houses to plan for: 45



Future Housing Provision

- How will the housing be delivered?
 - Strategic allocation
 - 'Natural' growth (infilling)
 - Neighbourhood plans
 - National policy documents

Future Housing Provision

Issues relating to Fovant

- > Village does not meet the Criteria for 'Secondary Village' status
- > Little or no development space for infill remaining within the present Housing Policy Boundary (HPB) line
- > Change in National Policy to remove gardens as 'brown-field spaces'
- > Difficulty with finding suitable land adjacent to the HPB for affordable housing 'exception sites'
- > Planning Inspectorate refusals for multiple new builds east of A30 into AONB, up valley ridges through the village, into Conservation Areas and areas of Special Open Space
- > Barriers to development of the open Countryside and sensitivities relating to Fovant's position in the centre of the West Wiltshire & Cranborne Chase AONB.

Future Housing Provision

Future Development

Some ideas

- > Resist the imposition of mandated Housing No. targets?
- > Opt for 'small village' status to allow infill development within the existing HPB in line with current practice?
- > Identify areas suitable for 'infill' development within the existing HPB (assuming the land owner was agreeable)
- > Consider preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan to identify the type and amount of new development that could be suitable within a 're-defined HPB' (i.e adjacent to existing)
- > Are there areas adjacent to the existing HPB where land-owners could be invited to consider allowing development?

Future Housing Provision

Future Development

Public Questions

Consultation Questionnaire

Chairman's Closing Remarks

Future Housing Provision

Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation

Wiltshire Council is consulting on the number of jobs and homes needed in Wiltshire over the next 15 years. The Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document has been shaped by previous consultations but this is the first time the draft strategy and policies that will manage how Wiltshire develops have been brought together for consideration and comment by the wider community.

The consultation takes place between 13 June and 8 August, 2011

Stages of preparation	Timeline
Draft core strategy preparation and developing draft policy options (involving): -Preparation of topic papers on key policy themes -Development of draft policy options for sustainability appraisal -Targeted consultation on the topic papers (with key stakeholders)	By May 2011
Consultation on emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy, including draft policy options	13 June to 8 August, 2011
Review of consultation feedback and production of the Pre-submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy	August to November 2011
Formal consultation on the Pre-submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy	December 2011
Collation of comments received and finalising the Submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy for Council Approval	February 2012
Examination	Spring/Summer 2012
Adoption	Autumn 2012

Fovant Parish Council

The Parish Clerk,
2 Ladydown View
Tisbury,
Salisbury, Wiltshire,
SP3 6LL. England.

Telephone: +44 (0)1747 870528
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1747 870528
E-mail: ladydown@waitrose.com

Reference: FPC/ SWW.CS.11

Date: 25 May 2011

Spatial Planning,
Economy and Enterprise,
Wiltshire Council,
PO Box 2281
Salisbury,
Wiltshire.
SP2 2HX

Dear Sir,

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY REVIEW

Reference: A. SWCS Focussed Changes as approved by Full Council dated February 2011
B. SWCS Consequential Changes as approved by Full Council dated February 2011
C. SWCS Sustainability Appraisal Update Note dated February 2011
D. Habitats Regulations Assessment Update Note dated February 2011
E. Review of the SWCS Topic Paper dated January 2011

The Parish Council refers to the Wiltshire Council letter dated 11th April 2011, inviting representations from the community relating to the following consultation documents which have been the subject of Review by Wiltshire Council subsequent to the announcement by Government that the Regional Spatial Strategy would be abolished and that the decision-making powers would be transferred back to the Wiltshire Council.

We have reviewed each of the referenced documents relating to the Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy and are pleased to submit our Parish Council's comments on the attached Representation Forms. In summary we have submitted a request for amendment in respect of the following documents:

Part B: SWCS Focussed Changes Document, Page 7, para FOC/03, Core Policy 1
Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 6/7, CS Ref: para 5.3, page 39, Section D
Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 12/13, CS Ref: CON/23 para 5.48, page 61
Part B: SWCS Sustainability Appraisal, Page 10, Core Policy 1: Tisbury Area
Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 12/13, CS Ref: CON/23 para 5.48, page 61
Part B: SWCS Habitats Regulations Assessment Document, Page 6, Appendix 1: Tisbury Area

We trust that this input will be incorporated into the final approved document.

Yours faithfully,

p.p.
Elizabeth Young
Parish Clerk

Ref:
(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

South Wiltshire Core Strategy
Focused Changes

Please return to Wiltshire Council, by 5pm on Friday 27th May 2011

By post to: Spatial Planning, Economy and Enterprise Wiltshire Council, PO Box 2281, Salisbury, SP2 2HX or

By e-mail to: forwardplanning@wiltshire.gov.uk

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title	Mr	
First Name	Nigel	
Last Name	Knowles	
Job Title (where relevant)	Parish Councillor	
Organisation (where relevant)	Fovant Parish Council	
Address Line 1	Thirlmere	
Line 2	Brook Street	
Line 3	Fovant	
Line 4	Wiltshire	
Post Code	SP3 5JB	
Telephone Number	01722 714381	
E-mail Address (where relevant)	Nigel.Knowles@Talktalk.net	

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Fovant Parish Council

3. To which part of the proposed changes to the submission draft Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Focused change	Page 7, para FOC/03, Core Policy 1	Consequential change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have entered No to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is **not**:

(1) Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the proposed changes are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the proposed changes, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not justified/Effective: Research/fact finding: the selection of Fovant as a Secondary Village within the Tisbury Community Area as stated in this part of the Review does not reflect recent infrastructure changes which have occurred in Fovant since the 2009 Core Strategy Review took place, and which have significantly reduced local services and facilities viz:

- 1) Designation of Fovant as a 'Secondary Village' at CON/10, Core Strategy Reference Para 5.3, page 39, Section D, conflicts with Fovant as being listed under Page 39, Section E, Small Villages; noting:
- 2) Infrastructure: Fovant no longer has a School or a Post Office in the village
- 3) Employment: The Fovant Trout Farm is no longer operational & the Post Office is closed
- 4) Communications: BT has de-commissioned the High Street Telephone Box
- 5) Site Specific Allocations DPD: No development site has been identified within the Fovant Housing Boundary and few (if any) areas are available for 'infill' developments taking into account development constraints within 3 x Fovant Conservation Areas (Church Lane, Fovant High St, Fovant Brook Street), the areas designated as Special Open Space, SSIs and AONB, and the village topography.
- 6) Affordable Housing Development: As part of the Fovant Housing Needs Survey carried out in 2008/9, three 'Exception' sites outside the Housing Boundary were considered - however all three sites were dismissed as unsuitable for various, planning, environmental and sustainability reasons.
- 7) One site (outside the Housing Boundary) was identified within the Strategic Land Availability Assessment, as possible for 6-10 units but was not pursued following work under paragraph 5) above and failure to meet all of the Criteria required under .

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed changes legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Core Policy 1, Paragraph FOC/03, Page 7, Tisbury Community Area.
Fovant should not be listed as a Secondary Village as it does not fulfil the necessary criteria for villages listed within the Core Strategy Reference Para 5.3, page 39, Section D; the correct listing is shown at Para 5.3, page 39, Section E (Small Villages)

Line 7; Delete: Fovant (from the list of Secondary villages considered suitable for primary growth)

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

There is a need to identify and explain to the Wiltshire Council Strategy Planning Department the topographical constraints as they apply to future development within Fovant. Fovant is a linear village which follows the Fovant Brook watercourse to the River Nadder – the village High St lies at the bottom of steep sided valley walls along its length.

Additionally, there are further constraints relating to the three Conservation Areas, and the Important Area of Open Space, Housing Restraint Area and the existing Housing Policy Boundary.

Moreover, the opportunities for infill development are extremely limited taking into account past development within the HPB throughout the village, the lack of brown-field sites and the change in National Government Policy with regard to 'back-land' development into residential garden space.

Several applications for developments for Fovant have in the past been the subject of Planning Enquiries, all of which were turned down.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:



Date:

25 May 2011

Ref:
(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

South Wiltshire Core Strategy
 Consequential Changes

Please return to Wiltshire Council, by 5pm on Friday 27th May 2011

By post to: Spatial Planning, Economy and Enterprise Wiltshire Council, PO Box 2281, Salisbury, SP2 2HX or

By e-mail to: forwardplanning@wiltshire.gov.uk

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title	Mr	
First Name	Nigel	
Last Name	Knowles	
Job Title (where relevant)	Parish Councillor	
Organisation (where relevant)	Fovant Parish Council	
Address Line 1	Thirlmere	
Line 2	Brook Street	
Line 3	Fovant	
Line 4	Wiltshire	
Post Code	SP3 5JB	
Telephone Number	01722 714381	
E-mail Address (where relevant)	Nigel.Knowles@Talktalk.net	

Fovant Parish Council

The Parish Clerk,
2 Ladydown View
Tisbury,
Salisbury, Wiltshire,
SP3 6LL. England.

Telephone: +44 (0)1747 870528
Facsimile: +44 (0) 1747 870528
E-mail: ladydown@waitrose.com

Reference: FPC/ SWW.CS.11

Date: 25 May 2011

Spatial Planning,
Economy and Enterprise,
Wiltshire Council,
PO Box 2281
Salisbury,
Wiltshire.
SP2 2HX

Dear Sir,

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY REVIEW

- Reference:
- A. SWCS Focussed Changes as approved by Full Council dated February 2011
 - B. SWCS Consequential Changes as approved by Full Council dated February 2011
 - C. SWCS Sustainability Appraisal Update Note dated February 2011
 - D. Habitats Regulations Assessment Update Note dated February 2011
 - E. Review of the SWCS Topic Paper dated January 2011


The Parish Council refers to the Wiltshire Council letter dated 11th April 2011, inviting representations from the community relating to the following consultation documents which have been the subject of Review by Wiltshire Council subsequent to the announcement by Government that the Regional Spatial Strategy would be abolished and that the decision-making powers would be transferred back to the Wiltshire Council.

We have reviewed each of the referenced documents relating to the Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy and are pleased to submit our Parish Council's comments on the attached Representation Forms. In summary we have submitted a request for amendment in respect of the following documents:

- Part B: SWCS Focussed Changes Document, Page 7, para FOC/03, Core Policy 1
- Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 6/7, CS Ref: para 5.3, page 39, Section D
- Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 12/13, CS Ref: CON/23 para 5.48, page 61
- Part B: SWCS Sustainability Appraisal, Page 10, Core Policy 1: Tisbury Area
- Part B: SWCS Consequential Changes Document, Pages 12/13, CS Ref: CON/23 para 5.48, page 61
- Part B: SWCS Habitats Regulations Assessment Document, Page 6, Appendix 1: Tisbury Area

We trust that this input will be incorporated into the final approved document.

Yours faithfully,


p.p.
Elizabeth Young
Parish Clerk

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Fovant Parish Council

3. To which part of the proposed changes to the submission draft Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Focused change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consequential changes	<input type="checkbox"/> Pages 6/7, CS Ref: para 5.3, page 39, Section D	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	---------------	--------------------------

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have entered No to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is **not**:

(1) Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the proposed changes are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the proposed changes, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not justified/Effective: Conflict within document/Research/fact finding: the selection of Fovant as a Secondary Village within the Tisbury Community Area as stated in this Document at Section D conflicts with the listing at Section E.

The Section D listing does not reflect recent infrastructure changes which have occurred in Fovant since the 2009 Core Strategy Review took place, and which have significantly reduced local services and facilities viz:

- 1) Designation of Fovant as a 'Secondary Village' at CON/10, Core Strategy Reference Para 5.3, page 39, Section D, conflicts with Fovant as being listed under Page 39, Section E, Small Villages; noting:
 - a. Infrastructure: Fovant no longer has a School or a Post Office in the village
 - b. Employment: The Fovant Trout Farm is no longer operational & the Post Office is closed
 - c. Communications: BT has de-commissioned the High Street Telephone Box

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed changes legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Document: Consequential Changes: CON/10, Core Strategy Reference Para 5.3, page 39, Section D

Delete: Fovant (from the list of Secondary villages)

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

There is a need to identify and explain to the Wiltshire Council Strategy Planning Department the infrastructure changes which mitigates against major primary development within Fovant due to the loss of essential village services and facilities which requires access to and reliance upon the Local Service Centre or other Secondary Villages.

Also a need to describe the topographical constraints as they apply to future development within Fovant. Fovant is a linear village which follows the Fovant Brook watercourse to the River Nadder – the village High St lies at the bottom of steep sided valley walls along its length.

Additionally, there are further constraints relating to the three Conservation Areas, and the Important Area of Open Space, Housing Restraint Area and the existing Housing Policy Boundary.

Several applications for developments for Fovant have in the past been the subject of Planning Enquiries, all of which were turned down.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:



Date:

25 May 2011

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Fovant Parish Council

3. To which part of the proposed changes to the submission draft Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Focused change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consequential changes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pages 12/13, CS Ref: CON/23 para 5.48, page 61	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--	---------------	--------------------------

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is **not**:

(1) Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the proposed changes are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the proposed changes, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Clarification and Confirmation Required – definition of 'Affordable Housing'

Confirm that the 'Affordable Housing' referred to under this Section relates to:

Social Housing to be provided (whether purchase, part-purchase or rent) as a proportion of the total number of units being constructed by a Developer within the village HPB accordance with an approved planning permission authorised by Wiltshire Council (and which housing is then allocated by reference to the Wiltshire Council's Housing Dept County-wide Waiting List)

And not;

Affordable Housing to be provided by Housing Associations (or similar) available for rent only for the benefit of the immediate local community normally built on land at an 'Exceptions Site' outside the village HPB

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed changes legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Document: Consequential Changes: CON/23, Core Strategy Reference Para 5.48, page 61

Insert definition for 'affordable housing'

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

There is a need to identify and explain what exactly is meant by the definition of Affordable Housing as currently, there is much confusion about what is actually meant by the term.

Where Local Communities are designated as 'Small Villages' they have a need to know what type of 'affordable housing' is of most benefit to the local community when considering development plans for their community.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:



Date:

25 May 2011

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Fovant Parish Council

3. To which part of the proposed changes to the submission draft Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Focused change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal	<input type="checkbox"/> Page 10, Core Policy 1: Tisbury Area	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---	---------------	--------------------------

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have entered No to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is **not**:

(1) Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the proposed changes are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the proposed changes, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not justified/Effective: Research/fact finding: the selection of Fovant as a Secondary Village within the Tisbury Community Area as stated in this Document is not justified as inclusion in the listing does not reflect recent infrastructure changes which have occurred in Fovant since the 2009 Core Strategy Review took place, and which have significantly reduced local services and facilities viz:

- a. Infrastructure: Fovant no longer has a School or a Post Office in the village
- b. Employment: The Fovant Trout Farm is no longer operational & the Post Office is closed
- c. Communications: BT has de-commissioned the High Street Telephone Box

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed changes legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Document: Sustainability Appraisal: Page 10, Core Policy 1, Tisbury Community Area,

Delete: Fovant (from the list of Secondary villages)

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

There is a need to identify and explain to the Wiltshire Council Strategy Planning Department the infrastructure changes which mitigates against major primary development within Fovant due to the loss of essential village services and facilities which requires access to and reliance upon the Local Service Centre or other Secondary Villages.

Also a need to describe the topographical constraints as they apply to future development within Fovant. Fovant is a linear village which follows the Fovant Brook watercourse to the River Nadder – the village High St lies at the bottom of steep sided valley walls along its length.

Additionally, there are further constraints relating to the three Conservation Areas, and the Important Area of Open Space, Housing Restraint Area and the existing Housing Policy Boundary.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:



Date:

25 May 2011

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Fovant Parish Council

3. To which part of the proposed changes to the submission draft Core Strategy does this representation relate?

Focused change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Habitats Regulations Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page 6, Appendix 1: Tisbury Area	Proposals Map	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If you have entered No to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Qu 6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is **unsound** because it is **not**:

(1) Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the proposed changes are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the proposed changes, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Not justified/Effective: Research/fact finding: the selection of Fovant as a Secondary Village within the Tisbury Community Area as stated in this Document is not justified as inclusion in the listing does not reflect recent infrastructure changes which have occurred in Fovant since the 2009 Core Strategy Review took place, and which have significantly reduced local services and facilities viz:

- a. Infrastructure: Fovant no longer has a School or a Post Office in the village
- b. Employment: The Fovant Trout Farm is no longer operational & the Post Office is closed
- c. Communications: BT has de-commissioned the High Street Telephone Box

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed changes legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Document: Sustainability Appraisal: Page 6, Appendix 1, Tisbury Community Area,

Delete: Fovant (from the list of Secondary villages)

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

There is a need to identify and explain to the Wiltshire Council Strategy Planning Department the infrastructure changes which mitigates against major primary development within Fovant due to the loss of essential village services and facilities which requires access to and reliance upon the Local Service Centre or other Secondary Villages.

Also a need to describe the topographical constraints as they apply to future development within Fovant. Fovant is a linear village which follows the Fovant Brook watercourse to the River Nadder – the village High St lies at the bottom of steep sided valley walls along its length.

Additionally, there are further constraints relating to the three Conservation Areas, and the Important Area of Open Space, Housing Restraint Area and the existing Housing Policy Boundary.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:



Date:

25 May 2011

SOUTH WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

Consultation of the Proposed Changes following the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Representation on the proposed changes from Councillor Bridget Wayman, Nadder & East Knoyle Division, and Chairman of the South West Wiltshire Area Board.

I have made representations to the EiP in respect of the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy about growth in the rural areas outside the Local Service Centres being targeted towards the Secondary Villages with some infill and exception development to be permitted in Small Villages. Other Settlements and the Countryside were described as, "often in remote rural areas and with no facilities of their own. Functionally, they are almost completely reliant on local service centres for day-to-day needs. As such they represent the most unsustainable location for new growth and hence new development will not be permitted in these villages. To reflect this any housing policy boundaries for settlements not listed in (A) to (E) or housing restraint areas currently located within the Local Plan are removed by this Strategy, and hence any new development will no longer be appropriate in these locations."

I made representations to the Inspector to the effect that some of the smaller villages and hamlets did wish to see some small amounts of development in order to prevent the villages from atrophying; that many of those settlements were not in remote rural areas and often had some facilities (such as village shops) which they considered vital to the life of the village.

The housing policy boundaries and housing restraint areas have since been reinstated which will permit some small amount of development in these smaller settlements to continue. A resolution was passed in Council on 10th November, 2009, "That Council agrees to undertake a full review including targeted consultation with parish councils on the application of the Housing Policy Boundaries and Housing Restraint Areas in the smaller settlements in South Wiltshire and equivalent across Wiltshire as part of the development of the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy, which will ensure a consistent approach to infill development across Wiltshire and allow local views on this issue to be sought". This review is still awaited.

Topic Paper 20, Review of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, January 2011, discusses "reviewing growth levels in rural areas" and states that,

Para 9.15 - "one of the issues that emerged through the pre-submission consultation was that the local communities were keen to ensure some growth within the smaller rural settlements. As such there was significant objection to the wholesale removal of existing settlement boundaries as proposed in the submission draft".

9.16 - "As discussed at the EiP into the SWCS, there was concern that the proposed removal of permissive housing policies in lower tier settlements within the Core Strategy might have a negative impact on their sustainability. That is, that the historic low levels of infilling that the Local Plan policies have delivered is important to provide local housing opportunities, support local services and support the vitality of settlements. It is important to emphasise that this is not related to the need for housing allocations, but rather an acknowledgement that many smaller settlements have an appetite for modest growth. There is no evidence that these communities wish to see the stagnation of these settlements. These policies have therefore been saved for

the time being, as reflected in the revised Core Policy 1 (CP1) put forward by the Council to the Inspector during the formal hearing sessions of the EiP.”

9.17 - “It is considered important that the Core Strategy makes provision for new housing in rural areas, thus providing a flexible strategic policy framework. This approach would ensure that communities can grow irrespective of whether this is through neighbourhood plans or community right to build.”

9.18 – “While the community have expressed that they would wish to see some development within some of the smaller villages to keep the villages from stagnating, they have emphasised that this should be modest and in keeping with the character of the settlements. In order to identify a reasonable level of housing and given the community views that the levels of growth that have been experienced in the recent past should continue, it is appropriate to base the number of houses that may be delivered through this source on the historic trends. This identifies average historic delivery of around 55 dwellings per year ... on small windfall sites (brownfield sites of under 10 dwellings). Based on this evidence it is proposed that the Core Strategy be revised to allow for 1100 houses in the plan period in the rural areas outside of the urban areas of Salisbury, Wilton, Amesbury and the Local Service Centres of Mere, Tisbury and Downton.”

9.19 – “It would be wrong to allocate this on a simple pro rata basis, as not all community areas are the same or have the same number of secondary settlements that are capable of accommodating modest growth. Table 3 shows each community area and the secondary settlements within them, as identified within Policy CP1 within the Core Strategy.”

Table 3 identifies 15 secondary settlements of which 3 (Broad Chalke, Dinton and Great Wishford) fall within the Wilton community area, 3 (Fovant Hindon and Ludwell) fall within the Tisbury community area, and 0 in the Mere community area.

9.20 – “Therefore, the distribution of these homes in each community area is logically made on the basis of the number of secondary settlements each has. This equates to an average of about 73 dwellings per settlement over the lifetime of the plan, or 3 homes per year.”

9.21 – **“However, there is no assumption that these settlements should accommodate 73 dwellings over the lifetime of the plan, as this is just an indication of the level of housing that each community area could reasonably accommodate. [My emphasis]** There are also a number of smaller villages that CP1 identifies that may be capable of accommodating some development, and development in these settlements would contribute towards delivery of the figure for the community area. No specific allowance is made for these smaller settlements but it is considered that any development could be accommodated within the rural allowance of 1,100.”

Table 4 shows the number of secondary settlements in each community area and distribution of numbers:

Wilton CA has 3 settlements, multiplied by 73 dwellings, to give 220 dwellings
Tisbury CA has 3 settlements, multiplied by 73 dwellings, to give 220 dwellings
Mere CA has 0 settlements which gives 0 dwellings.

9.22 – “This distribution is a realistic reflection of past windfall trends and a direct reflection of the stated aim of many settlements to have some modest growth to avoid stagnation. Due to its

