

# 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):<br>-Preparation of topic papers on key policy themes<br>-Development of draft policy options for sustainability appraisal<br>-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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 27<sup>th</sup> 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<br>(where relevant)      | Parish Councillor          |  |
| Organisation<br>(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<br>(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,<br>para FOC/03,<br>Core Policy 1 | Consequential change |  | Proposals Map |  |
|----------------|--|----------------------|--|---------------|--|

4. Do you consider the change proposed is :

|                         |     |  |    |   |
|-------------------------|-----|--|----|---|
| 4.(1) Legally compliant | Yes |  | No |   |
| 4.(2) Sound             | Yes |  | No | √ |

*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                       | √ |
| (2) Effective                       | √ |
| (3) Consistent with national policy |   |

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 27<sup>th</sup> 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\*

*\*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.*

### 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

|                                    |                            |  |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Title                              | Mr                         |  |
| First Name                         | Nigel                      |  |
| Last Name                          | Knowles                    |  |
| Job Title<br>(where relevant)      | Parish Councillor          |  |
| Organisation<br>(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<br>(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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 type="checkbox"/> | Pages 12/13, CS<br>Ref: CON/23<br>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 10<sup>th</sup> 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

nature at this point it is not possible to be certain over where the windfall proposals may come forward. Therefore, while it is valid to make a reasonable allowance for housing to facilitate these aspirations, the Core Strategy is a strategic document and it is not appropriate for it to be spatially distributed down to individual settlement level. Rather the SWCS should set a positive, facilitating framework to allow these goals to be delivered. In time, subject to the passage of the Localism Bill, this may include communities pursuing a neighbourhood plan or right to build scheme.”

**Comment:** It is reassuring to read the acknowledgement that many smaller settlements wish to see some modest growth and that this has now been reflected in Core Policy 1 by the removal of “New housing will not be permitted outside the settlements in Core Policy 1”.

However, even though the commentary lists the secondary settlements in each community area and allocates the average figure of 73 dwellings per settlement and then goes on to say that “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”, this is not reflected in the Key Focussed Changes to SWCS. In each community area the secondary villages are still listed with the notation that limited growth will be appropriate, and goes on to specify that infill development will be permitted in certain specified Small villages. Further, at the end of the changes to Core Policy 1, it states that, “Apart from the housing numbers attached to Local Service Centres, development will be focussed on the Secondary Villages in each Community Area”, which seems to contradict the observation in Topic Paper 20 that “there is no assumption that these settlements [the secondary settlements] should accommodate 73 dwellings over the lifetime of the plan”.

It is, therefore, most likely that any significant development will be required to be focussed on the secondary villages. In the Tisbury Community Area there are only 3 Secondary Villages and the average number is 73 dwellings per Secondary Village. Wilton Community Area is the same. (Mere CA is slightly different not having any secondary villages and 50 house to accommodate.)

**The wording of the changed Core Policy 1 must be altered to reflect that the secondary villages will each not have to accommodate 73 dwellings over the lifetime of the plan.**

Further, it is noted in Table 19: Balance of housing needed compared to revised Core Strategy Allocations, that in the Rest of Tisbury Community Area there have been 29 housing completions, 21 commitments, a total of 50, leaving 170 dwellings to find out of a total allocation of 220 over the course of the plan period. The 50 completed and committed is 22.7% of the total and indicates that it is hard to find suitable sites in the community area to accommodate the allocated level and it must be concluded that the allocation is too high. The allocation in the Tisbury Community Area should be reduced to reflect that the Secondary Villages have neither the capacity nor the desire to embrace what would be large-scale development in terms of ratio between existing number of dwellings and those proposed. For example, Hindon has approximately 245 dwellings; an increase of 73 dwellings would be an increase of 30%, something that the village does not wish to see given the historic planning and environmental restraints that exist to protect the recognised heritage of the settlement.

Hindon would welcome the opportunity to accommodate some additional housing, particularly affordable housing, but not of the order that would result from the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. The parish would welcome the opportunity presented through neighbourhood planning or community right to build, but considers that the Core Strategy would impose too high a base

line starting point as it has been advised that neighbourhood plans or community right to build can only increase, not decrease, the allocation of housing numbers in the Core Strategy.

**Fovant is the second mentioned secondary settlement. The parish council believes that some development would be possible within its existing Housing Policy Boundary to accommodate infill and other small developments to the benefit of the community, but it does not believe that it could accommodate the housing numbers of the order of 73 dwellings indicated for secondary settlements for very similar reasons as Hindon. Fovant has 297 dwellings at present; an additional 73 dwellings would represent a 25% increase in the size of the village which would not be acceptable.**

**Fovant incorporates an Important Area of Important Open Space, a Housing Restraint Area, two Conservation Areas, as well as being located within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CC&WWDAONB). The local topography and linear style of the village constrains development and a recent housing needs survey indicated a small requirement for local people. Despite considering three Exception sites adjacent to the Housing Policy Boundary, none were deemed suitable by the planning department.**

Ludwell is the third secondary settlement in the Tisbury Community Area and the parish council has expressed real concern that there might be a possible 73 dwellings allocated to the village. Ludwell currently has 210 dwellings. An increase of 73 dwellings would equate to an increase of 35% in the size of the settlement. As with Fovant and Hindon, this would be an unacceptable level of increase.

The parish council accepts and would welcome some additional housing, but are of the opinion that a more modest number of 12 dwellings should be allocated to the village as affordable housing. Ludwell is a small settlement with very limited facilities which can only be reached by car or on foot along a very narrow stretch of the main A30 with little or no pavement, making the walking journey hazardous for pedestrians. There is a major development of 700 houses only 3 miles away on the eastern fringe of the local town of Shaftesbury which is likely to increase traffic using the A30 to Salisbury or the railway station in Tisbury. As with Hindon and Fovant, Ludwell lies within the CC&WWDAONB and the AONB and the proximity of Win Green has been a major criteria in denying planning permission by the planning authority.

When the Regional Spatial Strategy imposed the housing numbers for South Wiltshire, it was felt by many communities that they had little or no option but to accept the numbers imposed upon them when the Core Strategy was drafted. However, now that the RSS has been abolished and Wiltshire Council has revised and reduced the numbers, the secondary settlements in the Tisbury Community Area, all of which are some considerable distance from any major strategic town or city, have wished to make the observations that they cannot accommodate the numbers of new dwellings suggested.

The total originally allocated to the rest of the Tisbury Community Area was 270, 90 per secondary settlement, to which they objected but felt powerless to refute. Now the total number has been reduced to 220, or 73 per secondary settlement, this is still regarded as too high, and due consideration should now be given to their objections regarding sustainability and overdevelopment given that this might represent an increase in the settlement size of between 25-30%. If the numbers were reduced to a more acceptable level with other tertiary settlements taking a small number of infill and exception site housing, the parishes would be more accommodating, especially with the opportunities that will arise from neighbourhood plans and

community right to build. In other words, they would wish to determine the levels of new housing themselves, not have it imposed by the Core Strategy. Historically, development in the secondary villages in the Tisbury Community Area has been very low, as can be seen from Topic Paper 20, Table 19.

Topic Paper 20, Table 19, shows that the number of completions and commitments in the Rest of the Tisbury Community Area is 50, which is 22.7% of the revised total of 220 dwellings. Comparing this with the completions and commitments in the Rest of the Wilton Community Area (70%), the Rest of the Southern Community Area (40%) and the Rest of the Mere Community Area (46%), would confirm the suggestion that there is very little scope or opportunity of the order put forward in the Key Focussed Changes to the South Wiltshire Core Strategy. The 220 should be significantly reduced.

If, for example, the completion and commitment rate of the Rest of the Southern Community Area of 40% is applied to the Rest of the Tisbury Community Area, a total of 125 dwellings would be a more acceptable number. Taking the completion and commitment total of 50, would leave 75 dwellings to find, or approximately 25 per secondary settlement over the rest of the Core Strategy period. If the Rest of the Wilton Community Area rate of 70% completions and commitments is applied, i.e. 50 dwellings equals 70% , then the total number of dwellings for the Rest of the Tisbury Community Area would be 72 dwellings, leaving 22 still to find, or approximately 7.5 per secondary settlement. This would suggest that the appropriate number of dwellings to be allocated to the Rest of the Tisbury Community Area should be in the region of 75 to 125 dwellings. Taking into account that there have been 50 completions and commitments, this would leave a balance of between 25 and 75 dwellings to find which would be a far more acceptable number and one which would be much more easily absorbed into these small secondary settlements and the smaller villages.

With the future ability for parishes to produce their own neighbourhood plans and the community right to build, as being proposed by the Localism Bill, there will then be the opportunity for all parishes to consider whether they want additional housing in their villages to provide additional affordable housing and/or key worker housing to ensure the sustainability of the communities and to support and balance the ageing populations in those communities. Neighbourhood plans and the community right to build are all about communities supporting development, not blocking it, and support can only come if the numbers of dwellings proposed in the Core Strategy are set at an acceptable level in the first place.

Bridget Wayman  
27<sup>th</sup> May, 2011.

Ref:  
(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

South Wiltshire Core Strategy

Please return to Wiltshire Council, by 5pm on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009

By post to: Planning Office, Spatial Planning South Team, 61 Wyndham Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP2 7NN or

By e-mail to: james.sutton@wiltshire.gov.uk

By fax to: 01722 434 247

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\***

*\*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.*

**2. Agent's Details (if applicable)**

Title

First Name

Last Name

Job Title

(where relevant)

Organisation

(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(where relevant)

---

---

**Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

---

Name or Organisation : South West Wiltshire Area Board

3. To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the DPD is :

|                         |     |                                |    |                                |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|
| 4.(1) Legally compliant | Yes | <input type="text" value="x"/> | No | <input type="text"/>           |
| 4.(2) Sound             | Yes | <input type="text"/>           | No | <input type="text" value="x"/> |

*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 type="text" value="x"/> |
| (2) Effective                       | <input type="text"/>           |
| (3) Consistent with national policy | <input type="text"/>           |

6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.  
If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The DPD is unsound for the reasons given on the attached sheet.

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

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD 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.

(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:

**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:

Sheet attached

**South Wiltshire Core Strategy – South West Wiltshire Area Board Submission**

| Comment  | Reference                               |
|--|---|
| <p>1. New Housing will not be permitted outside the settlements named in Core Policy 1 and thus the Housing Restraint Areas in Appendix F are deleted but it is not clear how the conclusions were reached to remove the policies and Housing Restraint Areas from so many villages when this and previous consultations found that many villages wished to see limited development permitted in addition to 100% affordable housing schemes (as stated in Core Policy 3):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. to address the need for more appropriate housing particularly for key workers and local people</li> <li>b. to lessen the pressure on the larger settlement</li> <li>c. to sustain the local rural economy</li> <li>d. to reduce the need to travel to work, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 13</li> <li>e. to create a balanced community and service the needs of an aging population.</li> </ol> <p>It is felt that the parish councils of rural villages ought to be able to identify in their areas suitable sites for appropriate small scale housing, not necessarily within the Housing Restraint Areas, based on need. Many villages no longer have any suitable sites within the Housing Restraint Areas and it may not always be necessary or appropriate to provide just 100% affordable housing. However, great care must be taken in not permitting larger scale development but small scale development should be permitted to help prevent rural villages from atrophy.</p> <p>It is also contended that the selection of the secondary villages and small villages is unsound. While many of the small villages do not meet the criteria for the secondary villages, if grouped together they are often mutually supportive. For example, one village may have a school but not a shop and is designated as a small village, yet it is dependant on children attending that school from other villages to keep it viable, whereas another village close by has the shop which supports the village with the school. Some small developments, therefore, may be necessary in all those villages in order to help maintain the services which they enjoy mutually and if we are to stop the out-migration of younger people from the villages we not only have to ensure that there are jobs in the rural economy but also that the services are there to cater for them.</p> | <p>CP 1 para 5.17</p> <p>Appendix F</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>2. Strategic Objective 2 states, under Desired Outcomes,:</p> <p>(Bullet point 2) More modest growth proportionate to the size of the settlement will have been delivered in the local centres of Mere, Downton, Wilton and Tisbury.</p> <p>(Bullet point 6) The regeneration of UK Land Forces HQ in Wilton with a significant number of new homes matched by employment opportunities will have taken place</p> <p><b>Core Policy 1</b> - The Settlement Strategy and distribution of growth in south Wiltshire, contains:<br/> Wilton Community Area<br/> <i>Planned Growth:</i><br/> Wilton Local Service Centre: 620 homes, 3ha of employment land<br/> Rest of Wilton Community Area: 950 homes</p> <p>In Chapter 7, Applying the Spatial Strategy to the Wilton Community Area, para 7.10 specifies that 1,570 new homes and 3 ha of employment land will be provided to meet the needs of the Wilton Community Area. UKLF is specified as a strategic site to provide 450 dwellings and 3 ha of employment land.</p> <p>It is not clear from the documents whether the 450 dwellings on UKLF are part of the 620 homes to be provided in the Wilton Local Service Centre allocation or from the Rest of Wilton Community Area allocation of 950 homes. It is unlikely that the Secondary Villages of Broad Chalke, Dinton and Great Wishford can accommodate 950 dwellings and, even if the UKLF allocation is part of the allocation, it is still a high number, 500, for those secondary villages remaining. Any other minor development in the small villages will have very little impact on the large total.</p> <p>It must be made clearer in the Core Strategy document how the 1,570 new homes will be allocated. It is too high a number to be left so vague when the secondary villages and Wilton itself have limited scope for development.</p> <p>It is questioned whether 3 ha are a sufficient allowance to create 1,200 jobs on the Wilton UKLF Site?</p> | <p>4.3</p> <p>5.17</p> <p>7.10</p> <p>7.10</p> |
| <p>3. Strategic Objective 5, and relevant Core Policies, make no reference to Village Design Statements. They should be given due recognition in the planning process and be included in the bullet point, "Community produced strategies such as community and parish plans <i>and Village Design Statements.</i>"</p>  | <p>1.13</p>                                    |
| <p>4. <u>Cross Border Relationships</u>. No mention is made of the relationship between Tisbury and North Dorset and Shaftesbury. Tisbury and Mere are both within the school catchment areas of Shaftesbury and Gillingham. With the expansion of Shaftesbury (750 houses u/c) there is concern that the railway station in Tisbury will be used more by Shaftesbury residents travelling east and Gillingham station for residents travelling west; both stations are already at capacity in terms of parking facilities and both stations are used by residents in the Tisbury and Mere Community Areas. While Gillingham is in Dorset, we appreciate that there may be little that can be done to influence parking provision there but as Tisbury is in Wiltshire greater influence must be used to ensure proper provision is made in that village. In Tisbury this will also have a knock-on effect on parking for the rest of the village and consideration must be given for addressing this problem in the very near future.</p>   | <p>2.7</p>                                     |
| <p>5. It is felt that the Tackling Local Needs section does not truly reflect the issues within rural settlements. Agriculture is a huge industry, likely to rise due to the evidence that the land is for food production which will create a need for small developments in smaller villages. It was felt that the agricultural industry and need for rural workers is not recognised sufficiently in the document. However, it is noted with satisfaction that the document acknowledges that half of the 6,000 businesses in South Wiltshire are located away from major settlements.</p>  | <p>3.4 (g)</p>                                 |

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| <p>6. Within the Tackling Local Needs section, Paragraph 2 of Retailing outside of Salisbury states: "The local centres of Downton, Mere and Tisbury ... have low vacancy rates and do not appear too vulnerable". This is incorrect in relation to Mere where a number of shops have closed and the premises have changed use which hides the vulnerability of the retail market in the village despite valiant attempts by the parish council to resist changes of use. It is also the case that in Mere the Co-op has purchased a competitor's premises after it closed to prevent any further competition from opening up in the village and although Core Policy 22 - Protection of Services and Community Facilities tries to address any future closures, it seems remarkably similar to previous attempts which failed and makes no provision for the sort of preventative activity currently carried out by the Co-op.</p> | <p>3.7 (b)<br/><br/>12.3</p> |
| <p>7. Core Policy 16 (Meeting Housing Needs in the Mere Community Area) states that no 1-bed affordable housing is needed. This is incorrect. For example, interim results of the Rural Affordable Housing Partnership for Wiltshire &amp; Swindon Housing Needs Survey (Community First, 2009) indicated such a need.</p>  | <p>10.11</p>                 |
| <p>8. Core Policy 22 – Protection of Services and Community facilities, replacing Salisbury District Local Plan Policy PS3, should be given greater emphasis to reflect the public's strong view that facilities and services within smaller settlements should be retained.</p>  | <p>12.3</p>                  |
| <p>9. Paragraphs within the Development Templates for sites around Wilton – UKLF site and Netherhampton – are too repetitious and prescriptive regarding Wilton House Historic Park and Garden thereby giving a disproportionate emphasis to this aspect.</p>   | <p>Appendix A</p>            |
| <p>10. Place Shaping Requirements and Key Delivery Milestones should include, for example, bus lanes from Wilton's Park &amp; Ride into Salisbury and access from the Shopping Village into North Street</p>  | <p>Appendix A</p>            |
| <p>11. It is acknowledged that the strategic sites around Wilton and Netherhampton would put increased burdens on the A36 and A30 road network and far beyond. Solutions to ease these increased burdens must be given high priority when considering any applications for development of the strategic sites.</p>  | <p>Appendix A</p>            |
| <p>12. All forms of rural parking provision must be addressed, in the larger service centres of Wilton, Tisbury and Mere and in the provision of parking spaces provided in new developments. Because rural transport networks are poor, residents are dependent on cars and many households of two adults, or more, require proper provision for parking off-road.</p>   |                              |
| <p>13. The creation and retention of Allotments should be encouraged and has not been sufficiently recognised in the document.</p>  |                              |
| <p>14. It has not been recognised in the document that high speed broadband is a vital service that needs to be installed across South Wiltshire's rural area and that the vibrant, viable and sustainable schools in the South need to be maintained by ensuring that young families are given the opportunity to remain in their villages.</p>  |                              |