



Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan

Submission draft plan

Consultation Statement Regulation 22 (1) (c)
Appendices M - P

May 2018

Wiltshire Council

Information about Wiltshire Council services can be made available on request in other languages including BSL and formats such as **large print** and audio. Please contact the council on **0300 456 0100**, by textphone on 01225 712500 or by email on customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk.

如果有需要我們可以使用其他形式（例如：大字體版本或者錄音帶）或其他語言版本向您提供有關威爾特郡政務會各項服務的資訊，敬請與政務會聯繫，電話：0300 456 0100，文本電話：(01225) 712500，或者發電子郵件至：customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk

يمكن، عند الطلب، الحصول على معلومات حول خدمات مجلس بلدية ويلتشرير وذلك بأشكال (معلومات بخط عريض أو سماعية) ولغات مختلفة. الرجاء الاتصال بمجلس البلدية على الرقم ٠٣٠٠٤٥٦٠١٠٠ أو من خلال الاتصال النصي (تيكست فون) على الرقم ٧١٢٥٠٠ (٠١٢٢٥) أو بالبريد الإلكتروني على العنوان التالي: customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk

ولتشار کونسل (Wiltshire Council) کی سروسز کے بارے میں معلومات دوسری طرزوں میں فراہم کی جاسکتی ہیں (جیسے کہ بڑی چھپائی یا آڈیو) اور درخواست کرنے پر دوسری زبانوں میں فراہم کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ براہ کرم کونسل سے 0300 456 0100 پر رابطہ کریں، ٹیکسٹ فون سے (01225) 712500 پر رابطہ کریں یا customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk پر ای میل بھیجیں۔

Na życzenie udostępniamy informacje na temat usług oferowanych przez władze samorządowe hrabstwa Wiltshire (Wiltshire Council) w innych formatach (takich jak dużym drukiem lub w wersji audio) i w innych językach. Prosimy skontaktować się z władzami samorządowymi pod numerem telefonu 0300 456 0100 lub telefonu tekstowego (01225) 712500 bądź za pośrednictwem poczty elektronicznej na adres: customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk

21 Appendix M - Summary of all the representations related to the site selection process that were received during the Regulation 19 consultation

- 21.1** This appendix provides a summary of the representations received in Plan order. The table includes the unique ID reference numbers ascribed to each consultee. Often a representation from a consultee presented a number of individual points (based on individual sites and/or elements of the Plan) and each of these comments have also been ascribed a unique reference number.
- 21.2** The unique consultee ID and unique reference numbers found in this Appendix are set out as follows:
- 21.3** **Consultee Unique ID** - 7 digit number. In some cases there are two numbers this is when there is both a consultee and agent attributed to a representation.
Comment Unique ID - 3 or 4 digit number. There may be numerous comments from the same consultee.
- 21.4** The list of main issues set out in Section 5 has been generated from the process of analysing every representation and comment received. Rather than respond to every single point made by consultees, the Council has grouped the comments and presented them in plan order. What follows is a summary of the points raised by consultees based upon the areas of the Plan that they commented upon. At the end of each summary is the Council's response to the points made.
- 21.5** The summary of responses presented in Appendix M are as follows:
- 21.6** **Part 1:** Housing Delivery Strategy
Part 2: East Wiltshire Housing Market Area
Part 3: Housing allocation H1.1: Empress Way, Ludgershall
Part 4: Housing allocation H1.2: Underhill Nursery, Market Lavington
Part 5: Housing allocation H1.3 Southcliffe, Market Lavington
Part 6: Housing allocation H1.4: East of Lavington School, Market Lavington
Part 7: North and West Housing Market Area
Part 8: Housing allocation H2.1: Elm Grove Farm, Trowbridge
Part 9: Housing allocation H2.2: Land off the A363 at White Horse Business Park, Trowbridge
Part 10: Housing allocation H2.3: Elizabeth Way, Trowbridge
Part 11: Housing allocation H2.4: Church Lane, Trowbridge
Part 12: Housing allocation H2.5: Upper Studley, Trowbridge
Part 13: Housing allocation H2.6: Southwick Court, Trowbridge
Part 14: Housing allocation H2.7: East of the Dene, Warminster
Part 15: Housing allocation H2.8: Bore Hill Farm, Warminster
Part 16: Housing allocation H2.9: Boreham Road, Warminster
Part 17: Housing allocation H2.10: Barters Farm, Chapmanslade
Part 18: Housing allocation H2.11: The Street, Hullavington
Part 19: Housing allocation H2.12: East of Farrells Field, Yatton Keynell
Part 20: Housing allocation H2.13: Ridgeway Farm, Crudwell
Part 21: Housing allocation H2.14: Court Orchard/ Cassways, Bratton
Part 22: South Housing Market Area
Part 23: Housing allocation H3.1: Netherhampton Road, Salisbury
Part 24: Housing allocation H3.2: Hilltop Way, Salisbury
Part 25: Housing allocation H3.3: North of Netherhampton Road, Salisbury
Part 26: Housing allocation H3.4: Land at Rowbarrow, Salisbury

Part 27: Housing allocation H3.5: Clover Lane, Durrington

Part 28: Housing allocation H3.6: Larkhill Road, Durrington

21.7 **Part 29:** Implementation and Monitoring

21.8 *Other procedural documents supporting the Plan*

Part 30: Sustainability Appraisal

Part 31: Habitats Regulations Assessment

Part 32: Landscape Assessment

Part 33: Viability Assessment

Part 34: Duty to Cooperate Statement

Part 35: Equality Impact Assessment

Table 21.1

Part 1:	Housing delivery strategy, site selection methodology and plan objectives		
No. of comments:	133		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	42 (1118090) 343 (857749) 439 (1124912/1124938) 599 (399075) 715 (1125714/404491) 810 (1120822) 1033 (1124796/1124792) 1094 (162663) 1243 (1122130) 1456 (706891) 1493 (706891) 1768 (556113) 1939 (1131233) 2281 (1132230/1132220) 2320 (1126903) 2392 (903251) 2582 (1133494/389561) 2636 (1133667/1133670) 2649 (983136) 2652 (983136) 2655 (983136) 2704 (977912) 2719 (977912) 2743 (1134431/1134428) 2967 (395940) 2973 (395940) 3005 (840643/646956) 3024 (382216) 3044 (1136406/1136403) 3047 (1136406/1136403) 3059 (389564/389561) 3075 (840359/443671) 3083 (820746/1137249) 3097 (893988) 3157 (817896/817881) 3187 (397159) 3199 (861027/1136403) 3230 (1138546/1133715) 3258 (841197/397761) 3312 (1132626/1126888) 3329 (1138958) 292 (924012) 1822 (1130951) 3085 (1137312/1137310) 3150 (817896)	90 (1119698) 418 (1138628/1103789) 461 (400077) 698 (1125766/1137501) 774 (378123) 924 (1037118/1126480) 1039 (393725) 1095 (1126899/1123010) 1316 (1128412) 1459 (900566/1125375) 1635 (1119095/894742) 1847 (1126111) 2083 (556573/556956) 2282 (1132230/1132220) 2357 (1132344/825048) 2398 (1132626/1126961) 2583 (1133494/389561) 2641 (824512/901379) 2650 (983136) 2653 (983136) 2697 (1134169) 2706 (977912) 2731 (1134308/1134306) 2893 (979508) 2971 (395940) 2974 (395940) 3008 (998345/556489) 3035 (1136406/1136403) 3045 (1136406/1136403) 3048 (1136406/1136403) 3060 (389564/389561) 3076 (840359/443671) 3084 (1137312/1137310) 3145 (1138002/1138006) 3158 (1138132/1126888) 3197 (861027/1136403) 3213 (1138508) 3256 (841197/397761) 3288 (1138628/1103789) 3320 (1138930) 41 (1118090) 490 (1125019) 2388 (390498) 3172 (449270)	142 (854597) 419 (1122982) 583 (393636) 714 (1125714/404491) 785 (378123) 925 (1037118/1126480) 1043 (393725) 1169 (1126846) 1450 (706891) 1480 (706891) 1641 (403792) 1848 (1126111) 2084 (556573/556956) 2283 (1132230/1132220) 2362 (1132344/825048) 2442 (449233/1122261) 2584 (1133494/389561) 2644 (1113871/1133715) 2651 (983136) 2654 (983136) 2703 (977912) 2708 (977912) 2739 (1134382/404491) 2966 (1135954/556489) 2972 (395940) 3002 (998345/1136047) 3023 (382216) 3043 (900160/900154) 3046 (1136406/1136403) 3058 (389564/389561) 3071 (1100941/404491) 3079 (840359/443671) 3096 (397800/1138537) 3151 (817896/817881) 3171 (449270) 3198 (861027/1136403) 3214 (1138508) 3257 (841197/397761) 3289 (1138628/1103789) 3322 (1138930) 134 (1024488) 1092 (1126886/1126888) 2715 (977912) 3173 (449270)

21.9 We received 133 representations on **the housing delivery strategy, site selection methodology and plan objectives**. The comments raised were varied, but in summary the issues emanating from the representations related to the points below. These have been split into subheadings but it should be noted that many of these issues are interlinked:

21.10 Conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and NPPF

- The Objectively Assessed Needs of the County (as set out in the WCS⁽³³⁾) are not being met in accordance with paragraphs 14 and 47 of the Framework. A 5% uplift should be applied.
- The Plan does not take into account the Wiltshire Core Strategy Partial review or new Strategic Housing Market Area evidence therefore it may be out of date quickly. It is using out of date housing targets.
- The housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy should not be seen as a minimum, neither should they be seen as a ceiling for development through the plan period. Potential under delivery on allocated sites in the Core Strategy and made neighbourhood plans should be addressed in the Housing Site Allocations Plan through the identification of more sites.
- The Plan should cover a longer time frame of at least 10 years.
- The plan should also consider allocating sites for employment development as the Wiltshire Core Strategy requires both. It should also consider sites for older person's accommodation.
- The Plan should be supported by the Wiltshire Green Infrastructure Strategy which is as yet incomplete.

21.11 Flexibility or rigidity of the Plan and site selection process:

- The methodology employed for allocating sites across the Housing Market Areas is unduly rigid and a more flexible approach should be taken to meeting indicative housing needs across the County.
- Housing sites should be identified at sustainable locations in more areas, not just the identified 'areas of search'. The Plan should not exclude sustainable sites and land within areas of search where the indicative housing need has already been met.
- Suitable sites should be considered in any locations that are in line with the Core Strategy's spatial strategy.
- The Plan should also consider sites outside of the SHLAA/SHELAA.
- Where areas are constrained consideration should be given to providing the housing requirement elsewhere in the wider HMA, for example, meeting some of the housing requirement for Trowbridge in the surrounding large villages.
- Reserve sites should be included.
- The capacity of each allocation should not be treated as absolute.
- Smaller sites should be considered to build in more flexibility.

21.12 Strategic approach to the distribution of sites

- In each HMA there were responses that called for more development in some areas and less development in others and which questioned the way that housing requirements were rigidly applied to community areas and settlements.
- A review of the Green Belt should be carried out.
- Other towns in the North and West HMA should meet housing requirements for Trowbridge, which is constrained.

33 The evidence to support the Wiltshire Core Strategy set the OAN as 44,000 homes to be delivered from 2006-2026. However, the indicative requirement to be delivered by the Core Strategy is 42,000

- Sites should be allocated in South Wiltshire to meet unmet housing need in the New Forest National Park.
- Sites should be allocated to meet unmet need in Swindon.
- Sites should be allocated in Chippenham.
- Land adjoining Shaftesbury in North Dorset should be considered for allocations.

21.13 Approach to Large Villages

- Rural affordable housing needs are not being met.
- There is too much housing in Large Villages and the scale is too large and not in line with the 10 dwellings set out in supporting text in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. It is not modest development.
- Comments were also made that a consistent approach is not being taken to Large Villages across the county, with allocations made at Large Villages in some community areas, and not others. This also applied to the Local Service Centres with allocations made at Market Lavington but not at Cricklade.
- Comments were made that whole villages should not be ruled out of assessment.

21.14 Housing Land Supply and source of sites

- Other sources of land supply should be considered. Derelict, underused and brownfield land should be considered. Long term empty homes should be brought back into use.
- Too much reliance on the SHLAA which does not allow strategic decisions.
- The settlement boundary review should be used to allocate land and boost supply.
- The 5 year housing land supply is exceeded in each HMA.
- A 20% buffer should be applied to reduce the risk of shortfall.
- 6 years supply should be provided to reduce the risk of under delivery.
- There is no supply of sites after 6 years.
- Neighbourhood plan allocations cannot be relied upon.
- A later base date should be used.
- A housing trajectory should support the plan. Further detail is required on the component of supply.
- A number of comments were made on the use or not of a windfall allowances

21.15 Relationships with neighbourhood plans

- The reliance on sites in neighbourhood plans creates uncertainty as the sites identified are not rigorously tested.
- Sites in areas with a made Neighbourhood Plan allocating sites should not be removed from the site selection process. For example, calls are made for allocating sites in Pewsey, Devizes and Malmesbury despite there being made neighbourhood plans in place.

21.16 Site selection methodology

- Sites allocated for non-residential uses such as Principle Employment Sites should not be excluded from the process.
- Comments made by the Environment Agency, Historic England and Highways England have been incorporated into the methodology. A summary of these thematic issues can be found in table 7.1.

21.17 These themes are covered under **main issue 1** in Section 7 of the main report.

21.18 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

- 21.19** The adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the housing requirement for Wiltshire until 2026 and the distribution of this housing requirement by Community Area, Principal Settlement, Market Town and Local Service Centre. The draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan has been prepared in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and delivers housing allocations in areas where the Core Strategy requirement is yet to be met. Within this Plan there is no need to look beyond these identified areas of search.
- 21.20** The Local Plan Review has begun and will review the Wiltshire Core Strategy on the basis of revised housing evidence. This is based on an emerging joint framework with Swindon and new housing market area evidence and will address any wider, longer-term issues related to housing delivery and ongoing local plan policy commitments.
- 21.21** The SHLAA/SHELAA provided a stock of available and developable sites and it has not been necessary to look beyond this evidence unless a clearly suitable site has been identified or submitted during a consultation exercise. Brownfield sites within settlement boundaries can already come forward through the provisions of national policy and the policies of the Core Strategy (the general presumption in favour of sustainable development).
- 21.22** Housing sites identified within made neighbourhood plans have been independently examined and therefore provide a credible and reliable source of housing land supply.
- 21.23** The Plan offers sufficient certainty in terms of housing land supply and promotes allocations in areas of the County that will further the area strategies of the Core Strategy. The planned allocations are therefore considered to be one of a number of sources of supply. Moreover, a windfall allowance is already made in the Council's housing land supply calculations.
- 21.24** **Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:**
- No changes proposed.

Table 21.2

Part 2:	East Wiltshire Housing Market Area		
No. of comments:	47		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	129 (115636) 116 (869060) 293 (924012) 520 (1125376) 714 (1125714/404491) 1459 (900566/1125375) 2142 (1131855) 2716 (977912) 3003 (998345/1136047) 3047 (1136406/1136403) 3110 (549444/1136047) 3143 (1138497/836762) 3200 (861027/1136403) 3207 (863519/1128217) 3223 (397800/1138537) 1698 (820230)	62 (838183) 284 (924012) 425 (899720) 521 (1125376) 716 (1125714/404491) 1478 (901977/901806) 2666 (983136) 2739 (1134382/404491) 3004 (998345/1136047) 3048 (1136406/1136403) 3111 (549444/1136047) 3153 (817896/817881) 3205 (863519/1128217) 3210 (863519/1128217) 3349 (1110188) 1701 (1129975)	64 (1119082) 291 (924012) 519 (1125376) 618 (1125727) 1093 (1126886/1126888) 1539 (1129236/1004509) 2714 (977912) 3002 (998345/1136047) 3035 (1136406/1136403) 3109 (549444/1136047) 3125 (1137779/1137777) 3196 (861027/1136403) 3206 (863519/1128217) 3211 (863519/1128217) 225 (1123590)

21.25 A total of 47 representations relating to the **East Wiltshire Housing Market Area** were received. In summary, the issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The distribution of housing in the East Housing Market Area.
- More emphasis should be applied to allocating housing sites in Large Villages.
- The Plan should make provision for anticipated under delivery on allocated sites within both the 'made' Devizes and Pewsey Neighbourhood Development Plans.
- Alternatives should be considered to over-dependence on Tidworth and Ludgershall, to ensure flexible supply.
- Affordability issues in rural communities are not addressed especially in the East HMA where no allocations are proposed at the large villages or market town of Marlborough. The impact of not addressing rural affordable housing need should be tested through the sustainability appraisal.
- Sites should be allocated at Large Villages in the East HMA in the same way they are in the North and West HMA.

21.26 Devizes Community Area

- There have been insufficient attempts to coordinate the Plan and neighbourhood planning processes.
- The Market Lavington Neighbourhood Plan is at a sufficiently late stage of preparation to let it allocate sites, not this Plan.
- Devizes Neighbourhood Plan may under deliver.
- Omission sites have been put forward in Market Lavington, Devizes, Great Cheverell and Bromham.

21.27 Marlborough Community Area

- Land should be allocated at Broad Hinton to meet the needs of rural communities.
- Omission sites have been identified in Aldbourne, Baydon, Fyfield and Marlborough.

21.28 Pewsey Community Area

- Pewsey is the only Local Service Centre in area and should have new development.
- Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan may under deliver.
- Omission sites have been identified at Pewsey.
- Request to amend site areas of SHLAA site references 1072 and 1083 to reflect omission site land at Swan Road, Pewsey.

21.29 **Council's response to themes/issues raised:**

- The Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the indicative housing requirement and distribution for Wiltshire over the period 2006 to 2026. The Strategy is based upon housing delivery within Wiltshire's 20 Community Areas and then broken down to provide an indicative housing requirement to be delivered at: Principal Settlements, Market Towns and Local Service Centres. The Plan is in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and delivers housing allocations in areas where the indicative Core Strategy requirements are yet to be met. The evidence suggests that there is no need to look beyond the identified areas of search. Neither is there any evidence at this stage to consider allocating additional strategic sites in areas with a 'made' neighbourhood development plan in place, allocated sites in made neighbourhood plans in Pewsey and Devizes for part of the housing land supply. The Local Plan Review process has begun and this will lead to a full review the Wiltshire Core Strategy on the basis of revised housing evidence.

21.30 **Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:**

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.3

Part 3:	Housing allocation H1.1: Empress Way, Ludgershall		
No. of comments:	7		
Comment ID	953 (1126553)	1036 (874600)	1287 (911081)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	2697 (1134169)	2979 (395940)	3082 (758096/758092)
	3201 (861027/1136403)		

21.31 A total of 7 representations relating to proposed allocation **H1.1: Empress Way, Ludgershall** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- A request to include additional detail within the policy to cover the potential for future transport links to be created to service the development;
- A request to include additional detail within the Plan to cover the potential for impacts on railway infrastructure and rail safety associated with increased pedestrian use of crossing points;
- A request to include additional detail in the Plan to address the need to deliver improvements to water infrastructure and control on odour impacts due to the proximity to the Sewage Treatment Works;
- A request to add more detail into the Plan to address the need to safeguard Public Rights of Way;
- Request to include additional detail regarding delivery of a school;
- Concern about adverse effects local water resources;
- Concern about adverse effects on biodiversity/green infrastructure associated with development of greenfield land;
- Concern about adverse effects associated with the loss of Best and Most Versatile (Grade 3a) agricultural land; and
- Support the need for landscape screening to ameliorate the impact of development on the wider countryside.

21.32 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The Council relied upon the a methodology for calculating site densities set out within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). In response to representations received, the issue of whether the assumptions regarding site densities were appropriate has been re-evaluated. In principle, the Council agree that the proposed site allocations should seek to make the best and most efficient use of land in line with national policy (see paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework). Therefore, where appropriate, it is considered that raising the density profile of sites may be achievable, provided such action does not compromise social and environmental objectives. In addition, raising site densities would also increase housing delivery and thereby help support land supply commitments in each of Wiltshire's three HMAs over the period to 2026.

- The Council is investigating the feasibility of bringing forward future transport links between the proposed allocation/development and the local highway network. At this stage it is considered that the need for identifying additional strategic network improvements will be investigated through the Local Plan Review process.
- Any amendments in relation to impacts on railway infrastructure and rail safety would need to be discussed and agreed between the site promoter and Network Rail. At this stage, no evidence justifies an alteration to the existing rail crossing point.
- It is recommended policy wording in relation to the delivery of water infrastructure and potential odour assessment is added.
- Potential adverse impacts of development of the site were considered through the site assessment process. Although potential adverse impacts were identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.

21.33 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend policy/supporting text in reference to water infrastructure/odour, school requirements and rights of way. Details can be found in Appendix Q Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.

21.34 The HRA update will inform any changes in relation to River Avon SAC (water abstraction) and Salisbury Plain SPA.

Table 21.4

Part 4:	Housing allocation H1.2: Underhill Nursey, Market Lavington		
No. of comments:	24		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	287 (924012) 290 (924012) 557 (1125376/1125375) 1734 (1104618) 2656 (983136) 2659 (983136) 2662 (983136) 2977 (395940)	288 (924012) 522 (1125376/1125375) 558 (1125376/1125375) 1735 (1130331) 2657 (983136) 2660 (983136) 2697 (1134169) 3202 (861027/1136403)	289 (924012) 556 (1125376/1125375) 559 (1125376/1125375) 1951 (1130978/1131263) 2658 (983136) 2661 (983136) 2919 (1135495) 3347 (1110188)

21.35 A total of 24 representations relating to proposed allocation **H1.2: Underhill Nursery, Market Lavington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The need to extend the site area of the allocation to provide an alternative means of access and deliver improved landscaping ;
- The suitability of the location;
- Potential conflict with the emerging Market Lavington Neighbourhood Plan;
- The accuracy of the policy and supporting text;
- Potential for surface water flooding;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites;
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concern over archaeological potential;
- Concern over landscape and visual impact; and
- Concern over transport impacts.

21.36 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.37 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment undertaken by TEP on behalf of the Council indicates that by extending the area of the allocation would not generate adverse impacts on the local landscape. Moreover, it is considered that a larger site area would enable development proposals to better incorporate landscape design objectives, such as the provision of wide green corridors to provide an improved edge to the settlement. An increased site area will also offer confidence in terms of housing delivery for the community area and make more efficient use of land.

- The Council acknowledges and supports the Market Lavington Neighbourhood Plan process. Indeed, the methodology employed to prepare the Housing Site Allocations Plan respected neighbourhood planning across the County. Where it was clear that neighbourhood plans had reached the formal consultation stage ⁽³⁴⁾ a decision was made to not allocate housing sites. At the time the Plan was being prepared, the emerging Market Lavington Neighbourhood Plan was not sufficiently far advanced and hence the decision was taken to allocate sites for housing to further the objectives of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. However the comments of the Parish Council were taken into consideration in the site assessment process; and encouragement to progress the neighbourhood plan has been consistently provided. The evidence that supports the Plan keeps the discussion open by stating that the situation may be reviewed should the Market Lavington Neighbourhood Plan be submitted during the Examination of the Plan.
- It is considered that sufficient sites have been allocated in the East HMA to be able to maintain a 5-year housing land supply
- Many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites have been allocated that are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits, and all issues including flooding have been taken into account, within the context of a housing delivery strategy based on the housing requirement in each Housing Market Area.
- Considerations such as the scale of development, sustainable location, access, and impacts on highways, landscape, archaeology and flooding were taken into account during the site assessment process. The planning application process will also require that any necessary assessment is carried out and informs the proposals so that requirements can be met.
- SA Objective 2 has been reviewed and it is considered unnecessary to amend, as the assessment balances the loss of agricultural land with the use of previously development land.
- Surface water flooding is a known issue in Market Lavington and is considered capable of being addressed through detailed drainage design.
- The Spring is being considered as an omission site, and as previously mentioned the allocations in Market Lavington may be reviewed if the Plan is submitted prior to examination of the Plan.

21.38 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Extend the site boundary to enable a suitable means of access delivered and landscape objectives to be met. The development of the site would benefit from the removal of a belt of Leylandii trees in order to enhance opportunities for strengthening the boundaries of the site with the planting of native species.

Table 21.5

Part 5:	Housing allocation H1.3: Southcliffe, Market Lavington		
No. of comments:	8		
Comment ID	119 (1120651/1120649)	2285 (924012)	805 (481043)
(Consultee/Agent ID):	807 (481043)	2697 (1134169)	2976 (395940)
	3203 (861027/1136403)	3348 (1110188)	

21.39 A total of 8 representations relating to proposed allocation **H1.3 Southcliffe, Market Lavington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation and request for alignment with the emerging policies of the neighbourhood plan;
- Potential for surface water flooding;
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concern over landscape and visual impact; and
- Concern over transport impacts.

21.40 Council response

- Considerations such as the impacts on highways, landscape and flooding were taken into account during the site assessment process. None of the potential impacts were thought to be insurmountable. The planning application process will require that any necessary assessment is carried out and informs proposals .
- Surface water flooding is a known issue in Market Lavington are capable of resolution through a detailed drainage scheme.

21.41 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.6

Part 6:	Housing allocation H1.4: East of Lavington School, Market Lavington		
No. of comments:	10		
Comment ID	286 (924012)	804 (481043)	805 (481043)
(Consultee/Agent ID):	2663 (983136)	2664 (983136)	2665 (983136)
	2697 (1134169)	2978 (395940)	3204 (861027/1136403)
	3346 (1110188)		

21.42 A total of 10 representations relating to proposed allocation **H1.4: East of Lavington School, Market Lavington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation and request for alignment with the policies of the emerging neighbourhood plan;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites, such as at Devizes;
- Concern over impacts on biodiversity;
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concern over landscape and visual impact, and potential for coalescence with West Lavington; and
- Concern over transport impacts and suitability of access.

21.43 Council response

- The site assessment took place in the context of areas of search identified according to the housing requirement of each HMA. Within this context it was concluded that the housing requirement at Devizes has been met through existing commitments;
- Considerations such as the impacts on highways, landscape and flooding were taken into account during the site assessment process. None of the potential impacts are considered to be insurmountable based on evidence available at the time of assessment.
- The SA concluded that access via the school is likely to be problematic, however further work with the site promoter has indicated a commitment to exploring possible options.

21.44 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- None.

Table 21.7

Part 7:	North and West Housing Market Area		
No. of comments:	457		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	5 (1105343)	13 (1102653)	24 (1115782)
	25 (1115782)	31 (1102653)	47 (1118224)
	48 (1118224)	49 (1118224)	50 (1118224)
	51 (1118224)	52 (1118224)	53 (1118606)
	54 (1118631)	59 (1118762)	68 (1119110)
	75 (1119264)	82 (1119288)	84 (1119432)
	95 (897503)	96 (1119992)	100 (987736 / 846301)
	102 (1120337)	107 (895657)	108 (112037)
	109 (899514)	110 (899514)	111 (899514)
	115 (1120545)	120 (1120653)	129 (1120660)
	130 (1120660)	132 (789551)	150 (1121687)
	155 (549888)	158 (1121833)	159 (402574)
	160 (402574)	166 (1122195)	168 (391073)
	171 (550023)	179 (1122693)	186 (1122860)
	198 (893748)	202 (1122960)	205 (1122982)
	206 (1122982)	209 (391073)	215 (1122860)
	254 (1122960)	255 (1122960)	256 (1122960)
	269 (1120376)	270 (897503)	282 (1120376)
	295 (1124372)	317 (1122860)	343 (857749)
	349 (549888)	353 (549888)	354 (549888)
	355 (549888)	356 (1124532)	357 (1124532)
	368 (1124560)	369 (1115782)	374 (402574)
	397 (900022)	399 (893748)	419 (1122982)
	426 (1124905)	428 (1124905)	439 (1124912/1124938)
	440 (1124908)	445 (1124959)	446 (1124959)
	461 (400077)	462 (400077)	480 (1125003)
	498 (1105805)	505 (1125261)	506 (1125261)
	529 (1102653)	530 (1102653)	545 (1125455)
	549 (1124865/549147)	552 (1125557)	575 (556401)
	602 (1125612)	621 (1124905)	629 (391073)
	630 (391073)	631 (391073)	632 (391073)
	633 (391073)	634 (391073)	635 (391073)
	651 (1125690)	654 (1125702)	686 (1125761)
	688 (1125761)	697 (1125761)	706 (900566 /1125375)
	707 (900566/1125375)	713 (1125829)	718 (1125820)
	719 (1125864)	725 (1125928)	752 (1138652)
	753 (1138652)	754 (1138652)	755 (1138652)
	762 (1126050)	799 (1126111)	781 (1126124)
	806 (1126214)	815 (893828)	818 (1126254)
	819 (1126254)	826 (1126249)	873 (547867)
	888 (1054271)	921 (1126508)	922 (1126508)
	923 (1037118/1126480)	955 (1126671)	959 (840630)
	967 (1054315)	970 (1126736)	1010(1139654)
	1015 (1126790)	1019 (1125612)	1020 (1125612)
	1021 (1125612)	1035 (1124796/1124792)	1074 (1126841/1004509)
	1076 (840630)	1112 (487991)	1113 (487991)

1114 (487991)	1115 (487991)	1116 (487991)
1117 (487991)	1118 (487991)	1119 (487991)
1120 (487991)	1121 (487991)	1122 (487991)
1123 (487991)	1136 (1126922)	1144 (897565)
1145 (897565)	1163 (901946/901806)	1192 (1126986)
1194 (1126986)	1195 (1127006)	1201 (403859)
1205 (1126753)	1208 (1127016)	1210 (901852/901806)
1225 (1127022)	1233 (1102653)	1241 (1127015)
1242 (836280/835942)	1243 (1122130)	1245 (1117600)
1370 (1128696)	1372 (1128696)	1385 (1128696)
1405 (1126945)	1407 (1128743)	1409 (1128743)
1418 (1128743)	1420 (1128759)	1422 (1128759)
1431 (1128759)	1446 (901829/901806)	1448 (901801/901806)
1449 (704457)	1451 (392243/901806)	1472 (1128886)
1480 (706891)	1495 (706891)	1503 (706891)
1522 (556645/901806)	1538 (1129228/901806)	1543 (390590/901806)
1548 (1051839)	1551 (1129287/1004509)	1552 (1129290)
1554 (1129290)	1562 (1129290)	1564 (1129295/1129296)
1566 (1129302)	1568 (1129302)	1577 (1129302)
1582 (1051839)	1605 (1129497 / 901806)	1609 (556645 / 901806)
1618 (1129612)	1619 (1129612)	1621 (1129612)
1622 (1129612)	1623 (1129612)	1624 (1129612)
1625 (1129612)	1626 (1129612)	1627 (1129612)
1628 (1129612)	1629 (1129612)	1630 (1129612)
1631 (1129612)	1632 (1129612)	1633 (1129612)
1634 (1129612)	1658 (901813/901806)	1667 (402907)
1670 (381339)	1672 (381339)	1673 (1129887)
1674 (1129887)	1675 (1129887)	1681 (381814)
1682 (381814)	1684 (381814)	1687 (1129933)
1688 (1129933)	1689 (1129933)	1690 (1129933)
1696 (1138653)	1704 (404631/863491)	1708 (1128190/863491)
1718 (704825)	1721 (709291)	1722 (709291)
1723 (709291)	1766 (556113)	1767 (5561130)
1817 (702421)	1818 (1130943)	1819 (702406)
1820 (705359)	1821 (1130946)	1849 (1126111)
1850 (1126111)	1851 (1126111)	1852 (1126111)
1853 (1126111)	1859 (547867)	1860 (547867)
1861 (547867)	1862 (547867)	1863 (547867)
1864 (547867)	1865 (547867)	1866 (547867)
1867 (547867)	1909 (895670)	1917 (1106467)
1921 (1106467)	1922 (1106467)	1939 (1131233)
1963 (1131292)	1967 (1127022)	1968 (1127022)
1969 (1127022)	1970 (1127022)	1983 (1131344)
1984 (1131344)	2026 (393425/817881)	2060 (705056)
2063 (705056)	2064 (705056)	2076 (1131654)
2078 (1131654)	2079 (1131654)	2080 (1131654)
2079 (1131654)	2080 (1131654)	2085 (556573/556956)
2087 (1131667)	2088 (1131667)	2089 (1131667)
2090 (1131667)	2092 (1131683)	2093 (1131696)
2094 (1131696)	2095 (1131696)	2096 (1131696)
2097 (1131696)	2105 (1131696)	2111 (1131720/1131715)
2143 (1131734)	2150 (1131734)	2162 (1131734)
2183 (1131913)	2184 (1131913)	2247 (1132119)
2253 (704678)	2263 (1132174)	2264 (1132174)

2265 (1132174)	2266 (1126756)	2291 (871876)
2292 (871876)	2315 (711666)	2321 (1132392)
2327 (1132392)	2343 (1132418)	2373 (1132552)
2374 (1132530/1006176)	2378 (1132552)	2379 (1132552)
2380 (1132552)	2381 (1132552)	2382 (1132552)
2384 (1132580/550322)	2386 (1132552)	2387 (1132552)
2389 (1132602)	2390 (1132602)	2391 (1132602)
2396 (903251)	2399 (1132626/1126961)	2400 (1132626/1126961)
2401 (1132626/1126961)	2402 (1132626/1126961)	2403 (1132626/1126961)
2415 (1132626/1126961)	2416 (1132626/1126961)	2432 (1126922)
2446 (711399/1132875)	2461 (642979/1100945)	2464 (642979/1100945)
2478 (1132963)	2479 (1132963)	2480 (899954)
2481 (899954)	2482 (899954)	2490 (1132963)
2491 (1132963)	2524 (836764/836762)	2542 (1116552)
2543 (1116552)	2551 (1116552)	2564 (1133465)
2565 (1133460)	2573 (1133460)	2587 (1133494/389561)
2588 (1133494/389561)	2589 (1133494/389561)	2592 (481059)
2607 (1133638)	2608 (1133638)	2612 (1133652)
2617 (1113716)	2623(1137289/1137295)	2635 (1133667/1133670)
2636 (1133667/1133670)	2642 (824512/901379)	2644 (1113871/1133715)
2646 (1113871/1133715)	2647 (1113871/1133715)	2648 (1113871/1133715)
2653 (983136)	2668 (983136)	2671 (983136)
2672 (983136)	2673 (983136)	2674 (983136)
2675 (983136)	2676 (983136)	2681 (1134057)
2685 (1134103/931633)	2697 (1134169)	2701 (1134177/1126238)
2702 (1134177/1126238)	2705 (977912)	2709 (977912)
2710 (977912)	2711 (977912)	2712 (977912)
2713 (977912)	2713 (977912)	2717 (977912)
2720 (1134745)	2722 (1134217/1005672)	2726 (404224/1122261)
2732 (1134308/1134306)	2735 (1134352/1124938)	2739 (1134382/404491)
2740 (1134431/1134428)	2741 (1134431/1134428)	2742 (1134431/1134428)
2743 (1134431/1134428)	2750 (1068308)	2751 (1068308)
2813 (709293)	2815 (709293)	2816 (709293)
2817 (709293)	2840 (1138316/1138317)	2846 (1126922)
2849 (1126922)	2849 (1126922)	2850 (1126922)
2852 (1126922)	2860 (1126922)	2861 (1126922)
2862 (1126922)	2864 (1126922)	2865 (1126922)
2866 (1126922)	2867 (1135059)	2883 (1135124)
2908 (397127)	2933 (701840)	2935 (701840)
2947 (1135685)	2949 (1135685)	3000 (1136804/1138276)
3007 (840643/646956)	3010 (392552)	3011 (1138653)
3036 (1136436/1135353)	3037 (1136436/1135353)	3038 (1136436/1135353)
3039 (1136436/1135353)	3040 (556491/901380)	3055 (389564/389561)
3056 (389564/389561)	3057 (389564/389561)	3071 (1100941/404491)
3075 (840359/443671)	3077 (840359/443671)	3080 (1137004/1137062)
3081 (1137004/1137062)	3084 (1137312/1137310)	3086 (1137322/1137324)
3098 (1126042)	3138 (1137830/1122261)	3141 (1137984/1130975)
3144 (1138002/1138006)	3146 (1138002/1138006)	3147 (1138002/1138006)
3149 (1138113/899110)	3152(817896/817881)	3154 (817896/817881)
3156 (817896/817881)	3159 (1138190)	3165 (1138190)
3174 (449270)	3181 (933220/1138250)	3188 (397159)
3212 (1138508)	3262 (841197/397761)	3263 (841197/397761)
3264 (841197/397761)	3265 (841197/397761)	3276 (1138699)
3277 (1138699)	3278 (1138699)	3279 (1138699)

3280 (1138699)	3281 (1138699)	3287 (1138699)
3296 (1138780)	3307 (1138780)	3313 (1132626/1126888)
3321 (1138930)	3323 (1138930)	3327 (1138939)
3354 (1119432)	3368 (1146217)	7 (1106037)
37 (903313)	162 (1121891)	1763 (556113)
2944 (1069602)	2735 (1134352)	

21.45 A total of 457 representations relating to the **North and West Housing Market Area** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Housing Land Supply shortfall/oversupply in the North and West HMA;
- Amount of land that is proposed to be allocated in the North and West HMA;
- Potential shortfalls/oversupply based on Community Area indicative requirements;
- Flexibility of supply and potential for alternative or additional sites;
- Flexibility of the 'areas of search' used to define where allocations should be located;
- Justification for removing certain settlements from the 'areas of search'.
- The need to provide suitable sites to meet shortfalls in neighbouring authorities;
- Obstacles in delivery of sites which are relied upon in the North and West HMA;
- The strategy to focus allocations at the Principal Settlements and Market Towns rather than smaller settlements;
- Provision for affordable housing within the North and West HMA;
- The strategy not to allocate land within the settlement boundary;
- The strategy to focus proposed sites in the Trowbridge and Westbury area, rather than around junction 17 of the M4.
- The role of, and reliance on neighbourhood plans to deliver supply in the North and West HMA;
- Strategic highways, infrastructure, flooding, education, landscape and ecology implications of allocations within the North and West HMA;
- Concerns about coalescence between settlements;
- Appropriate consideration of the need to protect the River Avon SAC within the context of the proposed allocations at Warminster;
- Lack of transport, economic and environmental modelling (GI Strategy and Transport Strategy);
- The potential need for a Green Belt review in the north-west Trowbridge/Bradford on Avon area;
- Correct title for the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy should be used within the Plan.

21.46 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.47 The Council considers the approach taken to the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy and support the provisions set out in the Plan.
- New and improved walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of transport.
- A refresh of the Trowbridge Transport Strategy has been undertaken to inform measures to support the allocations in the draft Plan;
- The Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the indicative housing requirement and distribution for Wiltshire over the period – 2006 to 2026. The Strategy is based upon housing delivery within Wiltshire's 20 Community Areas and then broken down to provide an indicative housing requirements to be delivered at: Principal Settlements, Market Towns and Local Service Centres. The Plan is in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and delivers housing allocations in areas where the indicative Core Strategy requirements are yet to be met. The evidence suggests that there is no need to look beyond the identified areas of search. The Local Plan Review process has begun and this will lead to a full review the Wiltshire Core Strategy on the basis of revised housing evidence.
- For Trowbridge it is anticipated that the delivery of housing on brownfield and greenfield sites will occur simultaneously to help address the projected number of homes needed for Trowbridge town set out within the Core Strategy (Core Policies 28 and 29). The potential risk of coalescence is recognised as a local issue in the Wiltshire Core Strategy (see paragraph 5.150) and has been taken account through the preparation of this Plan during site assessments under the landscape objective of the sustainability appraisal.

21.48 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Ensure the correct title is used for the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy.
- Add additional wording to adequately address the need to protect the River Avon SAC.
- No further changes.

Table 21.8

Part 8:	Housing allocation H2.1: Elm Grove Farm, Trowbridge		
No. of comments:	34		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	8 (1106114) 128 (1120660) 626 (391073) 1008 (1126635) 1692 (1129933) 2323 (1132392) 2326 (1132392) 2405 (1132626/1126961) 2408 (1132626/1126961) 2697 (1134169) 3161 (1138190) 3164 (1138190)	105 (1120337) 156 (1121833) 980 (1126635) 1136 (1126922) 1816 (901939/901806) 2324 (1132392) 2328 (1132392) 2406 (1132626/1126961) 2483 (1132963) 2983 (395940) 3162 (1138190)	127 (1120660) 189 (1122860) 1007 (1126635) 1505 (1138653) 2322 (1132392) 2325 (1132392) 2404 (1132626/1126961) 2407 (1132626/1126961) 2484 (1132963) 3160 (1138190) 3163 (1138190)

21.49 A total of 34 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.1: Elm Grove Farm, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Impacts on biodiversity (including protected bat habitats and other local wildlife);
- Uncertainty of agricultural land quality;
- The site, and land adjacent to the site, is prone to flooding;
- Potential for harm to heritage assets (including Grade II listed farmhouse and nearby former farm worker cottages);
- Loss of recreational space;
- Loss of buffer/coalescence between Trowbridge and North Bradley;
- Request to include additional detail regarding delivery of a school;
- Capacity of infrastructure providers including schools and health service;
- Traffic concerns including impact of existing congestion, and connectivity with town centre; and
- Need for cycling and walking routes

21.50 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.51 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy, alongside the provisions already set out in the Plan;

- The proposed site allocation is located within flood zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle. Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site specific flood risk and drainage assessment;
- It is considered that any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside;
- The site would accommodate a new primary school to serve the area alongside new housing appropriate contributions would be likely to be sought to help fund additional local school capacity.
- Funding contributions may also be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries and dentistry at the town.
- New and improved walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services/employment would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of travel.
- A refresh of the Trowbridge Transport Strategy has been undertaken to inform measure to support the allocations in the draft Plan.

21.52 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to clarify that new cycling and walking routes should connect to adjoining employment; additional emphasis on flood risk and drainage requirements.
- Insert text to require subsequent planning applications to be supported by a detailed, site specific heritage assessment.

Table 21.9

Part 9:	Housing allocation H2.2: White Horse Business Park, Trowbridge		
No. of comments:	78		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	18 (1114350) 103 (1120337) 131 (1120664/1115452) 188 (1122860) 351 (549888) 359 (1124532) 363 (1124560) 367 (1124560) 508 (1125262) 569 (1125262) 624 (391073) 657 (1125429) 1203 (1125498) 1232 (1126962) 1283 (1125498) 1452 (403859) 1455 (403859) 1488 (1126962) 1491 (1126962) 1691 (1129933) 2182 (1131913) 2376 (1132562) 2385 (1132552) 2411 (1132626/1126961) 2485 (1132963) 3074 (890227/1132859)	21 (1115490/1115452) 124 (1120660) 157 (1121833) 195 (110487) 352 (549888) 361 (1124560) 364 (1124560) 407 (1138653) 541 (1125430) 582 (1125429) 655 (1125429) 658 (1125429) 1204 (1125498) 1281 (1125498) 1284 (1125498) 1453 (403859) 1457 (403859) 1489 (1126962) 1492 (1126962) 1694 (1129933) 2269 (1132158) 2377 (1132562) 2409 (1132626/1126961) 2412 (1132626/1126961) 2489 (1132963) 3139 (396076)	79 (1119276) 125 (1120660) 170 (550023) 279 (1120337) 358 (1124532) 362 (1106487) 366 (1124560) 507 (1125262) 542 (1125430) 605 (1125621) 656 (1125429) 723 (1125881) 1207 (403859) 1282 (1125498) 1285 (1125498) 1454 (403859) 1458 (403859) 1490 (1126962) 1642 (403792) 1832 (1130978/1130975) 2375 (1132562) 2383 (1132552) 2410 (1132626/1126961) 2413 (1132626/1126961) 2986 (395940) 3142 (1137984/1130975)

21.53 A total of 78 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.2: Land off the A363 at White Horse Business Park, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed and the density of development;
- The need/demand for the development;
- The site area of the allocation;
- Loss of buffer/coalescence between Trowbridge and North Bradley and loss of identity of North Bradley and Southwick;
- Potential conflicts with the WCS;
- The location of development within the allocation area, including whether the allocation is unduly restrictive to the north-east;
- Negative impacts on property values;
- The need to protect biodiversity (including protected bat habitat);
- Uncertainty of agricultural land quality;

- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including light and air pollution, and noise disturbance);
- The site, and land adjacent to the site, is prone to flooding;
- Potential for harm to heritage assets (including listed buildings and cemetery);
- Uncertainty over archaeological importance of the site;
- Loss of land for recreation;
- Capacity of infrastructure providers including schools and health service;
- Sustainability of the site in terms of proximity to facilities and town centre services;
- Concerns over safety of access and highways capacity; and
- Concern over lack of local employment opportunities.

21.54 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.55 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- There are some factual corrections necessary to amend the site boundary;
- It is considered that any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and would maintain the separate identity of the village of North Bradley and Southwick;
- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy; and the provisions within the Plan;
- The site is of a size which could deliver areas of public open space or green infrastructure within the site;
- It is considered that the proposed density can be increased albeit this will still be constrained in the light of heritage and ecological concerns;
- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets present;
- There is no consistent and up-to-date information relating to quality/grade of agricultural land underlying the site;
- It is unlikely that local air quality will be denigrated to the extent that this would impact on local biodiversity. The development at this site would likely generate increased levels of noise and light pollution associated with housing development which are not considered likely to be significant;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment;

- Funding contributions may be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries and dentistry at the town;
- Opportunities to improve walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of transport;
- The Council has prepared a refresh of the Trowbridge Transport Strategy which identifies measures to support allocations
- It is not the role of this site allocation plan to deliver strategic transport routes such as the A350 improvement at Yarnbrook or West Ashton.

21.56 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to reflect site ownership.
- Amend site capacity to ensure efficient use of land, consider with heritage and environmental concerns.
- Amend text to reflect Heritage Impact Assessment and ensure that at the planning application stage, the layout and design of the site gives great weight to conserving heritage assets and their settings.
- Give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements by requiring any subsequent planning application to be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and comprehensive drainage strategy.

Table 21.10

Part 10:	Housing allocation H2.3: Elizabeth Way, Trowbridge		
No. of comments:	77		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	78 (1119270) 401 (893748) 513 (1125317) 709 (1125772) 835 (1126276) 890 (1054271) 935 (392036/1126545) 973 (1126216) 987 (1125773) 1014 (1126789) 1170 (1126945) 1231 (1126182) 1318 (897270) 1354 (399816) 1406 (1126945) 1643 (403792) 1911 (895670) 1914 (895670) 2126 (1131752/1131750) 2348 (1132437) 2421 (1126826) 2424 (1126826) 2595 (899448) 2598 (899448) 2667 (983136) 2988 (395940)	184 (1122741) 402 (893748) 623 (391073) 763 (1126050) 836 (1126276) 933 (392036/1126545) 936 (392036/1126545) 979 (897270) 988 (1125773) 1022 (1125612) 1227 (549589) 1292 (1126216) 1319 (897270) 1355 (399816) 1494 (1128958) 1909 (895670) 1912 (895670) 1915 (895670) 2341 (1126903) 2349 (1132437) 2422 (1126826) 2425 (1126826) 2596 (899448) 2599 (899448) 2892 (1135178) 3262 (841197/397761)	400 (893748) 403 (893748) 708 (1125773) 803 (1126182) 837 (1126276) 934 (392036/1126545) 959 (840630) 986 (1125773) 1012 (1126785) 1096 (399816) 1230 (1126182) 1317 (897270) 1320 (897270) 1356 (399816) 1549 (1129270) 1910 (895670) 1913 (895670) 2119 (1131752/1131750) 2347 (1132437) 2420 (1126826) 2423 (1126826) 2438 (1132805) 2597 (899448) 2600 (899448) 2895 (1135178)

21.57 A total of 77 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.3: Elizabeth Way, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed and the density of development;
- The need/demand for the development;
- Incorrect site area of the allocation;
- Loss of buffer/coalescence between Trowbridge and Hilperton;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites/brownfield sites;
- Lack of justification for the delay Trowbridge Ashton Park development;
- Failure to declare vested interests;
- Conflicts with the emerging Hilperton Neighbourhood Plan;
- Uncertainty over the extent of what is described as 'Hilperton Gap';
- Impacts on biodiversity (including wildlife species/habitat);

- Unregistered land within the site;
- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including light and air pollution, and noise disturbance);
- The site, and land adjacent to the site, is prone to flooding;
- The need to undertake further heritage assessment to inform the principle, capacity and key design response/ principles to mitigate/minimise harm;
- Uncertainty over archaeological importance of the site;
- Loss of land for recreation and resulting implications for health and wellbeing of communities;
- Developer contributions for necessary supporting infrastructure;
- Capacity of infrastructure providers including schools and health service;
- Sustainability of the site in terms of proximity to facilities and town centre services;
- Concerns over safety of access and highways capacity; and
- Concern over lack of local employment opportunities.

21.58 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.59 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The Council has refreshed the Trowbridge Transport Strategy which identifies measures to support allocations;
- There are some factual corrections necessary to amend the site boundary to align to Elizabeth Way;
- It is considered that any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and would maintain the separate identity of the village of Hilperton;
- The neighbourhood plan within the area is in conflict with the objectives of this plan as per Wiltshire Council representations to the Regulation 16 stage of the Hilperton Neighbourhood Plan;
- It is considered that the density can be increased to maximise effective use of land;
- The 'Hilperton Gap' is a locally used name for the area;
- Brownfield sites within Trowbridge have been included in the windfall allowance as per Topic Paper 3;
- It is unlikely that local air quality will be denigrated to the extent that this would impact on local biodiversity;

- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy as well as the provisions already made in the Plan;
- An ecological assessment of the site would be required to support individual planning applications;
- All land within the proposed site boundary is on registered land with landowner consent as per Topic Paper 2;
- Development at this site would likely generate increased levels of noise and light pollution associated with housing development which are not considered likely to be significant;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment. Flood mitigation that takes place within the proposed site would also help alleviate flooding issues on nearby land;
- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets and appropriate reference made in the Plan;
- The proposed site will accommodate sufficient public open space in accordance with policy. The site is of a size which could deliver areas of public open space or green infrastructure within the site;
- Funding contributions may be sought where needed to increase capacity to provide local infrastructure within the town. Opportunities to improved walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services including the town centre, would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of travel;
- It is considered that suitable access and highway provisions can be made;
- It is beyond the remit of this document to plan for future employment opportunities, that said there are employment opportunities and land available to support employment growth within the town.

21.60 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to align with Elizabeth Way Relief Road.
- Amend site capacity to ensure efficient use of land.
- Amend text to reflect Heritage Impact Assessment and to ensure the relationship between development proposals and heritage assets is addressed through detailed design.
- Greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.11

Part 11:	Housing allocation H2.4: Church Lane, Trowbridge		
No. of comments:	152		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	9 (1106114)	15 (1102653)	28 (1102653)
	34 (1102653)	87 (1119574)	101 (1120322)
	165 (1102653)	180 (1122693)	222 (1102653)
	344 (1122693)	347 (1122693)	348 (1122693)
	371 (1124567)	372 (1124567)	373 (1124567)
	383 (1124567)	410 (1120653)	419 (1122982)
	421 (1122982)	422 (1122982)	423 (1122982)
	430 (1124905)	431 (1124905)	432 (1124905)
	435 (1124905)	449 (1124959)	450 (1124959)
	451 (1124959)	454 (1124959)	504 (1117600)
	523 (1102653)	524 (1102653)	525 (1102653)
	526 (1102653)	527 (1102653)	528 (1102653)
	535 (1125430)	536 (1125430)	537 (1125430)
	572 (1117600)	573 (1117600)	574 (1117600)
	627 (391073)	636 (1125656)	648 (1125656)
	649 (1125656)	652 (1125690)	653 (1125690)
	660 (1122982)	690 (1125761)	691 (1125761)
	692 (1125761)	695 (1125761)	822 (1126254)
	824 (1126254)	1056 (1126818)	1103 (1126922)
	1131 (1126922)	1132 (1126922)	1133 (1126922)
	1134 (1126922)	1135 (1126922)	1175 (1126976)
	1198 (1127006)	1200 (1127006)	1375 (1128696)
	1376 (1128696)	1377 (1128696)	1380 (1128696)
	1411 (1128743)	1412 (1128743)	1413 (1128743)
	1416 (1128743)	1424 (1128759)	1425 (1128759)
	1426 (1128759)	1429 (1128759)	1466 (1128886)
	1467 (1128886)	1468 (1128886)	1469 (1128886)
	1470 (1128886)	1471 (1128886)	1479 (1128903)
	1482 (1128903)	1483 (1128903)	1484 (1128903)
	1485 (1128903)	1486 (1128903)	1487 (1128903)
	1523 (1129173/402467)	1556 (1129290)	1557 (1129290)
	1560 (1129290)	1563 (1129290)	1570 (1129302)
	1571 (1129302)	1572 (1129302)	1575 (1129302)
	1644 (403792)	1918 (1106467)	1923 (1106467)
	1926 (1106467)	1929 (1106467)	1931 (1106467)
	1933 (1106467)	2067 (1117600)	2068 (1117600)
	2069 (1117600)	2099 (1131696)	2102 (1131696)
	2104 (1131696)	2144 (1131734)	2147 (1131734)
	2329 (1132398)	2330 (1132398)	2331 (1132398)
	2332 (1132398)	2333 (1132398)	2334 (1132398)
	2335 (1132398)	2342 (1132398)	2365 (1102653)
	2429 (1126922)	2430 (1126922)	2433 (1126922)
	2437 (1126922)	2439 (1126922)	2544 (1116552)
	2547 (1116552)	2613 (1133652)	2615 (1133652)
	2618 (1133652)	2620 (1133652)	2622 (1133652)
	2843 (1126922)	2844 (1126922)	2845 (1126922)

2858 (1126922)	2859 (1126922)	2863 (1126922)
2906 (1135254)	2984 (395940)	3024 (382216)
3128 (1132566)	3129 (1132566)	3130 (1132566)
3131 (1132566)	3132 (1132566)	3133 (1132566)
3325 (1138955)		

21.61 A total of 152 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.4: Church Lane, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation;
- Harm to buffer/coalescence between Trowbridge and Southwick;
- The need to protect biodiversity (including protected bat habitat);
- Objection to loss of agricultural land;
- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including air pollution and noise disturbance);
- The site, and land adjacent to the site, is prone to flooding;
- The need for a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the principle, capacity and key design response/ principles to mitigate/minimise harm;
- Potential for harm to heritage assets (including setting of St Johns Church and listed buildings along the A361, Hall masters dwellings, 344 Frome Road and Rose Villa);
- Uncertainty over archaeological importance of the site;
- Potential loss of rural character of the Church Lane area, and impacts on rural views;
- Potential negative impact on Southwick Country Park;
- Concerns over safety of pedestrians and other road users;
- Loss of land for recreation;
- Capacity of infrastructure including schools and health services, and leisure;
- Sustainability of the site in terms of proximity to facilities and town centre services; and
- Concerns over safety of access and highways capacity.

21.62 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.63 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Brownfield sites within Trowbridge have been included in the Windfall allowance as per topic Paper 3;

- The Council believe that the draft plan is in accordance with the WCS;
- It is considered that any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and would maintain the separate identity of the village of Southwick;
- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy alongside provision already made in the Plan;
- An ecological assessment of the site would be required to support individual planning applications;
- There is no consistent and up-to-date information relating to quality/grade of agricultural land underlying the site;
- It is unlikely that local air quality will be denigrated to the extent that this would impact on local biodiversity. The development at this site would likely generate increased levels of noise and light pollution associated with housing development which not considered likely to be significant. Mitigation measures would need to be developed in accordance with national and local plan policy;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment;
- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets present and appropriate reference should be made in the Plan;
- Natural England notes that the site appears to be a very well used area for recreation. Whilst this maybe the case, it is within private ownership and is available and deliverable in terms of the proposed housing allocation;
- The site is of a size which could deliver areas of public open space or green infrastructure within the site;
- Funding contributions may be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries and dentistry at the town.
- Opportunities to improve walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of travel.
- The Council has refreshed the Trowbridge Transport Strategy which identifies measures to support the allocations.

21.64 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to include land between the current boundary and the river to ensure land can be used to mitigate bat impacts.
- Amend text to reflect Heritage Impact Assessment and to ensure design and layout gives great weight to conserving the significance of heritage assets and their settings.
- Give greater emphasis to flood and drainage.

Table 21.12

Part 12: Housing allocation H2.5: Upper Studley, Trowbridge			
No. of comments:	77		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	10 (1106114)	181 (1122693)	207 (1122982)
	208 (1122982)	345 (1122693)	424 (1122982)
	429 (1124905)	433 (1124905)	434 (1124905)
	436 (1124905)	448 (1124959)	452 (1124959)
	453 (1124959)	455 (1124959)	500 (1125248)
	622 (1125632)	628 (391073)	659 (1122982)
	689 (1125761)	693 (1125761)	694 (1125761)
	696 (1125761)	821 (1126254)	823 (1126254)
	831 (1125248)	832 (1125248)	833 (1125248)
	834 (1125248)	838 (1125248)	964 (1126711)
	1000 (1125632)	1001 (1125632)	1197 (1127006)
	1199 (1127006)	1291 (1126711)	1373 (1128696)
	1378 (1128696)	1379 (1128696)	1381 (1128696)
	1410 (1128743)	1414 (1128743)	1415 (1128743)
	1417 (1128743)	1423 (1128759)	1427 (1128759)
	1428 (1128759)	1430 (1128759)	1555 (1129290)
	1558 (1129290)	1559 (1129290)	1561 (1129290)
	1569 (1129302)	1573 (1129302)	1574 (1129302)
	1576 (1129302)	1657 (395553/901806)	1919 (1106467)
	1924 (1106467)	1927 (1106467)	1930 (1106467)
	1932 (1106467)	1934 (1106467)	2145 (1131734)
	2148 (1131734)	2163 (1126221)	2164 (1126221)
	2165 (1126221)	2166 (1126221)	2167 (1126221)
	2168 (1126221)	2169 (1126221)	2170 (1126221)
	2545 (1116552)	2548 (1116552)	2905 (1135254)
	2985 (395940)	3042 (381339)	

21.65 A total of 77 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.5: Upper Studley, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation;
- The need to protect biodiversity (including Ancient Woodland and local wildlife species);
- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including air pollution and noise disturbance);
- Loss of open countryside, hedgerows and trees;
- The site's partial location within flood zone 2/3 and proximity to a main river (Lambrok Stream), and the need for a sequential approach to development within the site;
- Concerns about increase of flood risk and ground water levels;
- Potential for harm to heritage assets (including ancient hedgerows and field setting for listed buildings);
- Archaeological importance of the site;

- Concerns over landscape impacts including views of the approach to Trowbridge and across the fields;
- Contributions towards delivery of the Trowbridge Recreation Management Mitigation Strategy;
- Capacity of infrastructure providers including schools and health service.
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Sustainability of the site in terms of proximity to facilities and town centre services; and
- Concerns over achievability of access and highways capacity.

21.66 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.67 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Brownfield sites within Trowbridge have been included in the windfall allowance as per Topic Paper 3;
- Sufficient consultation has occurred in the process to date. Wiltshire Council has followed planning regulations and its Wiltshire Council Statement of Community Involvement (SCI);
- There is no known ancient woodland surrounding the site;
- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy and the provisions already in the Plan.
- An ecological assessment of the site would be required to support individual planning applications;
- It is unlikely that local air quality will be denigrated to the extent that this would impact on local biodiversity. The development at this site would likely generate increased levels of noise and light pollution associated with housing development which not considered likely to be significant. Mitigation measures would need to be developed in accordance with national and local plan policy;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment;
- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets present and appropriate reference should be made in the Plan.
- It is considered that any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and would maintain the separate identity of the village of Southwick;
- Funding contributions may be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries and dentistry at the town.

- Opportunities to improve walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of travel; and
- The Council has refreshed the Trowbridge Transport Strategy which identifies measures to support the allocations.

21.68 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site capacity to ensure efficient use of land
- Amend text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.13

Part 13:	Housing allocation H2.6: Southwick Court, Trowbridge		
No. of comments:	321		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	11 (1106114)	27 (1102653)	36 (1117629)
56 (1118631)	57 (1118631)	58 (1118631)	
72 (1119171)	80 (1119276)	86 (1119574)	
88 (1119601)	89 (1119640)	104 (1120337)	
113 (1120523)	114 (1120523)	121 (1120653)	
122 (1120660)	123 (1120660)	135 (1105805)	
149 (1121678)	182 (1122693)	190 (1122860)	
200 (1122926)	271 (1120653)	272 (1120653)	
273 (1120653)	280 (1120337)	312 (1122860)	
314 (1122860)	315 (1122860)	329 (1121687)	
346 (1122693)	350 (549888)	404 (1122926)	
405 (1122926)	406 (1122926)	411 (1124853)	
412 (1124853)	413 (1124853)	414 (1124853)	
415 (1124853)	416 (1124853)	417 (1124853)	
419 (1122982)	420 (1122982)	427 (1124905)	
447 (1124959)	469 (1124995)	470 (1124995)	
471 (1124995)	472 (1124995)	473 (1124995)	
474 (1124995)	515 (1121943)	516 (1121943)	
517 (1125371)	531 (1125418)	532 (1125418)	
533 (1125418)	534 (1125418)	538 (1125430)	
539 (1125430)	540 (1125430)	584 (1121943)	
585 (1121943)	586 (1121943)	587 (1121943)	
588 (1121943)	589 (1121943)	590 (1121943)	
625 (391073)	680 (1120653)	681 (1120653)	
682 (1120653)	683 (1120653)	684 (1120653)	
687 (1125761)	784 (1126137)	786 (1126137)	
787 (1126137)	788 (1126137)	789 (1126137)	
790 (1126137)	791 (1126137)	792 (1126137)	
793 (1126137)	794 (1126137)	795 (1126137)	
820 (1126254)	942 (1125371)	943 (1125371)	
944 (1125371)	945 (1125371)	946 (1125371)	
947 (1125371)	948 (1125371)	1125 (1126925)	
1126 (1126925)	1127 (1126925)	1128 (1126925)	
1129 (1126925)	1130 (1126925)	1185 (1126992)	
1186 (1126992)	1187 (1126992)	1189 (1126992)	
1196 (1127006)	1217 (1127043)	1268 (1128249)	
1269 (1128249)	1270 (1128249)	1271 (1128249)	
1272 (1128249)	1273 (1128249)	1274 (1128249)	
1364 (1128709)	1365 (1128709)	1366 (1128709)	
1367 (1128709)	1368 (1128709)	1371 (1128696)	
1408 (1128743)	1421 (1128759)	1525 (1126754)	
1526 (1126754)	1527 (1126754)	1528 (1126754)	
1529 (1126754)	1530 (1126754)	1531 (1126754)	
1532 (1126754)	1533 (1126754)	1534 (1126754)	
1535 (1126754)	1536 (1126754)	1537 (1126754)	
1553 (1129290)	1567 (1129302)	1645 (403792)	
1671 (381339)	1683 (381814)	1685 (381814)	

1693 (1129933)	1695 (1129933)	1797 (1126137)
1799 (1126137)	1800 (1126137)	1801 (1126137)
1802 (1126137)	1803 (1126137)	1804 (1126771)
1805 (1126771)	1806 (1126771)	1807 (1126771)
1808 (1126771)	1833 (1105334)	1834 (1105334)
1835 (1105334)	1836 (1105334)	1838 (1130993)
1839 (1130993)	1840 (1130993)	1841 (1130993)
1854 (1126184)	1855 (1126184)	1856 (1126184)
1857 (1126184)	1858 (1126184)	1894 (1127014)
1895 (1127014)	1896 (1127014)	1897 (1127014)
1898 (1127014)	1899 (1127014)	1900 (1127014)
1901 (1127014)	1902 (1127014)	1903 (1127014)
1920 (1106467)	1925 (1106467)	1928 (1106467)
1965 (1127014)	1966 (1127014)	1996 (1131414)
1997 (1131414)	1998 (1131414)	1999 (1131414)
2000 (1131414)	2039 (1127011)	2091 (1131676)
2098 (1131696)	2100 (1131696)	2101 (1131696)
2103 (1131696)	2109 (1131722)	2112 (1131696)
2146 (1131734)	2149 (1131734)	2181 (1131913)
2196 (1126189)	2197 (1126189)	2198 (1126189)
2199 (1126189)	2200 (1126189)	2284 (1105334)
2290 (1128249)	2319 (1132380)	2414 (1132626/1126961)
2448 (1132724)	2449 (1132724)	2450 (1132724)
2451 (1132724)	2452 (1132724)	2453 (1132724)
2454 (1132724)	2455 (1132724)	2456 (1132724)
2457 (1132724)	2458 (1132724)	2459 (1132724)
2460 (1132724)	2468 (1132928)	2469 (1132928)
2470 (1132928)	2471 (1132928)	2472 (1132928)
2494 (1133026)	2495 (1133026)	2496 (1133026)
2497 (1133026)	2498 (1123921)	2499 (1133076)
2500 (1133076)	2501 (1133076)	2530 (1133364)
2531 (1133364)	2532 (1133364)	2533 (1133364)
2546 (1116552)	2549 (1116552)	2550 (1116552)
2566 (1133460)	2567 (1133460)	2568 (1133460)
2569 (1133460)	2570 (1133460)	2571 (1133460)
2572 (1133460)	2575 (1133485)	2576 (1133485)
2577 (1133485)	2578 (1133485)	2579 (1133485)
2580 (1133485)	2609 (1133638)	2764 (1134495)
2765 (1134495)	2766 (1134495)	2767 (1134495)
2768 (1134495)	2818 (1126309)	2839 (1127011)
2904 (1135254)	2918 (1133638)	2920 (1126309)
2921 (1126309)	2922 (1126309)	2923 (1126309)
2924 (1126309)	2925 (1126309)	2926 (1126309)
2927 (1126309)	2956 (1135801)	2987 (395940)
3078 (840359/443671)	3099 (1137560/1137556)	3100 (1137560/1137556)
3101 (1137560/1137556)	3102 (1137560/1137556)	3103 (1137560/1137556)
3104 (1137560/1137556)	3105 (1137560/1137556)	3106 (1137560/1137556)
3107 (1137560/1137556)	3134 (1119640)	3135 (1119640)
3136 (1119640)	3137 (1119640)	3266 (1138693)
3267 (1138693)	3268 (1138693)	3269 (1138693)
3270 (1138693)	3271 (1138693)	3272 (1138693)
3273 (1138693)	3274 (1138693)	3275 (1138693)
3282 (1138699)	3283 (1138699)	3284 (1138699)
3285 (1138699)	3315 (1138930)	3316 (1138930)

3317 (1138930)	3318 (1138930)	3319 (1138930)
3326 (1138958)	3328 (1138958)	3329 (1138958)
3330 (1138958)	3331 (1138958)	3333 (1138856)
3340 (1138984)	3341 (1138984)	3342 (1138984)
3343 (1138984)	3344 (1138984)	3345 (1138984)
3361 (1118606)	3366 (1119640)	

21.69 A total of 321 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.6: Southwick Court, Trowbridge** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed and density of development;
- The site area and scale of the allocation;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites/brownfield sites;
- Potential conflicts with the WCS;
- Potential conflicts with the emerging North Bradley NDP and Southwick NDP;
- Loss of buffer/coalescence between Trowbridge and Southwick and loss of identity of Southwick;
- The need for the allocation in light of expected increases in rate delivery of Ashton Park;
- Lack of need for housing at Southwick;
- Need for biodiversity protection and enhancement (such as at Lambrook Stream corridor, protected bat species etc.);
- The site, and land adjacent to the site, is prone to flooding. Need to assess flood risk and take a sequential approach to development with the site with an appropriate buffer to areas of flood risk;
- Drainage problems historically across the site;
- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including air pollution and noise disturbance);
- The need for a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the principle, capacity and key design response/ principles to mitigate/minimise harm;
- Potential for harm to heritage assets (including Grade II* listed Southwick Court and II listed buildings, such as St Johns Church).
- Protection of ancient hedgerow and post-medieval earthworks and water meadows;
- Uncertainty over archaeological importance of the site;
- Concern about the impacts of additional use of Southwick Country Park;
- Loss of open space;
- Capacity of infrastructure providers including schools and health service; and
- Concerns over highways capacity and impact.

21.70 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.71 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- All known alternative sites have been assessed in accordance to the methodology as set out in Topic Paper 2 and the Trowbridge Community Area Topic Paper;
- Work is continuing on the Trowbridge Bat Mitigation Strategy and future development will need to be in line with this strategy and provisions to protect bat species have already been made in the Plan;
- The Council believe that the draft plan is in accordance to WCS Core Policies 29, 50, 51 and 58;
- The neighbourhood plans within the area are not at a sufficiently advanced stage of preparation and therefore as per the methodology cannot be relied upon;
- Brownfield sites within Trowbridge have been included in the Windfall allowance as per Topic Paper 3;
- Level of development at Trowbridge is derived from the Wiltshire Core Strategy and do not present a disproportionate level of development, as Trowbridge is a Principal Settlement;
- There is an identified indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge to be delivered during the Plan period. In accordance to the methodology therefore, the Plan will need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement;
- Sufficient consultation has occurred in the process to date. Wiltshire Council has followed planning regulations and its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI);
- There is no consistent and up-to-date information relating to quality/grade of agricultural land underlying the site;
- The supporting text is proposed to be amended in light of the comments from the Environment Agency (EA) that request enhancement to Lambrook Stream corridor to improve habitat for biodiversity, with an undeveloped buffer should also be left along the edge of the site and the indicative flood zone 2/3;
- It is unlikely that local air quality will be denigrated to the extent that this would impact on local biodiversity. The development at this site would likely generate increased levels of noise and light pollution associated with housing development which not considered likely to be significant. Mitigation measures would need to be developed in accordance with national and local plan policy;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment;
- There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site for housing could not be supported by suitable and timely investment into water supply infrastructure as well as sewage infrastructure to cope with demand;

- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets present and appropriate references are made in the Plan;
- Any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and would maintain the separate identity of the village of Southwick;
- Funding contributions may be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries and dentistry at the town;
- Opportunities to improved walking and cycling routes to existing and planned local services would encourage future residents to use sustainable forms of travel;
- The Council has refreshed the Trowbridge Transport Strategy which includes measures to support the allocations in the Plan.

21.72 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to reflect Heritage Impact Assessment and ensure appropriate consideration is given to the significance of heritage assets and their settings;
- Amend text to require an undeveloped buffer to be left along the edge of the site and the indicative flood zone 2/3 and that the development would need to enhance the Lambrok Stream corridor to improve habitat for biodiversity.

Table 21.14

Part 14:	Housing allocation H2.7: East of the Dene, Warminster		
No. of comments:	64		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	1310 (1128369) 1501 (706891) 1510 (706891) 1513 (706891) 1516 (706891) 1544 (1129255) 2042 (701827) 2045 (701827) 2048 (701827) 2295 (1132219) 2298 (1132219) 2502 (1132219) 2505 (1132219) 2729 (645345/389644) 2910 (397127) 2913 (397127) 2989 (395940) 3243 (645345/1138525) 3246 (645345/1138525) 3249 (645345/1138525) 3252 (645345/1138525) 2735 (1134352)	1447 (706936) 1508 (706891) 1511 (706891) 1514 (706891) 1524 (1129196) 1646 (403792) 2043 (701827) 2046 (701827) 2270 (704409) 2296 (1132219) 2299 (1132219) 2503 (1132219) 2506 (1132219) 2868 (1135059) 2911 (397127) 2914 (397127) 3241 (645345/1138525) 3244 (645345/1138525) 3247 (645345/1138525) 3250 (645345/1138525) 3253 (645345/1138525)	1500 (706891) 1509 (706891) 1512 (706891) 1515 (706891) 1542 (704465) 1660 (1129823) 2044 (701827) 2047 (701827) 2294 (1132219) 2297 (1132219) 2493 (1132219) 2504 (1132219) 2507 (1132219) 2909 (397127) 2912 (397127) 2915 (397127) 3242 (645345/1138525) 3245 (645345/1138525) 3248 (645345/1138525) 3251 (645345/1138525) 3254 (645345/1138525)

21.73 A total of 64 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.7: East of The Dene, Warminster** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The need for the development and the relationship of housing requirements with the West Warminster Urban Extension (WWUE);
- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The suitability of parts of the site to be developed;
- The planning history of the site;
- Conformity with the adopted Development Plan;
- The need to protect biodiversity (River Avon SAC and SSSI, local wildlife);
- The loss of greenfield land;
- Flooding issues on the site and in the local area and the lack of SFRA Level 2 or Surface Water Management Plan;
- Potential harmful impacts on heritage assets (including Bishopstrow Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings);
- Disagreement over potential landscape impacts;
- Concern over infrastructure capacity (including schools);

- The sustainability of the site;
- Concerns over highways and access impacts; and
- Concern over lack of local employment opportunities.

21.74 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.75 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- In order to provide surety of housing land supply in the North and West HMA land is required to be allocated at Warminster, being that it is one of the higher order Market Towns with a wide range of facilities, services and employment opportunities.
- Assessment of the site and its constraints has led to the conclusion that development should be located primarily within the northwest part of the site, where landscape and conservation impacts can be more effectively mitigated;
- Further heritage work has been undertaken for this allocation to ensure great weight is given to heritage assets present and appropriate references made in the Plan;
- Additional wording is proposed to be added to the supporting text to ensure that the policy adequately addresses the need to protect the River Avon SAC;
- The proposed allocation is located within flood zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle. Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site specific flood risk assessment which should inform design, layout and any mitigation measures required;
- While local school capacity is noted as problematic, primary school expansion is possible.
- Evidence indicates that the local highways network is capable of accommodating the number of dwellings proposed and that access could be achieved.
- Due to the location at a Market Town and the proximity of the site to existing bus networks the site is considered to be in a reasonably sustainable location.

21.76 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to reflect Heritage Impact Assessment to ensure appropriate consideration is given to the significance of heritage assets and their settings.
- Give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements through site specific assessments.

Table 21.15

Part 15:	Housing allocation H2.8: Bore Hill Farm, Warminster		
No. of comments:	7		
Comment ID	1603 (556400/901806)	1661 (1129823)	3140 (1137935/556489)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	2735 (1134352)	2990 (395940)	3061 (1137935/556489)
	3062 (1137935/556489)		

21.77 A total of 7 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.8: Bore Hill Farm, Warminster** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation;
- The need to protect biodiversity (River Wylde SAC and SSSI);
- Potential for negative public health impacts due to proximity to the biodigester and A36;
- Suitability of the site for residential development due to proximity to the biodigester and A36;
- Concerns over landscape impacts; and
- Potential for connection to onsite renewable energy from the adjoining biodigester.

21.78 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.79 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The level of homes proposed is considered reasonable given the mix of uses on the site and its local context.
- Additional wording is proposed to be added to the supporting text for Warminster to ensure that the policy adequately addresses the need to protect the River Wylde SAC and SSSI;
- Greater emphasis can be placed on the need to consider noise and odour in developing future design and layout. Therefore development of the site is unlikely to lead to any significant negative impacts on public health;
- Site area should be increased to reflect land ownership;
- Evidence suggests that the site is developable from a landscape perspective; and
- Development proposals which seek to incorporate design measures to reduce energy demand will be supported under WCS Core Policy 41.

21.80 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to reflect land available for development; give greater emphasis to issues relating to sites proximity to A36 and biodigestion, and flood and drainage, and biodiversity requirements.

Table 21.16

Part 16:	Housing allocation H2.9: Boreham Road, Warminster		
No. of comments:	5		
Comment ID	1521 (556098/901806)	2271 (704409)	2735 (1134252)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	2869 (1135059)	2991 (395940)	

21.81 A total of 5 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.9: Boreham Road, Warminster** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation;
- The status of the site given the recent appeal that has been allowed;
- The need to retain the site for agriculture;
- The need to protect biodiversity (River Wylye SAC, SSSI and local wildlife) and retention of a buffer strip;
- Reference to within the Plan to heritage assets;
- Concerns over highways, access and parking.

21.82 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.83 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The site has planning permission secured by Appeal for 35 self build homes. Approximate numbers would allow for 35 dwellings to be considered.

21.84 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to give greater emphasis to heritage assets, biodiversity and flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.17

Part 17:	Housing allocation H2.10: Barbers Farm, Chapmanslade		
No. of comments:	9		
Comment ID	1089 (1126867)	1565 (1129300/1129296)	2431 (691512)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	2434 (691512)	2435 (691512)	2436 (691512)
	2443 (1132855)	2992 (395940)	3189 (397159)

21.85 A total of 9 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.10: Barbers Farm, Chapmanslade** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites/brownfield sites;
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Retention of a public right of way along northern boundary;
- Concerns over drainage; and
- Provision of affordable housing.

21.86 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.87 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- It is considered that the number of dwellings proposed is acceptable as the site is both available and deliverable and the housing numbers would contribute to the over-all supply required;
- Clarification should be given about the need to retain the public right of way;
- The proposed site allocation is located within flood zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle. Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site specific flood risk and drainage assessment; and
- The number of dwellings proposed would allow for affordable housing units.

21.88 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to reflect public rights of way on site and to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.18

Part 18:	Housing allocation H2.11: The Street, Hullavington		
No. of comments:	33		
Comment ID	1018 (1126792)	1216 (393425/817881)	1386 (1128720)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	1391 (1128722)	1401 (1128725)	1402 (1128729)
	1403 (1128733)	1404 (1128741)	1419 (1128755)
	1432 (1128763)	1440 (1128799)	2025 (393425/817881)
	2267 (849874)	2268 (849874)	2394 (903251)
	2535 (1133384/825048)	2536 (1133384/825048)	2537 (1133384/825048)
	2538 (1133384/825048)	2539 (1133384/825048)	2540 (1133384/825048)
	2563 (1133467)	2624 (1133467)	2830 (1133467)
	2831 (1134739)	2832 (1134739)	2833 (1134740)
	2834 (1134740)	2835 (1134741)	2836 (1134741)
	2837 (1134742)	2838 (1134742)	2980 (395940)

21.89 A total of 33 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.11: The Street, Hullavington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed;
- The site area of the allocation and area of land identified for the school expansion;
- Potential for the site to come forward through the emerging Hullavington Neighbourhood Plan;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites;
- Concern on the impact of proposal on biodiversity;
- Impacts on local water infrastructure capacity and supply;
- Impacts on local drainage infrastructure;
- Request to include additional detail regarding expansion of school;
- Concerns over highways and access and parking;
- Potential impacts on Junction 17 of the M4.

21.90 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.91 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The site assessment process (stage 4) gives justification as to the size of the site;
- The Council welcomes the progress of the neighbourhood plan and its compatibility with the proposed allocation. The potential to extend the allocation can be explored through that process. However reference to a buffer to the watercourse should be removed;

- Through the site assessment process and as evidenced in Chippenham Community Area Topic Paper all reasonable alternatives have been considered;
- There are no biodiversity or geological designations within or in immediate proximity to the site and potential adverse effects are minor with potential for mitigation. The potential for reptiles, nesting birds and badgers can be considered through an ecological assessment required to inform a future planning application.
- There is no capacity at the Hullavington sewage treatment works. Capacity appraisals would be needed in respect of both water supply and sewage infrastructure. However, there is no evidence to suggest that development of the site could not be supported by suitable and timely investment into water supply infrastructure and sewage infrastructure;
- Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment and consideration given to Groundwater Protection Zones;
- Following further discussion with Highways England to overcome their objection the development is unlikely to have a harmful impact on Junction 17 of the M4;
- As stated in para 5.106 of the Plan access would be from The Street / Norton Road and would require highway improvement works to the existing junction layout and visibility splays associated with The Street / Norton Road junction; and
- The site area for the school should be corrected.

21.92 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend supporting text to correct reference to school area, remove land to the north of the proposed allocation and give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.19

Part 19	Housing allocation H2.12: East of Farrells Field, Yatton Keynell		
No. of comments:	88		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	12 (1109996) 126 (987736/846301) 900 (1126445) 909 (1126488) 912 (1126488) 1613 (1129609) 2021 (1131470) 2024 (1131470) 2121 (1131760) 2124 (1131760) 2275 (1132255) 2278 (1132255) 2510 (1133063) 2514 (1126401) 2517 (1126401) 2627 (1133656) 2630 (1133656) 2690 (1134147) 2694 (1134147) 2777 (1134567) 2780 (1134567) 2826 (1134708) 2880 (1135124) 2885 (1135124) 2930 (1126714) 2936 (1135674) 2939 (1135674) 3355 (1139017) 3358 (1139017) 3362 (397149)	16 (1114552) 551 (1124865/549147) 901 (1126445) 910 (1126488) 913 (1126488) 1639 (1129642) 2022 (1131470) 2070 (1131611) 2122 (1131760) 2125 (1131760) 2276 (1132255) 2508 (1133063) 2511 (1133063) 2515 (1126401) 2625 (1133656) 2628 (1133656) 2669 (983136) 2692 (1134147) 2695 (1134147) 2778 (1134567) 2824 (1134708) 2827 (1134708) 2882 (1135124) 2928 (1126714) 2931 (1126714) 2937 (1135674) 2961 (1135851) 3356 (1139017) 3359 (1139017)	39 (1117869) 899 (1126445) 902 (1126445) 911 (1126488) 1300 (1126488) 1883 (1131172) 2023 (1131470) 2071 (1131617) 2123 (1131760) 2133 (1131832) 2277 (1132255) 2509 (1133063) 2513 (903251) 2516 (1126401) 2626 (1133656) 2629 (1133656) 2670 (983136) 2693 (1134147) 2696 (1134147) 2779 (1134567) 2825 (1134708) 2879 (1135124) 2884 (1135124) 2929 (1126714) 2932 (1126714) 2938 (1135674) 2981 (395940) 3357 (1139017) 3360 (1139309)

21.93 We received 88 representations relating to **H2.12: East of Farrells Field, Yatton Keynell**. The comments raised were varied, but in summary the issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The site area of the allocation;
- The quanta of homes to be developed ;
- The need/justification for housing at Yatton Keynell;
- Whether a neighbourhood plan should instead be the mechanism to allocate housing sites;
- Impacts on biodiversity;
- Support for woodland corridor as footpath wildlife corridor;
- Location of existing pipeline apparatus on the site;

- Concerns over highways safety risk and increased traffic;
- Concerns over increased pollution levels (including air pollution and noise disturbance);
- Potential cost implications for surface water drainage solutions;
- Concern over coalescence with Tiddleywink and Cold harbour;
- Concerns over potential detrimental visual impacts and reduction of landscape quality;
- Capacity and potential benefits for the school and GP practice;
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Preference for access from the B4039 rather than through Farrell's Field;
- Site lies in Groundwater Source Protection Zone;
- Potential impacts on Junction 17 of the M4; and
- Lack of engagement with the Plan process;

21.94 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.95 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- No neighbourhood area has been designated to allow for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan and therefore as per the methodology cannot be relied upon;
- There is an identified indicative residual requirement for the Chippenham Community Area to be delivered during the Plan period. In accordance with the methodology therefore, the Plan will need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement;
- Environment Agency has no objection subject to comments from Drainage Authority (Wiltshire Council);
- Sufficient consultation has occurred in the process to date. Wiltshire Council has followed planning regulations and complied with its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI);
- The woodland/wildlife corridor should be removed from the allocation to correctly reflect land ownership;
- The pipeline through the site will be accounted for and the masterplan of the site should apply statutory easements;
- The proposed site allocation is located within flood zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle. Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment;
- Any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and through sensitive design can be accommodated appropriate to its local context;

- Appropriate contributions would be likely to be sought to help fund additional local school and health care capacities;
- Any planning application would have to address any highway concerns; and
- Following further discussion with Highways England the development is unlikely to have a harmful impact on Junction 17 of the M4.

21.96 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to move track from proposed site boundary and amend text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.20

Part 20:	Housing allocation H2.13: Ridgeway Farm, Crudwell		
No. of comments:	242		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	386 (1124620)	620 (1125644)	849 (1126295)
850 (1126295)	866 (1126302)	867 (1126302)	
868 (1126302)	869 (1126302)	891 (1126419)	
892 (1126419)	893 (1126419)	894 (1126419)	
956 (1126672)	1003 (1126672)	1004 (1126672)	
1005 (1126672)	1006 (1126672)	1055 (1126811)	
1058 (1126831)	1293 (1128343)	1294 (1128343)	
1295 (1128343)	1296 (1128343)	1297 (1128343)	
1298 (1128343)	1340 (1128466)	1506 (1129122)	
1517(1132949/1129139)	1518 (1132949/1129139)	1520 (1132949/1129139)	
1579 (1129320)	1580 (1129320)	1581 (1129320)	
1591 (1129432)	1592 (1129432)	1593 (1129432)	
1594 (1129432)	1595 (1129432)	1607 (1129532)	
1608 (1129532)	1610 (1129532)	1614 (1129610)	
1615 (1129610)	1616 (1129610)	1617 (1129610)	
1636 (1129633)	1637 (1129633)	1638 (1129633)	
1663 (1129836)	1664 (1129836)	1665 (1129836)	
1666 (1129836)	1668 (1129853)	1676 (1129909)	
1677 (1129909)	1678 (1129909)	1679 (1129909)	
1699 (1129967)	1703 (1130026)	1707 (391297)	
1710 (1130083)	1760 (1130479)	1761 (1130479)	
1762 (1130479)	1814 (1130710)	1868 (1131070)	
1869 (1131070)	1870 (1131070)	1871 (1131070)	
1872 (1131127)	1935 (1131233)	1936 (1131233)	
1937 (1131233)	1938 (1131233)	1941 (1131243)	
1942 (1131243)	1943 (1131243)	1944 (1131243)	
1945 (1131251)	1948 (1131251)	1949 (1131251)	
1950 (1131251)	1952 (1131251)	1953 (1131251)	
1954 (1131274)	1955 (1131274)	1976 (1131326)	
1977 (1131326)	1978 (1131326)	1979 (1131326)	
2004 (1131422)	2005 (1131422)	2006 (1131422)	
2007 (1131422)	2008 (1131422)	2009 (1131422)	
2010 (1131422)	2107 (1131712)	2108 (1131712)	
2110 (1131712)	2118 (1131739)	2127 (1131826)	
2128 (1131826)	2130 (1131826)	2131 (1131826)	
2132 (1131826)	2134 (1131833)	2135 (1131833)	
2136 (1131833)	2137 (1131833)	2138 (1131833)	
2139 (1131833)	2140 (1131833)	2141 (1131833)	
2171 (1131894)	2172 (1131898)	2173 (1131898)	
2174 (1131894)	2175 (1131898)	2176 (1131898)	
2178 (1131905)	2179 (1131905)	2180 (1131905)	
2185 (1131914)	2187 (1131925)	2194 (1131925)	
2202 (1131946)	2203 (1131946)	2204 (1131946)	
2205 (1132007)	2206 (1132008)	2207 (1132008)	
2208 (1132008)	2209 (1132008)	2210 (1132008)	
2211 (1132008)	2212 (1132007)	2213 (1132007)	
2214 (1132007)	2216 (1132024)	2217 (1132024)	
2218 (1132024)	2254 (1132154)	2255 (1132154)	
2256 (1132154)	2257 (1132154)	2258 (1132154)	

Part 20:	Housing allocation H2.13: Ridgeway Farm, Crudwell		
No. of comments:	242		
	2259 (1132154)	2260 (1132165)	2261 (1132165)
	2262 (1132165)	2273 (1132247)	2274 (1132247)
	2285 (1132276)	2286 (1132276)	2287 (1132276)
	2288 (1132276)	2289 (1132276)	2344 (1132429)
	2345 (1132429)	2395 (903251)	2426 (1132711)
	2444 (1132869)	2445 (1132869)	2462 (1132907)
	2463 (1132907)	2465 (1132907)	2467 (1132907)
	2473 (1132949)	2474 (1132949)	2475 (1132949)
	2476 (1132949)	2518 (1133304)	2519 (1133304)
	2520 (1133304)	2521 (1133304)	2522 (1133304)
	2523 (1133360)	2526 (1133360)	2527 (1133360)
	2528 (1133360)	2529 (1133360)	2552 (1133425)
	2553 (1133425)	2554 (1133425)	2555 (1133425)
	2771 (1134553)	2772 (1134553)	2773 (1134553)
	2774 (1134553)	2775 (1134553)	2776 (1134561)
	2781 (1134590)	2782 (1134590)	2783 (1134590)
	2784 (1134590)	2785 (1134604)	2787 (1134604)
	2788 (1134604)	2789 (1134604)	2790 (1134617)
	2801 (1134623)	2805 (1134632)	2806 (1134632)
	2807 (1134632)	2808 (1134632)	2809 (1134642)
	2810 (1134642)	2811 (1134642)	2819 (1134691/861292)
	2820 (1134691/861292)	2821 (1134746)	2822 (1134748)
	2823 (1134748)	2841 (1134824)	2842 (1134824)
	2847 (1134824)	2853 (1134824)	2854 (1134824)
	2855 (1134910)	2856 (1134910)	2857 (1134910)
	2875 (1135161)	2876 (1135102)	2877 (1135102)
	2878 (1135102)	2881 (1135127)	2886 (1135127)
	2887 (1135127)	2941 (1135683)	2942 (1135683)
	2943 (1135683)	2957 (1135814)	2958 (1135814)
	2959 (1135849)	2960 (1135849)	2962 (1135849)
	2963 (1135864)	2964 (1135864)	2965 (1135864)
	2982 (395940)	3306 (1138853)	

21.97 A total of 242 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.13: Ridgeway Farm, Crudwell** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The site area of the allocation;
- The quanta of homes/scale if development;
- The need/justification for housing at Crudwell;
- Potential conflicts with the WCS;
- Whether a neighbourhood plan should instead be the mechanism to allocate housing sites;
- Concern about local surface water drainage capacity;
- Effects of development on surface water flow and flooding;

- Potential loss of views across open farmland in a conservation area;
- Unsuitability of access to village services via Public Right of Way (PROW) which is often waterlogged;
- Impact of development on capacity of local services and infrastructure (such as the local school which is on a constrained site);
- Concerns over highways safety and increased traffic;
- Poor public transport;
- Potential impacts on Junction 17 of the M4; and
- Concern over lack of local employment opportunities.

21.98 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.99 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The neighbourhood plan is not at a sufficiently advanced stage of preparation and therefore as per the methodology cannot be relied upon;
- There is an identified indicative residual requirement for the Malmesbury Community Area to be delivered during the Plan period. In accordance with the methodology therefore, the Plan will need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement;
- The proposed site allocation is located within flood zone 1. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle subject to comments from Drainage Authority. Any proposals for development of this site should be informed by a site specific flood risk assessment;
- There is no evidence to suggest that development of the site for housing could not be supported by suitable and timely investment into water supply infrastructure as well as sewage infrastructure to cope with demand given current capacity issues which need to be appraised further by Wessex Water;
- The site is not within the Crudwell Conservation Area;
- Any development of the site would not lead to a significant encroachment of further built form into the countryside and a sensitive approach should be taken to design and layout including strategic landscaping. It is considered that the site boundary should be extended to the field boundary to the north to allow for a strong landscaping framework on the northern boundary;
- The school is currently full but expansion is considered possible through the planning application process. At this stage there is no known reason why permission could not be achieved, appropriate contributions would be likely to be sought to help fund additional local school capacity;
- The proposed extension to the Public Right of Way (PROW) would be maintained in accordance with regulation;

- Following further discussion with Highways England the development is unlikely to have a harmful impact on Junction 17 of the M4;
- The site is within walking distance of the services and facilities within the village but part of the route lacks a footway, as does existing housing in the immediate vicinity of the site, which is being addressed by the existing permission for part of the site;
- There are no highway objection to the deliverability of this proposed allocation; and
- Consistent with the Wiltshire Core Strategy, large villages are appropriate locations for development in the rural areas.

21.100 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to allow for landscaping and amend supporting text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.21

Part 21	Housing allocation H2.14: Court Orchard/ Cassways, Bratton		
No. of comments:	214		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	4 (1105335)	19 (1126059)	33 (1126059)
	201 (1126059)	499 (1125220)	502 (1125255)
	512 (1125261)	514 (1125357)	545 (1125408)
	561 (1125220)	562 (1125220)	563 (1125255)
	564 (1125255)	565 (1125255)	566 (1125255)
	576 (1125261)	577 (1125261)	578 (1125261)
	579 (1125261)	580 (1125261)	581 (1125261)
	650 (1124313)	700 (1125770)	701 (1125770)
	702 (1125770)	703 (1125770)	704 (1125770)
	705 (1125770)	710 (1125789)	733 (1125387)
	734 (1125387)	760 (1126008)	764 (1126059)
	769 (1126059)	801 (1126183)	811 (1126224)
	860 (703974)	861 (703974)	862 (703974)
	863 (703974)	864 (703974)	870 (1126317)
	889 (1126410)	903 (1126224)	904 (1126224)
	905 (1126224)	906 (1126224)	928 (1126059)
	929 (1126059)	930 (1126059)	931 (1126059)
	932 (1126059)	938 (1126059)	939 (1126059)
	940 (1126059)	941 (1126059)	957 (1125693)
	961 (1126678)	962 (1126215)	963 (1126678)
	971 (1126734)	977 (1126750)	981 (1126766)
	982 (1126764)	990 (1125408)	991 (1125408)
	992 (1125408)	993 (1125408)	994 (1125408)
	995 (1125408)	1002 (1126760)	1016 (1126784)
	1023 (1124313)	1024 (1124313)	1025 (1124313)
	1026 (1124313)	1027 (1124313)	1028 (1124313)
	1029 (1124313)	1111 (1126059)	1167 (1126059)
	1220 (705001)	1228 (1127957)	1243 (1122130)
	1277 (1126678)	1278 (1126678)	1279 (1126678)
	1280 (1126678)	1290 (1126215)	1322 (1126766)
	1323 (1126766)	1324 (1126766)	1325 (1126766)
	1326 (1126764)	1327 (1126764)	1328 (1126764)
	1329 (1126764)	1331 (1126764)	1465 (901952/901806)
	1474 (705001)	1475 (705001)	1476 (705001)
	1477 (705001)	1578 (692980)	1611 (1129546)
	1612 (1129546)	1659 (1129817)	1711 (704825)
	1716 (704825)	1717 (704825)	1719 (704825)
	1720 (704825)	1724 (704825)	1725 (704825)
	1726 (704825)	1727 (704825)	1728 (704825)
	1729 (704825)	1730 (704825)	1731 (704825)
	1732 (704825)	1733 (704825)	1736 (704825)
	1737 (704825)	1745 (704825)	1746 (704825)
	1747 (704825)	1748 (1126760)	1749 (1126760)
	1750 (704825)	1751 (1126760)	1752 (704825)
	1753 (704825)	1754 (704825)	1755 (704825)
	1756 (704825)	1757 (704825)	1758 (704825)
	1759 (704825)	1787 (704825)	1971 (1127957)

1972 (1127957)	1788 (1126766)	1789 (704825)
1790 (704825)	1791 (1126766)	1792 (1126766)
1793 (1126766)	1794 (704825)	1795 (704825)
1796 (704825)	1837 (1130991)	1956 (1131280)
1957 (1131280)	1958 (1131280)	1959 (1131280)
1960 (1126059)	1961 (1126059)	1973 (1127957)
1974 (1127957)	1975 (1127957)	2002 (1126750)
2003 (1126750)	2054 (1131542)	2055 (1131542)
2056 (1131542)	2057 (1131542)	2058 (1131542)
2059 (1131542)	2243 (1132119)	2244 (1132119)
2245 (1132119)	2246 (1132119)	2248 (1132119)
2249 (1132119)	2250 (1132119)	2251 (1132119)
2252 (1132119)	2300 (1125770)	2301 (1125770)
2302 (1125770)	2303 (1125770)	2304 (1125770)
2358 (704313)	2359 (704313)	2360 (704313)
2367 (1132525)	2368 (1132525)	2369 (1132525)
2370 (1132525)	2371 (1132525)	2372 (1132525)
2559 (1133437)	2560 (1133437)	2561 (1133437)
2562 (1133437)	2631 (1133661)	2632 (1133661)
2633 (1133661)	2634 (1133661)	2684 (1134131)
2686 (1134131)	2687 (1134131)	2688 (1134131)
2689 (1134131)	2691 (1134131)	2888 1137557
2732 (1134308/1134306)	2993 (395940)	3190 (397159)
3292 (1136156)	3293 (1136156)	3294 (1136156)
3314 (1138914)		

21.101 A total of 214 representations relating to proposed allocation **H2.14: Court Orchard/Cassways, Bratton** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The need and justification for development within Bratton;
- The quanta of homes to be developed / proposed density;
- The site area of the allocation;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites/brownfield sites;
- The potential for alternatives to be sought through a neighbourhood plan;
- Conformity with the adopted Development Plan;
- Inaccuracies in the data used in the assessment;
- Impacts on biodiversity (including Salisbury Plain SPA, local SSSIs, wildlife species)
- The need to retain the site for agriculture;
- Land stability;
- Impacts on air quality / noise pollution;
- Effects of development on surface water flow and flooding;

- Potential for harmful impacts on heritage assets (including Bratton Conservation Area, local archaeology and historic landscape);
- Disagreement over potential landscape impacts and ability to mitigate impacts, including from higher ground and the White Horse /Bratton Camp;
- Concern about impacts on amenity of adjoining residents;
- The need to preserve existing public rights of way that adjoin the site;
- Impact of development on capacity of local services and infrastructure (including schools, healthcare);
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concerns over highways, access and parking.
- Concern over lack of local employment opportunities.

21.102 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.103 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The Plan has been developed in conformity with the WCS, and its approach to allocating at large villages is in conformity with the WCS's Plan led approach to delivery of housing.
- In order to provide surety of housing land supply in the North and West HMA land is required to be allocated at some large villages. The Westbury Community Area remainder was considered as an area of search as there is an indicative residual requirement for the area, and the most suitable site has been identified as the allocation site.
- There is not a well progressed neighbourhood plan in the village and the Council is unable to rely on a neighbourhood plan to deliver allocation(s).
- The density of the site at 40 dwellings is considered to be reasonable given the constraints of the site. However, the promoters of the site have carried out further detailed assessment and potential layouts which show that 35 dwellings may be more readily accommodated.
- Evidence suggests that the site is developable from a landscape perspective, and that potential impacts on biodiversity and heritage can be mitigated within the site.
- Evidence also suggests that air and noise pollution arising would not be a barrier to development of the site, and that access is achievable from Westbury Road.
- Evidence indicates that there are sufficient local services available to support development.
- Potential impacts on amenity of existing residents cannot be determined at this stage. Detailed design and layout of a future planning application will need to demonstrate that the site will be laid out in a manner which preserves amenity.

- The Plan requires that improved connections to adjoining public rights of way BRAT24 and BRAT25 should be facilitated through any subsequent development proposals.

21.104 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend the capacity of the site to 35 dwellings from 40 dwellings and amend supporting text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements.

Table 21.22

Part 22	South Housing Market Area		
No. of comments:	490		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	60 (1118793)	66 (1119095/894742)	83 (1106218)
	133 (1120822)	138 (466628)	141 (854597)
	144 (1121429)	145 (446472)	146 (1121618)
	147 (1121643)	148 (448144)	152 (447313)
	164 (1121931)	173 (1106381)	174 (1122535)
	176 (1122629)	191 (1124558)	193 (447691)
	194 (447691)	196 (862429)	197 (1122902)
	203 (447691)	210 (1122659)	214 (446026)
	216 (1123223)	217 (1123267)	218 (1123267)
	220 (1123399)	221 (1123400)	227 (1123646)
	228 (1123667)	229 (1123667)	230 (1123667)
	231 (1123667)	232 (1123667)	233 (1123667)
	234 (1123667)	235 (1123646)	236 (1123646)
	237 (1123646)	238 (1123646)	239 (1123646)
	240 (1123646)	241 (1123646)	242 (1123399)
	243 (1123399)	244 (1123399)	245 (1123399)
	246 (1123399)	247 (1123399)	248 (1123399)
	253 (1123223)	260 (1120170)	261 (1105345)
	262 (1122629)	264 (1124064)	265 (1124133)
	275 (1124180)	276 (1124219)	277 (466628)
	278 (466628)	294 (1124309)	298 (1124180)
	299 (1124180)	300 (1124180)	301 (1124180)
	302 (1124180)	303 (1124180)	304 (1124180)
	305 (1124133)	306 (1121429)	308 (1121429)
	309 (1121429)	310 (1124064)	311 (1124064)
	313 (1122902)	316 (1122902)	318 (1122902)
	319 (1122902)	320 (1122902)	312 (1122902)
	322 (1122902)	323 (448144)	324 (448144)
	325 (448144)	326 (448144)	328 (862429)
	330 (862429)	331 (862429)	332 (862429)
	333 (862429)	334 (862429)	335 (862429)
	365 (1123578)	370 (1124562)	376 (390915)
	377 (1118211)	379 (473545)	385 (447590)
	388 (979503)	398 (1124760)	409 (1124540)
	444 (448368)	457 (446464)	458 (446464)
	476 (1105345)	477 (1105345)	478 (1105345)
	479 (1105345)	483 (1124998)	485 (1125007)
	486 (1125007)	487 (1125007)	488 (1125007)
	489 (1125007)	491 (1106218)	492 (1125050)
	495 (899851)	497 (1125224)	509 (1125265)
	510 (1125268)	511 (1125268)	518 (1124364)
	555 (1125096)	560 (446465)	571 (446465)
	597 (1125594)	606 (1125626)	637 (1125438)
	638 (1125438)	639 (1125438)	640 (1125438)
	641 (1125438)	642 (1125438)	643 (1125438)
	644 (1125438)	645 (1125438)	646 (1125438)
	647 (1125438)	661 (1124540)	662 (1124540)

663 (1124540)	665 (1124540)	666 (1124540)
667 (1124540)	668 (1124540)	669 (1124540)
675 (446026)	676 (446026)	679 (902116)
712 (1106030)	717 (1125847)	720 (448231)
721 (448231)	724 (1125899)	726 (1125964)
727 (1125964)	728 (1125964)	729 (1125986)
730 (1125986)	731 (1125986)	732 (1125988)
745 (1123135)	746 (1123135)	747 (1123135)
748 (1123135)	749 (1123135)	750 (1123135)
751 (1123135)	756 (1126905)	759 (1126905)
761 (1126905)	774 (378123)	780 (378123)
796 (378123)	798 (1126176)	800 (466447)
812 (1126228)	825 (1125482)	828 (1126265)
829 (1126265)	830 (1126265)	841 (1125265)
842 (1125265)	843 (1125265)	844 (1125265)
845 (1125265)	846 (1125265)	847(1125265)
851 (1125268)	852 (1125268)	853 (1125268)
854 (11252689)	855 (1125268)	856 (1125268)
858 (1125356)	859 (1126268)	872 (1126319)
875 (1126328/326118)	879 (1126328/326118)	883 (1126342)
887 (1126383)	896 (1126342)	897 (1126342)
898 (1126342)	908 (1126187)	914 (1125356)
915 (1125356)	916 (1125356)	917 (1125356)
918 (1125356)	919 (1125356)	920 (1125356)
937 (1125432)	949 (862429)	952 (446834)
958 (1126683)	960 (1126692)	966 (1126718)
976 (1126323)	984 (1126763)	996 (1125096)
997 (1125096)	998 (1125096)	999 (1125096)
1009 (862429)	1011 (1126779)	1013 (1126779)
1017 (1125373)	1030 (1126795)	1031 (1126797)
1032 (1126797)	1034 (1126797)	1037 (393725)
1038 (393725)	1040 (393725)	1041 (393725)
1042 (393725)	1062 (898778)	1063 (898778)
1075 (1126851)	1078 (1126871)	1079 (1126871)
1080 (1126871)	1081 (1126871)	1082 (1126871)
1083 (1126871)	1084 (1126871)	1085 (1126944)
1090 (1126843)	1091 (1126725)	1100 (1126914)
1101 (1126914)	1147 (1126943)	1148 (1126943)
1150 (1126946)	1164 (1126801)	1165 (1120809)
1174 (1126946)	1177 (1126969)	1178 (446889)
1179 (1126987)	1181 (1126987)	1183 (1126987)
1184 (1126987)	1188 (1126977)	1211 (1126977)
1212 (1127034)	1213 (1127034)	1214 (1127034)
1218 (1127005)	1222 (1127054)	1223 (1127054)
1224 (1127054)	1234 (1125482)	1235 (1125482)
1236 (1127967)	1237 (1127967)	1238 (1127967)
1239 (1127967)	1240 (1126300)	1244 (1127962)
1247 (458507)	1248 (458507)	1249 (458507)
1250 (458507)	1251 (458507)	1252 (458507)
1253 (458507)	1254 (458507)	1255 (458507)
1266 (1126268)	1267 (1126268)	1288 (1126692)
1289 (1126692)	1311 (1126323)	1312 (1126323)
1313 (1126323)	1314 (1126323)	1315 (1126323)
1332 (1126763)	1333 (1126763)	1334 (1126763)

1335 (1126763)	1336 (1126763)	1337 (1126763)
1338 (1126763)	1339 (1126763)	1341 (1126779)
1345 (1126779)	1346 (1126779)	1347 (1126779)
1348 (1126779)	1349 (1126779)	1350 (1126779)
1351 (1126779)	1352 (1126779)	1360 (1124065)
1361 (1124065)	1362 (1124065)	1363 (1124065)
1374 (1126801)	1382 (825522)	1384 (825522)
1496 (446038)	1497 (446038)	1498 (446038)
1499 (446038)	1584 (1119095/894742)	1596 (1126176)
1597 (1126176)	1598 (1126176)	1599 (1126176)
1600 (1126176)	1601 (1126176)	1602 (1126176)
1635 (1119095/894742)	1648 (1129695)	1649 (1129720)
1650 (905964)	1705 (1126719)	1706 (1126719)
1709 (1130070)	1739 (1130378/1122261)	1768 (556113)
1770 (556113)	1772 (556113)	1775 (556113)
1780 (556113)	1785 (556113)	1786 (556113)
1809 (1126757)	1815 (1130720/894742)	1884 (447415)
1885 (447415)	1886 (447415)	1887 (447415)
1888 (447415)	1889 (1127005)	1890 (1127005)
1893 (392667)	1907 (477226)	1908 (477226)
1916 (447918)	1940 (468232)	1946 (1130616)
1947 (1130616)	1980 (1126300)	1981 (1126300)
1982 (1126300)	1985 (1131395)	2011 (1131426)
2016 (1131457)	2027 (1131477)	2049 (1131544/1131505)
2050 (1131544/1131505)	2051 (1131544/1131505)	2052 (1131544/1131505)
2053 (1131544/1131505)	2081 (1131660)	2086 (1131666/1131662)
2120 (1131754/1131747)	2151 (1131878)	2152 (1131878)
2153 (1131878)	2154 (1131878)	2155 (1131878)
2156 (1131878)	2157 (1131878)	2158 (1131878)
2159 (1131878)	2160 (1131878)	2161 (1131878)
2220 (391071)	2221 (1125984)	2222 (1125984)
2227 (1125984)	2230 (408500)	2231 (408500)
2283 (1132230/1132220)	2305 (1132344/825048)	2306 (1132344/825048)
2307 (1132344/825048)	2308 (1132344/825048)	2309 (1132344/825048)
2310 (1132344/825048)	2311 (1132344/825048)	2312 (1132344/825048)
2313 (1132344/825048)	2314 (1132344/825048)	2355 (445966)
2366 (1132230/1132220)	2392 (903251)	2396 (903251)
2591 (1133523)	2441 (1132344/825048)	2590 (1133523)
2640 (1133686)	2619 (900160/900154)	2637 (1133686)
2966 (1135954/556489)	2718 (977912)	2736 (1134260/1131505)
2738 (1134260/1131505)	2786 (446826)	2791 (446826)
2792 (1134607)	2793 (1134607)	2794 (1134607)
2795 (1134607)	2796 (1134607)	2797 (1134607)
2798 (1134611)	2799 (1134611)	2800 (1134611)
2802 (1134611)	2803 (1134611)	2804 (1134611)
2870 (467669)	2871 (467669)	2872 (467669)
2873 (467669)	2889 (446149)	2890 (446149)
2891 (446149)	2894 (979508)	2907 (1135279)
2946 (893417)	3008 (998345/556489)	3013 (900160/900154)
3014 (900160/900154)	3015 (900160/900154)	3016 (900160/900154)
3022 (900160/900154)	3025 (900160/900154)	3027 (1136367)
3028 (1136367)	3029 (1136367)	3030 (1136367)
3031 (1136367)	3032 (1136367)	3033 (1136367)
3034 (1136367)	3043 (900160/900154)	3049 (900160/900154)

3063 (1136627/1136618)	3064 (1136627/1136618)	3065 (1136627/1136618)
3067 (1136806/1136797)	3068 (1136804/836252)	3070 (1136804/836252)
3073 (1136804/836252)	3090 (395552/817881)	3112 (835920/438199)
3113 (835920/438199)	3114 (835920/438199)	3115 (835920/438199)
3116 (835920/438199)	3117 (835920/438199)	3118 (835920/438199)
3119 (835920/438199)	3120 (835920/438199)	3121 (835920/438199)
3122 (393560/1131505)	3123 (393560/1131505)	3230 (1138546/1133715)
3329 (1138958)	22 (1115637)	1763 (556113)
3026 (457823)	3324 (393855)	3335 (1123514)
3336 (1123514)	3337 (1123514)	

21.105 A total of 490 representations relating to the **South Wiltshire Housing Market Area** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Insufficient sites are allocated in the Housing Market Area (HMA) to maintain a 5-year housing land supply and further allocations should be made.
- Objections to majority of the housing requirement focusing on three sites in Harnham and Netherhampton – smaller sites should be allocated instead to aid delivery and allocations should be distributed through the HMA.
- Concerns over potential impacts of development on ecology, including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), the River Avon and Salisbury Plain.
- The residual requirement for the South Wiltshire HMA should increase to reflect that the Churchfields and Central Car Park sites are unlikely to be developed within the plan period.

21.106 Salisbury

- The Plan provides for a surplus of about 600 houses for Salisbury/Wilton, which is not justified;
- The number of homes allocated at Netherhampton Road is too high;
- Allocations at Netherhampton Road would be detrimental to the visual approach to the city, Salisbury's important landscape, and the cathedral, as well as surface water flooding concerns;
- Netherhampton Road could not be developed until the end of the Plan period, or after 2026;
- Highways Agency considers transport network improvements are necessary to accommodate development at Salisbury as development will impact on the A36 and there is a need for an up to date Salisbury Transport Strategy.

21.107 Amesbury, Bulford and Durrington

- Comments relate to Durrington not being suitable for further housing including due to lack of services;
- The approach to allocate two sites in Durrington and none in Amesbury is questioned;

- The cumulative impact of the military rebasing is not taken into account.

21.108 Large villages

- Not allocating sites in any Large Villages is inconsistent with approach in the North & West HMA. More sites should be allocated in rural villages.
- Object to Shrewton, Idmiston and Mere being discounted as locations for housing allocations.
- The Council should allocate additional land in the Amesbury Community Area.
- The residual Southern Wiltshire Community Area requirements rely on strategic commitments which appear ambitious in yield and delivery timing

21.109 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.110 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of the sites is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- It is considered that sufficient sites have been allocated in the South HMA to improve housing land supply.
- Many sites have been considered through the site selection process at Amesbury, Bulford and Durrington. In terms of local context, the Army Basing Programme is recognised as being a factor likely to put pressure on local services and facilities. However, this important Programme will be delivering necessary infrastructure to support military families in line with Core Policy 37 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and a master-planned approach. As such, the Basing Programme has been considered as operating outwith the requirements being addressed through the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. Therefore, on the basis of evidential assessments, sites have been allocated that are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits to the local area. Such benefits include improvements to local infrastructure and services.
- The situation in the South HMA is different to that in the North and West HMA - it is not considered that allocations should be made in Large Villages, see relevant community area topic papers;
- It is considered that sufficient sites have been allocated in the Amesbury Community Area to meet housing requirements;
- The 'more sustainable' sites identified by the site assessment methodology in this area of search were at Durrington. However, due to the role of Amesbury as a Market Town within this Community Area, a site at Amesbury that was assessed as 'less sustainable' was considered for allocation and subsequently rejected due to the impact of noise from the A303 and the available evidence at the time that indicated the land was likely to be included in the plans to widen the A303;
- The potential effects of site allocations on ecology has been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment and significant effects are considered able to be mitigated adequately;

- Reasons for not allocating sites at Shrewton, Idmiston and Mere are presented in the relevant Community Area Topic Papers;
- The level of housing allocations in Salisbury/Wilton is considered necessary to make up for lack of delivery within the Plan period on other strategic sites in Salisbury;
- The number of homes allocated on the Netherhampton Road site is considered acceptable and will allow for significant sustainability benefits to be delivered on-site;
- Potential visual and surface water impacts have been considered through the site selection process and are not considered so significant to mitigate that measures are not achievable to reduce any effects;
- It is considered that the majority of the Netherhampton Road site is deliverable within the Plan period;
- The Salisbury Transport Strategy is being refreshed and will include measures to mitigate the effects of proposed housing allocations in Salisbury. The Highways Agency are involved in that refresh;
- Housing requirements in the Southern Wiltshire Community Area take into account developable commitments which are considered will be delivered in the Plan period and therefore there is no outstanding requirement in this community area.

21.111 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.23

Part 23:	Housing allocation H3.1: Netherhampton Road, Salisbury		
No. of comments:	289		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	3 (1104997)	30 (1116631)	32 (1116908)
	40 (1118090)	46 (1118211)	69 (446039)
	73 (1119180)	91 (1119713)	92 (403805)
	93 (402956)	117 (1120594)	151 (899859)
	163 (1121929)	175 (1122652)	183 (1122632)
	185 (1122587)	211 (446026)	219 (1123379)
	249 (1122632)	250 (1122632)	251 (1122632)
	252 (1122632)	257 (1122587)	258 (1122587)
	259 (1122587)	261 (1105345)	281 (1124300)
	296 (1124300)	297 (1124300)	327 (1120809)
	336 (1120809)	337 (1120809)	338 (1120809)
	339 (1120809)	340 (1120809)	341 (1120809)
	342 (1120809)	380 (1118211)	460 (446464)
	468 (1123964)	482 (1124998)	484 (1123408)
	547 (1123977)	554 (1123977)	567 (1125575)
	592 (1124364)	593 (1124364)	594 (1124364)
	603 (1123046)	607 (1125626)	608 (1125626)
	609 (1125626)	610 (1125626)	611 (1125626)
	674 (1125563)	711 (1125794)	757 (1126905)
	765 (1123501)	770 (1126040)	774 (378123)
	777 (1126103)	783 (1126119)	797 (1126119)
	802 (1126187)	810 (1120822)	813 (1126228)
	817 (1126248)	827 (1126264)	839 (1126280)
	865 (378123)	871 (378123)	876 (1126328/326118)
	880 (378123)	965 (1126730)	968 (1126730)
	969 (1126730)	972 (1126730)	974 (1126730)
	975 (1126730)	978 (1126219)	1052 (393725)
	1053 (393725)	1054 (393725)	1064 (898778)
	1065 (898778)	1066 (898778)	1067 (898778)
	1068 (898778)	1069 (898778)	1087 (1126865)
	1104 (1125563)	1105 (1125563)	1106 (1125563)
	1107 (1125563)	1108 (1125563)	1109 (1125563)
	1110 (1125563)	1124 (1128746)	1137 (1125794)
	1138 (1125794)	1139 (1125794)	1140 (1125794)
	1141 (1125794)	1142 (1125794)	1143 (1126359)
	1146 (1126511)	1171 (447787)	1173 (1126846)
	1182 (1125989)	1202 (1126918)	1206 (1126834)
	1215 (1126977)	1219 (1126772)	1226 (1125160)
	1256 (445982)	1257 (445982)	1258 (445982)
	1259 (445982)	1299 (447657)	1301 (447657)
	1302 (447657)	1303 (447657)	1304 (447657)
	1315 (1126323)	1342 (1106010)	1344 (1106010)
	1357 (1126359)	1358 (1126359)	1359 (1126359)
	1369 (1126511)	1392 (1126846)	1393 (1126846)
	1394 (1126846)	1395 (1126846)	1396 (1126846)
	1397 (1126846)	1399 (1106010)	1436 (1126918)

1437 (1126918)	1438 (1126918)	1439 (1126918)
1441 (447893)	1442 (447893)	1443 (447943)
1444 (447943)	1445 (447943)	1461 (1126772)
1462 (1126772)	1463 (1126772)	1464 (1126772)
1481 (1125160)	1504 (402734)	1540 (1129241/901806)
1586 (1106010)	1647 (403792)	1653 (905964)
1654 (905964)	1680 (1129911)	1702 (1125649)
1714 (1126717)	1715 (1126717)	1742 (1130390)
1743 (1130390)	1744 (1130390)	1810 (1126757)
1811 (841393/558013)	1813 (1126757)	1842 (1131000)
1843 (1131000)	1844 (1131000)	1845 (1131014)
1846 (1131014)	1873 (899628/899623)	1874 (899628/899623)
1875 (899628/899623)	1876 (899628/899623)	1877 (899628/899623)
1878 (899628/899623)	1879 (899628/899623)	1880 (899628/899623)
1881 (899628/899623)	1882 (899628/899623)	1891 (1131188)
1988 (446468)	1990 (1131397)	1991 (1131399)
1992 (1131400)	1993 (1131400)	1994 (1131400)
1995 (1131404)	2012 (1131426)	2014 (1131426)
2017 (1131457)	2019 (1131457)	2028 (1131477)
2030 (1131477)	2032 (1131488)	2033 (1131488)
2034 (1131488)	2035 (1131504)	2036 (1131504)
2072 (1131624)	2073 (1131624)	2074 (1131630)
2075 (1131630)	2106 (1131705)	2114 (1131555)
2115 (1131555)	2129 (1135876)	2231 (408500)
2177 (1125482)	2188 (1125482)	2189 (1125482)
2190 (1125482)	2223 (1125984)	2225 (1125984)
2228 (1125984)	2241 (1126757)	2279 (1132230/1132220)
2316 (1132372)	2317 (1132372)	2318 (1132372)
2336 (1132344/825048)	2337 (1132344/825048)	2338 (1132344/825048)
2339 (1132344/825048)	2340 (1132344/825048)	2346 (1132428)
2350 (1132344/825048)	2351 (445966)	2353 (445966)
2356 (1126178)	2363 (1126178)	2393 (903251)
2427 (1132740)	2486 (1132978)	2487 (1132978)
2488 (1132978)	2556 (1133436)	2601 (1133628)
2602 (1133628)	2603 (1133628)	2604 (1133628)
2605 (1133628)	2606 (1133628)	2698 (1133531)
2699 (1133531)	2700 (1133531)	2721 (445981)
2723 (445981)	2727 (448417)	2746 (1134443)
2747 (1134443)	2748 (1134443)	2749 (1134443)
2752 (1134443)	2753 (1134443)	2896 (1135230)
2898 (1135230)	2900 (1135230)	2902 (1135230)
2950 (408128)	2952 (408128)	2954 (408128)
2996 (395940)	3012 (900160/900154)	3050 (900160/900154)
3051 (900160/900154)	3166 (873511)	3167 (873511)
3168 (873511)	3169 (873511)	3170 (873511)
3233 (1138534)	3234 (1138534)	3235 (1138534)
3236 (1138534)	3237 (1138534)	3238 (1138534)
3239 (1138534)	3240 (1138534)	3297 (1138813)
3308 (1138819)	3309 (1138819)	3310 (1138819)
3311 (1138819)	3332 (1138954)	3334 (1138982)
3339 (1138982)		

21.112 A total of 289 representations relating to proposed allocation H3.1: Netherhampton Road, Salisbury were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The scale of the allocation;
- Concern that further greenfield development would be required because of delays bringing forward central brownfield sites;
- The need and justification for the development;
- Concerns that the site could not be developed until the end of the Plan period, or after 2026;
- Objections to majority of housing requirement allocated at Harnham and Netherhampton.
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites, including smaller sites;
- Potential detriment to the visual approach to the city, Salisbury's important landscape, and the cathedral spire;
- Development on land that currently separates Salisbury from Netherhampton;
- Potential for harm to Cranborne Chase AONB setting;
- Concerns that development on higher land will harm landscape;
- The need for a Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Surface water flooding concerns;
- The need to protect biodiversity (including River Nadder SAC and SSSI);
- The need for transport network improvements to address impacts on the A36;
- The need for an up to date to the Salisbury Transport Strategy;
- Potential adverse impacts of added congestion on local road networks;
- Uncertainty over deliverability of bus service to serve the site;
- Improvements needed to existing sewage and water infrastructure;
- Impacts of reduced air quality and impact on public health, including impacts on the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Salisbury;
- Uncertainty over archaeological sensitivity of the site;
- Lack of doctors surgery and pharmacy and need for additional GPs;
- Request to include additional detail regarding delivery of a school;
- Lack of guidance regarding the requirement for approval of a masterplan;
- Need for new primary school capacity; and

- Lack of need for more employment land as Harnham already has unoccupied employment land.

21.113 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.114 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Delays in delivering the Churchfields strategic allocation is recognised in the Plan and for that reason, other site allocations are required;
- Many sites have been considered through the site selection process - sites have been allocated that are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits;
- The level of housing allocations in Salisbury/Wilton is considered necessary to make up for lack of delivery within the plan period on other strategic sites in Salisbury;
- The number of homes allocated on the Netherhampton Road site is considered acceptable and will allow for significant sustainability benefits to be delivered on-site;
- Potential visual and surface water impacts have been considered through the site selection process and are not considered so significant that mitigate measures are not achievable to reduce any effects;
- It is considered that the majority of the Netherhampton Road site is deliverable within the plan period;
- The Salisbury Transport Strategy is being refreshed and will include measures to mitigate the effects of proposed housing allocations in Salisbury. The Highways Agency are involved in that refresh;
- Negotiations are being held with local public transport providers and it is considered that this site can be served by frequent and reliable bus services;
- It is considered that water and sewerage infrastructure in the area can be adequately enhanced to deal with the additional housing allocated on this site;
- It is considered that impacts on local air quality can be adequately mitigated - this site is in reasonable proximity to the range of services and facilities in Salisbury city centre, and whilst vehicle usage is likely to increase in the area, mitigation measures are possible, for example through increasing and improving existing public transport accessibility along Netherhampton Road and through the refresh of the Salisbury Transport Strategy;
- Regarding views towards the cathedral spire, development on this site will be restricted to below the 75m contour line and the site is large enough to accommodate a significant amount of Green Infrastructure, open space and landscaping in the design and layout that will help reduce the impacts of the site;
- The site has high potential for archaeology however this is a very large site and the exact extent of archaeological works is not certain. It is possible that the area of archaeological interest only covers a section of this site. Assessment and preservation in situ would be required and is considered possible;

- The edge of the Cranborne Chase AONB lies approx. 2km south-west of this site. No significant impacts on the AONB are considered likely from development of this site. Keeping development below the 75m contour will allow development to relate to the valley floor and provide a sufficient visual buffer to the open countryside without impinging on the setting of the AONB;
- The plan policy for this site requires provision of sufficient healthcare capacity to meet the need created by the development. This is likely to be through agreed developer contributions;
- The plan policy requires at least 1.8ha of land for a two-form entry primary school along with playing pitches as well as provision for school development to ensure need generated by development is met.

21.115 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Add text to Policy H3.1 to clarify that the masterplan should be approved as part of the planning application process.
- Amend text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements, as well as biodiversity.

Table 21.24

Part 24:	Housing allocation H3.2: Hilltop Way, Salisbury		
No. of comments:	8		
Comment ID	14 (1113883)	17 (1114697)	1046 (393725)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	1651 (905964)	2038 (1131509/1131505)	2997 (395940)
	3175 (873511)	3176 (873511)	

21.116 A total of 8 representations relating to proposed allocation **H3.2: Hilltop Way, Salisbury** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The site has now had outline planning permission granted for 10 dwellings;
- Potential harm to the local landscape and skyline; and
- Highways and access concerns.

21.117 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

- The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

21.118 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.25

Part 25:	Housing allocation H3.3: North of Netherhampton Road, Salisbury		
No. of comments:	145		
Comment ID (Consultee / Agent ID):	70 (446039)	74 (1119180)	81 (1113687)
	94 (1119762)	118 (1120591)	177 (1122629)
	212 (446026)	263 (1122629)	266 (1119762)
	267 (1119762)	307 (1121429)	459 (446464)
	475 (1123964)	548 (1123977)	553 (1123977)
	568 (446465)	570 (446465)	591 (1124364)
	595 (1124364)	596 (1124364)	612 (1125626)
	613 (1125626)	614 (1125626)	615 (1125626)
	616 (1125626)	617 (1125626)	758 (1126905)
	766 (1123501)	771 (1126040)	775 (1126092)
	814 (1126228)	840 (1120809)	877 (1126328/326118)
	881 (378123)	1049 (393725)	1050 (393725)
	1051 (393725)	1070 (898778)	1071 (898778)
	1072 (898778)	1073 (898778)	1086 (1126725)
	1149 (1126943)	1172 (447787)	1176 (1126846)
	1180 (1126987)	1190 (1125989)	1191 (1126918)
	1261 (1120809)	1262 (1120809)	1263 (1120809)
	1305 (447657)	1306 (447657)	1307 (447657)
	1308 (447657)	1309 (447657)	1343 (1126779)
	1353 (1106010)	1387 (1126846)	1388 (1126846)
	1389 (1126846)	1390 (1126846)	1398 (1106010)
	1400 (1106010)	1433 (1126918)	1434 (1126918)
	1435 (1126918)	1585 (1106010)	1652 (905964)
	1712 (1126717)	1713 (1126717)	1738 (1130390)
	1740 (1130390)	1741 (1130390)	1812 (1126757)
	1989 (446468)	2013 (1131426)	2015 (1131426)
	2018 (1131457)	2020 (1131457)	2029 (1131477)
	2031 (1131477)	2116 (1131555)	2117 (1131555)
	2191 (1125482)	2192 (1125482)	2193 (1125482)
	2195 (1125482)	2224 (1125984)	2226 (1125984)
	2229 (1125984)	2232 (899628/899623)	2233 (899628/899623)
	2234 (899628/899623)	2235 (899628/899623)	2236 (899628/899623)
	2237 (899628/899623)	2238 (899628/899623)	2239 (899628/899623)
	2240 (1126757)	2242 (1126757)	2280 (1132230/1132220)
	2352 (445966)	2354 (445966)	2361 (1126178)
	2364 (1126178)	2428 (1132740)	2512 (903251)
	2557 (1133436)	2593 (394962)	2594 (394962)
	2724 (445981)	2725 (445981)	2728 (448417)
	2754 (1134443)	2755 (1134443)	2756 (1134443)
	2757 (1134443)	2758 (1134443)	2759 (1134443)
	2897 (1135230)	2899 (1135230)	2901 (1135230)
	2903 (1135230)	2951 (408128)	2953 (408128)
	2955 (408128)	2998 (395940)	3108 (841393/558013)
	3177 (873511)	3178 (873511)	3179 (873511)
	3216 (1138534)	3217 (1138534)	3218 (1138534)
	3219 (1138534)	3220 (1138534)	3221 (1138534)
	3222 (1138534)	3301 (1138819)	3302 (1138819)
	3303 (1138819)	3304 (1138819)	3338 (1138982)
	774 (378123)		

21.119 A total of 145 representations relating to proposed allocation **H3.3: North of Netherhampton Road, Salisbury** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The scale of development and size of the site;
- The suitability of the site compared to alternative sites;
- The need to protect biodiversity (including River Nadder SAC and SSSI, local wildlife sites);
- Improvements that are needed to existing sewage and water infrastructure;
- Potential risk of surface water flooding;
- Potential detriment to the visual approach to the city and views of the cathedral;
- The need for a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the principle, capacity and key design response/ principles to mitigate/minimise harm;
- The need for transport network improvements to address impacts on the A36;
- The need for an up to date Salisbury Transport Strategy;
- The need for a Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Concerns about increase in pollution levels, including noise and air quality);
- The dependency of the site on delivery of H3.1 to deliver social and community facilities e.g. primary school; and
- The potential in combination impacts of allocations at Netherhampton Road on local infrastructure, services and facilities.

21.120 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.121 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- It is considered that water and sewerage infrastructure in the area can be adequately enhanced to deal with the additional housing allocated on this site;
- It is considered that all development can take place within Flood Zone 1 and that a sufficient buffer can be put in place between development and Flood Zone 2. Mitigation measures to deal with surface water on the site are achievable;
- The area is sensitive in terms of the setting to the Cathedral and views towards it. Proposals would need to be sensitively designed taking into account the objectives of the City of Salisbury Conservation Area Management Plan to afford weight to the significance of the asset and minimise harm. The Council has now undertaken a heritage impact assessment (as well as the requirement for detailed site specific heritage assessment). Proposals would need to provide for a high quality, sustainable development that enhances an important approach to the City;

- The Salisbury Transport Strategy is being refreshed and will include measures to mitigate the effects of proposed housing allocations in Salisbury. The Highways Agency are involved in that refresh;
- Negotiations are being held with local public transport providers and it is considered that this site can be served by frequent and reliable bus services;
- It is considered that H3.1 is deliverable and that a new primary school on that site is achievable which will also serve the needs of this site;
- It is considered that the pressures that development of both Netherhampton Road sites place on local infrastructure, services and facilities can be mitigated through a requirement for adequate developer contributions to meet the needs created by both developments. This will include direct provision of some facilities on site, together with contributions towards other infrastructure away from the sites.

21.122 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend text to reflect heritage impact assessment and to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements, as well as biodiversity.

Table 21.26

Part 26:	Housing allocation H3.4: Land at Rowbarrow, Salisbury		
No. of comments:	31		
Comment ID	1266 (1126268)	85 (925022)	213 (446026)
(Consultee / Agent ID):	767 (1123501)	772 (1126040)	878 (1126328/326118)
	882 (378123)	1047 (393725)	1048 (393725)
	1088 (1126725)	1604 (1119095/894742)	1655 (905964)
	1656 (905964)	1823 (1130961/556489)	1824 (1130961/556489)
	1825 (1130961/556489)	1826 (1130961/556489)	1827 (1130961/556489)
	1828 (1130961/556489)	1829 (1130961/556489)	1830 (1130961/556489)
	1831 (1130961/556489)	2558 (1133436)	2760 (1134443)
	2761 (1134443)	2762 (1134443)	2763 (1134443)
	2769 (1134443)	2770 (1134443)	2999 (395940)
	3180 (873511)		

21.123 A total of 31 representations relating to proposed allocation **H3.4: Land at Rowbarrow, Salisbury** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Scale/quantum of development;
- The southern part of the site is located within the boundary of Woodbury Ancient Villages Scheduled Monument;
- The site has high archaeological potential; and
- Concerns regarding impact on views towards the cathedral spire and Old Sarum.
- Available land is incorrectly identified, and should exclude landscape buffer from adjoining development.

21.124 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.125 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- A small section of the site, in the southern corner, is located within the boundary of Woodbury Ancient Villages Scheduled Monument. Development will not take place in this part of the site on higher ground and the setting of the Scheduled Monument is not a primary contributor to its significance;
- It is considered that the archaeological value of this site can be maintained. The southern part of the site which contains the Scheduled Monument will not be developed and there will be a full archaeological assessment prior to any future planning application;
- Regarding views towards Salisbury Cathedral, it is considered that significant effects can be avoided. In combination with heritage assessment, development will need to take place within a strong landscape framework that maintains views towards the cathedral spire and this is considered possible.

21.126 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Amend site boundary to reflect land available for development and exclude the woodland buffer surrounding the neighbouring development.
- Amend text to provide clarity about landscape requirements and how heritage matters will be addressed.

Table 21.27

Part 27	Housing Allocation H3.5: Clover Lane, Durrington		
No. of comments:	12		
Comment ID	154 (447313)	494 (1123429)	496 (1125173)
(Consultee/Agent ID)	544 (899941)	664 (1124540)	1102 (1126914)
	1584 (1119095)	1986 (1131395)	638 (1133686)
	2639 (1133686)	2677 (983136)	2994 (395940)

21.127 A total of 12 representations relating to proposed allocation **H3.5 Clover, Lane, Durrington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Concerns over the achievability and suitability of access via Clover Lane;
- Request to review the boundary of the site allocation due to inconsistency in maps presented in the Plan and Community Area Topic Paper.
- Concerns about impact on highways network;
- The need to protect biodiversity (River Avon SAC and SSSI);
- Recommendations and requirements in relation to foul drainage and water management due to the site's relationship with the Source Protection Zone (groundwater);
- Concerns about potential for harm to heritage assets (including Commonwealth War Graves Commission Cemetery, Conservation Area);
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concern about landscape, loss of pasture land; and
- Concern over lack of facilities and employment in Durrington.

21.128 Council's response to themes / issues raised:

21.129 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- Development should be delivered according to the policy and taking account of issues raised during site assessment and consultation, including impacts on the River Avon SAC and SSSI, water infrastructure and drainage. The planning application process will also require that any necessary assessment is carried out and informs the proposals so that requirements can be met.
- The site allocation boundary needs to be corrected to align with the map shown in the Amesbury Community Area Topic Paper.
- The allocation assumes that development will be configured to ensure that existing rights of access to the paddock are maintained, and promoters confirm that this is the case.

- The promoters of the site are working with the relevant parties to achieve access via Clover Lane.
- Considerations such as the impacts on highways, landscape, flooding and local services were taken into account during the site assessment process. None of the potential impacts were thought to be insurmountable based on evidence available at the time of assessment.

21.130 Proposed changes required to address themes / issues raised:

- Amend allocation boundary to correct mapping error.
- Amend text to provide greater clarity on heritage matters; flood risk, drainage and groundwater; and biodiversity.

Table 21.29

Part 28	Housing Allocation H3.6: Larkhill Road, Durrington		
No. of comments:	5		
Comment ID	153 (447313)	672 (1124540)	1590 (1119095/894742)
(Consultee/Agent ID)	1987 (1131395)	2995 (395940)	

21.131 A total of 5 representations relating to proposed allocation **H3.6: Larkhill Road, Durrington** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The quanta of homes to be developed and housing density;
- The site area of the allocation;
- Concerns about precedent being set for development south of Larkhill Road;
- The need to protect biodiversity (River Avon SAC, SSSI and local wildlife);
- Concern about potential harm to heritage assets (Durrington Walls);
- Request to include additional wording requiring education contributions;
- Concern about adverse impacts on highways and public safety due to traffic and parking; and
- Recommendations and requirements in relation to foul drainage and water management due to the site's relationship with the Source Protection Zone (groundwater).

21.132 Council response

- Consideration has been made of the request to include additional land within the allocation but as the land is within the settlement boundary and is constrained by its current use as a car park it is not proposed to include it;
- It is considered that sufficient sites have been allocated in the South HMA to improve housing land supply;
- Development south of Larkhill Road should only come forward through an allocation via this Plan or a neighbourhood development plan, as the undeveloped land is outside the settlement boundary;
- Considerations such as the impacts on highways, landscape, flooding and local services were taken into account during the site assessment process. None of the potential impacts were thought to be insurmountable based on evidence available at the time of assessment.
- Development should be delivered according to the policy and taking account of issues raised during site assessment and consultation, including impacts on the River Avon SAC and SSSI, water infrastructure and drainage, and the layout and density of development. The planning application process will also require that any necessary assessment is carried out and informs the proposals so that requirements can be met.

21.133 Proposed change(s) required to address themes / issues raised:

- Amend text to give greater emphasis to flood and drainage requirements, as well as biodiversity.

Table 21.30

Part 29:	Implementation and Monitoring		
No. of comments:	5		
Comment ID	673 (378123)	677 (378123)	678 (378123)
(Consultee/Agent ID):	2643 (382305)	2707 (977912)	

21.134 A total of 5 representations relating to **Implementation and Monitoring** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- The flexibility and contingency of the Plan to ensure development needs are met;
- Reviewing housing delivery against objectively assessed need.
- The need for a clear monitoring/review mechanism is required.
- Absence of up to date Annual Monitoring Report (AMR);
- Inadequacies of monitoring the effectiveness of Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) policies;
- Monitoring impacts and mitigation of effects on the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA).

21.135 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.136 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- The WCS was adopted on 20 January 2015. The housing requirement contained in the WCS represents the only up to date housing requirement for Wiltshire. This is the requirement against which the land supply is assessed. Wiltshire Council monitors housing annually and produces both housing land availability reports and housing land supply statements.
- In order to present a position that represented the anticipated housing land supply at the point of examination as closely as possible and to conform to national policy on evidence (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 158), the Council estimated the 2017 base date housing land supply position in order to inform the Plan.
- Investigate the issues raised in relations to the New Forest SPA.

21.137 Proposed change(s) required to address themes / issues raised:

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.31

Part 30:	Sustainability Appraisal		
No. of comments:	207		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	135 (1105805)	185 (1122587)	195 (1106487)
	257 (1122587)	258 (1122587)	259 (1122587)
	265 (1124133)	336 (1120809)	499 (1125220)
	500 (1125248)	521 (1125376/1125375)	528 (1102653)
	529 (1102653)	531 (1125418)	532 (1125418)
	533 (1125418)	545 (1125408)	558 (1125376/1125375)
	572 (1117600)	590 (1121943)	650 (1124313)
	780 (378123)	831 (1125248)	832 (1125248)
	833 (1125248)	834 (1125248)	838 (1125248)
	840 (1120809)	877 (1126328/326118)	878 (1126328/326118)
	879 (1126328/326118)	880 (378123)	900 (1126445)
	910 (1126488)	911 (1126488)	912 (1126488)
	913 (1126488)	929 (1126059)	968 (1126230)
	969 (1126230)	972 (1126230)	974 (1126230)
	975 (1126230)	1023 (1124313)	1025 (1124313)
	1028 (1124313)	1029 (1124313)	1032 (1126797)
	1040 (393725)	1135 (1126922)	1136 (1126922)
	1216 (393425/817881)	1495 (706891)	1504 (402734)
	1540 (1129241/901806)	1551 (1129287/1004509)	1584 (1119095/894742)
	1590 (1119095/894742)	1606 (1129527/901806)	1629 (1129612)
	1671 (381339)	1690 (1129933)	1691 (1129933)
	1702 (1125649)	1724 (704825)	1727 (704825)
	1764 (556113)	1787 (704825)	1796 (704825)
	1798 (1130564/1120649)	1883 (1131172)	1903 (1127014)
	1910 (895670)	1965 (1127014)	1966 (1127014)
	1973 (1127957)	2025 (393425/817881)	2026 (393425/817881)
	2085 (556573/556956)	2114 (1131555)	2115 (1131555)
	2116 (1131555)	2117 (1131555)	2123 (1131760)
	2220 (391071)	2252 (1132119)	2279 (1132230/1132220)
	2280 (1132230/1132220)	2302 (1125770)	2306 (1132344/825048)
	2307 (1132344/825048)	2308 (1132344/825048)	2309 (1132344/825048)
	2310 (1132344/825048)	2311 (1132344/825048)	2313 (1132344/825048)
	2337 (1132344/825048)	2366 (1132230/1132220)	2389 (1132602)
	2401 (1132626/1126961)	2403 (1132626/1126961)	2404 (1132626/1126961)
	2405 (1132626/1126961)	2510 (1133063)	2516 (1126401)
	2535 (1133384/825048)	2536 (1133384/825048)	2537 (1133384/825048)
	2538 (1133384/825048)	2539 (1133384/825048)	2540 (1133384/825048)
	2606 (1133628)	2628 (1133656)	2658 (983136)
	2659 (983136)	2664 (983136)	2669 (983136)
	2671 (983136)	2673 (983136)	2674 (983136)
	2694 (1134147)	2701 (1134177/1126238)	2702 (1134177/1126238)
	2715 (977912)	2722 (1134217/1005672)	2819 (1134691/861292)
	2825 (1134708)	2889 (446149)	2890 (446149)
	2891 (446149)	2896 (1135230)	2898 (1135230)
	2899 (1135230)	2900 (1135230)	2901 (1135230)
	2902 (1135230)	2931 (1126714)	2937 (1135674)
	3016 (900160/900154)	3021 (382216)	3050 (900160/900154)

3067 (1136806/1136797)	3074 (890227/1132859)	3078 (840359/443671)
3098 (1126042)	3099 (1137560/1137556)	3100 (1137560/1137556)
3103 (1137560/1137556)	3106 (1137560/1137556)	3109 (549444/549441)
3110 (549444/549441)	3111 (549444/549441)	3113 (835920/438199)
3115 (835920/438199)	3117 (835920/438199)	3119 (835920/438199)
3121 (835920/438199)	3122 (393560/1131505)	3132 (1132566)
3144 (1138002/ 1138006)	3150 (817896/ 817881)	3153 (817896/ 817881)
3154 (817896/ 817881)	3171 (449270)	3172 (449270)
3174 (449270)	3189 (397159)	3195 (1136806/1138320)
3200 (861027/1136403)	3201 (861027/1136403)	3202 (861027/1136403)
3203 (861027/1136403)	3204 (861027/1136403)	3206 (863519/1128217)
3216 (1138534)	3217 (1138534)	3218 (1138534)
3219 (1138534)	3220 (1138534)	3221 (1138534)
3222 (1138534)	3224 (1138534)	3225 (1138534)
3226 (1138534)	3227 (1138534)	3228 (1138534)
3235 (1138534)	3236 (1138534)	3237 (1138534)
3238 (1138534)	3239 (1138534)	3240 (1138534)
3243 (645345/1138525)	3244 (645345/1138525)	3245 (645345/1138525)
3246 (645345/1138525)	3247 (645345/1138525)	3248 (645345/1138525)
3249 (645345/1138525)	3250 (645345/1138525)	3251 (645345/1138525)
3252 (645345/1138525)	3253 (645345/1138525)	3254 (645345/1138525)
3256 (841197/397761)	3262 (841197/397761)	3355 (1139017)

21.138 A total of 207 representations relating to the **Sustainability Appraisal** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Ensuring that the level of effect (harm) on the significance of heritage assets and their setting has been considered;
- Assessment of other 'reasonable alternative' sites that are not adjacent to the settlement boundary;
- Assessment of other sites not considered because they are in areas with no outstanding indicative requirement;
- Assessment of other 'sustainable sites' in areas where there is no outstanding indicative requirement to make up for under delivery in Trowbridge;
- Decisions to not assess sites in Large Villages has not been tested by the SA; and
- The lack of updated transport strategies for Trowbridge and Salisbury does not allow for an accurate assessment of effects of sites in those settlements

21.139 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.140 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- It is considered that the SA has undertaken a thorough and consistent assessment of the effects of each site on heritage assets using the most up-to-date evidence and information. It is considered reasonable to recommend, in some instances, that further Heritage Impact Assessment is undertaken before a planning application is submitted;
- The Council's Site Selection Process Methodology sets out the reasons why sites that are not adjacent to a settlement boundary, and not in an 'Area of Search', have not

- been considered further, and are therefore not considered to be 'reasonable alternatives' for the purposes of the SA;
- The decision not to allocate sites in Large Villages in the East HMA is explained in the Council's Site Selection Process Methodology, on the basis of a high level of existing housing supply in that HMA, and it is not considered necessary to assess that decision in the SA.

21.141 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Changes have been made to the sustainability appraisal report as a result of the representations and these are highlighted in the revised sustainability appraisal report.

Table 21.32

Part 31:	Habitats Regulations Assessment		
No. of comments:	45		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	575 (556401)	876 (1126328/326118)	1112 (487991)
	1115 (487991)	1121 (487991)	1233 (1102653)
	1245 (1117600)	1797 (1126137)	2039 (1127011)
	2091 (1131676)	2103 (1131696)	2104 (1131696)
	2109 (1131722)	2112 (1131696)	2163 (1126221)
	2170 (1126221)	2284 (1105334)	2290 (1128249)
	2306 (1132344/825048)	2498 (1123921)	2643 (382305)
	2648 (1113871/1133715)	2668 (983136)	2818 (1126309)
	2894 (979508)	2918 (1133638)	3018 (382216)
	3019 (382216)	3020 (382216)	3042 (381339)
	3076 (840359/443671)	3077 (840359/443671)	3079 (840359/443671)
	3101 (1137560/1137556)	3112 (835920/438199)	3114 (835920/438199)
	3116 (835920/438199)	3118 (835920/438199)	3120 (835920/438199)
	3138 (1137830/1122261)	3233 (1138534)	3234 (1138534)
	3241 (645345/1138525)	3242 (645345/1138525)	3255 (1138571/438199)

21.142 A total of 45 representations relating to the **Habitats Regulations Assessment** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Issues and uncertainty concerning impacts on the Bath and Bradford Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
- Disagreement over the degree of potential harm to the Bath and Bradford Bats SAC;
- Concerns about the implications of the Bath and Bradford Bats SAC on the deliverability and development trajectories of sites;
- Issues and uncertainty concerning impacts on the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC), related to forecasting of growth and the Nutrient Management Plan (NMP), and impacts of water abstraction;
- Recommendation from the EA for a specific policy relating to the River Avon SAC;
- Disagreement over the degree of potential harm to the River Avon SAC;
- Issues and uncertainty concerning impacts on the Salisbury Plain Special Protection Area (SPA);
- Disagreement over the degree of potential harm to the Salisbury Plain SPA; and
- Cross boundary issues concerning the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA);

21.143 Council's response to themes/issues raised:

21.144 The Council considers the approach taken with the identification of this site is based on reasonable evidence and in general conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy. In light of the issues raised the Council's response is the following:

- An Addendum to the HRA has been produced which addresses the comments raised.

21.145 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- Further detail can be found in the Addendum to the HRA.

Table 21.33

Part 32:	Landscape Assessment		
No. of comments:	10		
Comment ID	876 (1126328/326118)	878 (1126328/326118)	995 (1125408)
(Consultee/Agent ID):	1765 (556113)	1786 (556113)	2303 (1125770)
	3078 (840359/443671)	3104 (1137560/1137556)	3122 (393560/1131505)
	3249 (645345/1138525)		

21.146 A total of 10 representations relating to the **Landscape Assessment** were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Concerns about appropriateness of vantage points from which sites were assessed;
- Potential inaccuracies within the Landscape Assessment;
- Concerns about consistency between the Landscape Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal, the County Landscape Character Assessment, previous planning history; and in relation site H3.4 a previous Development Brief prepared for the site;
- There is a need for specific heritage impact assessment, as well as Landscape Assessment.

21.147 Council response to themes / issues raised:

- The TEP assessment has endeavoured to consider viewpoints at a range of distances and the wider landscape settings;
- The landscape assessment is consistent across sites and in line with the Landscape Institute's best practice guidance.

21.148 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- No changes proposed.

Table 21.34

Part 33:	Viability Assessment		
No. of comments:	36		
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	135 (1105805)	934 (392036/1126545)	1032 (1126797)
	1034 (1126797)	1036 (874600)	1037 (393725)
	1038 (393725)	1122 (487991)	1341 (1126779)
	1519 (1129146/901806)	1604 (1119095/894742)	1811 (841393/558013)
	1816 (901939/901806)	1823 (1130961/556489)	1881 (899628/899623)
	1994 (1131400)	2052 (1131544/1131505)	2111 (1131720/1131715)
	2120 (1131754/1131747)	2126 (1131752/1131750)	2163 (1126221)
	2312 (1132344/825048)	2388 (390498)	2392 (903251)
	2400 (1132626/1126961)	2673 (983136)	2674 (983136)
	3012 (900160/900154)	3040 (556491/901380)	3115 (835920/438199)
	3117 (35920/438199)	3119 (835920/438199)	3121 (835920/438199)
	3251 (645345/1138525)	3255 (1138571/438199)	3262 (841197/397761)

21.149 A total of 36 representations relating to the Viability Assessment were received. The issues emanating from the representations related to:

- Inconsistency in the approach to seeking developer contributions for education;
- The need for viability testing on the impacts on railway infrastructure; and
- Overall approach to developer contributions and relationship with CiL.

21.150 Council's response to themes /issues raised:

- The Council has appropriately tested viability in line with national guidance and clearly set out the approach in the viability assessment.

21.151 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- None.

Table 21.35

Part 34:	Duty to Cooperate Statement		
No. of comments:	11		
Comment ID	292 (924012)	873 (547867)	1687 (1129933)
(Consultee/Agent ID):	1687 (1129933)	2419 (558939)	2828 (1134720)
	2828 (1134720)	2894 (979508)	2966 (1135954/556489)
	2966 (1135954/556489)	3040 (556491/901380)	

21.152 A total of 11 representations relating to the **duty to cooperate** were received. A summary of comments received under the duty to cooperate can be found table 2 of the main statement.

21.153 Further to this a number of parish councils commented that Wiltshire Council did not consult effectively with neighbourhood planning groups.

An Addendum has been produced to the Duty to Cooperate Statement which sets out the details of issues raised by prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities and the Council response to them.

Table 21.36

Part 35:	Equality Impact Assessment
No. of comments:	1
Comment ID (Consultee/Agent ID):	99 (1120148)

21.154 A total of 1 representation relating to the **Equality Impact Assessment** was received which referred to national guidance.

21.155 Council's response to themes / issues raised:

- An Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared in accordance with national guidance.

21.156 Proposed change(s) required to address themes/issues raised:

- None.

22 Appendix N - Table of 'omission sites' that were promoted by respondents to the Regulation 19 consultation

22.1 Appendix N

22.2 Omission Sites

22.3 Several responses proposed alternative land for allocation in the draft Plan. These sites have been grouped together and defined as 'omission sites' and take one of three forms:

- Omission sites in areas of search where housing allocations are not currently being sought.
- Omission sites that have already been assessed in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought, where new evidence has been submitted or they have been resubmitted through representations.
- Omission sites that are new sites that have not previously been assessed in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought (these sites have been assigned site references beginning with OM).

Table 22.1

East Housing Market Area				
Consultee ID (consultee / Agent) Rep number	Omission sites in areas of search where housing allocations are NOT being sought.	Omission sites already assessed in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought where new evidence has been submitted or they have been resubmitted through representations	Omission sites that are NEW sites in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought.	Council response
Devizes				
Consultee ID: 861027 / 1136403 Rep No: 3196, 3200	Land at Coate Bridge, Devizes (SHELAA site 693a).			The local housing needs of Devizes has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Devizes Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst these sites await planning permission, we have no evidence at this stage to say that there is any encumbrance to development. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.
Consultee ID: 397800 / 1138537 Rep No: 3096, 3223	Land at Roundway Park, Devizes (SHELAA site 549a and/or 549b)			The local housing needs of Devizes has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Devizes Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst these sites await planning permission, we have no evidence at this stage to say that there is any encumbrance to development. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.

<p>Consultee ID: 900566 / 1125375 Rep No:1459</p>	<p>Land east of Windsor Drive, Devizes (SHELAA sites 624 and 524)</p>			<p>The local housing needs of Devizes has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Devizes Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst these sites await planning permission, we have no evidence at this stage to say that there is any encumbrance to development. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 901997 / 901806 Rep No: 1478</p>	<p>Greenacres, Green Lane, Devizes (SHELAA site 3259)</p>			<p>The local housing needs of Devizes has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Devizes Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst these sites await planning permission, we have no evidence at this stage to say that there is any encumbrance to development. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.</p>
<p>Devizes Community Area Remainder</p>				
<p>Consultee ID: 549444 / 549441 Rep No: 3111</p>	<p>Breach Close, Bromham (SHELAA site 668)</p>			<p>There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1125376 / 1125375 Rep No: 519-522, 556-559, 618</p>		<p>Land at the Spring, Market Lavington (SHELAA site 3268) – new evidence has been provided on archaeological potential on the site and flood risk</p>		<p>Further assessment has been carried out. The SA scoring for archaeological potential has changed and the site progressed to stage 4 of the methodology. The site was removed at stage 4 of the methodology as development would lead to the loss of land that contributes to the rural character at this approach to the village and measures to achieve heritage objectives and mitigate surface water flooding</p>

				(if possible) would limit the developable area, further detail can be found in the community area topic paper.
Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2708, 2714	Land at Westbury Road, Great Cheverell (part of SHELAA site 541)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 1136406 / 1136403 Rep No: 3035, 3047, 3048	Land at Sandlease Farm, Worton (SHELAA site 1068)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 899720 / 549147 Rep No: 425	Mulberry Lodge, Rowde (SHELAA site 3367)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 394670 Rep No: 1057, 1059-1061	Land off Lavington Lane, West Lavington (SHELAA site 711)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739	Land north of Blackberry Lane, Potterne (No location plan provided)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.

Marlborough				
Consultee ID: 549444 / 549441 Rep No: 3111	Elcot Lane, Marlborough (SHELAA site 660)			The residual requirement is very low and the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1137779 / 1137777 Rep No: 3125	The Tile Factory, Elcot Lane, Marlborough (No SHELAA reference)			The residual requirement is very low and the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1129236 / 1004509 Rep No: 1539	Land at Manton Estate (PAC Farms), Marlborough (SHELAA site 3560)			The residual requirement is very low and the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Marlborough Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 863519 / 1128217 Rep No: 3205-3211	Land at Lottage Farm, Aldbourne (SHELAA site 3485)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 863519 / 1128217 Rep no: 3205-3211	Land at Russley Green, Baydon (SHELAA site 3188)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Consultee ID: 1125714 / 404491 Rep No: 714-716	Land at Broad Hinton (SHELAA site 3207)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.

Consultee ID: 1138497 / 836762 Rep No: 3143	Land at Riverdell Farm, Fyfield (Land including SHELAA site 3344)			In line with the Core Strategy allocations are not being made at Small Villages
Consultee ID: 893988 Rep No: 3097	Land rear of Penllyne, Newton Road, Ramsbury (SHELAA site 1087)			There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.
Pewsey				
Consultee ID: 998345 / 1136047 Rep No: 3002-3004	Land at Swan Road, Pewsey (SHELAA sites 1083 and 1072)			The local housing need of Pewsey has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.
Consultee ID: 817896 / 817881 Rep No: 3153	Land at the former Pewsey Hospital (broadly aligns with SHELAA 653)			The local housing need of Pewsey has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.
Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2666	Land at Astley Close, Pewsey (SHELAA site 1300)			The local housing need of Pewsey has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan. The Council therefore fully anticipates these sites will deliver housing within the remaining plan period.
Pewsey Community Area				

<p>Consultee ID: 549444 / 549441 Rep No: 3111</p>	<p>Browns Lane, Great Bedwyn (SHELAA site 552)</p>			<p>There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 549444 / 549441 Rep No: 3111</p>	<p>Saddler's Way, Burbage (SHELAA site 665)</p>			<p>There is no strategic priority to identify sites at Large Villages in the East Housing Market Area as the objective to provide surety of housing supply is largely met in the East HMA and development in Large Villages should be of a scale to meet local needs. In addition, the Burbage Neighbourhood Development Plan was submitted in June 2017 and has also considered how the community wish to address local housing need.</p>

Table 22.2

North and West Housing Market Area				
Consultee ID (consultee / Agent) Rep number	Omission sites in areas of search where housing allocations are NOT being sought.	Omission sites already assessed in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought where new evidence has been submitted or they have been resubmitted through representations	Omission sites that are NEW sites in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought.	Council response
Bradford on Avon				
Consultee ID: 901813 / 901806 Rep No: 1658	Land between Cemetary and Woolley Street, Bradford on Avon (south half of SHELAA site 3102a)			The indicative residual requirement for Bradford on Avon to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. This includes the strategic allocation identified through the WCS for land at Kingston Farm.
Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739	Land at Upper Bearfield Farm, Bradford on Avon (SHELAA 287)			The indicative residual requirement for Bradford on Avon to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. This includes the strategic allocation identified through the WCS for land at Kingston Farm.
Bradford on Avon Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 1129146 / 901806 Rep No: 1519	Former tannery site, Holt (SHELAA site 253)			The indicative residual requirement for Bradford on Avon Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has

				been met. The Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement in Bradford on Avon Community Remainder.
Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2712	Land at Melksham Road, Holt (SHELAA sites 3308a and 3308b)			The indicative residual requirement for Bradford on Avon Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. The Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement in Bradford on Avon Community Remainder.
Calne				
Consultee ID: 900566 / 1125375 Rep No: 706, 707	Land North of Low Lane, Calne (Land including SHELAA sites 451, 489, and 488 and 495 in part)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Calne to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1124796 / 1124792 Rep No: 1033, 1035	Land at Wenhill, Calne (SHELAA sites 709, 3311, 3312 and 3251)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Calne to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 841197 / 397761 Rep No: 3263	Land off Abberd Lane/land south of Spitfire Road, Calne (SHELAA sites 488 and 489)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Calne to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 841197 / 397761 Rep No: 3264	Land off Low Lane, Calne (Land			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Calne to be delivered during the Plan period has

	including SHELAA site 487)			been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement
Consultee ID: 113482 / 404491 Rep No: 2739	Land at Sandpit Lane, Calne (No location plan provided)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Calne to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Calne Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 1129497 / 901806 Rep No: 1605	Land north of Old Road, Derry Hill (SHELAA site 3302)			The indicative residual requirement for Calne Community Area Remainder to be delivered Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Corsham				
Consultee ID: 556491 / 901380 Rep No: 3040, 3041	Land north of Potley Land/Leafield Industrial Estate, Corsham (SHELAA site 3149)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Town of Corsham to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 836280 / 835942 Rep No: 1242	Land north of Bradford road, Corsham (SHELAA site 3250)			The indicative residual requirement for the Market Ton of Corsham to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Corsham Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 1132530 / 1006176 Rep No: 2374	Land south of Westwells Road, Neston (SHELAA site 9999)			The indicative residual requirement for the Corsham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not

				need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 404631 / 863491 Rep No: 1704	Former Colerne Airfield (SHELAA site 3253)			The indicative residual requirement for the Corsham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Chippenham				
Consultee ID: 817896 / 817881 Rep No: 3157	Land at Forest Farm, Chippenham (SHELAA site 494)			The draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan does not cover the Principal Settlement of Chippenham.
Consultee ID: 1137289 / 1137295 Rep No: 2623	Land at Shotwell, Chippenham (SHELAA site 454b)			The draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan does not cover the Principal Settlement of Chippenham.
Chippenham Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 1133667 / 1133670 Rep No: 2635			Land to the south of Lye Common, at Christian Malford (OM018)	The local housing needs of Christian Malford has been addressed through a series of allocations in the made Christian Malford Neighbourhood Plan.
Consultee ID: 1139654 Rep No: 1010		SHELAA site 3129, Hullavington – new evidence on availability.		The site was originally discounted as it was not available. New evidence suggests it is available therefore further assessment has been carried out. The site has been assessed and ruled out at Stage 4 of the site selection methodology because the smaller site options at the village would seem to have less overall sustainability benefit than the larger site options considered, further detail can be found in the community area topic paper.

<p>Consultee ID: 1129527/ 901806 Rep No: 1606</p>		<p>Land to rear of Newton, Hullavington SHELAA sites 1112 and 690 - new heritage evidence (OM017)</p>		<p>Combined, this is a new site and further assessment has been carried out. The site has been assessed and ruled out at Stage 2a of the site selection methodology because one landowner did not agree to the proposal.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 393425/ 817881 Rep No: 2026</p>			<p>Land at Hullavington Airfield (OM011)</p>	<p>This is a new site, and further assessment has been carried out. The site has been assessed and ruled out at Stage 3 of the site selection methodology.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2671</p>		<p>Land at Sutton Lane, Sutton Benger (SHELAA site 600)</p>		<p>The large village of Sutton Benger is ruled out of the assessment process at Stage 2B. Housing sites are not being identified in Sutton Benger due to recent growth and school capacity.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2711</p>			<p>Land at High Street, Sutton Benger (OM019)</p>	<p>The large village of Sutton Benger is ruled out of the assessment process at Stage 2B. Housing sites are not being identified in Sutton Benger due to recent growth and school capacity.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126841 / 1004509 Rep No: 1074</p>		<p>SHELAA site 3549, Sutton Benger</p>		<p>No new evidence to assess. The large village of Sutton Benger is ruled out of the assessment process at Stage 2B due to recent growth and school capacity.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134177 / 1126238 Rep No: 2701</p>			<p>Land east of Yatton Keynell off B4039 (OM015)</p>	<p>Further assessment has been carried out. The site has been assessed and ruled out at Stage 3 because the assessment process identified major adverse effects on built heritage and impact on the AONB.</p>

Consultee ID: 1124865 / 549147 Rep No: 549		Land at Tiddleywink, Yatton Keynell (part of SHELAA site 3264)		The site is not adjacent to the settlement boundary for Yatton Keynell and would therefore not be assessed according to the site assessment methodology.
Malmesbury				
Consultee ID: 817896 / 817881 Rep No: 3154		Land at Whychurch farm to the south of Filands, Malmesbury (SHELAA site 649)		The indicative residual requirement at Malmesbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met in part due to the allocation of housing through the made Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1136804 / 1138276 Rep No: 3000		Land adjacent to Waitrose, Malmesbury (No SHELAA)		The indicative residual requirement at Malmesbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met in part due to the allocation of housing through the made Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Malmesbury Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 824512 / 901379 Rep No: 2642		Land at Cotswold Community, Ashton Keynes (SHELAA site 484)		Housing in Ashton Keynes has been allocated by the Ashton Keynes Neighbourhood Plan.
Consultee ID: 1037118 / 1126480 Rep No: 923		Land at Dairy Farm Bungalow, Ashton Keynes (SHELAA site 702)		Housing in Ashton Keynes has been allocated by the Ashton Keynes Neighbourhood Plan.
Consultee ID: 1129287 / 1004509 Rep No: 1551		Street Farm Paddocks, The Street,		New evidence on access means further assessment has been carried out. The amended

		Oaksey (SHELAA site 3349) – new access evidence		site is ruled out at Stage 2a as the site area that falls outside the settlement boundary is below the threshold of 5 units therefore do not take forward for further consideration.
Consultee ID: 449270 Rep No: 3174		Land at Broadfield Farm, Great Somerford (Land including SHELAA site 2053)		Housing in Great Somerford has been allocated by the Great Somerford Neighbourhood Plan.
Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739			Land at Tuners Lane, Crudwell (OM014)	The site has been assessed and ruled out at Stage 4. The site appears reasonably well-located to village services however there is uncertainty that the carriageway is suitable for increased numbers of vehicles or that routes for pedestrians and cyclists are deliverable. There are also potential issues with respect to heritage and proximity to the conservation area.
Melksham				
Consultee ID: 1137312 / 1137310 Rep No: 3084-85	Land north of Woodrow Road, Melksham (Land including SHELAA site 3107)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 556645 / 901806 Rep No: 1609	Land at Upside Park, Melksham (SHELAA site 264)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 841197 / 397761 Rep No: 3262	Land to the north west of Melksham/land south of			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has

	Woodrow Road(SHELAA sites 1027 and 715)			been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 400077 Rep No: 461, 462	Land South of Bath Road, West of Carnation Lane (SHELAA site 3331)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 400077 Rep No: 462, 1538	Old Loves Farm, Bowerhill (SHELAA site 3345)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 136436 / 1135353 Rep No: 3036-3039	Land west of Semington Road, Melksham (SHELAA site 728)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739	Land south of Bowerhill (Part of SHELAA site 1006)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1134745 Rep No: 2720	Land at Boundary Farm, West of Western Way, Melksham (Land including part of SHELAA site 3105d)			The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.

<p>Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739</p>	<p>Land south of the A365 at Roundponds Farm, Shurnhold, Melksham (Part of SHELAA site 3352)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Melksham and Bowerhill village to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Melksham Community Area Remainder</p>				
<p>Consultee ID: 556645 / 901806 Rep No: 1522</p>	<p>Land Adjacent to Atworth Business Park (SHELAA site 311)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134177 / 1126238 Rep No: 2702</p>	<p>Land to South of prospect Fields, Atworth (SHELAA site 317)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 134431 / 1134428 Rep No: 2743</p>	<p>Land north of the Lye, Seend (No location plan provided)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1132602 Rep No: 2389, 2390, 2391</p>	<p>North of Pound Lane, Semington (SHELAA site 328)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>

Consultee ID: 711399 / 1132875 Rep No: 2446	Land to the south east of Semington (No SHELAA)			The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1132580 / 550322 Rep No: 2384	Land north of St George's Road, Semington (SHELAA site 331)			The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 390590 / 901806 Rep No: 1543	Land off First Lane, Whitley (SHELAA site 3459)			The indicative residual requirement for the Melksham Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Trowbridge				
Consultee ID: 391073, 550023, 1126922 Rep No: 630, 171, 2852		Land south of Green Lane Wood, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 256) – no new evidence given.		Site already assessed and no new evidence given.
Consultee ID: 391073, 111387/113715, 55023/1126922 Rep No: 631, 2648, 171, 2852		Land north of Green Lane Wood, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 292).		Site already assessed and no new evidence given.
Consultee ID: 391073, 1126922 Rep No: 633, 2852		Land at West Ashton Road, Trowbridge (SHELAA		Site already assessed and no new evidence given.

		site 3247) - no new evidence given.		
Consultee ID: 550023 Rep No: 171		Land at Lower Biss Farm, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 261) – no new evidence given.		Site already assessed and no new evidence given.
Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2668, 632		Land at Biss Farm (formerly the West Ashton Road Employment Site), Trowbridge (SHELAA site 3247) – new evidence about its status as a Principal Employment Site.		This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being a Principal Employment Site.
Consultee ID: 1126922, 391073, 1126922 Rep No: 1136, 634, 2852		District Council Offices, Bradley Road, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 1018)		This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136		Land and buildings, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 198)		This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136		Trowbridge Garden Centre (SHELAA site 200)		This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary.

Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136		The Stables, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 247)		This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136		Drynham Road, Trowbridge (SHELAA site 248) (1.68 ha not yet accounted for)		The majority of SHELAA site 248 is allocated in the Plan within H2.1 Elm Grove Farm apart from a small section of land not controlled by the land owner.
Consultee number 1124560 and 1126922 Rep No: 364 and 2852			Bowyers (OM020)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 2852			East Wing (OM021)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 2852			Trowbridge Hospital (OM022)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 2852			Margaret Stancombe School (OM023)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 2852			Virgin site (OM024)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 2852			Ashton Street Centre (OM025)	This site was assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted.
Trowbridge Community Area				

<p>Consultee ID: 1138113 / 899110 Rep No: 3149</p>	<p>Land at the Grange, Devizes Road, Hilperton (SHELAA site 291)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136</p>	<p>Land to the rear of the Lion and Fiddle, Hilperton (SHELAA site 645)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136</p>	<p>Land to the rear of 118 Trowbridge Road, Hilperon (SHELAA site 646)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126922 Rep No: 1136</p>	<p>Land to the rear of 116 Trowbridge Road, Hilperton (SHELAA site 647)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1132626 Rep No: 2400</p>	<p>Land at Maxcroft Farm, Hilperton (SHELAA site 3541)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>

<p>Consultee ID: 392243 / 901806 Rep No: 1451</p>	<p>Land at Marsh Road, Hilperton (SHELAA site 290)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1138002 / 1138006 Rep No: 3144 check original rep</p>	<p>Land off Southwick Road, North Bradley (No SHELAA)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 840359 / 443671 Rep No: 3075, 3077</p>	<p>Land south of Blind Lane, Southwick (Part of SHELAA site 3271)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2713</p>	<p>Land at Wynsome Street, Southwick (SHELAA site 327 and part of 315)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 901946 / 901806 Rep No: 1163</p>	<p>Land at 100 Frome Road, Southwick (SHELAA site 3341)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Trowbridge Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Royal Wootton Bassett</p>				

<p>Consultee ID: 389564 / 389561 Rep No: 3055</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1133494/389561 Rep No: 2589</p>	<p>Lower Woodshaw, Royal Wootton Bassett (SHELAA site 507)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739</p>	<p>Land immediately north of the railway line off Bincknoll Lane at Woodshaw, Royal Wootton Bassett (part of SHELAA 3357)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739</p> <p>Consultee ID: 933220 / 1138250 Rep No: 3181</p>	<p>Land north of Bincknoll Lane, Woodshaw / Land to the east of Royal Wootton Bassett (part of SHELAA 3357)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 840643 / 646956 Rep No: 3007</p>	<p>Land at Marsh Farm, Royal Wootton Bassett (SHELAA 499)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1100941 / 404491 Rep No: 3072</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1134282 / 404491 Rep No: 2739</p>	<p>Land north of Coped Hall, Swindon Road / Land north of Swindon Road, Royal Wootton Bassett (west part of SHELAA 3366)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>

Consultee ID: 1134282 / 404491 Rep No:2739	Land north of Swindon Road, Royal Wootton Bassett (east part of SHELAA 3366)			The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 642979 / 1100945 Rep No: 2461, 2464	Land at Whitehill Lane, Royal Wootton Bassett (SHELAA 3161)			The indicative residual requirement for Royal Wootton Bassett to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder				
Consultee ID: 556573 / 556056 Rep No: 2085	Land at Horsey Down, Cricklade (SHELAA 3088)			The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1133465 Rep No: 2564	Land at Brook House, Cricklade (No SHELAA)			The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1128190 / 863491 Rep No: 1708	Land at The Forty, Cricklade (SHELAA site 701)			The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.

<p>Consultee ID: 1134382 / 404491 Rep No: 2739</p>	<p>Land at Hook Street, Lydiard Tregoze (SHELAA 2042)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 817896 / 817881 Rep No: 3152</p>	<p>Land at Pound Farm, Lyneham (SHELAA 3126)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1138508 Rep No: 3212</p>	<p>Land off Calne Road, Lyneham (SHELAA 3356)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1132626 / 1126888 Rep No: 3313</p>	<p>Land off Victoria Drive, Lyneham (part of SHELAA 3406 and 476)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2709</p>	<p>Land at Chippenham Road, Lyneham (SHELAA 3496)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>

<p>Consultee ID: 389564 / 389561 Rep No: 3056</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1133494 / 389561 Rep No: 2588</p>	<p>Widham Farm, Purton (SHELAA 442)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Royal Wootton Bassett and Cricklade Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Warminster</p>				
<p>Consultee ID: 1134352 / 1124938 Rep No: 2735</p>			<p>Land at Brick Hill, Bath Road, Warminster (OM005)</p>	<p>New site that is taken forward for assessment. The site is ruled out as a possible allocation at stage 4 as it is found to have 6 moderate adverse effects which would be problematic to mitigate. Therefore, the site is identified as 'less sustainable'. There are enough 'more sustainable' (and 'less sustainable' sites with 5 or less moderate adverse effects) at Warminster and so this site is ruled out.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 404224 / 1122261 Rep No: 2726</p>		<p>Land on Upper Marsh Road, Warminster (SHELAA site 239) – new access evidence</p>		<p>New access evidence assessed. Site is taken forward for further assessment and ruled out as a possible allocation at Stage 3.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134103 / 931633 Rep No: 2685</p>		<p>93 Bath Road, Warminster (SHELAA site 3516) – within new settlement boundary</p>		<p>This site is assessed and ruled out at Stage 2 due to being within the amended settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1134103 / 931633 Rep No: 2685</p>		<p>Increase capacity within the West Warminster Urban Extension (SHELAA sites 730,</p>		<p>The site is already a strategic allocation within the WCS. An acceptable capacity for the site has been agreed through the endorsed masterplan for the site.</p>

		791, 273, 277, 743, 3084)		
Consultee ID: 1129295 / 1129296 Rep No: 1564			Land to the south of Boreham Road, Warminster (OM006)	New site that is taken forward for assessment. The site is ruled out as a possible allocation at stage 3 as there are 3 major adverse effects identified and likely to arise from development of this site. Therefore, the site is not considered further.
Warminster Community Area				
Consultee ID: 1137830 / 1122261 Rep No: 3138		Land at Chitterne Road, Codford (SHELAA site 612) - new evidence re sewerage treatment infrastructure that would not discharge unacceptable phosphate concentrations and not automatically ruling out sites a certain distance from the River Avon SAC.		Assessed new evidence and considered that the decision to score site 612 as 'major adverse' against SA objective 1 is correct. Major adverse effects are identified associated with the River Avon SAC, therefore the site is not considered further in the site selection process.
Consultee ID: 1137830 / 1122261 Rep No: 3138			Land at Codford (OM012)	The site has been appraised and ruled out at stage 2a as it is considered that there is insufficient access to the site. The site is accessed via a narrow track (with Public Right of Way along) off the highway. Therefore, there is no appropriate vehicular access to the site.

Consultee ID: 1137004 / 1137062 Rep No: 3081			Land west of Greenlands, Heytesbury (OM004)	This is a new site and has been assessed. The site is ruled out at Stage 3. Major adverse effects are identified associated with the River Avon SAC, therefore the site is not considered further in the site selection process.
Consultee ID: 1138316 / 1138317 Rep No: 2840			Knook MoD Camp (OM026)	The site is in the open countryside. The site is in use by the military and therefore not available for development.
Consultee ID: 1131720 / 1131715 Rep No: 2111			Sydenhams Yard, Maiden Bradley, Warminster (OM027)	This site is at a Small Village and would therefore not be considered as a potential housing site according to the site assessment methodology.
Consultee ID: 1129295 / 1129296 Rep No: 1564			Land to the east of Bishopstrow Road, Bishopstrow (OM028)	This site is in the Open Countryside and would therefore not be considered as a potential housing site according to the site assessment methodology.
Westbury				
Consultee ID: 977912 Rep No: 2710	Land at Storridge Road, Westbury (Land including SHELAA site 742)			The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1134217 / 1005672 Rep No: 2722	Land at Warminster Road, Westbury (SHELAA site 3375)			The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 1134308 / 1134306 Rep No: 2731, 2732, 2734	Land within Westbury town			The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.

<p>Consultee ID: 1133494 / 389561 Rep No: 2587, 3057</p>	<p>Land at Bratton Road, Westbury (SHELAA site 3404)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2675</p>	<p>Fairdown Avenue, Westbury (SHELAA site 272)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2674</p>	<p>Mane Way, Westbury (SHELAA site 3205)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 817896 / 817881 Rep No: 3156</p>	<p>Land at Westbury Leigh, Westbury (SHELAA sites 3375, 3337 and part of 622)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 836764 / 836762 Rep No: 2524</p>	<p>Land to the north of Sand Hole Lane, Westbury (SHELAA site 3223)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 901852 / 901806 Rep No: 1210</p>	<p>Land at Slag Lane/land at Frogmore Road, Westbury (SHELAA site 3218)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 901829 / 901806 Rep No: 1446</p>	<p>Land at Shallowaggon Lane,</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the</p>

	Westbury (SHELAA 3445)			Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 901801 / 901806 Rep No: 1448	Turnpike Field, Old Dilton Lane, Westbury (SHELAA 3375)			The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 983136 Rep No: 2673	Land west of Dartmoor Road, Westbury			The indicative residual requirement for Westbury to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to meet an indicative residual requirement.
Westbury Community Area				
Consultee ID: 1125770 Rep No: 701-705, 2300-2304, 1718, 2247			Land at Pear Tree Orchard, Bratton (OM007)	The site is fully within Bratton settlement boundary and is therefore excluded from the site selection process and removed at Stage 2a of the process.
Consultee ID: 1137322 / 1137324 Rep No: 3086		Land south of Westbury Road, Bratton (SHELAA site 738)		The site is taken forward for further assessment following the submission of new access evidence. Access to the site is considered to be achievable although delivering acceptable sight lines would require significant engineering operations. However, development at two sites in Bratton would not reflect modest growth, therefore the least sustainable site (this site) is rejected at Stage 4 of the process.
Consultee ID: 1119432 Rep No: 84, 3354	Land at Hawkeridge Village (SHELAA site 338)			This site is at a Small Village and would therefore not be considered for allocation, in line with the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the site assessment methodology.

Table 22.3

South Housing Market Area				
Consultee ID (consultee / Agent) Rep number	Omission sites in areas of search where housing allocations are NOT being sought.	Omission sites already assessed in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought where new evidence has been submitted or they have been resubmitted through representations	Omission sites that are NEW sites in areas of search where housing allocations are being sought.	Council response
Amesbury, Bulford and Durrington				
Consultee ID: 393560 / 1131505 Rep No: 3122		Land north of London Road, Amesbury (SHELAA site 3379)		New evidence submitted relating to noise impact of the A303. Following further assessment it is considered that there is no need to alter the original assessment. Noise impacts remain problematic and difficult to mitigate. The site is ruled out at stage 4 of the site selection process.

<p>Consultee ID: 1136804 / 836252 Rep No: 3068</p>			<p>Re-use of employment site Minton Distribution Park for mixed use development, Amesbury (OM016)</p>	<p>This site is identified as a Principle Employment Site and is located within Amesbury settlement boundary. Therefore, it is removed at Stage 2a of the site selection process. Any future consideration would be as part of the Local Plan Review process.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126914 Rep No: 1100</p>		<p>Land to the east of Netheravon Road, Durrington (SHELAA site 3410)</p>		<p>The site was originally removed at Stage 2a as it is designated as Open Space by the saved policy R10 of the Salisbury District Local Plan 2011.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1119095 / 894742 Rep No: 1584 / 66</p>		<p>Land to the rear of Durrington Manor (SHELAA site S98)Entirety of S98, Durrington</p>		<p>The rationale for allocating part of the site is explained in evidence and the draft Plan. The primary issues relate to the impact on Durrington Manor and the Conservation Area, as well as the harmful extension of the urban area of the village into sensitive open countryside.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1119095 / 894742 Rep No: 1590 / 66</p>		<p>Land to the rear of the Vets (adjacent to SHELAA site 3179); request to be incorporated into the proposed allocation H3.6</p>		<p>Consideration has been made of the request to include additional land within the allocation and Wiltshire Council concluded that it would not be appropriate to do this; The land is within the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 395552 / 817881 Rep No: 3090</p>		<p>Kings Gate, Amesbury (SHELAA site S1013)</p>		<p>This site is reassessed. It is part of the King's Gate strategic allocation in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The site has been completed as per the planning permission.</p>
<p>Amesbury Community Area Remainder</p>				

<p>Consultee ID: 998345 / 556489 Rep No: 3008</p>		<p>Buller Park, East of Idmiston Road, Porton (SHELAA Site 70)</p>		<p>Housing in Porton has been considered through the Porton Neighbourhood Plan and sites are identified for housing.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1138571 / 438199 Rep No: 3255</p>			<p>Land off Elstone Lane, Shrewton (OM010)</p>	<p>Site considered and removed at stage 2a of site selection process. Site is isolated from the urban edge of the settlement and is not adjacent to a SHELAA site that is adjacent to the settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 835920 / 438199 Rep No: 3112, 3113</p>		<p>Land to the west of Tanners Lane and south of the Hollow, Shrewton (SHELAA site S146)</p>		<p>The SA references the conclusions of the HRA regarding Shrewton which recommend that 'any options for Shrewton be removed from the site selection process at stage 3 as any development here would fail an appropriate assessment on the basis of uncertainty' (HRA, June 2017, page 33).</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 835920 / 438199 Rep No: 3114, 3115</p>		<p>Land north of the A360, Shrewton (SHELLA site S150)</p>		<p>The SA references the conclusions of the HRA regarding Shrewton which recommend that 'any options for Shrewton be removed from the site selection process at stage 3 as any development here would fail an appropriate assessment on the basis of uncertainty' (HRA, June 2017, page 33).</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 835920 / 438199 Rep No: 3116, 3117</p>		<p>Land south of Nettley Farm, Shrewton (SHELAA site S151)</p>		<p>The SA references the conclusions of the HRA regarding Shrewton which recommend that 'any options for Shrewton be removed from the site selection process at stage 3 as any development here would fail an appropriate assessment on the basis of uncertainty' (HRA, June 2017, page 33).</p>

<p>Consultee ID: 835920 / 438199 Rep No: 3118, 3119</p>		<p>Land at Rolleston Manor Farm, Shrewton (SHELAA site S152)</p>	<p>The SA references the conclusions of the HRA regarding Shrewton which recommend that 'any options for Shrewton be removed from the site selection process at stage 3 as any development here would fail an appropriate assessment on the basis of uncertainty' (HRA, June 2017, page 33).</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 835920 / 438199 Rep No: 3120, 3121</p>		<p>Land south of London Road, Shrewton (SHELAA site S154)</p>	<p>The SA references the conclusions of the HRA regarding Shrewton which recommend that 'any options for Shrewton be removed from the site selection process at stage 3 as any development here would fail an appropriate assessment on the basis of uncertainty' (HRA, June 2017, page 33).</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126899 / 1123010 Rep No: 1095</p>		<p>Land to the rear of Hinds Meadow (SHELAA S113), Shrewton – new access evidence</p>	<p>New evidence received relating to access and which has been considered. Access to the site is via a narrow restricted byway (bridleway). It is likely that third party land would be required to bring it to an acceptable standard and width. No other possible access. The site remains ruled out at stage 2a of site selection process.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1136806 / 1136797 Rep No: 3067, 3195</p>		<p>SHELAA sites 90, 91 and 92 Land between Winterbourne Earls village School and the Railway Line, Winterbourne Earls – new evidence on the impact of odour from the pig farm.</p>	<p>These sites were originally removed at Stage 3 due to impact of odour. The new evidence on the impact of odour from the pig farm has been assessed and does not change the SA score.</p>
<p>Mere Community Area</p>			

Consultee ID: 1138546 / 1133715 Rep No: 3231	Land at Castle Street, Mere (SHELAA site S1051)			The indicative residual requirement for the Local Service Centre of Mere to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Consultee ID: 449233 / 1122261 Rep No: 2442	Land to the rear of Hinton, Mere (No SHELAA)			The indicative residual requirement for the Local Service Centre of Mere to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Salisbury Community Area (including Wilton Town)				
Consultee ID: 1131878 Rep No: 2151-2161 Consultee ID: 1136627/1136618 Rep No: 3063-3066			Land at London Road, Salisbury (OM001)	This new site has been considered but removed at stage 2a of the site selection process as site to be brought within settlement boundary as it has an implemented planning permission.
Consultee ID: 899628/899623 Rep No: 2232-2239			Land north of the A3094 (OM002)	This site has been assessed at stage 3 of the site selection process as a 'less sustainable' site. It has not progressed to Stage 4.
Consultee ID: 1131754/1131747 Rep No: 2120		Land at Harnham Trading Estate, Salisbury (SHELAA site S237)		Site is within the settlement boundary. Site rejected at stage 2a of site selection process.
Consultee ID: 1131544/1131505 Rep No: 2049-2053			The Yard, Hampton Park, Salisbury (OM003)	This site has been assessed at stage 3 of the site selection process and progresses to stage 4 as a 'more sustainable' site. The site is proposed for allocation.

<p>Consultee ID: 1132344 / 825048 Rep No: 2305 - 2314</p>		<p>Land to the north of Old Sarum (SHELAA site S80)</p>		<p>This site was originally assessed as 'less sustainable' and removed after Stage 3 of the site selection process. New evidence has been submitted and considered. The site is still considered a 'less sustainable' site and does not progress to Stage 4.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 898778 Rep No: 1063</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1126871 Rep No: 1082</p>	<p>Land around Odstock Hospital. (inc. SHELAA site 3423)</p>			<p>This site is within the Southern Wiltshire Community Area, where the remaining indicative requirement has been met. The site is isolated from the Salisbury settlement boundary.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1131555 Rep No: 2114, 2115</p>			<p>Sites to the north of Salisbury, north of the River Nadder (no specific sites named)</p>	<p>No specific sites identified for assessment.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 447415</p> <p>Rep No: 1886</p>			<p>Sites to the north of Devizes Road, Salisbury (no specific sites names)</p>	<p>No specific sites identified for assessment.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1132230 / 1132220 Rep No: 2279-2283, 2366</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1126871 Rep No: 1079</p>		<p>Land north of Downton Road, Salisbury (SHELAA site S159)</p>		<p>This site was originally assessed as 'less sustainable' and removed after Stage 3 of the site selection process. New evidence was submitted and considered by the Council. It is considered that the original assessment is reasonable and the site does not proceed to stage 4.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 900160 / 900154 Rep No: 2619, 3012, 3022, 3025,</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1126871</p>		<p>Land off Britford Lane, Salisbury (SHELAA</p>		<p>This site was originally removed on access grounds at stage 2a of the site selection process. New evidence was submitted and has been</p>


Rep No: 1080		site 3435) new flood and transport evidence.		considered which resulted in the site being taken forward for assessment at Stage 3. The Stage 3 assessment assessed the site as a 'less sustainable' site and the site not taken forward to stage 4.
Consultee ID: 1134260 / 1131505 Rep No: 2736-2738		Quidhampton Quarry, Salisbury (SHELAA site S253)		Site rejected at stage 2a of site selection process. Part of site allocated as employment allocation (WCS Core Policy 20) and waste allocation (Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations Local Plan 2013). It is not known how this site could be accessed for a housing development of up to 191 dwellings. Current access via railway bridge (Penning Rd) is single lane and not suitable. Other possible access would be dependent on 3rd party land.
Consultee ID: 1131666 / 1131662 Rep No: 2086		Maltings and Central Car Park site, Salisbury (SHELAA site S227)		This site was originally rejected at Stage 2a due to being designated as a strategic site by WCS Core Policy 20. Site within settlement boundary. No new evidence has been submitted to change this assessment.
Consultee ID: 1131509 / 1131505 Rep No: 2038		Hilltop Way, Salisbury (SHELAA site S61)		Site permitted on appeal ref APP/Y3940/W/17/3173509
Consultee ID: 1122207 / 1122206 Rep No: 167, 169			Land at Lower Bemerton Road, Salisbury (OM008)	Site is partially within the flood zone. The remaining capacity is < 5 therefore the site is removed from consideration at stage 2a of the site selection process.
Consultee ID: 1130720 / 894742 Rep No: 1815			Land off Mill Lane, Stads Sub Case Salisbury (OM013)	No strategic imperative to allocate land for a single dwelling. Site selection methodology is not considering sites of less than 4 dwellings. Site excluded at Stage 2a.

<p>Consultee ID: 446026 Rep No: 676</p> <p>Consultee ID: 1129241/901806 Rep No: 1540</p>		<p>Harnham Business Park (SHELAA site 3187)</p>		<p>Site assessed at Stage 3 of the site selection process. Site does not progress to stage 4 as 'major adverse' effects due to loss of employment land.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126871 Rep No: 1081</p>		<p>Land adjacent A354, Salisbury (SHELAA site 3421)</p>		<p>The site assessed at stage 3 of site selection process. Site assessed as a 'less sustainable' site and does not progress to stage 4.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1119095 / 894742 Rep No: 1604</p>			<p>Land adjoining Britford park and ride (OM009)</p>	<p>There is no agreement to secure a right of access to this site, and therefore access to the site cannot be guaranteed. The site is ruled out at Stage 2a.</p>
<p>Southern Wiltshire Community Area Remainder</p>				
<p>Consultee ID: 1125988 Rep No: 732</p>	<p>Land at Rivermead, Braemore Road, Downton. (SHELAA site S195)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for Downton to be delivered during the Plan period has been met, through the Downton Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 1126328 / 326118 Rep No: 879</p>	<p>Land at Church Lane, Laverstock (SHELAA site S204)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Southern Wiltshire Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>
<p>Consultee ID: 900160 / 900154 Rep No: 3015-16</p>	<p>Land to the east of Southampton Road, Alderbury (SHELAA site S110/3445)</p>			<p>The indicative residual requirement for the Southern Wiltshire Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.</p>


Consultee ID: 473545 Rep No: 379	Land at The Banks, Whiteparish (SHELAA site S181)			The indicative residual requirement for the Southern Wiltshire Community Area Remainder to be delivered during the Plan period has been met. Therefore, the Plan will not need to allocate additional land to help meet an indicative residual requirement.
Tisbury Community Area				
Consultee ID: 1135954 / 556489 Rep No: 2966	Land east of Littledown (Wincombe Business Park, Shaftesbury) (Part of SHELAA site 3446 and 3323)			The site is located within the open countryside and therefore does not progress to Stage 2a of the site selection process. The site is ruled out.
Wilton Community Area				
Consultee ID: 1130378 / 1122261 Rep No: 1739		Land at Newtown, Broad Chalke (SHELAA site 3338) - new evidence relating to feasibility of access		The site has been reassessed on the basis of new access evidence. The site continues to be ruled out at Stage 2a as it is considered that the road is not wide enough to accommodate access requirements.
Consultee ID: 1130378 / 1122261 Rep No: 1739		Land at Knighton Road, Broad Chalke (SHELAA site 3339)		All sites at Broad Chalke were originally removed after assessment at Stage 2b, due to the potential impact on the AONB and the limitation of school capacity or expansion.

23 Appendix O - Maps showing 'omissions sites' promoted by respondents to the Regulation 19 consultation


Omission sites at Amesbury




Omission sites at Ashton Keynes




Omission sites at Bratton




Omission sites at Christian Malford




Omission sites at Codford




Omission sites at Crudwell




Omission sites at Heytesbury



Omission sites at Hullavington




Omission sites at Salisbury (north)




Omission sites


Omission sites at Shrewton



Omission sites at Sutton Benger




Omission sites at Trowbridge



Omission sites

Omission sites at Warminster



24 Appendix P - Analysis of representations specifically relating to the settlement boundary review

East Housing Market Area

24.1 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Aldbourn** (3 representations)

Table 24.1

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
226	Aldbourn Parish Council (1122943)	Changes noted. No immediate comment. Reserve right to request future revisions in light of upcoming neighbourhood plan.	Noted. Settlement boundaries can also be reviewed through the neighbourhood planning process. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP) did not review the boundary for a settlement where it was considered a review had already been undertaken in a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. Future reviews of settlement boundaries through the neighbourhood planning process will supersede the relevant settlement boundary in the WHSAP once the related neighbourhood plan is Made.	No action.
442	Richard Price (932551)	Keep the existing settlement boundary at H4 to H5 to include the rest of the curtilage of Beech Knoll House (garden/paddock). The proposed revised boundary now follows an old Georgian wall that runs across the middle of property and excludes the 1 acre	While the paddock (and the adjacent garden of the house to the north) is at the edge of the settlement, it is part of the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (bordered by	Action: Retain the paddock (and the adjacent garden of the house to the north) within the proposed

		<p>paddock on the other side of the road that is part of the property and within the existing settlement boundary.</p>	<p>residential development to the north, road to the east and path to the west). Its continued inclusion has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.</p>	<p>revised boundary but</p> <p>continue to exclude the field previously included further north and move the boundary line up to but not including the path to the west, at H4 and H5.</p>
3208	<p>Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (863519)</p>	<p>Include Land at Lottage Farm site at J2 and J3 within the proposed revised boundary. The site is situated adjacent to the east of the proposed extension of the settlement boundary to the north, which is supported. Appendix 1 [to this representation] shows the location of the site. The inclusion of this site would allow for the indicative residual requirement for the Marlborough Community Area (34 dwellings) to be met in the Plan period, in accordance with Core Policy 2 of the WCS. The settlement boundaries of Marlborough and the four large villages within the Community Area do not include sites with the potential for delivery of dwellings, including site allocations or planning permissions. Unclear how the indicative residual</p>	<p>It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.</p>	<p>No action.</p>

		requirement of 34 dwellings will be met, as these settlements do not include sites to deliver this quantum of development. It is unlikely that this number of dwellings would come forward through windfall within the settlement boundaries during the Plan period.		
--	--	--	--	--

24.2 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Baydon** (3 representations)

Table 24.2

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3017	Bill Evans (1136300)	Extend settlement boundary at the southern edge of the village to include Turf Run (F8 and F9). The house and its curtilage at Becketts does not represent the perceived natural southern edge of the village of Baydon. A Landscape Statement (September 2017) [attached to this representation] demonstrates that the perception of the edge of the village, when approaching from the direction of Aldbourne to the south west of Baydon, lies to the south of Turf Run. A combination of non-natural features, e.g. views of street and road signage, glimpses of built form, telegraph poles, contrast strongly with rural features to the south along Aldbourne Road and is therefore physically related to the Baydon. On this basis, a more logical location for the settlement boundary would be to the south of Turf Run. This would be well-defined by physical features and respond positively to the existing physical character. The exclusion of Turf Run from the settlement boundary is inconsistent with other examples of the settlement boundary being extended to include residential properties on the edge of settlements, e.g. dwellings to the west of Marlborough (B6,B7 and C6), dwellings to the north	Turf Run cannot be described as isolated development physically detached from the settlement because it lies at the end of a ribbon of development that juts out to the south of Baydon. The majority of the curtilage of the property lies between two existing dwellings (i.e. Becketts and Turf Run), to the north and south, and Aldbourne Road to the east and, therefore, relates more closely to the built environment. Including the curtilage would not substantially extend the built form of the settlement because it lies within this ribbon of development.	Action: To comply with the revised settlement boundary review methodology, the settlement boundary at the southern edge of the village should be extended to include Turf Run and its curtilage.

		of Aldbourne (13, J2 and J3) and dwellings to the north of Baydon (H5).		
3209	Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (863519)	<p>Include Land at Russley Green site at H5 within the proposed revised boundary. The site is situated adjacent to the west of the proposed extension of the settlement boundary to the north west, which is supported. Appendix 1 [to this representation] shows the location of the site. The inclusion of this site would allow for the indicative residual requirement for the Marlborough Community Area (34 dwellings) to be met in the Plan period, in accordance with Core Policy 2 of the WCS. The settlement boundaries of Marlborough and the four large villages within the Community Area do not include sites with the potential for delivery of dwellings, including site allocations or planning permissions. Unclear how the indicative residual requirement of 34 dwellings will be met, as these settlements do not include sites to deliver this quantum of development. It is unlikely that this number of dwellings would come forward through windfall within the settlement boundaries during the Plan period.</p>	It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.	No action
3209	Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (863519)	<p>Include triangular parcel of land, within client's control, at H5 that the revised settlement boundary has removed from the settlement boundary. It is bordered on all sides by the road. It is currently overgrown but could be brought forward for</p>	Given that this piece of land is surrounded to the east, south and west by built development and bordered on all sides by the road, this is	Action: To comply with the revised settlement boundary review methodology, the settlement boundary at

		use as an informal village green in conjunction with the development of the Land at Russley Green site.	recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment.	the northern edge of the village should include this triangular parcel of land, at H5.
3370	Owner off Land off Manor Lane, Baydon (1157644)	<p>Include entirety of garden of Dacre, Manor Lane, at H7, within the settlement boundary and/ or allocated for housing development. Permission granted in 2007 for change of use from agricultural to residential hard surfacing and erection of garage extension (K/56453). This has been implemented. Permission granted in 2008 for proposed lobby link, linking the sections of existing and approved garages together also replacing roof window with small dormer window in art studio (K/58403/F). Clearly separate from open countryside.</p> <p>No housing requirement specifically for Baydon, as a large village, and no neighbourhood planning process to allocate sites.</p>	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden. The hedgerow shows clear separation of garden from open countryside. Its inclusion has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	Action: Include the entirety of the garden of Dacre, Manor Lane, at H7, within the settlement boundary.

24.3 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Broad Hinton** (3 representations)

Table 24.3

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
23/29	Amanda Le Pape (1115636)	Include dwellings within the village, which have not been included within the proposed revised settlement boundary, that date from the early 1800s and can be considered established within the community.	It is unclear which houses are being referred to in the representation. However, built development has been included within the settlement boundary in line with the revised settlement boundary review methodology.	No action
23/29	Amanda Le Pape (1115636)	Include land to the north/northwest of the village hall within the proposed revised settlement boundary. It is suitable for building in line with the Government's core strategy for building houses and has not been included. A small and sensitive development here would be welcomed by the village and the local amenities (e.g. school, church, pubs etc.). It would encourage younger families into the village and redress the imbalance with the ageing population of the village.	It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.	No action
714	R.D. Horton and Son (1125714)	Core Strategy Core Policy 1 sets out the Settlement Strategy, identifying the various tiers of settlements across the County. Whilst the Policy sets out different requirements for each tier, the Policy does not set out any "priority" for where new development should be focused. This is further evidenced by Paragraph 4.15 of the Core Strategy which sets out that the HSA	Core Policy 1 specifies the level of development appropriate for each tier of settlement. Higher tier settlements, principal settlements, are expected to provide significant levels of jobs and homes. Development in the lowest tier settlements, large and small villages, will be limited to that needed to help meet the housing needs of settlements and	No action

		DPD will review settlement boundaries to allow new housing to come forward.	to improve employment opportunities, services and facilities. Therefore, Core Policy 1 does set out a clear priority for where new development should be focused.	
--	--	---	---	--

24.4 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Devizes** (3 representations)

Table 24.4

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
63	Devizes Town Council (838183)	The change to the settlement boundary for Devizes is justified as it corrected a slight anomaly.	Support noted.	No action.
65	Devizes Area Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (1119082)	The change to the settlement boundary for Devizes is justified as it corrected a slight anomaly.	Support noted.	No action.
2940	Berkeley Strategic (1135680)	<p>Include Land at Horton Road, Devizes, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. Berkeley Strategic is the freehold owner of 7.2ha of land at this site. This site is allocated in the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) as a strategic employment site (Land between A361 and Horton Road, Devizes) under Core Policy 12, which states that the site will contribute 8.4ha of employment land.</p> <p>The proposed settlement boundary for Devizes has been prepared contrary to paragraph 4.15 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The failure to include the strategic allocation within the proposed revised settlement boundary poses a risk to the future development of this site for the reasons set out in paragraph 4.15, i.e. that development outside the settlement boundaries will be strictly controlled.</p>	<p>The purpose of the settlement boundary is to define the built form of a settlement. There is likely to be uncertainty over how much space within the red line on a site plan drawing is taken up by the built form. Therefore, the proposed revised settlement boundary excludes site allocations identified in the development plan. However, once built/ commenced, the development can be included within a future review of the settlement boundaries.</p>	No action.

24.5 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **East Housing Market Area** – settlements not being reviewed (two representations)

Table 24.5

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
116	Bernie Bradshaw (869060)	Request that Land to the East of Ball Road, Pewsey is removed from the Pewsey Plan as land with the potential for development. I believe it was due to a lack of communication between Wiltshire Council and Pewsey Parish Council that the draft Settlement Boundary has not been agreed already.	The settlement boundary for Pewsey is not being reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. It has already been reviewed through the neighbourhood planning process for Pewsey. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will not be reviewing settlement boundaries where this is considered to have been undertaken by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan.	No action
3003	Bovis Homes (998345)	<p>The reason for redrawing the limits of development is that, over 2014-16, a proposal for housing was rejected by Pewsey Parish Council on three occasions, rejected by Wiltshire Council on three occasions and finally rejected by the independent assessor from Bristol. I believe it will save a good deal of time and effort if the limit of development was put back to pre-1985.</p> <p>The absence of a proposed revised settlement boundary for Pewsey is considered short-sighted and damaging. Through the review of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, it is likely that further housing sites will be required. Therefore, the Council should be taking this opportunity to provide further directions for growth in sustainable locations. The settlement boundary view</p>	The Review of the Core Strategy and the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan are being progressed as separate policy documents, as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme. The settlement boundary for Pewsey is not being reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. It has already been reviewed through the neighbourhood planning process for Pewsey. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will not be reviewing settlement boundaries where this is considered to have been undertaken by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan.	No action

		should be part of a combined Core Strategy Review and Housing Site Allocations Plan. This will help ensure the delivery of allocations and offer greater certainty to communities.		
--	--	--	--	--

24.6 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Market Lavington** (8 representations)

Table 24.6

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Retain existing settlement boundary at I5 and J5. The proposed extension to the settlement boundary includes a dwelling that is sited behind the current 'ribbon' development line of the village, not well attached to the urban framework and, therefore, not suitable for any possible future development. As such, it should not be included within the settlement boundary. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built residential development that is physically related to the settlement. The dwelling is not isolated development that is physically detached from the settlement.	No action.
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Retain existing settlement boundary at L5. The proposed extension to the settlement boundary includes the Fiddington Nursery site. This site should be retained for potential employment uses to keep the settlement sustainable and not encourage re-development. The site is not well-attached to the urban framework. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built employment development in Local Service Centres that is physically related to the settlement. The site is surrounded by residential development to the north west, west and south-west. Core Policy 35 protects employment land in principal settlements, market towns and local service centres from residential development.	No action.
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Exclude the industrial units included within the proposed extension to the settlement boundary at K7 and L7. This site should be retained for potential employment uses to keep the settlement sustainable	This is Southcliffe Business Park. The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built employment development in Local Service Centres that is physically related to the settlement. The site is	No action.

		and not encourage re-development. The site is not well-attached to the urban framework. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	attached to existing residential development to the north/ north-west. Core Policy 35 protects employment land in principal settlements, market towns and local service centres from residential development.	
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Retain the existing settlement boundary at J6. There are no residential properties, only disused farm buildings, barns and sheds, within the proposed extension to the settlement boundary. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	This is an error on the proposed revised settlement boundary. The explanation for the amendment is 'J7, J6 – Amend boundary to include curtilage of properties that relate more closely to the built form of the settlement'. This does not apply to this area of land, which is simply disused farm buildings, barns and sheds.	Action: Retain existing boundary at J6 to exclude this area of land that contains disused farm buildings, barns and sheds.
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Retain existing settlement boundary at 18 and J8. The proposed extension to the settlement boundary includes a commercial yard operation. This site should be retained for potential employment uses to keep the settlement sustainable and not encourage re-development. The site is not well-attached to the urban framework. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built employment development in Local Service Centres that is physically related to the settlement. The site is bordered by the road (Lavington Hill) and residential development to the north. Core Policy 35 protects employment land in principal settlements, market towns and local service centres from residential development.	No action.
283	Market Lavington Parish Council (924012)	Generally, the boundary review seems sensible. However, the Parish Council has the above comments. The Marlborough Neighbourhood Plan has the power to amend the settlement boundary de facto by allocating sites	Support noted. Other comments addressed above. The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary. However, settlement boundaries can also be reviewed through	No action.

		<p>proposed in the neighbourhood plan. It is up to Wiltshire Council whether they choose to revise the settlement boundary to accommodate these or leave it to the neighbourhood plan. (See also attachment)</p>	<p>the neighbourhood planning process. Future reviews of settlement boundaries through the neighbourhood planning process will supersede the relevant settlement boundary in the WHSAP once the related neighbourhood plan is Made.</p>	
1587	Slater Reynolds (396105)	<p>To include the full, garden curtilage of the property and reflect its planning history, move the settlement boundary around Parsonage Mead, The Spring, at F7 and F8, to at least follow the stream to the south and access road to the playing fields to the north, ideally it should be extended further south up to the boundary of the playing fields. (See also attachment)</p>	<p>The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement. The methodology also says that the settlement boundaries should follow but not include clearly defined physical features, such as roads and water courses. For these reasons, the settlement boundary should be moved to follow, but not include, the stream to the south and the access road to the east. Most of this area is included within the existing settlement boundary. This change would not substantially extend the settlement. However, the methodology excludes the extended curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the countryside (e.g. a field or paddock) or has the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. Extending the settlement boundary further south up to the playing fields would not, therefore, be appropriate for these reasons.</p>	<p>Action: Move the proposed revised settlement boundary around Parsonage Mead to follow, but not include, the stream to the south (from the access road to the playing fields to the hedgerow border with Clyffe Hall) and to follow, but not include, the access road to the playing fields (from its junction with the B3098 up to the stream) to the east. However, do not include the field south of the stream or the rest of the access</p>

				road from the stream up to the playing fields.
1588	Slater Reynolds (396105)	Include the full length of the driveway/ access road, at F7 and F8, to Parsonage Mead and the frontage of 41, The Springs and the adjacent section of the B3098 within the settlement boundary. Otherwise, the land and buildings would be within the settlement boundary but the short length of private road road (about 18m) would be outside. This may be a mistake but might affect future intentions to improve the access situation for 41 The Spring by creating a driveway into the north garden and neighbouring buildings. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The private, access road to Parsonage Mead should be considered as part of the curtilage of the property that relates more to the built form than the open countryside. Therefore, it should be included within the settlement boundary. However, the revised settlement boundary methodology says that the settlement boundary should follow but not include clearly defined physical features, such as roads. Therefore, it should not include the adjacent section of the B3098.	Action: Extend the proposed revised settlement boundary to include the private access road to Parsonage Mead up to but not including the adjacent section of the B3098.
1589	Slater Reynolds (396105)	Include within the settlement boundary the thin strip of land, at F7, within the Clyffe Hall kitchen garden area, which contains pedestrian access at its northern end from the highway to the greenhouses within the garden, which are within the proposed revised settlement boundary. This runs, on the other side of a brick wall, alongside the driveway/ private access road to Parsonage Mead (part of which is excluded but this issue is covered in a separate comment but relates to this comment).	The kitchen garden area forms part of the curtilage, which relates more to the built form of Clyffe Hall than the open countryside. Therefore, this whole area up to the brick wall on the western side of the kitchen garden area should be included within the proposed revised settlement boundary, thus encompassing the thin strip of land in question. <i>(See also Comment #3350)</i>	Action: Extend the proposed revised settlement boundary to include the rest of the kitchen garden area up to and including the brick wall on the west side of the kitchen garden area.

		Include the adjacent section of the B3098 up to the western side of the access road within the proposed revised settlement boundary. <i>(See also attachment)</i>		
1734, 1951	GS and M Payton Trust (1104618) Castlewood Properties Ventures Ltd (1130978)	Settlement boundary map should include full allocation at Underhill Nursery (H1.2). <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to define the built form of a settlement. There is likely to be uncertainty over how much space within the red line on a site plan drawing is taken up by the built form. Therefore, the revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes site allocations from within the settlement boundary.	No action.
2678	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) (983136)	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) supports the inclusion of the Fiddington Hill nursery at L5 within the proposed revised settlement boundary	Support noted.	No action.
3350	William Hall (1138993)	Include the whole 'walled' kitchen garden of Clyffe Hall and front drive, at E7, F7, E8 and F8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. This would be line with the revised settlement boundary review methodology to include gardens but not adjoining amenity land. <i>(See also attachment)</i>	The walled kitchen garden area forms part of the curtilage, which relates more to the built form of Clyffe Hall than the open countryside. Therefore, this whole area should be included within the proposed revised settlement boundary. <i>(See also Comment #1589)</i>	Action: Extend the proposed revised settlement boundary to include the whole 'walled' kitchen garden area and front drive of Clyffe Hall.

24.7 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Marlborough** (6 representations)

Table 24.7

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
223	Ian Mellor (1123590)	The settlement boundary for Marlborough is sound and justified. <i>(See General SBR Tables table for other general comments in Representations 3091-4 on the Revised SBR methodology)</i>	Support Noted.	No action.
396	Mark Ashley (1122440)	Include land associated with and within the curtilage of The Beeches, Downs Lane, Marlborough at B7 within the proposed revised settlement boundary, so that all of land associated with this property is included in the same way as for all of the neighbouring properties that surround this property.	The land indicated on the diagram attached to this representation is a large field on the edge of the built form of the settlement, separated from built development to the east by a clearly defined physical feature (i.e. a large hedgerow). In appearance, the field relates more closely to the adjoining open countryside to the west.	No action
418, 3288	Marlborough College (1138628)	Our objections in part relate to the methodology applied to determine settlement boundaries. This needed to be explored and has not been justified by the evidence base. Further, the Council's assessment appears subjective and is not borne out by the detailed characteristics of the individual sites in question.	Comments on site-specific examples are addressed below.	No action

1697	Marlborough Town Council (820230)	<p>Marlborough Town Council recognises that the settlement boundary will have to be adjusted in the coming years to include new housing developments and additional amenities, e.g. the Salisbury Road housing development on Crown Estates land, a new cemetery to replace the current one that is nearly full, a new school site for Preshute School that is in an unsuitable building with outside temporary classrooms.</p> <p>The settlement boundary will be reviewed as part of the Marlborough Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>Manton is named as a small village but, in fact, is part of Marlborough through boundary changes made in 1934. It is unclear if the settlement boundary for Marlborough should include Manton. It currently does not.</p>	<p>Noted. Settlement boundaries can also be reviewed through the neighbourhood planning process.</p> <p>The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan (WHSAP) did not review the boundary for a settlement where it was considered a review had already been undertaken in a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. Future reviews of settlement boundaries through the neighbourhood planning process will supersede the relevant settlement boundary in the WHSAP once the related neighbourhood plan is Made.</p> <p>Manton is classified as a small village under Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) and, therefore, no longer has a settlement boundary.</p> <p>Marlborough, which is classified as a market town, and Manton are separate settlements and, therefore, do not share a settlement boundary.</p>	No action
1700	Marlborough Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group (1129975)	<p>Manton is named as a small village but, in fact, is part of Marlborough through boundary changes made in 1934. It is unclear if the settlement boundary for</p>	<p>Manton is classified as a small village under Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) and, therefore, no longer</p>	No action.

		Marlborough should include Manton. It currently does not.	has a settlement boundary. Marlborough, which is classified as a market town and retains a settlement boundary, and Manton are separate settlements. They do not share a settlement boundary.	
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Retain the existing boundary at D8, E8 and F8 to include the A4 Bath Road within the proposed revised settlement boundary	The revised settlement boundary methodology states that the settlement boundaries define the built form of the settlement by, where practicable, following but not including clearly defined physical features , such as walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses.	No action.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Support extension of settlement boundary at C8 and D8 to include residential properties to the south of the A4 Bath Road.	Support noted.	No action.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Retain the existing boundary at F8, G8, G9, H8 and H9 to include Marlborough College playing fields and main car park bounded by the River Kennet and the gardens and allotments adjacent to Marlborough College's Master's Lodge, bordering Pewsey Road. All fall within the confines of the main school campus. The areas in question are in active use for educational purposes and are physically and	Marlborough College is built community facilities development that is physically related to the settlement. Its curtilage, which includes the playing fields, main car park, gardens and allotments, relates more closely to the built environment and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. The settlement boundary	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary at F8, G8, G9, H8 and H9 to include Marlborough College playing fields, main car park, gardens and allotments. However, the settlement boundary should follow

		functionally related to the settlement, of which the College forms an integral part. The land in question already benefits from a strong and defensible boundary to the countryside. By drawing the boundary too tightly (albeit unjustified), the Council would be imposing undue restriction and a lack of flexibility in enabling the College to meet its development needs in the future.	should follow the River Kennet, which is a clearly defined physical feature.	but not include the A4 Bath Road in G8, until it reaches the edge of the land owned by Marlborough College included within the existing settlement boundary.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Retain the existing boundary at G5, G6, H6 and H7 to include Hyde Lane within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary methodology states that the settlement boundaries define the built form of the settlement by, where practicable, following but not including clearly defined physical features , such as walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses.	No action.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Support extension of settlement boundary at H7 to include Marlborough College sports club house and store buildings.	Support noted.	No action.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Support extension of settlement boundary at F7 and G7 to include Barton Dene and Hammons cottages.	Support noted.	No action.
3291	Marlborough College (1138628)	Retain the existing boundary at E7, F6 and F7 to include College Fields area of public open space within the proposed revised	The site is bordered by residential development to the east, south and west. To the north, it is bordered by a	Action: Retain the existing boundary at E7, F6 and F7 to include

		<p>settlement boundary. This land was transferred as open space as part of the College Fields residential and hence urban development. It is bounded by residential/urban development with a strong defensible boundary to countryside to the north.</p>	<p>hedgerow, which forms a clearly defined physical boundary. Therefore, this land is recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment.</p>	<p>the College Fields area of public open space within the proposed revised settlement boundary.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

24.8 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Ramsbury** (4 representations)

Table 24.8

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3091-4	Mr and Mrs Dallas (1137549)	Include the full curtilage of The Old Mill, Scholards Lane (18) and several other properties and their curtilages that form an intrinsic part of the historic settlement of Ramsbury.	The existing settlement boundary around The Old Mill, Ramsbury has been retained because, as advised by Ramsbury and Axford Parish Council during the informal consultation in summer 2014, including the full curtilage as requested would mean that the boundary line would go through the river and over land that floods. However, the properties on the east of the road off Scholards Lane/ Newton Road should be included because they are physically related to the settlement and bordered by the River Kennet to the south, have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Include the properties to the south of Newton Road, on the east of the road adjacent to The Old Mill, Scholards Lane, and their curtilages.

24.9 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Rowde** (6 representations)

Table 24.9

Representation(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
6, 387, 737	Rowde Parish Council (1105479) Wiltshire Council - Housing (979503) Wiltshire Council - Estates (1138634)	Include recently completed development (six dwellings) at Reed Place, off Silverlands Road, at I8 and J8.	Settlements boundaries will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption to take account of recently commenced or completed developments since the cut-off point for the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan of April 2016.	No action.
425	Dr John Land (899720)	<p>Include Land at Mulberry Lodge, Rowde, at H5, (SHLAA site 3367) within the proposed settlement boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy classifies Rowde as a large village, with good facilities and services, suitable for sustainable growth • No allocations have been identified in large villages in the East Wiltshire Housing Market Area • Settlement boundary drawn too tightly and provides few opportunities for future development • Infilling opportunities mostly taken up within the last decade and few completions/ commitments since 2006 (estimated at 8-10 dwellings) • No neighbourhood planning area submitted/ approved. Thus, up to 	It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.	No action.

		<p>Wiltshire Council to ensure suitable housing sites available</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No site survey analysis by Wiltshire Council. Sites rejected on basis of limited informal consultation with Parish Council • Disagree with Report on the Informal Consultation on the Approach to Large Villages (January 2016), which states SHLAA site 3367 has drainage, flooding and highways issues based upon comments attributed to Rowde Parish Council but unverified/ substantiated. No opportunity for landowner to response to these comments. However, land already raised above flood zone. Highway analysis and initial consultation with Wiltshire Council suggests no technical impediment to development. Site can deliver 6 to 8 small dwellings to help meet local housing needs. 		
776	Andrew Fleming Associates (1124863)	<p>Include Land at Malthouse Farm, Rowde, at F6 and G6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy classifies Rowde as a large village, with good facilities and services, suitable for sustainable growth • Conflict with Wiltshire Core Strategy Objective 3, bullet point 4 about a 'flexible approach' and responding positively to opportunities, rather than 'an overly prescriptive, rigid approach'. • No allocations have been identified in large villages in the East Wiltshire Housing Market Area • Settlement boundary drawn too tightly and provides few opportunities for future development • Infilling opportunities mostly taken up within the last decade and few completions/ 	It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.	No action.

		<p>commitments since 2006 (estimated at 8-10 dwellings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No neighbourhood planning area submitted/ approved. Thus, up to Wiltshire Council to ensure suitable housing sites available • No site survey analysis by Wiltshire Council. Sites rejected on basis of limited informal consultation with Parish Council • NPPF paragraph 55 and NPPG paragraph 001 support new housing in rural areas. NPPG recognises that '<i>All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas</i>'. 		
778	Andrew Fleming Associates (1124863)	<p>Retain the redundant farm buildings, at F6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No site survey analysis by Wiltshire Council. Change from existing settlement boundary appears to be a desktop exercise. • Farm buildings redundant, severed from an agricultural holding and most of the larger steel frame storage barns unsuitable/ unviable for employment purposes. • Most of the buildings are in poor condition and require extensive repairs and alterations for business use. • Employment use would generate more traffic than residential development and conversion, with adverse impact on local highway network 	The employment development, consisting of farm buildings, is surrounded on three sides by existing residential development and somewhat set back from the edge of the village.	Action: Retain existing settlement boundary at F6 and include redundant farm buildings within the settlement boundary.

24.10 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **West Lavington and Littleton Panell** (22 representations)

Table 24.10

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
67, 139, 1157	Cllr Richard Gamble (402716) David Rowles (1121345) West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Retain area behind 67-69 High Street, West Lavington and adjacent properties, J8, K8, J9 and K9, within the proposed revised settlement boundary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only one part, at the northern end, could be described as 'a farm building and farm yard at the edge of a large village'; the remainder comprises domestic buildings or gardens (#67 – see also attachment) • Both these properties are clearly domestic buildings/gardens and have been within the settlement boundary for at least the past 25 years or so. They should be retained within the existing settlement boundary. (#139 – see also attachment) • The buildings and space immediately behind Hooks Court can be described as farm buildings and farm yard and can thus be excluded in accordance with the stated criteria. However, the area behind 67-69 High Street is a private garden, private garage and out buildings and should not be excluded on the basis that it forms "the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) ..." The Manor and the Manor yard should be included as they are 	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell

		clearly "a built residence ... that is physically related to the settlement." Its proposed exclusion is bizarre. (#1157 – see also attachment)		
67, 77, 394, 685, 1154	<p>Cllr Richard Gamble (402716)</p> <p>RD and S Robson (1119213)</p> <p>Sharon Coombs (1124637)</p> <p>West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)</p>	<p>Retain area behind 109 High Street, Littleton Panell, at H5 and H6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greater part of this area is an extensive rustic garden associated with 109 High Street. It is divided into several sections where the owners have generously hosted numerous community events. It is not agricultural nor does it relate to the open countryside. It does not extend the built form of the settlement as it is within the line of the former burgage plots, which form the existing settlement boundary in this area. (#67 – see also attachment) • The garden extends to the rear to the boundary with the field owned by Mr Coxhead on one side and a house on the other side. Part of the neighbouring garden, at 115 High Street, appears to have been excluded too. • There is proof of purchase of the garden to the rear of 115 High Steet, Littleton Panell, which clearly shows the boundaries and that the garden is part of the curtilage of 115. It should not be considered undeveloped, unowned, greenbelt or free for the 	<p>The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>

		<p>building of houses. (#394/685 – see also attachments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is for the most part the rustic garden of 109 High Street, which is within the line of the original burgage plots and not visibly part of the countryside or agricultural in any way. A small section forms the garden of 115 High Street. (#1154 – see also attachment) 		
67, 1162	<p>Cllr Richard Gamble (402716)</p> <p>West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)</p>	<p>Retain area of High Street, Littleton Panell, at G5, which excludes part of the A360 and adjacent lanes. This amendment has no basis on any of the defined criteria and appears bizarre. (#67 – see also attachment)</p> <p>This is a minor change, in the area adjacent to the High Street, Littleton Panell, with no apparent justification or consequence. (#1162 – see also attachment)</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>
67, 1156	<p>Cllr Richard Gamble (402716)</p> <p>West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)</p>	<p>Retain existing settlement boundary line adjacent to the village playing field, at J7 and J8, which excludes part of the surrounding Sandfield and Mill Lane. Given that the playing field is bounded on the north by houses, on the east by the primary school, on the west by the village hall and on part of the south by sheltered housing, it would be more logical to include the field on the basis that it is “Recreational or</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>

		<p>amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment". (#67 – see also attachment)</p> <p>The primary school and the pre-school should also be included on the basis that each comprise 'development such as ... schools ... that is physically related to the settlement". They are obviously not related to anything else and do not in themselves "have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement'. (#1156 – see also attachment)</p>	<p>boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.</p>	
67, 1159	<p>Cllr Richard Gamble (402716)</p> <p>West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)</p>	<p>Include the newly built sports pavilion, at H8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary at Dauntsey's School. Its inclusion would comply with the criteria, which states that 'Built and commenced residential and community facilities development such as religious buildings, schools and community halls, that is physically related to the settlement'. (#67 – see also attachment)</p> <p>Indeed, the entire perimeter of Dauntsey's School grounds should be included because it is physically related to the settlement and include recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement. The school grounds are not related to anything else and do not have the capacity to substantially extend the</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell</p>

		built form of the settlement, except through school use. Any development of the school is not a development of the settlement. (#1159 – see also attachment)		
809	Paul Langham (a'Beckett's Vineyard) (481043)	Include the new build house at the back of 25 and 27 High Steet, Littleton Panell, and the field leading down to Semington Brook, at G3, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. The Conservation Area, in the 2003 Conservation Statement, includes a'Beckett's House, 25 and 27 High Street, Littleton Panell. However, the proposed revised settlement boundary is much smaller than the Conservation Area and does not include these properties. How can the Conservation Area not be within the settlement boundary? (#809 – see also attachment)	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell
1057, 1059, 1060, 1061	Gaiger Bros (Mr G Gaiger) (394670)	Include Land off Lavington Lane, West Lavington, at J6, K6 and J7, be included within the proposed revised settlement boundary (and/ or allocated within the Plan). Community support, scale sufficient to help meet local housing need and community benefits, e.g. second access and parking for Dauntsey Primary School. The draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan is not 'positively	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell

		<p>prepared', 'justified', 'effective' or 'consistent with national policy' because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing need is inaccurately measures and is not express this as a minimum • It does not comply with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, which has a presumption in favour of sustainable development • It does not identify housing at large villages, such as West Lavington and Littleton Panell, which have a range of services and facilities and require modest growth to support them. • It will not deliver sufficient affordable housing, relying upon neighbourhood planning process, which may not take place, and flawed Core Policy 44 (Exceptions). This requires allocation of larger sites within large villages. • The deliverability of many site allocations in the Devizes Community Area is in question and there are discrepancies over the figures relied upon in calculating housing land supply 	boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	
1151	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Include the house, outbuildings and surrounding garden area of 12 Pagnall Lane, at F3, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. The garden extends at its northern end along a clearly defined hedge opposite 13 Pagnell Lane and should be included as 'the curtilage of a property that relates	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell

		more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden)'. The space immediately to the north side of this hedge is an agricultural field and should be excluded according to the criteria that it 'relates more closely to the open countryside (e.g. a field or paddock) or has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location'. (#1151 – see also attachment)	Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	
1152	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Support inclusion of 2, 11 and 13 Russell Mill Lane, at G4 and H4, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. (#1152 – see also attachment)	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell
1153	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Support inclusion of 3 and 8 Russell Mill Lane, at H5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. (#1153 – see also attachment)	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell

			the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	
1155	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Retain the triangle of land beyond 24 Eastfield, at J6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. This is part of the garden of 24 Eastfield. (#1155 – see also attachment)	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell
1158	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Support inclusion of land behind 44-56 High Street, West Lavington, at J8 and J9. This is a minor change that corrects the boundary line along footpath. (#1158 – see also attachment)	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell
1160	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	The change to the settlement boundary at Dauntsey School car park, at G7 and G8, is a minor change of no consequence but, see response to #1159, the whole perimeter of Dauntsey	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan.	Action: Include the whole perimeter of Dauntsey School within the settlement boundary.

		School should be included within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	
1161	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	Support the inclusion of the new houses at The Farm, Littleton Panell, at G5.	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell
1151-1162	West Lavington Parish Council (1126948)	The West Lavington neighbourhood planning process is well advanced and considering a site allocation of 40-60 dwellings (on Land off Lavington Lane, West Lavington) and a review of the settlement boundary. A draft plan is expected to be submitted to Wiltshire Council in January 2018.	The settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for West Lavington and Littleton Panell

24.11 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Worton** (5 representations)

Table 24.11

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
67, 2621	Cllr Richard Gamble (402716)	Support Worton Parish Council's request for no change to the existing settlement boundary without direct consultation and consideration. The existing settlement boundary is long established and, in many respects, reflects the historic settlement as defined by burgage plots etc. Many of the proposed changes are not consistent with the methodology. For example, the school grounds and gardens, at G6 and G7, are certainly not 'more related to the open countryside'. The compiler may have been unfamiliar with the location and not examined the aerial photography. Worton is currently preparing a neighbourhood plan and I have no doubt responsible proposals will be made regarding the settlement boundary in due course.	The school grounds and garden are physically related to the settlement and have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary around Five Lanes Primary School, at G6 and G7.
604	Worton Parish Council (785423)	Lack of consultation with individuals whose properties would be affected by the proposed changes. They may be unaware of the implications of how the proposed changes could affect them. We have attempted to bring this to their attention but are not satisfied that this has been successful.	The Council undertook an informal consultation on revisions to the settlement boundary with town and parish councils, to which Worton Parish Council responded, in summer 2014	No action.

		<p>Lack of onsite assessments/ judgements have led to a complex picture, which is both illogical and careless. As a Parish Council, it is a very difficult task to consult/ inform on a property by property basis, is not within our remit and could give rise to justified complaint if done on a piecemeal basis.</p> <p>No changes should take place until directly affected individuals have been informed.</p>	<p>and a full public consultation between July and September 2018.</p>	
773	Andrew Fleming Associates (1124863)	<p>Include Land at Mill Road, Worton, at E6, F5 and F6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy classifies Rowde as a large village, with good facilities and services, suitable for sustainable growth • Conflict with Wiltshire Core Strategy Objective 3, bullet point 4 about a 'flexible approach' and responding positively to opportunities, rather than 'an overly prescriptive, rigid approach'. • No allocations have been identified in large villages in the East Wiltshire Housing Market Area • Settlement boundary drawn too tightly and provides few opportunities for future development • Infilling opportunities mostly taken up within the last decade and few completions/ commitments since 2006 (estimated at 8-10 dwellings) 	<p>It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site should be treated as an omission site and assessed through the site selection process.</p>	No action.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No neighbourhood planning area submitted/ approved. Thus, up to Wiltshire Council to ensure suitable housing sites available • No site survey analysis by Wiltshire Council. Sites rejected on basis of limited informal consultation with Parish Council • NPPF paragraph 55 and NPPG paragraph 001 support new housing in rural areas. NPPG recognises that 'All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas'. (#773 – see also attachment) 		
983	Worton Neighbourhood Plan Group (1126765)	The existing settlement boundary should include all the housing along Mill Road, at C5, D5, C6 and D6, but this is not shown on the settlement boundary review map for Worton in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. However, this area is shown as being within the settlement boundary on the policies maps accompanying the Kennet Local Plan. We expect that this is an error and request that this area is included within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The exclusion of this area along Mill Road would appear to be an error on the settlement boundary review map.	Action: Include the housing along Mill Road, at C5, D5, C6 and D6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary, as it appears on the policies maps accompanying the Kennet Local Plan. Adjust the line showing the existing settlement boundary accordingly.
3305	David Brierly (1138840)	Include the entirety of my mother's garden within the proposed revised settlement boundary. The gardens of all properties on the same side of the street are included.	Representation does not specify which property is being referred to by the comment. However, it is likely to be Oak House, 80 High	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary in 16 and J6 and extend to include the entirety of the curtilage of

			Street, Worton, at 16. This is the curtilage of a property that relates more the built environment and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Oak House, 80 High Street, Worton.
--	--	--	---	------------------------------------

North and West Housing Market Area

24.12 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for Ashton Keynes (2 representations)

Table 24.12

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
907	Ashton Keynes Parish Council (1126124)	Support proposed revised settlement boundary for Ashton Keynes.	Support noted.	No action.
926	Partridge Homes (1037118)	<p>The proposed revised settlement boundary for Ashton Keynes is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sufficiently flexible to boost housing supply, including the required affordable homes outlined in the adopted neighbourhood plan • The settlement boundary is proposed to shrink, despite national policy shift to boost housing supply and a clear local need for more affordable homes. Very little prospect of a viable and deliverable site coming forward of a scale to provide affordable homes. • Request settlement boundary reviewed to ensure that development that caters for social needs (including social housing and self-build housing) in sustainable locations is acceptable in principle. 	Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect changes to the built form since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries, not to allocate sites. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan allocates sites that have been assessed through the site selection process.	No action.

24.13 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Atworth** (4 representations)

Table 24.13

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3183	Neston Park Estate (1138214)	Include Land at West Farm, at G6 and H6, within the settlement boundary. There is a need for additional land to be allocated to meet objectively assessed housing need for the Plan period.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes employment sites at the edge of large villages from within the settlement boundary.	No action.
2037, 3184/3185	Effie Gale-Sides (1131512) Neston Park Estate (1138214)	Include Atworth Business Park and Land to the east of Atworth Business Park, at J6, J7 and K7, within the settlement boundary. There is a need for additional land to be allocated to meet objectively assessed housing need for the Plan period.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes employment sites at the edge of large villages from within the settlement boundary. The adjacent land is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.

24.14 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Bratton** (8 representations)

Table 24.14

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
274	Mr and Mrs J and F Hyde (1124520)	Include the full garden curtilage of Court Lane Farm, 2 Court Lane, Bratton, at G6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. The gardens in the north, west and south of the village have been included.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden). This garden is surrounded on three sides by existing residential development.	Action: Include the full garden curtilage of Court Lane Farm, 2 Court Lane, Bratton, at G6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
699 1229	Bratton Parish Council (1125770) Peter Brabner (705001)	Object to any change to the settlement boundary, except to propose the inclusion of the disused tennis courts at East Marsh Farm, Lower Road, at I5.	Objection noted. The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more the built environment. The tennis courts are surrounded on three sides, by existing residential development and Lower Road.	Action: Include the tennis courts at East Marsh Farm, Lower Road, at I5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
950	Arno Pilz (1126612)	Include the Grade II Listed East Marsh Farm, garage, old barn, small outbuildings and mature garden, at I5 and J5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. This would apply the same methodology to this property as other properties and avoid splitting.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden). This garden relates more to the built environment and should be included. However, the adjacent paddock and woodland should be excluded.	Action: Include the Grade II Listed East Marsh Farm, garage, old barn, small outbuildings and mature garden, at I5 and J5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
1027	Louis Lillywhite (1124313)	Settlement boundaries should only be adjusted if there is specific	The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect changes to the built form that have occurred	No action.

		justification, which has not been shown regarding Bratton.	since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundary.	
2304	Bratton Parish Council (1125770)	Particular concern at the southern extension to the village, which the Parish Council felt might encourage owners of large Victorian and Georgian houses to seek permission to develop their gardens for housing.	Noted. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or would have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	No action.
2525	Nicola Morris (1122130)	Include the full garden curtilage of Grange Farm, 61 Lower Farm Road, Bratton, at G5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden). This garden and access is surrounded on three sides by residential development and its inclusion would be in keeping with the settlement boundary line either side, forming a straight boundary.	Action: Include the full garden curtilage of Grange Farm, 61 Lower Farm Road, Bratton, at G5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
2574	Frances Southern (1120634)	Retain the existing settlement boundary behind 51 Yew Tree Farm, Lower Road, at H5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden). This garden is surrounded on three sides by residential development and its inclusion would be in keeping with the settlement boundary line either side, forming a straight boundary.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary behind 51 Yew Tree Farm, Lower Road, at H5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.

24.15 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Calne** (10 representations)

Table 24.15

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
192	CG Fry & Son Ltd (1122879)	Include Land at Silver Street, Calne, at D12, E12, D13 and E13, within the settlement boundary. This is a commenced development; vehicular access to the site commenced in June 2017. Therefore, this site should be included under the revised settlement boundary review methodology.	For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. This will be updated prior to submission and/or adoption.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with development since April 2016.
601	Campaign to Protect Rural England (399075)	<p>Include planning permissions at H4, H5 and H6, some of which have commenced. If the intention is to define the built edge then this map fails because the boundary fails to properly recognise reality on the ground.</p> <p>Constantly reviewing boundaries is unsettling to residents and poor for forward planning when deciding what is unacceptable.</p>	For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. This will be updated prior to submission and/or adoption.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with development since April 2016.
739	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Include Land to the west of the Oxford Road roundabout, by the junction of Beversbrook Road and Oxford Road, at G3 and H3. This is a commenced development, with development having commenced in December 2016.	For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. This will be updated	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with development since April 2016.

			prior to submission and/or adoption.	
1033	Bowood Estate (1124796)	Promoting inclusion of Land at Wenhill, South West Calne, at C11, D11, C12, D12, E12, C13 and D13, as an omission site. There is an over reliance on windfall development. Past rates are not reliable evidence of future supply, especially since settlement boundaries are only being adjusted to take into account commenced commitments. This will not provide any additional windfall potential.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built environment since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries, not to allocate sites for development. This is the purpose of the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.
1097	Calne Town Council (1126863)	Include development that has commenced since 2016 within the settlement boundary.	For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. This will be updated prior to submission and/or adoption.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with development since April 2016.
1541, 2477/2492, 3087/3088	GFL Developments (1129247) Five Rivers Homes Ltd (1132956) Hills Homes Development Ltd (900566)	Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan to be based on adequate up-to-date and relevant evidence. The Plan fails in this regard. Planning permissions that have not commenced have not been included within the settlement boundary. However, that	For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. This will be updated prior to submission and/or adoption.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with development since April 2016.

		<p>they have been granted planning permission confirms that they are acceptable in planning policy and other terms. The decision to submit a planning application would have been made with the intention to build out the approved scheme. They have a timescale of three years to be implemented. If they lapse, then the planning history of the site is a material planning consideration for the submission of further planning applications.</p> <p>The pre-submission settlement boundary is out-of-date and not in conformity with the NPPF. Some developments with planning permission and some that have commenced/ completed have not been included, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Land at Abberd Lane (Barretts), at H8 and I8, for 124 houses has commenced. b) Land at Oxford Road (Hills), at H4, H5 and H6, for 200 houses has commenced. c) Land at Sandpit Road (GFL Developments), at H6, for 12 houses has planning permission. d) Land at the east end of Sandpit Road, at H7, for 21 houses has planning permission. e) Land at Oxford Road (Hills), at G6, for 26 houses has a planning application pending determination. 	<p>However, Land at Abberd Lane is already included within the pre-submission settlement boundary.</p> <p>The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built environment since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries, not to allocate sites for development. This is the purpose of the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>f) Land at Oxford Road (David Wilson Homes), at H4, for 42 houses has a planning application pending determination, which also earmarks land immediately to the north of the site for a further 42 houses, at H3 and H4.</p> <p>g) Land at Oxford Road (Hills), at H5, I5 and H6, is earmarked for a future 100+ houses</p> <p>The emerging Calne Neighbourhood Plan identifies a settlement boundary apparently unchanged from the former North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011, which is out-of-date. No indication that the settlement boundary is to be amended to include their allocation of a site for up to 250 houses, at H8, I8, H9, I9, H10 and I10.</p>	<p>It is also the prerogative of communities to review settlement boundaries through the neighbourhood planning process.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

24.16 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Chapmanslade** (4 representations)

Table 24.16

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
736	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	<p>Retain site at H6 – Land Rear of 102 High Street, Chapmanslade within the settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to residential development on the high street • Site used to provide drainage facilities for 104 and 106 High Street before these dwellings connected to mains (part of curtilage and has limited capacity to extend the built form, or recreational/ amenity space relates more closely to settlement) • Comprises small enclosure with established boundaries and resembles garden land more than open countryside • Southern boundary runs along the same straight line as the boundaries to the rear of 104 to 118 High Street, forming a clear delineation between the built form and open countryside • Proposed amendment also excludes built development of 102c High Street, which fronts the High Street • No evidence to justify why site and adjoining residential property have been excluded 	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment, or the curtilage of a property that has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This area is surrounded by existing residential development and would not extend the settlement boundary beyond the existing line of the built form.</p>	<p>Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary at H6 to include the existing residential dwelling and the area of land behind.</p>
857	Aedifico Ltd (378124)	<p>Include Green Farm Industrial Estate and associated plot, at I7, within the settlement</p>	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1:</i></p>	<p>No action.</p>

		boundary. Exclusion of employment sites on edge of large villages is flawed but this site is not on the edge of the village.	<i>Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes employment development at the edge of large villages.	
1209, 3194	Chapmanslade Parish Council (1127016) Francis Morland (397159)	Chapmanslade Village Hall and amenity area, at F5, should remain outside of the settlement boundary. Object to inclusion of playing field and village hall, which puts at risk the long-term use of these facilities for public use.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes built and commenced community facilities development that is physically related to the settlement. However, the pre-submission boundary does not include the playing fields.	No action.

24.17 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Christian Malford** (3 representations)

Table 24.17

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
55 619	Christian Malford Parish Council (1118671) Kevin Watson (910890)	The Chippenham Community Area Remainder Topic Paper is incorrect; the Christian Malford Neighbourhood Plan is reviewing the settlement boundary. The existing settlement boundary has been amended to include sites being allocated in the neighbourhood plan. A draft neighbourhood plan was put out for consultation between 5th June and 18th July, 2017.	The settlement boundary for Christian Malford has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Christian Malford.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Christian Malford.
2040	Mr & Mrs Hawker (1131519)	Include Land at Main Road, Christian Malford, at F4, within the proposed revised settlement boundary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its inclusion would be supported by the revised settlement boundary review methodology • It is allocated for residential development in the emerging Christian Malford Neighbourhood Plan (as site reference HS3) 	The settlement boundary for Christian Malford has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Christian Malford.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Christian Malford.

24.18 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Codford** (4 representations)

Table 24.18

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3363	Codford Parish Council (1143232)	Proposed settlement boundary does not reflect comments submitted in 2014/15 to the informal consultation on the draft settlement boundaries (as follows – taken from representation to informal consultation): 1. Include full curtilage of garden at I6.9 2. Do not extend settlement boundary to include the rear garden at H7.3 3. Either exclude or include farm buildings at G/ H 5.8, preferably include, rather than only include half of the site 4. Large garden at G5.5 split into two. Inconsistent with elsewhere. Though recommend no change to boundary 5. Include disused farm buildings behind and adjacent to 124 High Street, Codford, at F5 and F6 6. Retain large garden area within settlement boundary at G6.5	Comments submitted during the informal consultation with town and parish councils have been considered in the preparation of the pre-submission settlement boundary. In fact: 1. Taken forward. The full curtilage of this garden has been included within the pre-submission settlement boundary. 2. Taken forward. The settlement boundary does not include the full curtilage of 4 Wool House Gardens. 3. Taken forward (in part). This employment site on the edge of a large village has been excluded as per the revised methodology. 4. Taken forward (in part). The full garden has been included. 5. Not taken forward but see response to representation 3363, 3364 and 3365 below. 6. Taken forward. This is large garden is now included within the settlement boundary.	No action.
3363, 3364, 3365	Codford Parish Council (1143232) Robert & Shiona Smith (1143251)	Include disused farm buildings behind and adjacent to 124 High Street, Codford, at F5 and F6, within the settlement boundary. This is surrounded by existing residential development and, being separated from the	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment or has limited capacity to extend the built	Action: Extend the settlement boundary at F5 and F6 to include the disused farm buildings

	Jane and Tim Anderson (1143253)	open countryside by the A36, relates more to the built form than the open countryside.	form of the settlement in terms of scale or location. The site is bordered to the north and east by existing residential development and separated from the countryside by the A36. It cannot be said to relate more closely to the open countryside nor as having the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.	and hard standing but exclude the small field to the south adjacent to the A36.
3369	Jill Mitchell (1157627)	Include the entirety of the garden of our property 'The Cottage', at J8, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden.	Action: Include the entirety of the garden of 'The Cottage', at J8, within the settlement boundary.

24.19 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Colerne** (1 representation)

Table 24.19

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	Take into account comments submitted during the informal consultation with parish councils. (a) Include field adjacent to Green Lane and Cleaves Avenue, at G6 and G7, within the settlement boundary.	This appears to be an undeveloped land on the edge of the settlement and is not part of the built form.	No action.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(b) Include Ladymead, 5 Bath Road and strip of the field between it and Copper Oaks Cottage to the south of Bath Road, at G7 and H7, within the settlement boundary.	Ladymead, 5 Bath Road is an isolated dwelling that is physically detached from the settlement by what appears to be undeveloped land that is not part of the built form.	No action.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(c) Include land east of Washmeres, to the south of Merryfields, Star Corner and to the west of Appledore, at I7, within the settlement boundary.	This appears to be undeveloped land on the edge of the settlement.	No action.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(d) Include land between Windermere, Ogbourne and 10 Chapel Path, at J7, within the settlement boundary.	This appears to be a large area of recreational or amenity land on the edge of the settlement that relates better to the open countryside.	No action.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(e) Exclude land adjacent to Ashley House and include Brambledown, Tutton Hill and garden, at J7, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary excludes employment development, farm buildings and farmyards on the edge of Large Villages and includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a	Action: Exclude the farm building on the edge of the settlement and include the garden of Brambledown, Tutton Hill, at J7.

			garden. The proposed change appears to exclude farm buildings and include the garden of Brambledown, Tutton Hill.	
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(f) Exclude garden land at Vale Court, Vicarage Lane, at J6, J7, K6 and K7, from the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden.	No action.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(g) Include garden land and recreational/amenity space adjacent to Eastrip Lane, Watergates Villa and 21/ 23 Watergates, at K6, K7, L6 and L7, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, and recreational/amenity space that relates better to the built environment. However, some of the extra land proposed for inclusion appears to a large field that relates better to the open countryside.	Action: Include the garden land and recreational/amenity space adjacent to Eastrip Lane and 21/ 23 Watergates, except for the large field to the southeast.
199	Colerne Parish Council (390446)	(h) Include garden land adjacent to 14 Eastrip Lane, at L4 and L5, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary methodology excludes the extended curtilage of a property that either relates more closely to the open countryside, e.g. a field or paddock, or has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	No action.

24.20 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Corsham** (6 representations)

Table 24.20

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1260	MOD/ Defence Infrastructure Organisation (1128216)	Include Allan Road built development and land, at B9, C8 and C9, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlement. This residential development is separated from the main built form.	No action.
1460	RST Corsham Ltd (901187)	Include site within outline planning permission, granted on appeal on 31st May 2017, for 31 dwellings at Peacock Grove, Corsham, at K9, K10, L9 and L10. Upon further assessment, it is considered that this site has the capacity for 50 dwellings. A new full application will be submitted in 2018 and the site will be fully deliverable within three years.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all types of unimplemented planning permissions.	No action.
2374	Rangeford Strategic (Westwells) Ltd (1132530)	Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy contains a brownfield target that has yet to be met. Core Policy 1 implies that settlement boundaries around all settlements above Large Villages will be important in identifying land. Settlement boundaries ignore some MOD development, treating Neston, Rudloe and Corsham as separate settlements. Some commenced development, e.g. former Royal Arthur site, Wadswick Green, not included within the settlement boundary.	Neston is a small village and, therefore, does not have a settlement boundary.	No action.

		Land south of Westwells Road, Neston, at A13, A14, B13 and B14, should be identified as a brownfield allocation.		
2417, 2418	G Tunbridge (1132861) Mr & Mrs Amall (1132941)	Include Land at 6 Halfway Firs, Bath Road, Corsham, at A7 and A8, within the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary includes only part of the curtilage of 6 Halfway Firs and does not reflect any physical boundary on the ground. The area is in residential use, surrounded on all three sides by built development and would not extend the built form of the settlement. The inclusion of this site would be consistent with the methodology and the inclusion of other sites on the edge of Corsham, particularly the land to the east of the site at Halfway Farm.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of properties that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	Action: Include the full curtilage of 6 Halfway Firs, Bath Road, at A7 and A8 within the settlement boundary.
3041	De Vernon Trustees (556491)	Include Land to the south of Potley Lane, Corsham, at F11 and G11. This site has detailed planning permission for 64 dwellings (16/02523/REM). It is unjustified and ineffective to remove this site from the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary should remain as it is and, also, be extended to include the site at Land to the north of Leafield Industrial Estate, Corsham, at D11 and E11.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all types of unimplemented planning permissions. However, the settlement boundaries will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption with recent commencements and completions. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form, not to allocate sites. The site at Land to the north of	No action.

			Leaffield Industrial Estate is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	
--	--	--	--	--

24.21 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Corsley** (1 representation)

Table 24.21

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
390	Wiltshire Council (Housing) (979503)	Include development of 5 dwellings adjacent to 4 Baytree Close, Corlseay Heath, at K7, due to commence in Autumn 2017 and complete 2018 within the settlement boundary.	The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.

24.22 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Cricklade** (9 representations)

Table 24.22

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
501	Julie Norman (730331)	Retain existing settlement boundary at Lypiatt House, at G9. The proposed boundary cuts off the corner of the garden. The garden boundary joins Chelworth Road at 90 degrees and does not follow the edge of the new tarmac driveway.	The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade
768	Cricklade Town Council (1051839)	Note that the draft Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan includes some of the changes proposed by Wiltshire Council. For example, the inclusion of Stockham Gardens, at L7, Spital Lane, at K7, the leisure centre, at F5 and F6, T. James Motors, at E5 and F5, and Abingdon Court, at K6.	The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade

1545, 2066	<p>Cricklade Town Council (1051839)</p> <p>Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd (863519)</p>	<p>Include Land south of The Forty, at H9 and I9, which has outline planning permission for 70 dwellings (13/07132/OUT). Not including areas within the settlement boundary that have planning permissions will weaken policies that seek to confine development within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The pre-submission settlement boundaries are out of date as they do not reflect recent planning permissions. The three best practice case studies referred to in Topic Paper 1, from Winchester, Purbeck and Ketting local authorities, have methodologies that include unimplemented planning permissions within their settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Site preparation works have taken place and, as of September 2017, a reserved matters application is with Wiltshire Council for determination. Work on the site could be undertaken immediately following approval. The draft Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan includes this appeal site within its settlement boundary. Planning permissions and proposed allocations will be counted against the housing supply of</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade</p>
------------	--	--	---	--

		<p>the Wiltshire Core Strategy so should be included.</p> <p>If sites within unimplemented planning permission are not included then they should be shown on the map as 'permitted sites' to better inform users.</p>		
1546	Cricklade Town Council (1051839)	<p>Exclude the two properties with substantial gardens at the northern end of West Mill Lane, at G4. These have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement. The area is at the end of a narrow lane, which makes access difficult. It is close to the North Meadow National Nature Reserve, an SSSI. Future infill development in this area should be resisted.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade</p>
1547, 1582	Cricklade Town Council (1051839)	<p>Exclude the full area of open space at Long Close/ Hall Close, at I4 and I5, and open space at Waylands, at J8 and K8, which have been partly included within the settlement boundary. The draft Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan excludes the whole of these areas of open space and, thus, avoids creating artificial boundaries.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade..</p>	<p>Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade</p>

1548	Cricklade Town Council (1051839)	The Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan is more advanced than shown in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The Regulation 16 consultation has ended and, at the time of writing, the town council anticipates the appointment of an independent examiner. The true status of the neighbourhood plan should be recognised.	The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade
2082	Bloor Homes (556573)	Include Land at Horsey Down site, at E5 and E6, within the settlement boundary.	The settlement boundary for Cricklade has since been reviewed by a sufficiently advanced neighbourhood plan. In April 2018, a draft plan was submitted to Wiltshire Council. Therefore, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan will no longer review the settlement boundary for Cricklade.	Action: Delete pre-submission settlement boundary for Cricklade

24.23 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Crudwell** (3 representations)

Table 24.23

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
849	Crudwell Parish Council (1126295)	If the Plan is adopted, the allocation of Ridgeway Farm will set a precedent as it is outside the designated red line settlement boundary.	Noted. However, all site allocations within the Plan are outside the settlement boundary.	No action.
1798	Mr & Mrs West (1130564)	Include commenced development of 10 dwellings (15/03136/OUT) at Ridgeway Farm, Tetbury Lane, Crudwell, at G6 and H6.	Noted. For the pre-submission settlement boundaries, the cut-off date for including built/ commenced planning permissions was 1 April 2016. The pre-submission settlement boundaries will be updated using the most recent GIS layer available (for consistency) prior to submission and/ or adoption.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries with commenced/ completed development since April 2016.
1798	Mr & Mrs West (1130564)	Include built development situated on the northern side of Tetbury Lane, at G6 and H6, up to and including the property Ye Old Forge within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	Noted. The revised settlement boundary methodology includes built/ commenced development that is physically related to the settlement.	Action: Include the built development up to and including Ye Old Forge property, to the west of the commenced development of 10 dwellings at Ridgeway Farm, Tetbury Lane, Crudwell, at G6 and H6.
2581	Lt Col Michael Whelan (862330)	Include full garden curtilage of property at Ravenscroft (I6 and J6) within the	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property	Action: Include the remaining part of the garden curtilage of the

		<p>proposed revised settlement boundary.</p>	<p>that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement. The addition of the remaining part of the curtilage would comply with both requirements and provide a logical, clear boundary with the open countryside.</p>	<p>property at Ravenscroft, off the A429, Crudwell, at I6 and J6 within the proposed revised settlement boundary.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

24.24 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Derry Hill & Studley** (2 representations)

Table 24.24

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
546, 2215	Calne Without Parish Council (1125505) Ioan Rees (1126777)	<p>Broadly supportive of settlement boundary around two main areas of houses at Derry Hill and Studley.</p> <p>However, either include all outlying areas of houses, at (i) Old Road, at K6, L6, K7 and L7; (ii) Devizes Road, at F10 and F11, and (ii) Norley Lane, at M5, N5 and N6, or, preferably exclude all three from the settlement boundary as they are effectively in open countryside outside the village areas. They are all very similar, in that they are small areas of linear housing, predominantly along one side of roads leading to and from the village. Old Road is about 200m from the nearest village boundary, Devizes Road is actually contiguous to Derry Hill and Norley Lane is about 350m from the Studley settlement boundary.</p> <p>The Old Road settlement boundary should certainly not be extended across the A4 to include isolated and unrelated housing on the opposite side of this major road.</p>	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlement. The three outlying areas at Old Road, Devizes Road and Norley Lane are physically detached from the settlements of Derry Hill and Studley.</p>	<p>Action: Exclude the outlying area of housing at Old Road, at K6, L6, K7 and L7, from the settlement boundary.</p>

24.25 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Dilton Marsh** (1 representation)

Table 24.25

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
2541	Dilton Marsh Parish Council (1133403)	Dilton Marsh Parish Council wishes for it to be reflected in the consultation material that they are preparing a neighbourhood plan. No changes to the settlement boundary are supported until the neighbourhood planning process is complete. However, the Bullivant Site, off Petticoat Lane, at L6 and M6, could be included within the settlement boundary at a later date.	The revised settlement boundary methodology excludes employment development at the edge of large villages.	No action.

24.26 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Hilperton** (8 representations)

Table 24.26

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
20	Peter Fielding (1054315)	Retain the existing settlement boundary along 181 Devizes Road and neighbouring properties, at M9 and N9, because the proposed settlement boundary bisects my garden and those of my neighbours.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> , includes the curtilage of properties that relate more closely to the built environment (e.g. garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This garden and those of neighbouring properties would comply with the methodology.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary for 181 Devizes Road and neighbouring properties, at M10 and N10 and extend/retain proposed settlement boundary, where necessary, to include the gardens of neighbouring properties.
722	Hilperton Parish Council (547867)	Support exclusion of Hilperton Primary School playing field, at K7 and K8, from within the settlement boundary and the continued exclusion of 'The Nursery site' in Marsh Road, at H4.	Support noted.	No action.
741	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Include Land at rear of Victoria Road and Wyke Road, at G8, G9 and G10, within the settlement boundary. If the outline planning application for Land West of Elizabeth Way (16/00672/OUT) is granted permission and implemented prior to next cut-off date then the Council's site should be considered for inclusion.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions from within the settlement boundary. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement, not to allocate sites. This site is	No action.

			an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	
1909, 1914	Hilperton Action Group (895670)	Remove SHLAA sites 263 and 297, at G7, G8, H7, H8, H9, I8, I9, I10, J9, J10 and J11, from allocation for housing because they are within Hilperton not Trowbridge and development in Large Villages should focus on small sites. Settlement boundaries were fixed in 2016 after a two year process of review, where Wiltshire Council rejected option of Land West of Elizabeth Way coming within Trowbridge.	This site is a proposed housing allocation in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes allocations from within the settlement boundary, which is a planning policy tool to guide development and is separate from parish boundaries.	No action.
2041	Henry Nurkowski (703908)	Amend the settlement boundary to include the rest of the curtilage of the Lion and Fiddle Inn, at L10, which is bisected by the proposed settlement boundary, as are other properties in Hilperton.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> , includes the curtilage of properties that relate more closely to the built environment (e.g. garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Amend the proposed settlement boundary, at L10, to include the car park of the Lion and Fiddle Inn and align with the settlement boundary for development either side of this property.
3155	Alistair Page (1138113)	Include Land at the Grange and the land immediately to the east, with planning permission for 15 dwellings, at M10 and N10, within the settlement boundary. Land at the Grange is essentially surrounded on all sides by the built form. Its inclusion will	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions from within the settlement boundary.	No action.

		ensure that the principle of development on this land is acceptable and, thereafter, allow the design of a suitable scheme that respects the character of the Conservation Area. This would facilitate development in sustainable locations to help bring forward the housing requirement as set out in Core Policy 2.		
3353	Tom Rutt (1139015)	Amend the settlement boundary to reflect the correct boundary of Maxcroft House, at F3.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> , includes the curtilage of properties that relate more closely to the built environment (e.g. garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Amend the proposed boundary, at F3, to reflect the correct boundary of Maxcroft House.

24.27 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Hullavington** (1 representation)

Table 24.27

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
2065	Hannick Homes & Development Ltd (863519)	The proposed revised settlement boundaries should include planning permissions. In some cases, as a result the settlement boundaries are already out of date. The three case studies, which are referred to in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology</i> , include planning permissions.	<p><i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology</i> considers unimplemented planning permissions, saying:</p> <p>‘The role of a settlement boundary is to define the built form of the settlement. Unimplemented planning permissions, by definition, have yet to be built and, therefore, do not form part of the built environment. Until they are built, there is still a degree of uncertainty over the exact layout of the urban form. Indeed, they may not be built out at all.</p> <p>However, for those planning permissions where development has commenced, there is a much greater certainty over the final built form of the development. Therefore, the revised settlement boundary review methodology will include within the settlement boundary built or commenced planning permissions but exclude all unimplemented planning permissions.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is recognised that settlement boundaries represent a snapshot in time. Unimplemented planning permissions subsequently built out can be included within a future review’.</p>	No action.

2065	Hannick Homes & Development Ltd (863519)	<p>Include the school playing fields in Hullavington, at J4, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social function, provides space for external play and formal recreation at the primary school • Unlikely to be sought for development owing to its present use. In any case, such an application would be subject to checks and controls undertaken by Wiltshire Council and Sports England, who seek to retain existing school playing fields • Inclusion would define a logical settlement boundary to the west of the settlement of Hullavington once the proposed housing allocation is built 	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built/commenced community facilities development that is physically related to the settlement and recreational or amenity space that is more related to the built form than the open countryside. The school playing fields are clearly better related to the settlement because of their function.</p>	<p>Action: Include the school playing fields, at J4, within the settlement boundary.</p>
------	--	---	--	--

24.28 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Lyneham** (2 representations)

Table 24.28

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
97	Garry Stewart (1119997)	Include planning permission (16/09372/FUL) for two dwellings, at I2 and I3, between the Vicarage and 79, The Green, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all types of unimplemented planning permissions.	No action.
3215	Chris Dodds (1138508)	Promoting Land off Calne Road, Lyneham, at H10, I10, H11, I11, H12 and I12, for residential development. Settlement boundaries tightly drawn and precludes sustainable development otherwise well-related to existing settlements. This is contrary to a positive approach to sustainable growth set out in the NPPF. An unnecessarily restrictive approach results in a Plan that is not positively prepared, not effective and ultimately fails to deliver the housing needed in Wiltshire. Restrictive policies should be positively framed so as not to preclude extensions to settlements coming forward where they can be successfully integrated into the wider setting.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement, not to allocate sites for development. This is an omission site and should be assessed through the site selection process of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.

24.29 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Malmesbury** (2 representations)

Table 24.29

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
2679	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) (983136)	Object to removal of area of land to the south of Verona House, at G4, which has an extant employment planning permission.	The methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.
3001	Minton Group Ltd (1136804)	Include the site adjoining Waitrose within the settlement boundary to provide a more logical rounding off of the boundary. This site is well-related to the settlement and there is little difference in terms of landscape character between it and the Waitrose site. There are no listed buildings within its immediate vicinity, whereas the Waitrose site is closer to the Grade II St John's Bridge and Avon Mills. The site is visually and functionally contained by the River Avon to the north and west, built development to the south and the A429 to the east.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement. This is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.

24.30 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Melksham and Bowerhill Village** (5 representations)

Table 24.30

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
393	Melksham Without Parish Council (857749)	Exclude Woolmore Farm, at I13 and J13, from within the settlement boundary. This is inconsistent with the methodology because employment sites at the edge of large villages should be excluded from the settlement boundary.	'Large village' is defined in Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015). Bowerhill is not classified as a 'Large village' but, due to its functional relationship with Melksham, it is considered together with Melksham for the purposes of the Core Strategy and they're classified as a market town.	No action.
395	Melksham Without Parish Council (857749)	Land use designations, e.g. employment land, amenity land and public open space, are not included on the settlement boundary maps. They were previously colour coded on the maps accompanying the West Wiltshire District Plan. How will these be preserved and recorded in the future?	The settlement boundary maps simply show the settlement boundary for the purposes of the consultation on the draft Plan. Upon adoption of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan, the adopted boundary will form part of the Local Plan policies map, which accompanies the Wiltshire Core Strategy and shows all of the relevant policies and designations. This is similar to the policies map that accompanied the West Wiltshire District Plan.	No action.
738	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Support inclusion of Woolmore Farm, at 113 and J13, because it relates more to the built form and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Support noted.	No action.

2186	Anthony Hemmings (1131985)	The settlement boundary should follow the property boundary between 541 Outmarsh and the site for the new air ambulance helicopter station, at D16. Permission has been granted for the air ambulance helicopter station. There is now no need for a buffer between 541 Outmarsh and this site.	The proposed revised settlement boundary will be updated to reflect built/ commenced development since the cut-off date of April 2016 for the pre-submission settlement boundary maps prior to submission and/ or adoption.	Action: Update proposed settlement boundary to reflect recent built/ commenced development prior to submission and/ or adoption.
3039	Terra Strategic Ltd (1136436)	Include Land to the West of Semington Road, Melksham, at C11, D11 and D12. Outline permission (17/01095/OUT) refused for residential development but site is in a sustainable location adjacent to the settlement boundary.	Inclusion of this area would not comply with the revised settlement boundary review methodology. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form and not to allocate land for development. This site should be considered through the site selection process as an omission site.	No action.

24.31 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **North Bradley** (5 representations)

Table 24.31

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
503	Cathryn Hanny (1125262)	Keep Woodmarsh Road in North Bradley, not Trowbridge. It appears that the proposed settlement boundary will remove 46 Woodmarsh Road, at I6, along with the rest of this side of the street, from North Bradley and make it a part of Trowbridge.	The settlement boundary is a policy tool to reflect the extent of the built form and direct development. It is separate from parish boundaries.	No action.
1193	Tim Hounsome (403859)	The revised settlement boundary review methodology has not been applied consistently. White Horse Business Park, at J3, J4, J5, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7 and M7, is isolated from both Trowbridge and North Bradley and, therefore, should not be included within the settlement boundary. The site is mostly built out so there is no need to change its planning status. Confusingly, the map does not indicate whether the site is within the Trowbridge or North Bradley settlement boundary.	The White Horse Business Park is considered to lie within the settlement boundary for Trowbridge. This area is employment development physically, and functionally, related to Trowbridge and therefore considered to be part of the settlement boundary for Trowbridge.	No action.
1193	Tim Hounsome (403859)	The proposed settlement boundary behind properties on the east side of Woodmarsh Road, at H5, I5, I6, J6 and J7, should be a straight line rather than deviate to follow small gaps in the frontage, which read as part of the built up area of the village. These amendments may lead to pressure for infill development but these would not be significant given the	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built	Action: Amend the proposed revised settlement boundary to include, where appropriate in line with the methodology, the curtilage of properties along the east

		extent of frontage development along Woodmarsh.	environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement.	side of Woodmarsh Road, at H5, I5, I6, J6 and J7.
1686	North Bradley Parish Council (1129933)	Landscaping should be provided with any expansion of the White Horse Business Park, at at J3, J4, J5, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, L2, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7 and M7. The Parish Council does not object to the boundary of this employment site being moved westwards, which it would normally see it as an encroachment into the parish. The area is not indicated as being suitable for saving as part of the proposed landscape setting policy, as identified in the Landscape Setting Report that supports the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The Parish Council is aware of the need to argue from sound evidence and values the local employment that could be provided by an expansion of this site.	Support noted.	No action.
3148	Wellbeck Strategic Land (1138002)	Settlement boundaries should include allocations so as to ensure delivery. If our proposed omission site at North Bradley, at Organpool Farm, between The Rank and Southwick Road, at E8, F7 and F8, is allocated then the settlement boundary should be amended to include it.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (June 2017)</i> , excludes unimplemented allocations because the built form is yet to be defined. This site is an omission site and should be	No action.

			considered through the site selection process.	
3351	Prime Meridian (1139002)	Support the inclusion of part of our client's site, at the south west of the village, at F8, F9, G8 and G9 plus F11, F12, G10, G11, H9 and H10, within the proposed settlement boundary.	Support noted.	No action.

24.32 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Oaksey** (5 representations)

Table 24.32

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
35, 38	James Woodhouse (1117609)	Include SHLAA site 684, at K6, L6 and L5, which has been granted planning permission for four dwellings (16/04578/ FUL)	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions from the settlement boundary.	No action.
61	Julian Barry (1119042)	<p>Include Greenacres Farm, with redundant farm buildings, at H7 and H8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary and allocate for housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house, gardens and outbuildings of Woodfields Farm, The Green, Oaksey have been included. This is a listed site, making development unlikely. • Previous support from planning officers for residential development at Greenacres Farm and affordable housing close to Bendy Bow in the field area • Proposed site at 11 Wick Road for 11 houses has a road that is generally narrower than The Green and within proximity of a Conservation Area. Greenacres is not within a Conservation Area • Include field area at Greenacres Farm, because there are plans to redevelop part of Bendy Bow estate. 	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes farm yards and farm buildings on the edge of large villages.	No action.

1550, 1551	Juliatt Todd (1129287)	<p>Retain the existing settlement boundary around SHLAA site 3349, Street Farm Paddocks, Oaksey, at I6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central site within the village, whereas the draft Plan seeks to extend the settlement boundary in a linear fashion, away from the centre of the village • Clearly defined boundaries, which means that there would be no further encroachment into the countryside • Residential curtilages to the east almost in line with the rear of the site • Between 2006 and 2016, there have been only 13 completions in Oaksey. No other suitable sites for housing within the village. • By removing sustainable sites from the settlement boundary, Wiltshire will be unable to meet its objectively assessed housing need. 	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the open countryside (e.g. a paddock).	No action.
------------	---------------------------	---	---	------------

24.33 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Purton** (1 representation)

Table 24.33

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1276	Purton Parish Council (1054962)	Retain College Farmyard, at K9, within the settlement boundary because this area has not been used for employment (farming) for decades and is not designated as employment land in any Wiltshire Council planning document or in the Purton Neighbourhood Plan.	The revised settlement boundary methodology excludes employment development, farm buildings and farmyards at the edge of large villages because the protection against residential conversion afforded to employment sites in Core Policy 35 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy does not extend to large villages. However, this site is no longer in employment use and is not designated as employment land in any planning documents.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary around College Farmyard, at K9.
1276	Purton Parish Council (1054962)	Adjust the proposed settlement boundary to skirt the southern boundary of St Mary school, including its car park to the east and the play area to the southeast, at K10 and K11, rather than taking it through the middle of the school.	The revised settlement boundary includes built community facilities development that is physically related to the settlement. The car park and play area are part of the curtilage of the property and/ or recreational/ amenity space that relates more closely to the built environment.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary around St Mary School, at K10 and K11, to include its car park to the east and play area to the southeast.

24.34 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Royal Wootton Bassett** (6 representations)

Table 24.34

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd (475682)	As operator, support removal of safeguarded rail fed aggregates depot, at C10, D10, C11, D11, E11 and F11, from within the settlement boundary	Supported noted.	No action.
2466	Oxford University Endowment Management (642979)	Include existing employment allocation at Templars Way Industrial Estate, at E12 and F12, and the emerging neighbourhood plan allocation at Maple Drive, at E4, F4, E5 and F5, within the settlement boundary. The methodology is flawed; excluding existing allocations means that the settlement boundary will be redundant as soon as they are implemented. The inclusion of both sites will ensure consistency between the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Neighbourhood Plan and the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	The revised methodology excludes unimplemented allocations from within the settlement boundary, such as the Wiltshire Core Strategy employment allocation Land to the west of Templars Way. The same would apply for the proposed neighbourhood plan allocation at Maple Drive. However, the Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of this allocation from the draft neighbourhood plan and it has been removed from the version that went to a referendum in April 2018.	No action.

2585, 3054	R Nevill (1133494) Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd (389564)	Include commenced development on land to the south of Interface Business Park, at G10, G11, H10, H11, I9, I10, I11, J10 and J11, which has planning permission (14/03343/FUL) for 68 dwellings, 39 bed care home and 22 age restricted dwellings and a country park. There has been recent consent on the care homes scheme for additional dwellings. The settlement boundary should take into account the whole site, including the open space (country park), and be drawn along the railway line, which forms the southern boundary of the site.	The pre-submission settlement boundaries will be updated with completions and commencements since April 2016 (the cut-off date for the pre-submission maps) prior to submission and/ or adoption.	Action: Update pre-submission settlement boundaries with completions and commencements since April 2016 prior to submission and/ or adoption.
3006	Leda Properties Ltd (840643)	The proposed revised settlement boundary is tightly drawn around the built form and restricts further growth. This is a short-sighted and damaging approach. It is likely that further housing sites will be required and, therefore, the opportunity should be taken to provide further direction for growth, not reduce options. The settlement boundary review should be part of a combined Core Strategy review and Site Allocations Plan with housing allocations included within the revised boundaries. This will help ensure delivery and offer greater certainty.	Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes in the built environment since the drawing up of the original settlement boundaries. The revised methodology excludes unimplemented allocations from within the settlement boundary. However, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan is proposing additional housing allocations to meet identified housing need across	No action.

			<p>Wiltshire, excluding Chippenham. The current Local Development Scheme (September 2107) includes the settlement boundary review as part of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. Paragraph 4.13 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy states that 'it will also be the prerogative of the community to review settlement boundaries through a neighbourhood plan.'</p>	
3069	Gallagher Estates (1100941)	<p>Long-term interest in development of land north of the town. Support purpose of settlement boundary review to clearly define the extent of the town, including where development can and can't take place, which will ensure that decisions about the future direction of growth can be made in a co-ordinated manner through the Local Plan Review. This addresses an existing deficiency highlighted by the Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector, who considered the existing settlement boundaries to be out-of-date.</p>	Support noted.	No action.

24.35 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Seend** (18 representations)

Table 24.35

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
204, 443, 464, 465, 466, 467, 481, 1640, 2611	Ian Seager (1122975) Mark Wood (933063) Steven Vaux (1124979) Brian Crisp (1124982) John Whalley (1124984) Yvette Rowe (1124988) Dawn Smethurst (1125004) Seend Parish Council (1129662) Dr Nigel Knott (1133677)	Retain the existing settlement boundary and exclude the extended western car park of the former Bell Inn, a Grade II listed building, at F8 and G8. Its inclusion could lead to future unnecessary and unwanted development for housing and would go against the emerging Seend Neighbourhood Plan, which identifies a significant view there within a landscape gap from Seend to the open countryside. The settlement boundary will be subject to review through the neighbourhood plan. Local engagement and knowledge will supersede weak desktop methodology.	The car park is the curtilage of a property (the Bell Inn) that relates more closely to the built environment and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. It will be the prerogative of communities to subsequently review their settlement boundary through the neighbourhood planning process.	No action.
456, 463, 1330, 1640, 2616	Seend Women's Institute (1124958) Seend Lye Recreation Field Charity (1124971) Jo Vaux (1128439) Seend Parish Council (1129662) Dr Nigel Knott	Retain the existing settlement boundary and include the Women's Institute allotments, at H6. They are largely surrounded by existing development and relate better to the built environment rather than the open countryside. Weak methodology. The settlement boundary will be subject to review through the neighbourhood plan.	The allotments are recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment because of its relationship with existing development and function.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary to include the Women's Institute allotments, at H6.

	(1133677)			
463, 1330, 2614 / 2616, 2745	Seend Lye Recreation Field Charity (1124971) Jo Vaux (1128439) Seend Parish Council (1129662) Dr Nigel Knott (1133677) Aster Homes (1134431)	Retain the existing settlement boundary and include the Seend Lye Recreation Field, at H6, I6 and I7. It is largely surrounded by existing development and relates better to the built form than the open countryside. Inconsistent application of methodology and lack of local knowledge. The settlement boundary will be subject to review through the neighbourhood plan.	The recreation field is recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment because of its relationship with existing development and function.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary to include the Seend Lye Recreation Field, at H6, I6 and I7.
848	Lady Carola Thorpe (1126286)	Curious about the rationale behind the changes to the existing settlement boundary, however broadly support them if the underlying intention is to protect the rural character of Seend. Disagree with some of the comments made by Seend Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.	Support noted. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to accurately reflect the built form of the settlement. Development outside of the settlement boundary would be considered as being in the open countryside.	No action.
1168	Seend Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (1126956)	Page 4 of the Melksham Community Area Topic Paper is incorrect. Seend Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was not asked whether it was allocating housing or reviewing the settlement boundary but this is stated as 'Unknown'. In fact, it is proposing to allocate housing and review the settlement boundaries.	Whether or not a neighbourhood plan is preparing to allocate housing or review a settlement boundary is listed as 'unknown' until there is documented evidence and a degree of certainty, i.e. the neighbourhood plan has	No action.

			published a draft plan for consultation.	
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	Proposed changes only for Seend and not Seend Cleeve or Sells Green. Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have looked at and applied the methodology to Seend and are in complete agreement that most changes are unnecessary.	Noted.	No action.
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	Support proposed change at the Bradley Lane entrance to School Road, at G7, because it tidies up the boundary	Support noted.	No action.
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	Support proposed change at the Horse Pond, at K6, because it tidies up the boundary.	Support noted.	No action.
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	Object to the inclusion of the extended curtilages of the large houses on the south side of Seend High Street, at I7 and J7. These properties relate more closely to the open countryside, as they are gardens/ paddocks, and they have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	These are relatively isolated dwellings from the main settlement, on the south side of the High Street, with large gardens that relate more closely to the open countryside, whose inclusion has the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Adjust the settlement boundary line to follow but not include the road on the north side of the High Street, at I7 and J7, thereby excluding the houses on the south side of the High Street at this location.
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	Support the inclusion of the church at the end of Church Walk and the three houses, one in Church Walk, the house on the corner of Church Walk and Seend House, H7, H8 and	Support noted.	No action.

		<p>I8. These are the curtilage of properties that relate better to the built form and have limited capacity to extend the built environment in terms of scale and location. The line of trees in H7 is part of amenity space that relates more closely to the built environment. We do not agree with including other parts of the area in H7.</p>		
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	<p>Object to moving the settlement boundary along the north of the High Street, at H7, but moving it back to the south of the High Street, at I7 and J7. This is inconsistent.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary follows but does not include clearly defined physical features, such as the High Street.</p>	No action.
1640	Seend Parish Council (1129662)	<p>Support the proposed change at G8 (south) because this tidies up the boundary.</p>	Support noted.	No action.
3352	Simon Peters (1139012)	<p>Owner of Seend House. Puzzled by the path of the settlement boundary around my house, at H7 and H8. It takes a weird loop over my property, excluding most of my garden to the north, which is at odds with how other houses have been treated. Suggest a more logical fit, which would be consistent with other properties, would be to continue the southern boundary west to join the neighbouring property.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary should follow but not include clearly defined physical features, such as walls/ hedgerows, and include the curtilage of a property that better relates to the built environment or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement.</p>	<p>Action: Adjust the settlement boundary line to continue the southern boundary west to join the neighbouring property, at H7 and H8.</p>

24.36 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Semington** (5 representations)

Table 24.36

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
112	Jean Monico (1114410)	Include the paddock area to 14 The Knapps, H7, when the planning permission for 24 dwellings at St Georges Road is included within the settlement boundary.	This area behind 14 The Knapps is the curtilage of the property that relates more to the built environment, adjacent to St Georges Road, and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement because the proposed settlement boundary would then form a straight line to St Georges Road.	Action: Extend the settlement boundary to include the area behind 14 The Knapps and join St Georges Road.
1099	Land Development and Planning Consultants Ltd (162663)	Include planning permission for 24 dwellings at St Georges Road, at G7, G8, H7 and H8, and former Sale Ground, at G8, G9, H8 and H9, a promoted SHLAA site (724), within the proposed settlement boundary. Including granted permissions and sustainable sites promoted through the SHLAA process would help future-proof the Plan, secure the five year housing land supply and ensure a defensible settlement boundary into the next Plan period.	The revised settlement boundary excludes unimplemented planning permissions. The SHLAA site is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.
1275	Anthony Hemmings (1131985)	Extend the proposed settlement boundary to the southern side of the former railway embankment, between 541 Outmarsh and the	The proposed revised settlement boundary will be updated to reflect built/ commenced development since the cut-off date of April 2016 for the pre-submission	Action: Update proposed settlement boundary to reflect recent built/

		new air ambulance helicopter station, at K1.	settlement boundary maps prior to submission and/ or adoption.	commenced development prior to submission and/ or adoption
1321	Semington Parish Council (396082)	Include the area behind 14, The Knapps, at H7, within the proposed settlement boundary.	This area behind 14 The Knapps is the curtilage of the property that relates more to the built environment, adjacent to St Georges Road, and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement because the proposed settlement boundary would then form a straight line to St Georges Road	Action: Extend the settlement boundary to include the area behind 14 The Knapps and join St Georges Road.
2390	Richborough Estates (1132602)	Include Land North of Pound Lane, at G5, G6, H5 and H6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	This site is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.

24.37 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Shaw and Whitley** (3 representations)

Table 24.37

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
71	Anna Humpston (1119160)	Include area of land, at J6 and K6, within the settlement boundary. It is bordered by existing development on all sides and the Whitley Golf Club entrance forms the boundary edge of the village.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement. This is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.
384	W Bollen (1138423)	Include land between 206 and 208 Corsham Road, Whitley, at K5, within the settlement boundary.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement. This is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.
3185	Neston Park Estate (1138214)	Include Whitley Farm, Whitley, at H5 and H6, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes employment sites at the edge of large villages.	No action.

24.38 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Sherston** (1 representation)

Table 24.38

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
598	Neville Burn (894625)	Include full garden curtilage of 15 Thompsons Hill, Sherston, at J8, and neighbouring residential properties on Thompsons Hill at I8, J8, 19 and J9, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built residential development and the curtilage of a property that relates better to the built form (e.g. a garden) or that would not substantially extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Include the full garden curtilage of 15 Thompsons Hill, Sherston, at J8, and neighbouring residential properties on Thompsons Hill at I8, J8, 19 and J9, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.

24.39 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Southwick** (2 representations)

Table 24.39

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
2447	Southwick Parish Council (1132724)	Do not support the changes in the proposed revised settlement boundary.	Noted. General objection. No specific points mentioned.	No action.
3193	Francis Morland (397159)	Do not support the changes in the proposed revised settlement boundary, particularly those at the western end of the settlement. For example, the inclusion of 100 Frome Road, at F7 and G7, the large house on the opposite side of Frome Road, at F8, and another on the west side of Wesley Road, at F8 and G8. These changes will seriously prejudice the emerging Southwick Neighbourhood Plan.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology, as set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (June 2017)</i> , includes built/ commenced development that is physically related to the settlement, as is 100 Frome Road, and the curtilage of properties that relates more closely to the built environment or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, as with Felstead House, The Old Forge and 8 Wesley Lane, on the opposite side of Frome Road.	No action.

24.40 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Sutton Benger** (1 representation)

Table 24.40

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
895	Chris Kelly (1126214)	The centrally located primary school should be relocated, rather than expanded, as part of any future development in the village.	Noted. However, the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan is not proposing any housing allocations in Sutton Benger.	No action.

24.41 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Sutton Veny** (8 representations)

Table 24.41

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
98	Will Templer (856196)	Amend the proposed settlement boundary to follow the line of Little Halse, Hill Road, Sutton Veny, at I8 and I9. It should follow the road and then from the road go directly down the side of the property rather than doglegging.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> states that the settlement boundary should follow but not include clearly defined physical features, such as roads and hedgerows. Amending the boundary in this location to follow the road and hedgerow boundary of Little Halse, Hill Road, would comply with the methodology.	Action: Amend the settlement boundary to follow the road (Hill Road) and then the hedgerow boundary of Little Halse, Hill Road, at I8 and I9.
437, 438, 439	Mr & Mrs Cutler (1124912)	Include full garden curtilage of Prospect House, Sutton Veny, at J8, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement in terms of scale and location. Extending the boundary to include the rest of the garden curtilage would comply with the methodology.	Action: Extend the settlement boundary to include the rest of the garden curtilage of Prospect House, at J8.
884, 885, 886	Philip Clark (424159)	Include full garden curtilage of 44 High Street, Sutton Veny, at I7, within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement in terms of scale and location. Extending the boundary to include the rest of the garden curtilage would comply with the methodology.	Action: Extend the settlement boundary to include the rest of the garden curtilage of 44 High Street, Sutton Veny, at I7.

1246	Roz Walker (1128189)	Include Land North of the Kennels, Norton Road, Sutton Veny, at I5, within the settlement boundary. This site has an extant planning permission (17/01776/FUL) and part of the site lies within the existing settlement boundary but the pre-submission boundary takes it out.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes all unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined. The changes proposed by the pre-submission settlement boundary at Grid Reference I5 include the removal of the Pound Barton Industrial Estate (as an employment site on the edge of a large village) and the redrawing of the settlement boundary to follow the boundaries of the adjacent residential properties.	No action.
------	----------------------	--	--	------------

24.42 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Trowbridge** (17 representations)

Table 24.42

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
27, 28, 31	Rachel Hunt (1102653)	Build housing on brownfield land rather than hold back sites within the existing settlement boundary	Noted. However, there is a general presumption in favour of development within settlement boundaries.	No action.
161	Joy Jeffreys (1121711)	Support inclusion of Meadowside, 39 Staverton within the proposed revised settlement boundary, at 12.	Noted.	No action.
168	Trowbridge Town Council (391073)	The draft Plan is inconsistent with national policy by treating all sites with the proposed revised settlement boundary as windfall when some have been identified as having the potential to deliver sustainable development within the Plan period.	Noted. However, there is a general presumption in favour of development within settlement boundaries.	No action.
187	Francesca Vowles (1122860)	If you change the settlement boundary for Trowbridge to include the proposed housing allocation at Southwick Court then the site will not be in Southwick so it can't really be called Southwick Court. You will have Southwick Country Park facing a Trowbridge housing estate. It's very muddled and confusing. I don't think you've thought this change of boundary through properly.	Noted.	No action.
408 1221	Rachel Turner (1120653)	Concerned that the proposed revised settlement boundary between Sandringham	Noted. The proposed changes to the existing settlement boundary should follow the	Action: Retain the existing settlement

<p>2534 2610</p>	<p>Roger Williams (1127014) Barbara Goodship (1133364) David Goodship (1133638)</p>	<p>Road and Balmoral Road in Trowbridge, which will run alongside the proposed housing allocation at Southwick Court (SHLAA site 3565), means that access to this site via one of these roads is planned. These roads were built as cul-de-sacs. The boundary hedge is protected by law. It appears that if the boundary is changed in this way that it will no longer form the boundary so access can be obtained from your new boundary. Why is it necessary to change the boundary at this location?</p> <p>Concerned that there may be issues with the proposed changes to the settlement boundary between Sandringham Road and Balmoral Road in Trowbridge, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on historic hedgerows • Effect on historic parish boundaries • legal issues relating to change of land use • supporting greenfield over brownfield development • lack of adequate consultation • loss of habitat for Bechstein's Bats • building on land that is prone to flooding • archaeological issues • denying resident's access to amenity land • changing cul-de-sacs into through road access • increasing local traffic pollution in a built up area 	<p>revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (June 2017)</i>. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment. The proposed changes to the existing settlement boundary mistakenly exclude these spaces at the edge of the settlement, which relate to the existing housing development, alongside Sandringham and Balmoral Road, at G10 and G11, and further along the western edge</p>	<p>boundary to include the recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the built environment and to follow clearly defined physical features, such as the hedgerow, at F7, F8, E9, F9, G9, G10 and G11.</p>
----------------------	---	---	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> insufficient health, education, transport, emergency services and other infrastructure 	of the settlement, at F7, F8, E9, F9 and G9. The methodology states that the settlement boundary should, where practicable, follow clearly defined physical features, such as hedgerows and watercourses.	
1832	Castlewood Properties Ventures Ltd (1130978)	Note that their site, Land off the A363 at White Horse Business Park is located outside of but adjoining the existing settlement boundaries of Trowbridge and North Bradley.	Noted.	No action.
1897	Roger Williams (1127014)	Lack of consultation on proposed changes to the settlement boundary, with reference to Southwick Court.	The draft plan was subject to a 10 week consultation between July and September 2017. A consultation event was held at County Hall Trowbridge, where the public were able to view the proposals and talk to planning officers. The draft plan was subject to a 10 week consultation between July and September 2017. A consultation event was held at County Hall Trowbridge, where the public were able to view the proposals and talk to planning officers.	No action.
2321	Jannette and Adrian Robinson (1132392)	Why does draft WHSAP say in paragraph 3.3 that no settlements within the Trowbridge CA have had their settlement boundaries reviewed through neighbourhood plans? What about the	At the time of writing of the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan, no settlements within the Trowbridge Community Area were considered to have had their settlement boundary	No action.

		Community Governance Review that took place in 2016?	reviewed through a neighbourhood planning process. The Community Governance Review is a separate matter that looks at the administrative boundaries of towns and parishes within Wiltshire. This Settlement Boundary Review looks at the limits of development, a planning tool that shows where development is acceptable in principle.	
2586 3053	R Nevill (1133494) Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd (389564)	Include site at Drynham Lane, Trowbridge, which is allocated in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Object to exclusion of site allocations because the settlement boundary should reflect the policies and allocations in the local plan, the Council is reliant on these sites to deliver much needed new homes and their inclusion would give certainty about the precise status of these allocated sites.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes site allocations because the purpose of the settlement boundary is to define the built form of a settlement. There is likely to be uncertainty over how much space within the red line on a site plan drawing is taken up by the built form.	No action.
2680	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) (983136)	Object to the proposed exclusion of Land to the South of Blackthorn Way (Staverton Triangle) from the Trowbridge settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes areas that relate more to the open countryside than the built form. This area opens out into the open countryside surrounding Trowbridge. The methodology also excludes sites with unimplemented planning permissions and omission sites, which should be considered through the	No action.

			site selection process of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	
3192	Francis Morland (397159)	White Horse Business Park is now and always has been within the parish of North Bradley, not Trowbridge. So it is contrary to Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology to include it within the settlement boundary. Rather, as an employment site on the edge of a large village, it should be outside the settlement boundary.	The White Horse Business Park is considered to lie within the settlement boundary for Trowbridge. The settlement boundary is a planning tool to define the built form of a settlement and is not the same as the parish boundary.	No action.

24.43 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Warminster** (40 representations)

Table 24.43

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
921; 1310; 1447; 1449; 1524; 1542; 1721/ 1722; 1817; 1818; 1819; 1820; 1821; 1983/ 1984; 2042; 2060/ 2061; 2076/ 2077; 2253; 2266; 2294/ 2295/ 2297; 2315; 2343; 2682; 2814; 2934; 2948;	Ian Cadzow (1126508) Adrian Rickett (1128369) Andrew de Lukacs Lessner (706936) Elizabeth de Lukacs Lessner (704457) Mr Stephen Climpson (1129196) WN Overy (704465) Michael Perry (709291) Julie Downton (702421) Brian Downton (1130943) Barrie Higgins (702406) Tom Williams (705359) Kate Williams (1130946) Jo Cadzow (1131344) Jeremy Cuff (701827) Mark Burnand (705056)	Object to any change to the existing settlement boundary for Warminster. The change to the settlement boundary for East of Dene, at P8 and P9, is not required, is illogical and will allow developers the opportunity to further speculatively develop the site beyond your proposed draft plan.	The Council committed to updating settlement boundaries to accurately reflect changes to the built form and adopt a consistent approach across the County by following the revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> .	No action.

	<p>Charlotte Burnand (1131654)</p> <p>Leo Ayles (704678);</p> <p>Jeremy Kelton (1126756);</p> <p>Orla and Paul Dunn Carder (1132219)</p> <p>Karen Johnson-Wright (711666)</p> <p>Karen Forster (1132418)</p> <p>Mr and Mrs N Sykes (1134057)</p> <p>Miss K Freeman (709293)</p> <p>Amanda Cuff (701840)</p> <p>Antony Pinsent (1135685)</p>			
1450;1456	East Boreham Residents Action Group (706891)	Reassess and update the Minimum Housing Requirement figures based on a consistent methodology outlined in the Core Strategy before allocating new sites and changing settlement boundaries.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement and not to allocate new sites for development.	No action.
1502; 2917	East Boreham Residents Action Group (706891); Nick Parker (397127);	Changing the settlement boundary to include the area of the road from Boreham Rd to the development site in the allocation will	This area of road is not included within the proposed revised settlement boundary (red line on the settlement boundary review maps)	No action.

		<p>only encourage developers to keep applying for planning permission for the remaining land of Home Farm in the future. Exclude the joining road area from the allocation and settlement boundary change, thus keeping it outside the settlement boundary but acknowledging the need for access from Boreham Road to the proposed new housing.</p>	<p>because the revised settlement boundary review methodology requires the settlement boundary to <u>follow but not include</u> clear physical features, such as roads.</p>	
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	<p>Warminster settlement boundary map, on page 28 of the Warminster Community Area Topic Paper, does not show the current planning status accurately; it excludes the Core Strategy allocations, proposed SHLAA sites and extant planning and completed permissions.</p> <p>Omission of Core Strategy boundaries might prejudice the Appendix D assessment criteria, which are the basis for many of the SHLAA site selection process decisions. This could declare the process flawed, if the settlement boundaries are not correct, in particular the exclusion criteria set out in Table D2,</p>	<p>The purpose of the settlement boundary review maps is to illustrate the changes to the settlement boundary between the existing boundary (shown as a blue line), which has been carried forward as part of the Wiltshire Core Strategy from the former district local plans, and the pre-submission boundary (shown as a red line).</p> <p>Chapters 5 and 6, which detail the site selection process, contain maps showing the relationship between the pre-submission settlement boundary and SHLAA sites.</p>	<p>Action: Consider how the settlement boundary review maps could be improved by, for example, showing the planning context alongside the settlement boundary lines.</p>

		Stage 2a questions 1 and 2. Further issues arise when assessing any SHLAA site on the basis of its separation from the settlement boundary or not being adjacent to it (e.g. 2091, 1007 and 1030).		
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	New Core Strategy Areas represent a considerable expansion of the town and settlement boundary. Even if the exact line cannot be currently defined (due to house positions not being agreed) then due regard must be made as if the boundary line is the same as the Core Strategy's allowance. The line can be tightened up later.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site allocations because the pattern of development is yet to be determined.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Support revised settlement boundary review methodology but make comments where this has not been applied consistently.	Support noted.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Support exclusion of the Warminster Common and allotments, at G9 and G10.	Support noted.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Object to the development of SHLAA sites 1032 and 302 for housing. (See earlier comments)	Noted. However, these proposed site allocations in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan are not included within the pre-submission settlement boundary.	No action.

			The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site allocations because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.	
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include existing commercial Biogas site, at G11 and G12, as a detached site (including its extant planning permission for commercial employment expansion).	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlements (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings and renewable energy installations) and unimplemented planning permissions.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include the newly developed extension to Damask Way, at J10, within the settlement boundary.	The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include the football club car park and clubhouse within the new green space, at I8, within the settlement boundary.	The football club car park and club house, though not the football pitch, are included within the pre-submission settlement boundary.	No action

1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	The small area alongside Boreham Road and rear of the Rock Lane houses, at N9, is currently subject to a planning application for which the Town Council has recommended refusal, but not yet determined by Wiltshire Council.	Noted. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	SHLAA site 304, at O9 and O10, recently approved by Secretary of State and included in the WCATP, should be included within the settlement boundary and linked to the existing Boreham Road properties.	This site is a proposed site allocation in in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site allocations and unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	The newly built housing development (ex. Bus Depot), at O10, should be included as a detached site.	The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i>	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.

			excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlements (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings and renewable energy installations) and unimplemented planning permissions.	
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	SHLAA site 603, at P8 and P9, included in the WCATP should be included within the settlement boundary and attached to the existing line.	This site is a proposed site allocation in in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site allocations because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Why is this MOD building, at O5 and O6, included with a narrow access line? Why has this MOD area been included, for the first time, together with all of the military barracks and ABRO workshops? This area has a barbed wire fence line and is not available to the public.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes built and commenced employment development in market towns that is physically related to the settlement. However, it also excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlements.	Action: Exclude the isolated MOD building, at O5 and O6, and the narrow access lane from within the pre-submission settlement boundary. This is an isolated development that is physically detached from the settlement.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Support the inclusion of the area at M4, M5, N4, N5,	Support noted.	No action.

		O3, O4 and O5, which is all military residential areas and accessible to the public, hence accepted as a detached site.		
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include the area, at L3, L4, M3 and M4. This is also an extensive military residential area and accessible to the public, and should also therefore be accepted as a detached site.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlements.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	All the military units (inc. residential housing) are much more extensive at N1, N2, N3, N4, O1, O2, O3, P1, P2, P3 and Q1. We question what policy or logic has been applied in order to understand why only part of this considerable area has been identified for inclusion with the new settlement boundary and others not included.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlements.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Support the inclusion of the residential units along Elm Hill, at K3 and K4, but the policy has not been applied consistently around the town boundary on similar properties.	Support noted.	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	The far north east end of the Warminster Business Park (access from Furnax Lane), at G2, H2 and H3, goes	The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to

		right up to the railway lines, and is mostly built on. These are existing employment areas.	prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.	submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	The site at G4 has planning permission, and is part of the Warminster Business Park.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined. However, The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include the Minster Church car park, at H5 with the churchyard boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement in terms of scale and location.	Action: Include the Minster Church car park, at H5, with the churchyard boundary.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Support inclusion of the Warminster School main grounds	The revised settlement boundary review methodology	Action: Include the grounds of the Warminster

		including the pool, workshops and Furneaux House as well as the hard sports courts within the new boundary, at G5 and H5. This would, however, exclude the green area sports field and pitches.	in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement in terms of scale and location. The methodology also excludes recreational or amenity space at the edge of the settlement that relates more closely to the open countryside.	School, excluding the large green area sports field that relates more closely to the open countryside.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include the perimeter of the recently approved Traveller settlement at the corner of Bath Road and Coldharbour Lane, at G4.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined. However, The pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.	Action: Update the pre-submission settlement boundaries prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	Include properties known as the White House and 109 Bath Road, at F3 and G4, to be consistent with	The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary</i>	Action: Include properties known as the White House and 109 Bath

		<p>the policy of existing “built development physically related to the settlement”. These properties are to be fully enclosed by the Core Strategy West Urban Extension.</p>	<p><i>Review (June 2017)</i> includes built and commenced development that is physically related to the settlement.</p>	<p>Road, at F3 and G4, within the settlement boundary.</p>
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	<p>The new Wiltshire Core Strategy – Warminster West Urban Extension (WWUE) extends from the Bath Road, at E2, F2, E3, F3, D4, E4, F4, G3, G4, B5, C5, D5, E5, F5, G5, H5, B6, C6, D6, E6, F6, G6, A7, B7, C7, A8, B8, C8, D8, B9, C9 and D9, on the north side of Victoria Road. This settlement boundary extension will need to be added at some time in the future when the full detailed site layout is approved. Noting that there will be extensive use of buffer zones along the A36 as well as internal to the new site.</p>	<p>Noted. However, this area is a proposed site allocation in in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site allocations because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	<p>The southern side of Victoria Road, at B8, C8, D8, B9, C9 and D9, contains the remaining part of the WWUE and consists of three separate sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Redrow site (known as Tascroft Rise) is already with full approval and under construction. The new boundary 	<p>Noted. However, this area is a proposed site allocation in in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes site</p>	<p>No action.</p>

		<p>can therefore be extended from St Andrews Road and Folly Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Persimmon Site (known as Bugley Farm) has not yet been approved, but an application is under review. The site will enclose the Bugley Barton Farm House which therefore should be included within the new boundary. • The remaining site (known as Folly Farm) does not as yet have any planning proposals, but remains within the designated WWUE. 	<p>allocations and unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined. However, the pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.</p>	
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	<p>The Rugby Club and grounds, at C9, will be surrounded by the WWUE, but should be excluded from the settlement.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the pre-submission settlement boundary, which has a cut-off date for new development of April 2016, will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption using the most up-to-date GIS layers.</p>	No action.
1662	Warminster Town Council (1129823)	<p>SHLAA site 1007, Grovelands, at E5, E6, F5, F6, G5 and G6, is subject to a current planning application (exception site), with 17 acres set aside as open space. If this site is approved the settlement boundary will need to be adjusted accordingly.</p>	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review (June 2017)</i> excludes unimplemented planning permissions because the exact pattern of development is yet to be determined.</p>	No action.

1767	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	This AONB is not commenting on the proposed settlement boundary amendments for Warminster.	Noted.	No action.
1962	Huw Jessop (1131292)	Move the settlement boundary to the Salisbury side of Bishopstrow Farm in line with Watery Lane, at O9, O10, P10, O11 and P11. This would be a natural boundary on the edge of Warminster and would then allow for reasonable infill development within this boundary. There will be a high demand for housing over the coming years and will require further land for mixed use development to be available and I would like my land, 6 acres that could provide 30 dwellings, to be considered. Previous discussions for 12 dwellings and outline details submitted for consideration. No formal application and no SHLAA submission. Any development of fields on this site would be a natural progression from expansion of Bishopstrow House Hotel and development of Home Farm.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement and not to allocate new sites for development.	No action.
2272	David Searle (704409)	Support removal of land surrounding the school in Woodcock	Support noted.	No action.

		Road, at N8, N9, O8 and O9. Too many school playing fields have been lost in recent times.		
2293	Al Wright (871876)	The Core Strategy sought to protect settlements preventing development outside settlement boundaries unless community led. The council told the community not to allocate sites reducing the power of the neighbourhood plan, under the guise that sites were not needed. Now the Neighbourhood plan is adopted without additional sites the council wants to allocate 3 more along with 3 or more already provided planning permission against current policy, so 6 or more sites added without community involvement.	Paragraph 4.27 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) states that the Core Strategy will allocate sites and broad locations for growth that are strategically important for the delivery of the Plan for Wiltshire. Additional sites will also be identified through the Chippenham and Housing Site Allocations DPDs to ensure the delivery of housing land across the plan period in order to maintain a five year land supply at each HMA.	No action.

24.44 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Westbury** (12 representations)

Table 24.44

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
742	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Include site on corner of A350 Trowbridge Road and Bitham Park, at J7, K7, J8 and K8, within the settlement boundary.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement. This is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.
1098, 3191	Heywood Parish Council (1131482) Francis Morland (397159)	Object to inclusion of both employment and residential land within the settlement boundary. This could lead to conflicts of use.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement. The methodology includes residential and employment development. Core Policy 35 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy protects employment land in principal settlements, market towns and local service centres from residential development. Employment sites on the edge of large villages are excluded from the settlement boundary.	No action.
1098, 2201, 3191	Heywood Parish Council (1131482) Barney Jones (1132105) Francis Morland (397159)	West Wiltshire Trading Estate, A4, A5, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, E3, E4, E5, E7, E8, F3 and F4., is wholly within Heywood parish and not Westbury. It should therefore be treated under the revised	West Wilts Trading Estate is on the edge of Westbury, a market town, and, therefore, under the methodology, included within the settlement boundary for the town.	No action.

		methodology as employment land on the edge of a large village.		
1098	Heywood Parish Council (1131482)	Lodge Farm Wood, at E3, is an isolated dwelling and should not be included within the proposed settlement boundary.	Lodge Farm Wood is not isolated development (adjacent to the West Wilts Trading Estate) that is physically detached from the settlement.	No action.
1265	MOD/ Defence Infrastructure Organisation (1128216)	Include built development at H13, H14, I13 and I14 within the settlement boundary. [Accompanying map suggests inclusion of recreational area]	Built development within this area is already included within the pre-submission settlement boundary.	No action.
1473	Newland Homes (395553)	Retain the existing settlement boundary to include Land to the North East of Station Road, at E7 and F7. This is an existing West Wiltshire District Plan allocation and the subject of planning application 17/07548/FUL for 88 houses. A previous planning permission on the site for 102 houses, W/10/02479/FUL, has lapsed. The principle of development on the site has been established with the allocation and previous planning permission.	The methodology excludes site allocations and unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.
1507	Backhouse Homes (1129123)	Include the entirety of the planning permission for the redevelopment of Westbury hospital into 58 houses, at I12 and J12. The existing settlement boundary and allocation on part of the site does not include the whole former Westbury Hospital site. Its inclusion would be a logical rounding off the settlement boundary.	The methodology excludes site allocations and unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.

1669	Institute of Engineering Designers (1129870)	Support the inclusion of Land at Courtleigh House, at E14, E15, F14 and F15, within the proposed settlement boundary. This site has been part of Westbury, as developed land, for at least 50 years and been occupied by the Institute of Engineering Designers for over 40 years. Its inclusion corrects inconsistencies in existing policy definitions of the settlement boundary for Westbury.	Support noted.	No action.
2683	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) (983136)	Include parcel of land to the east of Mane Way, at D13 and D14, within the settlement boundary. The existing western edge of the settlement boundary follows the railway line and the A3098 (Mane Way), which forms a physical boundary to the built edge of the town. Presumably, its omission is a drafting error during the preparation of the previous local plan. Its inclusion would be in line with the draft settlement boundary review methodology, which states that the boundary should follow clearly defined physical features, such as roads.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement 'by, <u>where practicable</u> , following but not including clearly defined physical features'. Much of this area is undeveloped land. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.
2975	Environment Agency (395940)	Changes mostly small with many boundaries pulled back from watercourses, which is beneficial. New area included to the north west of Westbury, at A4, A5, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, E3, E4, E5, E7, E8, F3 and F4, that has the River Biss along its western edge. Advise that any	Noted.	No action.

		development is kept at least 8m away from the watercourse corridor to preserve its function as a wildlife route.		
3009, 3191	Westbury Town Council (1138673) Francis Morland (397159)	Object to inclusion of Leighton House, at H13, I13 and I14. The Town Council is satisfied with the allocation of associated housing already. Inclusion pre-empts the emerging Westbury Neighbouring Plan being able to protect and make best use of this site when disposed of by the MOD.	This is built development that is physically related to the settlement and, therefore, included under the methodology.	No action.
3009, 3191	Westbury Town Council (1138673) Francis Morland (397159)	Object to the inclusion of Leighton Sports Centre, at I13. Puts at risk their long-term public use.	This is built development that is physically related to the settlement and, therefore, included under the methodology. Core Policy 49 protects the public use of community facilities.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support the inclusion of Pinto Walk, at E12 and E13. We understand that planning permission has been submitted on part of this land for a potential day nursery site; we would expect this to be included within the boundary.	Support noted. However, the methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support inclusion of Black Horse Lane, at D13 and D14.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Object to inclusion of Courtleigh, at E15 and F15. This property has stood outside the boundary for the last 100 years and is an isolated dwelling.	This is built development that is physically related to the settlement (surrounded by residential development on two sides and separated	No action.

			from fields by Sandhole Lane) and, therefore, included under the methodology.	
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support inclusion of Fell Road/ Hackney Way, at E11.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support inclusion of Redland Lane, at F10 and F11.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support adjustment at Oldfield Road, at E9/ E10, F9.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Note that the strategic site, Station Road Sailing Lake, at F7, F8, G7 and G8, has not been included within the boundary.	Noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	There are previous planning permissions at Station Road/ The Ham, at F6 and F7, and the area is the subject of planning applications on the land that include permissions for residential dwellings.	Noted. However, the methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support inclusion of Industrial Estate at A4, A5, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, E3, E4, E5, E7, E8, F3 and F4.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Note that Land North of Bitham Park, at J7 and K7, which has planning permission, has not been included.	Noted. However, the methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.

3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support proposed change at L8.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support the protected green space at K11 and L11.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Support the proposed change at D14.	Support noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	Note that the proposed change at J6, J7 and I7 reflects The Mead development	Noted.	No action.
3009	Westbury Town Council (1138673)	No specific comments on proposed changes at K8, D15 and D16 and H14.	Noted.	No action.
3191	Francis Morland (397159)	Object to inclusion of Westbury railway station and car parks. Puts at risk their long-term public use.	Noted. This is built development that is physically related to the settlement and, therefore, under the methodology, is included within the settlement boundary. However, Core Policy 66 specifically promotes the development and/ or improvement of Westbury railway station. The land required for this and other realistic proposals on the strategic transport network will be protected from inappropriate development.	No action.
3191	Francis Morland (397159)	Object to inclusion of the White Horse Health Centre and car park. Puts at risk their long-term public use.	This is built development that is physically related to the settlement and, therefore, included under the methodology. Core	No action.

			Policy 49 protects the public use of community facilities.	
3191	Francis Morland (397159)	Object to inclusion of Westbury Leigh Primary School and playgrounds. Puts at risk their long-term public use.	This is built development that is physically related to the settlement and, therefore, included under the methodology. Core Policy 49 protects the public use of community facilities.	No action.
2733	Absolute Solvents (1134308)	Support extension of Westbury settlement boundary to include built development to the north of the avoiding railway line. However, it could go further and include areas at Brook Lane, at C6, C7, D6 and D7, and elsewhere in Westbury and allocations/permissions that form part of the housing supply to provide a realistic picture of the built form during the Plan period.	The methodology excludes site allocations and unimplemented planning permissions. Any future development of this area could be included within a subsequent review of settlement boundaries.	No action.

24.45 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Yatton Keynell** (7 representations)

Table 24.45

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
441, 549, 550	D and G A'Bear (1124865)	<p>Include Land at Tiddlywinks, at K10 and L10, within proposed revised settlement boundary.</p> <p>The settlement boundary for Yatton Keynell has been drawn tightly around the existing built form and provides little opportunity for small scale future development. Almost all infilling has been taken up within the previous decade and there will be no small scale suitable and available housing sites within the village up to 2026.</p> <p>The proposed allocation, East of Farrell's Field, will create a major visual impact at the beginning of the village and a reduction of landscape quality, as well as a significant loss of countryside.</p> <p>A selection of smaller sites would be more in keeping with the village character and could be accommodated where they would have little adverse landscape impact.</p> <p>Self or custom build dwellings more likely to be delivered through small sites rather than a large housing allocation. This will require space within</p>	<p>The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>This site was considered during the site selection process.</p>	No action.

		existing villages rather than a tightly drawn, restrictive boundary		
874	Chris Hutton (893262)	<p>Include the full curtilage of The Old Forge, Yatton Keynell, at J8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a large garden (mixture of mown lawn leading onto wild grass and mown paths). Not large enough to be split between garden and paddock • Border clearly defined by fence, trees or hedges. Existing boundary bisects garden. • Neighbouring gardens large. The existing boundary bisects through their lawns but the proposed revised settlement boundary will include all of their gardens • Garden presents limited capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement and not large enough to be used for a paddock • Inconsistent approach to large gardens within Yatton Keynell and in other settlements, e.g. Bratton and Derry Hill & Studley 	<p>The proposed settlement boundary includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement. Part of the curtilage of this property outside the existing settlement boundary clearly appears in aerial photographs to be used as a garden. This area would be more or less in line with the proposed settlement boundary behind the neighbouring properties. The part of the curtilage furthest from the main dwelling contains what appears, from aerial photograph and photographs submitted with the representations, to be an agricultural shed and comprise wild grass and mown paths.</p>	<p>Action: Extend the proposed revised settlement boundary as far as to include the curtilage of The Old Forge, Yatton Keynell, at J8, that has the appearance of a garden, which brings it roughly into line with the proposed extensions to the settlement boundary alongside the neighbouring properties.</p>
901	Nicola Bridgeman (1126445)	<p>None of the parish councils within the Chippenham Community Area responded to the consultation. This raises questions about the quality of the consultation that has taken place and whether the Council has</p>	<p>Noted. However, the informal consultation undertaken between July and September 2014 provided town and parish councils with the opportunity to comment on draft proposals for amendments to</p>	<p>No action.</p>

		complied with its statement of community involvement.	settlement boundaries. These comments then informed the proposed amendments to the settlement boundaries in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	
2122	Anthony Hardingham (1131760)	Quality of the consultation in question as none of the parish councils within the Chippenham CA responded to the consultation on the site allocations plan and settlement boundary review.	Noted. However, the parish councils were notified of the consultation and invited to the public consultation events. Furthermore, an informal public consultation on draft settlement boundaries was carried out with town parish councils between July and September 2014.	No action.
2122	Anthony Hardingham (1131760)	Noting that the land adjacent to Farrells Field is in open countryside outside the current settlement boundary.	The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan is proposing housing allocations outside of the settlement boundary because there is a presumption in favour of development within the settlement boundary.	No action.

South Housing Market Area

24.46 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Amesbury** (1 representation)

Table 24.46

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3089	Bloor Homes (Southern) (395552)	Include built and commenced development at King's Gate, pursuant to planning permissions granted in 2016 and 2017. Unless the proposed revised settlement boundary is brought up to date, it will not be accurate nor form a sound basis against which to assess future planning applications.	Settlements boundaries in the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan were updated to take account of implemented planning permissions up to April 2016, which was the cut-off date.	Action: Update settlement boundaries to take account of implemented planning permissions since April 2016.

24.47 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Broad Chalke** (4 representations)

Table 24.47

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1739	AT Jeans (1130378)	Sites 3338 and 3339 were put forward for inclusion with the revised settlement boundary for Broad Chalke but were rejected during the site selection assessment. However, the settlement boundary review should run concurrent with the neighbourhood plan process so that both plans are the same.	It is not possible for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan to run concurrently with every neighbourhood plan, which each progress to an individual timescale. However, if a neighbourhood plan subsequently reviews its settlement boundary than, when it is Made, this will replace the settlement boundary in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.
1782	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	This AONB is, however, very concerned by the Broad Chalke boundary extension at I8. The majority of the extension is the garden of a dwelling that is an isolated property on the south side of the lane. If the purpose of the boundary review is to regularise land that is built upon then the AONB strongly recommends that the boundary should be drawn tight to the southern side of the dwelling and not along the southern garden boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes isolated dwellings that are not physically related to the settlement. This property is an isolated property on the south side of Bury Lane.	Action: Exclude the property, Rest Harrow, at I8, from the proposed revised settlement boundary.
1783	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	There does not appear to be any explanation why the established Manor Farm and associated buildings, at I6, J6, I7 and J7, are not included within the settlement boundary when those buildings appear to be adjacent to the eastern side of the extended boundary at I7.	Manor Farm, with associated buildings, is built residential development that is physically related to the settlement.	Action: Include Manor Farm and associated buildings, at I6, J6, I7 and J7, within the proposed

				revised settlement boundary.
2945	Broad Chalke Parish Council (893417)	<p>Pleased previous comments submitted during informal consultation with town and parish councils have been taken into account. Therefore, support removal of all SHLAA sites in Broad Chalke from consideration for housing development; rationalisation of settlement boundaries to reflect recent development, curtilage of existing properties and environmental factors, and conclusion that there is no scope for large scale housing development in Broad Chalke.</p> <p>However, concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing development at Gurston Road (north of the Marsh), on the western side of the village, at B7, C7, D7, B8, C8 and D8, is not included within the settlement boundary • Timing of consultation precludes inclusion of positive proposals emerging from the neighbourhood plan 	The settlement boundary of Broad Chalke comprises three separate settlement boundaries in proximity to each other. The housing development at Gurston Road is no further from these three separate areas than they are from each other.	Action: Include the housing development at Gurston Road, at B6, B7, C7, D7, B8 and C8, within a separate settlement boundary

24.48 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Coombe Bissett** (1 representation)

Table 24.48

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1773	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs (556113)	Retain the existing settlement boundary at J6, K6 and K7 because concerned about extending into the river flood plain. Unfortunate to indicate that further development could be acceptable in this location. Any development would effectively and visually narrow the river valley and restrict views across it where there is a public right of way but it would also be contrary to the natural form of the valley floor widening as it progresses to join the River Avon.	The settlement boundary excludes the curtilage of properties that have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. The extension of the settlement boundary in this location would have this effect.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary at J6, K6 and K7.

24.49 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Dinton** (2 representations)

Table 24.49

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1784	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs (556113)	This AONB welcomes the retention of the Dinton settlement boundary to the areas of housing. However, the AONB is concerned that the development boundary's contained area is beginning to appear rather thin and straggly in the north-west and south-west sectors by the inclusion of extended, and somewhat isolated, developments.	Support noted. The extension of the settlement boundary reflects the extent of the built form and includes built development that is physically related to the settlement. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes isolated development that is not physically related to the settlement.	Action: Amend the proposed revised settlement boundary to : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •exclude isolated development, at F8, F4 and I6 •give the settlement boundary a more compact form by including areas, at F5 and F4 •follow but not include roads at F5, F4, F5, G5 and I5.
1964	Dinton Parish Council (390575)	The new settlement boundary cuts several of the residential gardens in Snow Hill in half.	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more to the built environment (e.g. a garden) or would not substantially extend the built form.	Action: Amend the proposed revised settlement boundary to include the entirety of the residential gardens in Snow Hill, at G5 and H5.

24.50 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Downton** (5 representations)

Table 24.50

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
268	Ian Campbell (899946)	Moot Lane the Playing Field, Moot Garden and part of Moot House's garden, at L5, M5, K6, L6, M6 and K7, the Memorial Garden and the Cricket Field, at, at G5, H5 and I5, should remain within the settlement boundary. These recreational or amenity spaces relate to the settlement, rather than the open countryside.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment.	Action(s): Retain the existing settlement boundary at K5, L5, M5, K6, L6, M6 and K7 to include Moot Lane, the Playing Field, Moot Garden and part of Moot House's garden. Retain the existing settlement boundary at G5, H5 and I5 to include the Memorial Garden and the Cricket Field.
268	Ian Campbell (899946)	Include Charles Church development, at F4 and G4, which is under construction, possibly part of Scott's House development, at F3 and G3, the tennis courts and Downton football club pitch, at E5, F5, E6 and F6, within the settlement boundary. The pre-submission boundary is so irregular that it is difficult to follow on the ground.	The cut-off date for commenced development to be included on the pre-submission settlement boundary maps was April 2016. These maps will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption. The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment.	Action: Extend the settlement boundary to include the tennis courts and Downton Football Club pitch at E5, F5, E6 and F6.

268	Ian Campbell (899946)	The boundary should be made consistent with Downton's Neighbourhood Plan.	Downton Neighbourhood Plan did not review the settlement boundary for Downton. However, it is the prerogative of the community to review settlement boundaries through the neighbourhood planning process.	No action.
268	Ian Campbell (899946)	<p>Inconsistencies in relation to car parking areas:</p> <p>a) Doctor's surgery car park, at L6, remains but adjoining Moot Garden car park, at L6 and M6, has been removed</p> <p>b) White Horse's car park, at I5 and J5, has been extended behind the Co-op</p> <p>c) Trafalgar School car park, at H6, has been added</p> <p>d) Leisure Centre car park, at E5 and F5, has been added</p> <p>e) Downton Baptist Church car park, at I6, has been removed</p> <p>f) Catholic Church car park, at L3 and M3, has not been added</p>	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a car park, and built community facilities development, such as religious buildings, that are physically related to the settlement.	<p>Action(s): Retain the existing settlement boundary at K5, L5, M5, K6, L6, M6 and K7 to include Moot Garden car park. (see above change).</p> <p>Retain the existing settlement boundary at I6 to include the Baptist Church car park.</p> <p>Extend the settlement boundary at L3 and M3 to include the Catholic Church and car park.</p>
671	Clifton Diocese (1125625)	Include the Church of the Good Shepherd, Barford Lane, at L3 and M3, within the settlement boundary. This would be consistent with other amendments to	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a car park, and	Action: Extend the settlement boundary at L3 and M3 to include the Catholic Church and car park.

		the Downton settlement boundary and the methodology.	built community facilities development, such as religious buildings, that are physically related to the settlement.	
985	Samantha Bennie (1126770)	Include the garden, at L7, M7 and L8, within the settlement boundary. Others, for example at I4 and J4, have been included, whereas these have been excluded. This garden, though on the edge of the settlement, lies between two existing buildings and should, therefore, be included.	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden.	Action: Extend the settlement boundary at L7, M7 and L8 to include the garden of these properties.
1774	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	This AONB is not commenting on the proposed settlement boundary amendments to Downton.	Noted.	No action.
2874	Downton Parish Council (467669)	Include the Charles Church development, at F4 and G4, within the settlement boundary. This was granted full planning permission on 01/06/2016 (14/065161/FUL) and has commenced.	The cut-off date for commenced development to be included on the pre-submission settlement boundary maps was April 2016. These maps will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption.	No action.
2874	Downton Parish Council (467669)	Support exclusion of recreational ground at the Moot, at L6, and the cricket ground, at H5, but the Borough greens, at H5 and I5, should also be excluded from the settlement boundary, as they are amenity greens.	Noted. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment.	No action.
2874	Downton Parish Council (467669)	Include the catholic church, at M3, within the settlement boundary, as	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that	Action: Extend the settlement boundary at L3 and M3 to

		St Laurence Parish church and graveyard are included.	relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a car park, and built community facilities development, such as religious buildings, that are physically related to the settlement.	include the Catholic Church and car park.
2874	Downton Parish Council (467669)	Include the Baptist church car park, at I6, however accept that the plot is separate from the church and may be exempt from inclusion.	The revised settlement boundary methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a car park, and built community facilities development, such as religious buildings, that are physically related to the settlement.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary at I6 to include the Baptist Church car park.
2874	Downton Parish Council (467669)	Downton Neighbourhood Plan did not undertake a review of the settlement boundary for Downton, as stated in Table 2.3, section 2.9 of the Southern Wiltshire Community Area Topic Paper, because did not received advice to do so at the time and the boundary was under consultation as part of the 2015 review. However, would consider making use of the ability within the neighbourhood planning process to do so as part of a review of the Made Downton Neighbourhood Plan, to make amendments within the Plan period (i.e. prior to 2026).	Noted.	No action.

24.51 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Durrington** (5 representations)

Table 24.51

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
389	Wiltshire Council - Housing (979503)	Include built/ commenced development of four dwellings for elderly people, with associated car parking spaces, on land to the rear of 17-20 Charles Road, Durrington, at H8 and I8.	This is infill development and the area is already included within the proposed settlement boundary for Durrington.	No action.
670, 1255	Durrington Town Council (1124540)	Object to expansion of the settlement boundary for Durrington. There has been over 40 infill developments within the past five years, in addition to the 140 homes built at Avon Fields. With the increase of 440 homes in Larkhill, the town will see a 34% increase in housing over an 8-10 period, potentially making Durrington less sustainable. There is concern that the settlement boundary will continue to expand to include further new sites that come forward outside of the existing settlement boundary.	The Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector required the Council to undertake a review of the existing settlement boundaries to ensure they are up to date and properly reflect development that has taken place. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form since the existing boundary was drawn up; the revised settlement boundary methodology excludes unimplemented planning permissions or site allocations.	No action.
1583	Richard Greenwood (1119095)	<p>Include Land at Hackthorn/ SHLAA site S98 (will provide about 170 dwellings) and nearby PDL land, at F3, G3, F4, G4, H4, F5, G5 and H5, within the proposed settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inconsistent application of methodology for Durrington and Bulford; correctly included Durrington School and Leisure Centre and western extent of Bulford but excluded northwestern 	<p>The revised settlement boundary excludes isolated development that is physically detached from the settlement.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of the settlement boundary review to allocate sites for development. This site has been assessed through the site selection process.</p>	No action.

		<p>extent of Durrington, including most of S98 and previously developed land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Proposed revised settlement boundary fails to allocate land for development on urban fringe of Durrington •Proposed revised settlement fails to show Durrington's Conservation Area boundary, which should be shown alongside the settlement boundary •Settlement boundary should include new allocated sites because they establish the new outer edge of the settlement by 2026. Not including them has created confusion among the public, indicates that the Council may not believe them likely to be built during the Plan period and undermining the Plan's clarity and public confidence in the Plan 	<p>The final, adopted settlement boundary will form part of the Policies Map, which will include other designations, such as Conservation Areas.</p> <p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes site allocations for the reasons set out in <i>Topic Paper 1: Settlement Boundary Review Methodology (June 2017)</i>.</p>	
1985	Michael Felce (1131395)	The proposed revised settlement boundary for Durrington given by Wiltshire (as I understand the position) is inconsistent with Wiltshire's proposals for extra housing. [No explanation is given].	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form of the settlement that have occurred since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan allocates sites for future residential development.	No action.

24.52 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Fovant** (3 representations)

Table 24.52

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
392	Wiltshire Council (Housing) (979503)	<p>Include Land at Sutton Road, Fovant, at E5, F5, E6 and F6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Site previously considered for affordable housing •Scheme unable to progress due to minimal local support for construction on this land •Currently an exceptions site 	This is a greenfield site on the edge of the village. The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries, not to allocate site for development.	No action.
1779	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	The AONB is not commenting on the proposed settlement boundary amendments for Fovant and Ludwell.	Noted.	No action.
2219	Fovant Parish Council (391071)	Fovant should not have a settlement boundary because it should be a small village. This was accepted during the South Wiltshire Core Strategy examination. However, a further assessment during the Wiltshire Core Strategy apparently concluded that Fovant was actually a large village but a copy of this assessment has not been seen by the parish council. The Core Strategy Planning Inspector requested that the Council take account of Fovant's incorrect classification during the preparation of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	Fovant is classified as a large village in the Wiltshire Core Strategy and, therefore, has a settlement boundary.	No action.

24.53 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Great Wishford** (1 representations)

Table 24.53

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1771	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	This AONB is not commenting on the proposed settlement boundary amendments to Great Wishford.	Noted.	No action.

24.54 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Hindon** (3 representations)

Table 24.54

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
140	Hindon Parish Council (854597)	Hindon Parish Council confirms that it will be allocating land for housing and reviewing the settlement boundary in their emerging neighbourhood plan. Therefore, table 2.3, page 7, of the Tisbury Area Topic paper is incorrect as it states 'unknown at this stage'.	Noted. However, table 2.3 states 'unknown at this stage', as to whether emerging neighbourhood plans will be allocating housing sites or reviewing settlement boundaries, unless the neighbourhood plan is sufficiently advanced, i.e. unless, at least, a draft plan has been published for consultation.	Action: Update Table 2.3 in all community area topic papers to reflect the latest position of emerging neighbourhood plans.
1778	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	The AONB welcomes the confirmation of the settlement boundary for Hindon on the north side, H5.	Support noted.	No action.
3095	CG Fry & Son Builders (449489)	CG Fry & Son have an interest in Land at Chicklade Road/ East Street, Hindon (SHLAA site 3157), which they are working with Hindon Neighbourhood Plan Group to bring forward for development. However, they are concerned that: •Settlement boundaries for local service centres and large villages are too tightly drawn and, thus, a constraint on future development and damaging for the more rural settlements, where brownfield/ infill sites are limited	Noted. However, the purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form that have occurred since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. Potential development sites in Fovant, Hindon and Ludwell were assessed through the site selection process. The Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector instructed the Council to review its settlement boundaries, which it is doing as part of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. However, the Core	No action.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There's still an unmet housing need for the Tisbury Community Area Remainder, which will need to be met in Fovant, Hindon or Ludwell. Housing opportunities need to be explored more fully in these settlements •More importance should be placed upon the role of neighbourhood plans to allocate sites for development and to review settlement boundaries 	<p>Strategy and the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan clearly state that neighbourhood plans may wish to allocate sites for development and review settlement boundaries.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

24.55 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Ludwell** (2 representations)

Table 24.55

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1779	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	The AONB is not commenting on the proposed settlement boundary amendments for Fovant and Ludwell.	Noted.	No action.
2916	Michael Vaughan (1135445)	<p>Support.</p> <p>The provision of extra land within the settlement boundary will aid the council's five year land supply. This is a positive allocation, it is justified to deliver much needed housing and is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>To ensure timely delivery the land owner would request a meeting with the council with a view to submitting a planning application in anticipation of the formal adoption of the policy in line with the NPPF paragraph 216. This would ensure that the plan is effective in what it is seeking to achieve.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Unclear which area is being referred to by the representation.</p>	No action.

24.56 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Mere** (11 representations)

Table 24.56

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
172	Anthea Beck (1122264)	Support the proposed extension of the settlement boundary along Shaftesbury Road, Mere, at M10, M11 and M12.	Support noted.	No action.
178	Woodlands (Mere) Ltd (448866)	Support inclusion of their site within the proposed revised settlement boundary for Mere, at K10.	Support noted.	No action.
391	Wiltshire Council (Housing) (979503)	Planning permission (16/09081/FUL), two dwellings on land adjacent to 2 Homefield, Mere, at F5 and F6, due to commence on 04/09/2018 and complete in spring 2018.	Noted. The settlement boundary will be updated prior to submission and/ or adoption to reflect subsequent development since the cut-off date for the pre-submission maps of April 2016	Action: Update maps prior to submission and/ or adoption.
1768	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	Amendments are proposed to the settlement boundary of Mere.	Noted.	No action.
1769	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	Proposed amendments to the settlement boundary of Mere do not impact directly on the AONB and therefore we have no comments.	Noted.	No action.
1904	Mere Parish Council (477226)	Broadly supportive of proposed revised settlement boundary, which is in line with our comments made during the informal consultation with parish councils but suggest that the garden area of Orchard House, at M8, be removed from the settlement boundary	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, for example a garden.	No action.

		because it contains the site of Southbrook Pond, which is an important drainage/ water holding pond for the Southbrook area in wet weather.		
1905	Mere Parish Council (477226)	Broadly supportive of proposed revised settlement boundary, which is in line with our comments made during the informal consultation with parish councils but suggest that, for consistency, there are three extended gardens on the eastern side of Shaftesbury Road, at M10, be included within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, for example a garden.	Action: Include gardens of properties on the eastern side of Shaftesbury Road, at M10.
1906	Mere Parish Council (477226)	Broadly supportive of proposed revised settlement boundary, which is in line with our comments made during the informal consultation with parish councils but suggest that, for consistency, there are three extended gardens on the western side of Shaftesbury Road, at L10, be included within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, for example a garden.	Action: Include gardens of properties on the western side of Shaftesbury Road, at L10.
2001	Stuart Chappell (1131447)	Support inclusion of curtilage of properties, i.e. large gardens, on Shaftesbury Road, at M10, M11 and M12, within the proposed revised settlement boundary, that relate more closely to the built environment. Properties with large gardens should not be allocated or given planning permission for new development. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF says that windfall allowance should not include residential gardens.	Support noted.	No action.

2440	C Hazzard (449233)	Include land to the rear of Hinton, Mere, at G7, within the proposed revised settlement boundary. This land and the Townsend Nursery site, which is proposed to be included within the settlement boundary as employment land, is suitable for residential development.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes in the built environment since the drafting of the existing settlement boundaries in the former district local plans, not to allocate sites for development. This should be considered as an omission site through the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.
3231	Richborough Estates (1138546)	Include Land at Castle Street, Mere, at E6, F6, E7, F7 and E8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary and/ or allocate the site for residential development.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes in the built environment since the drafting of the existing settlement boundaries in the former district local plans, not to allocate sites for development. This should be considered as an omission site through the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.

24.57 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Pitton** (2 representations)

Table 24.57

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
735	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	<p>Retain existing settlement boundary by land at Above Hedges, Pitton, at H6. This is a Council site that is adjacent to and directly opposite an existing residential development. Although adjacent to the edge of the village and open countryside, it should be considered as infill development. Pre-application advice for the construction of single dwelling considered that, as a site for infill development, it was considered to have adequate infrastructure and suitable for development.</p> <p>This site is not one that was considered and dismissed through the SHLAA consultation. The site referred to by Pitton Parish Council, in their response to the informal consultation on settlement boundaries, is at the immediate end of Above Hedges, which is outside the settlement boundary. This site is currently within the boundary. The Parish Council response was of the view that any substantial development apart from infill would be detrimental. This site is infill and would be substantial development, therefore no detrimental impact on the village.</p> <p>This site is amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment than the open countryside. It does not have the capacity to substantially extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale or location.</p>	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all unimplemented planning permissions (this site now has outline planning permission for one detached four bedroom dwelling – 17/09121/OUT). The site is part of a larger field at the edge of the settlement.	No action.

2113	Pitton & Farley Parish Council (392675)	Object to including additional land within the settlement boundary until the flooding issue is resolved, particularly the large area (1.15ha) in the middle of the village and other areas to the west. Pitton suffers from groundwater flooding, every three years on average, that floods homes and roads, disrupts local businesses and overwhelms the four drainage system.	<p>The large area in the middle of the village is surrounded by built development and there is no reason under the revised settlement boundary review methodology to exclude it from within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Flooding concerns associated with new development can be addressed through the planning application process, against Core Policy 67 and other relevant policies.</p>	No action.
------	---	---	--	------------

24.58 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Salisbury** (21 representations)

Table 24.58

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
167, 169	Eamon Bundred (1122207)	<p>Include Land Opposite 45-65 Lower Road, Salisbury, at G8 and H8, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Omission site •On edge of settlement boundary, new proposed boundary to east and west •Boundary follows river up to this site, diverts around and then back again •Part land flood zone 1, potential two houses, not green belt 	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built environment since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. Omission sites will be considered through the site selection process.	No action.
183	William Roper (1122632)	The Core Strategy should be revised to allow consideration of development outside defined settlement boundaries. Allow new settlement to the north of Salisbury to be considered.	There is a general presumption in favour of development within settlement boundaries. However, the Core Strategy and the draft Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan allocate sites for development that are outside of the existing settlement boundaries. Potential development sites north of Salisbury, which were submitted through the SHLAA process, were assessed through the site selection process.	No action.
740	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Include London Road Park and Ride Car Park, at L6 and M6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The car park is part of the built form of the settlement and by including it the settlement boundary	Action: Include the London Road Park and Ride Car

			would follow a clearly defined physical feature, i.e. the railway.	Park, at L6 and M6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
779 1043, 1044, 1045 1383	Margaret Wilmot (378123) Salisbury City Council (393725) Laverstock and Ford Parish Council (825522)	<p>Need to clarify whether Old Sarum forms part of the settlement of Salisbury. The proposed revised settlement boundary appears to include Old Sarum, at L1, K2, L2, M2, K3 and L3. However, if Old Sarum is part of the settlement of Salisbury then this conflicts with the definition of 'continuous urban areas' in paragraph 5.2 of the Core Strategy. Old Sarum is not continuous with Salisbury so fails to comply with the above definition.</p> <p>If Old Sarum is part of the settlement of Laverstock and Ford, then it fails to comply with Core Policy 1 in that small villages do not have a settlement boundary.</p> <p>The development at Old Sarum should not be part of the settlement of Salisbury. It is within the parish of Laverstock and Ford, as well as the Southern Wiltshire Community Area. It forms an 'island' that is separated from the main urban area of Salisbury. Why is this settlement not identified within the Southern Wiltshire Community Area Topic Paper? There are already seven separate settlements identified within Southern Wiltshire, Old Sarum should be the 8th.</p>	The development at Old Sarum is included within the proposed revised settlement boundary for Salisbury. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to reflect changes in the built environment since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. There is no necessity for the settlement boundary, which reflects the limits of development, to be a continuous line; there can be two or more separate settlement boundaries for a settlement.	No action.

779	Margaret Wilmot (378123)	There is no explanation why the Longhedge strategic housing allocation, at J1, K1, J2 and K2, which is now being built alongside Old Sarum, is not included within a settlement boundary when Old Sarum is included within a settlement boundary.	The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built or commenced development up to April 2016, the cut-off date. Prior to submission and/ or adoption, it will be updated with subsequent development built or commenced up to the date for which the latest information is available.	Action: Update the settlement boundaries with built or commenced development since April 2016, up to the date for which the latest information is available prior to submission and/ or adoption.
1044	Salisbury City Council (393725)	Where a settlement is extended into a neighbouring parish, there needs to be an explanation of the mechanism whereby supporting infrastructure is identified and delivered.	Infrastructure directly related to a development is usually provided directly by the developers or secured through planning obligations in section 106 agreements. Other infrastructure may be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy or other mechanisms, for example grant funding. The parish in which the development takes places receives a proportion of CIL contributions from the development. The necessary infrastructure may be identified either through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which supports the Core Strategy, site allocations plans or during the planning application process.	No action.

1045	Salisbury City Council (393725)	No involvement of Salisbury Area Board or Salisbury City Council in pre-application discussions regarding the development at Longhedge. This conflicts with the commitment in Core Policy 3 to identify and deliver infrastructure requirements through liaison with area boards, town and parish councils and appropriate local stakeholders. This is a major concern because of the impact this development will have on the city of Salisbury and the missed opportunity for Salisbury City Council and Salisbury Area Board to discuss and agree infrastructure requirements, such as sustainable transport links between the development and the settlement of Salisbury.	This is a matter to discuss through the planning application process.	No action.
1383	Laverstock and Ford Parish Council (825522)	Support the change in the draft settlement boundary, which was consulted upon with town and parish councils in 2014, has been modified and the settlement boundary is now restricted to the boundary of the dwellings in the vicinity of Hampton Park, Bishopdown Farm and Riverdown Park, at J4, K4, L4, M4, J5, K5, L5, M5, K6 and L6.	Support noted.	No action.
1604	Richard Greenwood (1119095)	To deliver much needed housing, there needs to be several corrections to the draft housing and settlement boundary DPD.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form that have occurred since the drafting of the existing settlement boundaries. The Wiltshire Housing Site	No action.

			Allocations Plan allocates sites for housing development.	
1823	MN, PA & RC Tilley (1130961)	Support allocation at Land at Rowbarrow, at K11 and K12, and request Council to confirm allocation of site for 100 dwellings in the submission Plan and extend the settlement boundary accordingly.	Support noted. However, the revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes unimplemented site allocations from within the settlement boundary.	No action.
2053	Trustees of The DJ Pearce 1998 Settlement (1131544)	Include The Yard, Salisbury site, at J4, K4, L4, J5, K5, L5, K6 and L6, within the settlement boundary (also an omission site)	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form that have occurred since the drafting of the existing settlement boundaries, not to allocate sites. Omission sites will be assessed through the site selection process.	No action.
2120	Legal and General Property Partners (1131754)	Support inclusion of site at Harnham Trading Estate, at G10, within proposed revised settlement boundary for Salisbury. However, wish for site to be allocated for housing in the WHSAP.	Support noted. Omission sites will be assessed through the site selection process.	No action.
2477, 2492 3087, 3088	Five Rivers Homes Ltd (1132956) Hills Homes Development Ltd (900566)	Inconsistent application of the revised settlement boundary review methodology, with a number of commenced schemes not included within the proposed revised settlement boundaries, such as: •Fugglestone Red •Longhedge •[A 200-unit scheme north-east of Calne]	The proposed revised settlement boundary includes built or commenced development up to April 2016, the cut-off date. Prior to submission and/ or adoption, it will be updated with subsequent development built or commenced up to the date for which the latest information is available.	Action: Update the settlement boundaries with built or commenced development since April 2016, up to the date for which the latest information is available prior to

		<p>•[A 12-unit scheme near Calne]</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed revised settlement boundaries do not correctly follow the methodology and there should be a complete revisit of all the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Salisbury is a principal settlement. Thus, commenced permissions and/ or existing employment sites should be included within the proposed revised settlement boundaries.</p>		submission and/ or adoption.
2477, 2492	Five Rivers Homes Ltd (1132956)	Support the continued inclusion of the Castle Works site, at J5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary because it is an existing employment development that is physically related to the settlement.	Supported for the continued inclusion of the Castle Works site, at J5, noted.	No action.
2737	S Walsh & Sons Ltd (1134260)	<p>Include Land at Quidhampton Quarry, at E6 and E7, within the proposed revised settlement boundary for Salisbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Large brownfield site capable delivering 200-300 houses •Adjacent to residential development and local services and facilities •Quarrying ceased and permission granted to return to development platform •Allocated in Core Strategy for employment but no market demand and housing more suitable 	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes site allocations.	No action.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Re-grading/ restoration can be done quickly and contribute to five year housing land supply, which Wiltshire cannot currently demonstrate •Should be considered for housing given national policy focus on brownfield development (e.g. Brownfield Land Register and Permission in Principle) 		
3066	Asda Stores Ltd (1136627)	<p>Include Land at Salisbury Retail Park, London Road (the 'Asda site'), at M5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Site with a history of planning consents, including a bulky goods retailing scheme in the mid-1990s, under which a start was made on the scheme (creation of an access arrangement off London Road) •Planning Officers report on planning application for an Asda store (which was approved but, due to market conditions, there is no longer a need for a foodstore in this location) accepts that this is a brownfield site and that building had commenced on the site with the creation of the access road. •Site located adjacent to residential and commercial development with good transport links 	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built or commenced employment development that is physically related to the settlement. Development on the site can be said to have commenced and the site is physically related to the settlement. Taking the settlement boundary up to the road, which surrounds the site to the north-east, would ensure it follows a clearly defined physical feature.	Action: Include Land at Salisbury Retail Park, London Road (the 'Asda site'), at M5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not including site within the proposed revised settlement boundary would mean that the Plan has not been positively prepared. 		
1815	Landowner of Land at Mill Lane, Stratford Sub-Castle (1130720)	<p>Include Land at Mill Lane, Stratford Sub-Castle, at H5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Small parcel of land surrounded on three sides by existing residential development; access to this land is already within the settlement boundary •Including this piece of land would not substantially extend the built form or affect the special character of the area •Land is not within a flood risk area nor are there any historic environment constraints 	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment. The site is surrounded on three sides by residential development and its inclusion would only bring the settlement boundary out in a straight line with residential development on either side.	Action: Include Land at Mill Lane, Stratford Sub-Castle, at H5, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.
3371	Keith Rodger (472513)	<p>Include the entirety of the garden of Elmfield House, Petersfinger, at M10, within the settlement boundary. The garden lies between the Park and Ride to the West, the A36 to the South and Elmfield House to the north.</p>	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. This area is the garden/ orchard of Elmfield House and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement because it is enclosed between the park and ride and the A36 road.	Action: Include the entirety of the garden of Elmfield House, Petersfinger, at M10, within the settlement boundary.

24.59 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Shrewton** (1 representation)

Table 24.59

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
3255	Ms Moria Barton (1138571)	The absence of housing site allocations in Shrewton is unjustified. This position should be reconsidered and 'Land off Elston Lane, Shrewton, at I2, should be included for consideration.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form of the settlement that have occurred since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. This is an omission site and should be considered through the site selection process.	No action.

24.60 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **South Housing Market Area** – settlements not being reviewed (1 representation)

Table 24.60

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
388	Wiltshire Council (Housing) (979503)	Additional dwelling in East Knoyle completed	Noted. However, East Knoyle is a small village and, therefore, does not have a settlement boundary.	No action.

24.61 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Tilshead** (2 representations)

Table 24.61

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
1264	MOD/ Defence Infrastructure Organisation (1128216)	Include area of land, SHLAA site 3383, at J5 and J6, within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect changes to the built form of the settlement that have occurred since the drawing up of the existing settlement boundaries. This site has been considered through the site selection process.	No action.
3367	Jonathan Kyte (1144754)	The proposed revised settlement boundary has excluded the pedestrian and vehicular access to Treetops, Back Lane, Tilshead, at G6. This is contrary to the methodology that includes the curtilage of a property.	This is a mapping error. The pedestrian and vehicular access to Treetops, Back Lane, should be included within the proposed revised settlement boundary.	Action: Include the access to Treetops, off Back Lane, at G6, within the settlement boundary.

24.62 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Tisbury** (8 representations)

Table 24.62

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
76	David Lacey (1106181)	Extend the settlement boundary to include a paddock, at F8, adjacent to Applewell House.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes land that relates more to the open countryside than the built environment, e.g. a field or paddock.	No action.
143, 375	West Tisbury Parish Council (1121411)	Include all of the gardens at E8 and F8 and draw the settlement boundary line to follow the line of large conifer trees (E8), joining Monmouth Road at West End cottage but carry on down the road to the conifer trees and head off in a straight line until it gets to the gardens at the back of Mount Pleasant then turning at a right angle to join the current line.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes gardens and recreational or amenity space at the edge of a settlement that relates more closely to the built environment and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement.	Action: Include the gardens and recreational/amenity space at E8/F8 within the settlement boundary.
143	West Tisbury Parish Council (1121411)	Support the inclusion of the school site, at F4, G4, F5 and G5, but only for educational development.	Support noted.	No action.
143	West Tisbury Parish Council (1121411)	Keep the open spaces within Tisbury, at G3 and G4, G4, H4, G5 and H5, outside of the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes recreational or amenity space that relates more closely to the built environment.	No action.

743	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Support extension the settlement boundary to include the Nadder Centre, swimming pool, school and former sports centre, at F4, G4, F5 and G5. It is a well-established, heavily developed site. It has a clear curtilage which relates more closely to the built environment than the open countryside and has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	Support noted.	No action.
816	St Modwen Properties (1126246)	Support inclusion of the railway station works site within the settlement boundary.	Support noted.	No action.
1776	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	Support retention of settlement boundary along the north-western edges of the River Nadder valley floor, particularly in sectors H9, H8, I8, I7, I6, J6 and K6.	Support noted.	No action.
1777	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	Concerned that the inclusion of the brownfield site to the south-west of the railway station within the amended Tisbury settlement boundary could be misunderstood. Recommends that development proposals there should not come forward before the completion of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Support amendment at F3 to G4. This reflects new edge of village development of employment units at Wyndhams Place.	Support noted.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Support amendment at the station works site, formerly Parmiter, at I8, J8, I9 and H9. This parcel of land is a derelict brownfield site which the parish council supports for mixed re-development. It will be allocated in the neighbourhood plan.	Support noted.	No action.

2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Support amendment at I4, J4, I5 and J5. This revision reflects existing development of Duck St and Ladydown View on the north-eastern edge of the settlement but potentially would encourage undesirable infilling along a very narrow single track lane with few passing places. Not in the neighbourhood plan. Narrowness of the lane may make further development unsuitable.	Support noted.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Support amendment at The Avenue, at I6, J6 and K6. The parish council strongly supports the adjustment of the settlement boundary to the northern side of 'The Avenue', reflecting the existing settlement.	Support noted.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Object to amendment at H3, H4 and I4. This is back garden development along Hindon Lane. The parish council does not support these revisions of the settlement boundary which are not conducive to sustainable development as there is no existing access.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Object to the amendment at Nadder Close car park, at I6. This area is currently in use as the village car park and should remain so. The parish council objects to the movement of the boundary. The site should be transferred permanently to the ownership and control of the parish council.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built development that is physically related to the settlement.	No action.

2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Object to the amendment at The Old Farmyard, at K6. This parcel of land is in the flood plain and floods regularly. It is unsuitable for development.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built development that is physically related to the settlement.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Object to the amendment at F4, F5, G4 and G5. The parish council objects most strongly to this proposed revision. The proposed new boundary is around the site of St John's school and the former Nadder Middle School. The parish council supports the recommendations of TisPlan, the emerging neighbourhood plan that this site should be reserved only for future potential expansion of educational provision. The site should not be allocated for general development.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built development, including community facilities, that is physically related to the settlement.	No action.
2829	Tisbury Parish Council (391632)	Object to the amendment at the land and gardens around the South Western Hotel, at I8. This revised boundary reflects the re-development of the old outbuildings but the gardens flood routinely. They should be excluded from the development boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built development that is physically related to the settlement.	No action.

24.63 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Whiteparish** (3 representations)

Table 24.63

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
378, 1077	Ian Scaife (473545)	Include the entirety of the garden curtilage of The Banks, Common Road, at H7, within the settlement boundary. Planning consent S/07/1416, dated 27 February 2008, confirms that this area is garden curtilage.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of a settlement. The proposed area for inclusion is in use as a garden and its inclusion would have limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement given its relationship to neighbouring properties (e.g. Church Barn and Memorial Hall).	Action: Include the entirety of the garden curtilage of The Banks, Common Road, at H7, within the settlement boundary.
378	Ian Scaife (473545)	Unsure why Whiteparish Church, Common Road, at H7, is included within the settlement boundary. This appears to reflect a misunderstanding of the nature of the site, its sensitivity and existing use as a Grade 1 listed church.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built and commenced community facilities development such as religious buildings that is physically related to the settlement.	No action.
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Exclude buildings at E7 and F7. These are agricultural buildings, not residential development as described in table of changes.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes farm buildings and farmyards at the edge of large villages.	Action: Retain the existing settlement boundary at E7 and F7 to exclude the agricultural buildings.
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Exclude strip of land to the rear of properties on Common Road, at H7	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built	No action.

		(west). This is more closely related to the countryside.	environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. The strip of land appears to be the immediate back garden to the property and its inclusion would not substantially extend the built form of the settlement.	
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Include Church Barn, Common Road, at H7 (east) within the settlement boundary.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built and commenced residential development that is physically related to the settlement.	Action: Include Church Barn, Common Road, at H7 (east) within the settlement boundary.
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Exclude rectangular and square extensions to the settlement boundary, at G9, because they are agricultural and push out into the New Forest National Park.	<p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built and commenced residential development that is physically related to the settlement and the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, in the case of the square extension a car port.</p> <p>The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. The rectangular extension appears to include the garden curtilage of the two properties.</p>	No action.
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Large gardens of two houses on Dean Lane, at I4 and I5, are included within proposed settlement boundary, however	The table of changes for the proposed settlement boundary for Whiteparish says, for the proposed changes in I4 and I5, 'Amend boundary to include the curtilage of a [sic]	No action.

		table of changes says that the settlement boundary is being amended to exclude recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements that relates more to the open countryside.	properties physically related to the built form of the settlement.'	
951	Whiteparish Parish Council (500702)	Exclude Ashmore House, Dean Lane, at H4 and H5, from the settlement boundary. This is a large country house set in grounds and should be excluded.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	No action.

24.64 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Wilton** (2 representations)

Table 24.64

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
136	Wilton Estate Office (390659)	Include planning permission (14/02287/FUL) at Cob Cottage, Burcombe Lane, at H9 and I9.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all unimplemented planning permissions.	No action.
136	Wilton Estate Office (390659)	Include the existing Park Garden House, Wilton House Garden Centre, at M6 and L6.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built or commenced development that is physically related to the settlement.	Action: Include the existing Park Garden House, Wilton House Garden Centre, at M6 and L6.
136	Wilton Estate Office (390659)	Include Land at Burdens Ball Farm, Queen Street, at K4/L4. The railway line forms an effective edge to the settlement and access comes from the northern point of the site.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes built or commenced development that is physically related to the settlement. The settlement boundary should follow, where practicable, clearly defined physical features, such as railway lines.	Action: Include land at Burdens Ball Farm, Queen Street, at K4/L4.
1781	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB (556113)	Support confirmation of the south-western extent of Wilton, particularly at F9, F10, G11 and G12.	Support noted.	No action.

24.65 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for **Winterslow** (3 representations)

Table 24.65

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
381, 382	Ian Flindell (861791)	Include the entirety of the garden of Beechwood, at E5, F5, E6 and F6, within the settlement boundary. At present, the boundary is drawn through the middle of the site. The emerging Winterslow Neighbourhood Plan recommends the whole of this site for residential development. Development of this site would be sustainable under local (Core Strategy) and national policy (NPPF) and contribute to delivering a five year housing land supply. The site is well-positioned in terms of local facilities and services and has good road access. It complies with the settlement boundary review methodology. No landscaping or planning considerations to justify bisecting site.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes the curtilage of a property that relates more closely to the built environment, e.g. a garden, or has limited capacity to extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location. However, the inclusion of the entirety of this garden would substantially extend the built form of the settlement in terms of scale and location.	No action.
1892	Kents Oak Ltd (1131190)	Include Land at Witt Road, at L6, within the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary review should take the opportunity to include small areas of land that are close to the village centre and in a sustainable location.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of the settlement, not to allocate sites. This site should be considered as an omission site through the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan.	No action.

Settlements not reviewed and general comments

24.66 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for settlements not reviewed (6 representations)

Table 24.66

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
116	Bernie Bradshaw (869060)	Pewsey: Exclude Land to the East of Balls Road, Pewsey, from the Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan.	The settlement boundary for Pewsey is not being reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan because it has already been reviewed by the Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan.	No action.
388	Wiltshire Council (Housing) (979503)	East Knoyle: Further to the ongoing Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan, having regard to the Councils own Council House Build Programme, I am pleased to confirm/ update on the following: 15/10824/FUL: Two single storey houses for elderly people, with associated access road and car parking, on land south of 1 Park Houses, East Knoyle. The dwellings are now constructed and occupied, this was an infill development site.	East Knoyle is classified as a small village by Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and, therefore, it does not have a settlement boundary.	No action.
1519	J&T Beaven (1129146)	Holt: Amend the Holt settlement boundary to include the whole of the Tannery site. Neither the Wiltshire Core Strategy nor Holt Neighbourhood Plan have amended the boundary in this way, despite providing support for the redevelopment of the site for housing and employment, and retain the	The settlement boundary for Holt is not being reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan because it has already been reviewed by the Holt Neighbourhood Plan.	No action.

		existing settlement boundary, which goes through the middle of the site.		
2111	The Trustees of Lord Seymour's 1971 Settlement/ Sherborne Holdings (1131720)	Maiden Bradley: Include site at Sydenham's Timber Merchants, Bradley Lane, Maiden Bradley, Warminster Wilts BA12 7JR within settlement boundary.	Maiden Bradley is classified as a small village by Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and, therefore, it does not have a settlement boundary.	No action.
3003	Bovis Homes (998345)	Pewsey: Short-sighted and damaging not to review Pewsey settlement boundary. Further housing sites likely to be proposed through the Core Strategy Review. Settlement boundary review should form part of combined Core Strategy Review/ Housing Site Allocations Plan with housing allocations included within revised boundaries.	The settlement boundary for Pewsey is not being reviewed by the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan because it has already been reviewed by the Pewsey Neighbourhood Plan.	No action.
3368	Barry Oram (1146217)	Latton: Include Land at Gosditch Road/ A419 within the settlement boundary.	Latton is classified as a small village by Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and, therefore, it does not have a settlement boundary.	No

24.67 Table of representations relating to the settlement boundary review for non-settlement specific comments (6 representations)

Table 24.67

Representation number(s)	Name(s)	Issue	Officer response	Proposed action
744	Wiltshire Council (Estates) (1138634)	Suggest settlement boundaries could be less tightly drawn around school sites. They exclude the wider school site and playing areas. Concerned that this does not allow for future on-site expansion of the schools.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology includes community facilities development, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls, which is physically related to the settlement. The extent to which the wider school site and playing areas of individual schools are included within the settlement boundary have been judged against other criteria in the methodology, such as those relating to the curtilage of a property and recreational/ amenity space at the edge of settlements.	No action.
782	Andrew Fleming Associates Ltd (1124863)	Tightly drawn settlement boundaries leave little to no opportunity for self or custom build development. These types of development are only likely to be delivered through small sites, rather than large housing extensions.	The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of settlements, not to allocate sites for development. For the remainder of the Plan period (i.e. up to 2026), this is being undertaken through the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The Local Plan Review will consider the need to allocate further development beyond the Plan period.	No action.
1094	Land Development & Planning Consultants Ltd (162663)	Removing settlement boundaries from large villages would provide for rural development well-related to existing settlements and, together with the neighbourhood planning process, allow	Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy retains settlement boundaries for settlements classified as principal settlements, market towns, local service centres and large villages. The Wiltshire	No action.

		for larger allocations to meet the identified needs of the community.	Housing Site Allocations Plan must be in conformity with policies in the Core Strategy.	
1286	Test Valley Borough Council (911081)	Support the settlement boundary review. However, aware that any future amendments to settlement boundaries close to the border with Test Valley could lead to increased pressure on housing requirements in the Borough and, thus, infrastructure requirements (e.g. transport, open space and other services) that would require further cross boundary co-operation.	Support noted.	No action.
2730	Absolute Solvents Ltd (1134308)	Settlement boundaries should include extant planning permissions and site allocations. They may not come forward immediately but where they are part of a housing or employment supply that the Council is relying upon during the Plan period then their inclusion would demonstrate that development in that area is supported.	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes all unimplemented planning permissions and site allocations. The role of a settlement boundary is to define the built form of the settlement. Unimplemented planning permissions, by definition, have yet to be built and, therefore, do not form part of the built environment. Until they are built, there is still a degree of uncertainty over the exact layout of the urban form.	No action.
2739	Webbpaton Client Group (1134382)	Support the settlement boundary review. Settlement boundaries should be adjusted to accommodate sites promoted for development through this consultation. Settlement boundaries adjoining the	The revised settlement boundary review methodology excludes unimplemented site allocations. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to define the built form of a settlement.	No action.

		<p>Swindon Borough Council area should be reviewed to fit with the Council's commitment for a joint HMA for Swindon and the M4 corridor with Swindon Borough Council. It would be against this commitment if the Site Allocation DPD is agreed before the completion of this joint initiative. No need for settlement boundaries with a policy of restricting development; development should be in sustainable locations as defined by planning law and the NPPF. The Core Strategy should identify the allocated sites but not prevent other sites coming forward because they are not within a settlement boundary where there is a lack of five year housing supply.</p>	<p>There is likely to be uncertainty over how much space within the red line on a site plan drawing is taken up by the built form.</p> <p>The purpose of the settlement boundary review is to reflect the built form of settlements, not to allocate sites for development. For the remainder of the Plan period (i.e. up to 2026), this is being undertaken through the site selection process for the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan. The Local Plan Review will consider the need to allocate further development beyond the Plan period.</p> <p>Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy retains settlement boundaries for settlements classified as principal settlements, market towns, local service centres and large villages. The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan must be in conformity with policies in the Core Strategy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

This document was published by the Spatial Planning team, Wiltshire Council, Economic Development and Planning Services.

For further information please visit the following website:

<http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/wiltshsgsiteallocationsplan.htm>

Information about Wiltshire Council services can be made available in other formats (such as large print or audio) and languages on request. Please contact the council on 0300 456 0100, by textphone on (01225) 712500 or by email on customerservices@wiltshire.gov.uk.