



Working towards a Core Strategy for Wiltshire

Topic paper 7: Economy

Addenda

Wiltshire Core Strategy
Consultation January 2012

Contents

1.0	Introduction, purpose of document and context	3
2.0	Findings of the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation	5
3.0	Analysis of Results of draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation	10
4.0	Follow-up work required as result of consultation	36
5.0	The identification of possible revised options for this topic area	37
6.0	Moving consultation responses and updated evidence forward to the submission draft Core Strategy	60

1.0 Introduction, purpose of document and context

1.2 This document is the second element of the series of topic papers that were published in order to present an audit trail setting out firstly the evidence and previous consultation upon which the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation was based; and secondly, to identify the results of the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation and determine which options to take forward or amend. This second topic paper now looks at the results of the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy (June 2011) consultation and determines how options are taken forward to submission. Any amendments or developments in evidence base that have evolved over the period have been written into a re-draft of the initial Topic Paper. This Topic Paper approach has been decided upon in order to make it easier for stakeholders to understand how the council has reached its conclusions. It has been a key part of identifying the challenges facing Wiltshire and feasible options for addressing them. The Topic Papers written are as follows:

- Topic Paper 1 - Climate Change
- Topic Paper 2 - Housing
- Topic Paper 3 - Settlement Strategy
- Topic Paper 3 - Settlement Strategy Appendices
- Topic Paper 4 - Rural Issues
- Topic Paper 5 - Natural Environment/ Biodiversity
- Topic Paper 6 - Water Management/ Flooding*
- Topic Paper 7 - Retail
- Topic Paper 8 - Economy
- Topic Paper 8 - Economy Appendices
- Topic Paper 9 - Planning Obligations
- Topic Paper 10 - Built and Historic Environment
- Topic Paper 11 - Transport
- Topic Paper 12 - Infrastructure
- Topic Paper 12 - Infrastructure Appendix
- Topic Paper 13 - Green Infrastructure
- Topic Paper 14 - Site Selection Process
- Topic Paper 15 - Military Issues
- Topic Paper 16 - Building Resilient Communities
- Topic Paper 17 - Housing Requirement Technical Paper
- Topic Paper 18 - Gypsy and Travellers

1.3 Assessing the Local Need - Why Are We Developing Policies on the economy of Wiltshire?

1.4 The need for this topic to be included within the emerging Local Development Framework has emerged clearly from an analysis of national planning policy and an appraisal of the growing body of specialist literature and evidence available to local planning authorities. Furthermore original work that has formed part of the base of evidence which will inform the Local Development Framework process has highlighted that there is a need for a new and effective set of policies to help meet Wiltshire's objectives

1.5 Review of Original Topic Papers

1.6 The original Economy Topic Paper has been reviewed and re-drafted to ensure that the initial evidence base was relevant and up to date. This addenda is supplemental to the re-drafted Topic Paper 8: The Economy. Additional up to date evidence has been incorporated into the updated topic paper to ensure that the submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy is based on as up to date evidence as possible.

1.7 Taking A Spatial approach

1.8 It would be a crude mistake to develop a set of policies which are based on a 'one size fits all' premise. Wiltshire is a rich and varied part of the Country and the issues and challenges

within it vary from place to place. For example, is it the case that the demand for affordable housing is uniform across the area or does it vary between settlements and should planning policies reflect this. The council believe that they should and spatial strategies should be produced that are rooted in the distinctive character of specific places and are tailored to solving their particular sets of problems. This is in a nutshell what spatial planning is all about.

- 1.9 One of the drawbacks that has been encountered in the past is that of plans and strategies being delivered over disparate areas, when it makes much more sense from the customers perspective to have them coordinated and covering the same areas. This is often called co-terminus service delivery and is based on joining up services and policy solutions so that they are more tailored to where they are needed.
- 1.10 To align policy solutions to the areas where the issues are arising, a detailed look has been taken at the diverse character of Wiltshire and assessed if there are broad areas which share similar characteristics and present similar sets of challenges.
- 1.11 The Wiltshire community areas were defined in the early 1990's in response to a review of local government boundaries that set greater store by 'natural' communities, i.e. areas that described real patterns of local life (shopping, employment, schooling, etc.) as opposed to administrative boundaries.
- 1.12 A number of dimensions were used to define these areas of local life including:- secondary school catchment areas, local convenience shopping patterns, postcode town boundaries, pre-1974 urban and rural district council boundaries, housing market areas, journey to work catchment areas, a historical study of patterns of local life by local historian, Dr. John Chandler, and the local geology/topography of the county.
- 1.13 On analysis the justification for the Community areas appears just as valid today as it did when they were formed. The community areas are based on a sound understanding of the hierarchy and function of settlements and how communities view their sense of place. Furthermore the issues and challenges identified do reflect the similarities within these existing areas and also the diversity between them.
- 1.14 However there is little point in rigidly sticking to a spatial pattern of interpreting the County if it is not appropriate to certain issues or challenges. For example the Military issues reach outside of an individual community area. Therefore while, where appropriate the Community Plan areas will form the basis of the spatial model, it will not be pursued dogmatically so, and where the functional relationship between places dictates, a flexible approach will be promoted. In other words the areas defined by the community plans should best be considered as soft verges rather than cliff edges.

2.0 Findings of the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation

2.1 What did we ask?

- 2.2 This section briefly summarises the policy approach within the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy and then analyses the consultation responses received. It then identifies which options and policies could be taken forward and assesses whether these are appropriate in terms of their conformity with national planning policy, sustainability appraisal etc.
- 2.3 The WCS identifies the economy as a key component and its importance is immediately highlighted through Strategic Objective 1:

Strategic objective 1: to deliver a thriving economy which provides a range of job opportunities

Wiltshire needs to encourage a buoyant and resilient local economy. The Core Strategy has an important role in enabling development to take place which will encourage economic vitality, providing local jobs for Wiltshire's population, whilst ensuring that sustainable development objectives have been met.

Key outcomes

- Land will have been identified in sustainable locations to provide for about 27,500 new jobs up to 2026.
- Where appropriate, existing employment sites will have been protected.
- Where appropriate, the suitable intensification and regeneration of established employment sites will have taken place.
- Major regeneration projects for Salisbury, Chippenham and Trowbridge as set out in the respective Visions will have been delivered.
- The rural economy will have diversified where appropriate.
- Smaller business premises will have been provided to support business start ups.
- Out commuting from Wiltshire will have been addressed.
- High quality education services will have assisted in providing the trained employees necessary to deliver economic growth.
- Redundant MoD land will, as far as possible, have been brought within the overall pattern of development.
- Wiltshire will have secured sustainable growth of established and emerging employment sectors building on existing strengths including defence related employment, bioscience, advanced manufacturing and business services.
- Potential for the expansion of green jobs will have been realised, particularly in relation to developing and installing renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.
- Wiltshire's tourism sector will have grown in a sustainable way, ensuring the protection and where possible enhancement of Wiltshire's natural, cultural and built environment assets.

Core Policy 2 identifies the delivery strategy for the Wiltshire Core Strategy and identifies that in line with the settlement strategy, the delivery strategy seeks to deliver future development in the most sustainable manner by making provision for around **175-182 hectares of new employment land** (over and above employment development which has already been built since 2006 or has permission). Core Policy 2 identifies the new employment land will be directed towards the key strategic locations of Salisbury, Amesbury and along the A350 corridor of Chippenham, Melksham, Trowbridge, Westbury and Warminster, with a specific focus at the principal settlements of Salisbury, Chippenham and Trowbridge and also that new strategic employment locations will only be released for employment generating development – generally defined as B1, B2 or B8.

The draft Core strategy sets out the community area profiles then distributes employment land in the following way:

CP number	New employment site	Saved Employment site	Total employment land allocated	Identified principal employment area protected through CP 2
5 – Chippenham	Abbeyfield School – 1 ha North East Chippenham – 2.5 ha South West Chippenham 28 ha East Chippenham – 2.5 – 6 ha		33.5 -37ha	Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate, Langley Park, Methuen Park and Parsonage Way Industrial Estate
6 – Trowbridge	Trowbridge Vision Areas of Opportunity will incorporate some business development including at Cradle Bridge, Castle Street / Court Street. Ashton Park Urban Extension – 30 ha		30 ha	Canal Road Industrial Estate White Horse Business Park Bryer Ash Business Park Bradford Road
7 – Bradford on Avon	Land at Kingston Far – 2 ha		2 ha	Treenwood Industrial estate Elm Cross Trading Estate
8 – Calne		Land East of Beaverbrok Farm and Porte Marsh Industrial Estate – 3.2 ha	3.2 ha	Porte Marsh Industrial Estate Station Road Industrial Estate
9 – Corsham		Land East of Leaffield Industrial Estate – 3.3 ha	3.3 ha	Leaffield Industrial Estate Fiveways Trading Estate
10 – Devizes	Land between A361 and Horton Road – 8.4ha Also identifies that land should bring forward Business park and incubator workspace function	Nurstead Road – 1.5 ha	9.9 ha	Banda Trading Estate Folly Road Hopton Industrial Estate Hopton Park Le Marchant Barracks Mill Road Nurstead industrial Estate Police Headquarters
11 - Malmesbury		Land North of Tetbury Hill – 1 ha	1 ha	Malmesbury Business Park Dyson site (Tetbury Hill) Land North of Tetbury Hill
12 – Marlborough				Marlborough Business Park Pelham Court Wagon Yard

CP number	New employment site	Saved Employment site	Total employment land allocated	Identified principal employment area protected through CP 2
13 – Melksham		Hampton Business Park – 4 ha	4	Bowerhill Industrial Estate Hampton Business Park Avonside Enterprise Park Intercity Industrial Estate Upside business Park Challemead Business Park Bradford Road Employment Area
14 – Pewsey				
15 – Tidworth		Land North of Tidworth Road (12 ha)	12 ha	Castledown (Land north of Tidworth Road)
16 – Warminster	West Warminster Urban Extension – 6 ha		6 ha	Crusader Park Warminster Business Park Woodcock road Industrial Estate Northlands Industrial Estate
17 – Westbury	Land at Hawkeridge – 14.7 ha (business park function)	North Acre Industrial Estate – 3.8 ha (remaining)	18.5 ha	West Wiltshire Trading Estate Brook Lane Trading Estate North Acre industrial Estate
18 – Wootton Bassett and Cricklade		Land to the West of Templars Way – 3.7 ha	3.7 ha	Whitehill Industrial Estate Interface Industrial Estate Coped Hall Business Park

In addition the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy contains a number of policies in order to maintain and direct employment development, which are summarised as follows:

CP 21 – Additional employment land

Proposals for additional employment development (use classes B1, B2 or B8) within or adjacent to the principal settlements and market towns will be considered against the following principles:

1. the proposed employment uses support the vision, role and function of the town, as identified in Core Policy 1 and in any future Neighbourhood Plan or similar planning document where applicable.
2. the new site facilitates the relocation and expansion of an existing employer whose premises are outdated and its extension and improvement cannot be accommodated within the existing site, or on adjacent land.
3. the proposed site will be attractive to key target sectors in the Wiltshire economy and have a reasonable prospect of coming forward for development.
4. the proposed site will be served by a realistic choice of means of transport.
5. the proposed site is well connected to the primary road network without passing through residential areas.

Core Policy 22 - Existing employment sites

Wiltshire's Principal Employment Areas (as listed in the Community Area Strategies) will be retained for employment purposes to safeguard their contribution to the Wiltshire economy and the role and function of individual towns. Proposals for renewal and intensification of employment uses within these areas will be supported.

Elsewhere within the principal settlements and market towns, employment sites and buildings currently or last used or allocated for employment uses (employment use Classes B1, B2 & B8) will be retained unless it can be demonstrated that:

- i. the proposed development will generate the same number or more permanent jobs than could be expected from the existing, or any potential employment use; or
- ii. where the proposal concerns loss of employment land of more than 0.25ha it is replaced with employment land of similar size elsewhere at that settlement; or
- iii. the change of use would facilitate the redevelopment and continuation of employment uses on a greater part of the site or alternative site, providing the same number or more permanent jobs than on the original whole site; or
- iv. the site is not appropriate for the continuation of its present or any employment use due to a significant detriment to the environment or amenity of the area; or
- v. there is valid evidence that the site has no long term and strategic requirement to remain in employment use, taking into account its value and contribution to the local economy, and is no longer viable for its present or any other employment use; or
- vi. on large sites, the change of use is to facilitate the relocation of an existing business from buildings that are no longer fit for purpose to more suitable premises elsewhere within a reasonable distance to facilitate the retention of employment.

Core Policy 23 - Economic regeneration

Regeneration of brownfield sites will be supported in the principal settlements and market towns where the proposed uses help to deliver the overall vision for that town and/or enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre by introducing a range of active uses that do not compete with the existing town centre.

Core Policy 25 - Rural diversification and enterprise

Proposals that provide suitable employment and tourism opportunities which add value to the rural economy will be supported, as follows:

Proposals that:

- i. enable the provision of broadband in rural areas.
- ii. seek to retain or expand businesses currently located within or adjacent to named villages **(31)**.
- iii. re-use suitable rural buildings for employment-generating uses.
- iv. develop rural enterprise hubs in appropriate locations.
- v. support sustainable farming and food production.

Will be supported provided that:

- i. they are of a scale in keeping with their surroundings.
- ii. they do not detract from the amenity of residential areas.
- iii. they are not detrimental to the character or appearance of the landscape or settlement.
- iv. they do not give rise to unacceptable levels of traffic.

Favourable consideration will be given to proposals to convert redundant buildings for employment and tourism uses where:

- i. the buildings are structurally sound and capable of conversion without major rebuilding, and only modest extension or modification which preserves the character of the original building.
- ii. such a use would not detract from the character or appearance of the landscape or settlement and would not be detrimental to the amenities of residential areas.
- iii. the building is served by a satisfactory access.
- iv. services are readily available on site.

3.0 Analysis of Results of draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation

3.1 Summary of responses

3.2 General

- Contrary to the emerging Wiltshire Economic Strategy
- Need to achieve appropriate provision of employment commensurate with increase in working age population.
- All strategic sites for growth should be identified and should be protected for B1, B2 and B8 use only.
- The consultation document needs to: Strengthen the commitment to securing employment (in particular high skilled/creative employment) in town centres. Protect and safeguard existing employment use buildings and sites for continued employment use. Promote the establishment of and provide support for employment clustering.
- Employment land that are deliverable should be prioritised
- Support aims of SO1.
- Supports SO1 in terms of attempting to gain self-containment. However as Wiltshire is rural and most out-commute a lot of development will be needed to facilitate self containment.
- Ex-MOD site should be explored for their economic potential and as part of mixed use sites especially when adjacent to settlements
- There is little evidence to support SO1. There is no connection between additional housing and economic activity.
- Apart from the proposals for the principal town of Chippenham and the larger villages, consideration should also be given to the opportunity for some additional employment and housing in suitable rural areas - especially where groups of villages, although not individually with the facilities or resources to warrant further development, when considered in combination with shared facilities - such villages ought to be afforded the opportunity for some additional development to address both employment and housing needs. Otherwise such villages will simply stagnate and decline. Rural settlements within or just outside the Badminton Estate land -within the Chippenham Community Area - include Littleton Drew, Nettleton Green and Burton - some of these settlements are known to share facilities with nearby villages. Within the Malmesbury Community Area, settlements within or just outside Badminton Estate land include Alderton, Luckington, Sopworth and Sherston.

3.3 Evidence base

- Economy evidence base is either scant or out of date.
- What is the rationale behind the sizes of proposed employment land allocations?
- Information needs to be provided on what is new employment land and what is existing.
- A realistic approach needs taking to allocated employment sites that aren't attractive to employers. Need to recognise that much employment is no longer in the B use class. Therefore other opportunities should be explored in line with PPS4.
- Explore redundant MOD site for their economic potential.
- Evidence base is not robust. E.g. employment requirements are based on loose assumptions and out of date employment densities, particularly B2 land uses. There are no high/low/ medium forecasts or sensitivity tests, and out-turn land use requirements are taken as firm figures.
- 2001 census cannot reflect what has happened to demographic over last 10 years. Should be based on 2011 census. Knowledge of those in farming etc could inform the strategy more appropriately.
- WCS does not look at the needs and requirements of existing businesses - just new jobs.
- Agriculture is not properly represented for such a rural community.
- DTZ workspace strategy identifies that less intensive development should be spread around about 7 towns in Wiltshire.

3.4 Green Economy

- Green economy around, renewable energy, waste recycling, tourism, recreation, rural pursuits, cultural heritage, habitat banking should all be considered.
- Green economy should include public transport operators and drivers.

3.5 Tourism

- SO for delivering tourism is weak. Tourist relative jobs add value across Wiltshire. No evidence in the WCS that the Cotswold Water park provided economic and tourism benefits.
- Wiltshire should make more of the environmental and historical assets it has
- Restoration of Wilts and Berks canal would have economic benefits. Priority plan for a new Melksham link would be a particular opportunity
- SO1 correctly identifies tourism, leisure and hospitality as a favoured target sector but does not follow this into policy. For example it does not consider tourism in detail.
- Devizes Marina should be specifically recognised. Enabling development might be needed for tourist facilities
- WCS should take proactive steps to increase tourism as this will help small businesses.
- Development of river areas or old canals will increase tourism.
- Supports SO1 but also considers that subsequent policies within the WCS should support measures which promote tourism throughout the County, including improved as well as new tourism facilities and attractions, and the provision of a range of good quality accommodation, including hotels. This should be in line with the GPG on tourism.
- The waterways of Wiltshire have the potential to bring more to the county. For every £1 invested in waterways it brings in at least £6. Value of other waterways apart from Chippenham should be recognised. Add to para 6.1.25 the Kennet & Avon Canal and the magnificent flight of locks Caen Hill, Devizes.
- We think that there should be a section on sustainable tourism in the Core Strategy and suggest that this is considered
- There is a lack of a topic paper for Tourism. Details plethora of tourism policies that is currently in the north Wiltshire DC local plan on location of tourism development, Wilts and Berks and Thames and Wevern canals, Swindon and Cricklade railway line, the Thames path national trail. Then highlights that the other former districts also had tourism policies that have not been pulled together either. There is lack of tourism policy within the WCS. We would expect the policy TM3 to be reflected as above in the Core Strategy. For information the Swindon and Cricklade Railway is about to start extending into the park at Mouldon Hill. Most of the work is funded and part of the development will see the cutting towards the Moredon Bridge site started.

3.6 Employment space

- Limited 10% of sites to warehousing.
- Need to provide support for small business.
- Employment development should precede housing development. Policy should limit land for warehousing to no more than 25% of sites.

3.7 Sectors

- All core strategies seem to talk about advanced technology and knowledge based enterprise - it located throughout the country. There has to be a degree of realism. Wiltshire does not qualify for these sectors as they are drawn from strong academic scientific bases.
- No reference to those employment by the armed forces, or farming and agriculture - two important sector. Need to establish if the military is a net benefit or burden.

3.8 Core Policy 21

- CP21 is too restrictive as the WCS only seems to allow employment development in the main settlements.
- CP21 is supported but is too restrictive. It suggests that inward investment or start-up businesses are not welcome, which is surely not the intention.
- CP21 is insufficient. Principal settlements and market should be dealt differently given the more rural nature of some settlements. Many old buildings need converting and to reduce energy and these should be used. Policy does address concerns regarding the loss of land for food production.
- Expand CP21 and 25 to encourage small scale rural employment on PDL. Develop alternative energy solutions on PDL in rural areas.
- CP 21 - Policy needs to also take care of abandoned sites.
- CP21 - AONB should be included within point 5. CP21 and 22 need to sustain the AONB and its setting. AONB should be added to point 5.

- So long as Sands Quarry, Corham is allocated, CP21 does not need to be amended. But could be amended to make sure MOD sites are not regarded as windfall.
- CP21 - strategic planning is required to allocate specific sites where there is employment demand and the appropriate sites.
- Support flexible approach, but needs to be acknowledged that some existing employment sites are also subject to redevelopment proposals elsewhere in WCS
- CP21 provides little certainty as to what the desired outcome is. Specifically, the proposed revisions confirm that: The provision of additional employment land will be the exception rather than the norm and that if an allocation is to be made in a Neighbourhood Plan or similar document, or if permission is to be granted for provision of additional employment land, all six of the listed criteria will need to be complied with
- Text should be amended to: Additional employment land 5.7 Proposals for additional employment development (use classes B1, B2 or B8) within or adjacent to the principal settlements and market towns will exceptionally be considered permitted against the following principles where it can be demonstrated that: 1. The proposed employment uses support the vision, role and function of the town, as identified in Core Policy 1 and in any future Neighbourhood Plan or similar planning document where applicable. 2. The new site facilitates the relocation and expansion of an existing employer whose premises are outdated and its extension and improvement cannot be accommodated within the existing site, or on adjacent land or on land specifically allocated for employment development under the Core Strategy policies for individual Community Areas (CS Policies 4- 20) . 3. The proposed site will be attractive to key target sectors in the Wiltshire economy and have a reasonable realistic prospect of coming forward for development within a defined time period, normally not more than two years. 4. The proposed site will be served by a realistic choice of means of transport. 5. The proposed site is well connected to the primary road network without passing through residential areas 6. There is a demonstrable need for the proposed site and the proposed site will not prejudice the delivery of sites allocated for employment development under CS Policies 4 - 20)"
- CP21 support policy but omits usual development management criteria.

3.9 CP 22

- Just keep point iv of CP22 as there could be other forms of employment that could use the site.
- CP22 does not sufficiently link to requirements of sustainable construction.
- CORE POLICY 21 Insert at the end 'and warehousing will be limited to 10% of a site'.
- Policies need to recognise importance of econ dev to welfare of rural communities.
- Should be based on more up to date evidence base.
- It is vital to retain existing employment sites within settlements. In the past many have been vacated without any effort to reuse them and converted to higher value residential use. This has made communities less sustainable
- CP22 should be reworded to enable any employment use on employment sites in line with PPS4 and draft NPPF. Policy should provide this flexibility on existing sites and principle employment areas.
- Restricting uses to B1, B2 and B8 is inflexible and not in line with PPS4.
- Need to ensure CP22 is in line with draft NPPF. It is clear the government's intention is to release low quality employment land for residential development.
- Consider a statement from MP Greg Clark issued in March of this year which states "The Government's top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy".
- The following should be added to CP22: in circumstances where historic employment allocations in previous Local Plans, or unimplemented planning permissions have not been taken up, and where viability evidence can demonstrate that the inclusion of an element of non-employment development is essential to deliver the allocation as a mixed-use scheme comprising employment and compatible non-employment uses.
- Core policy 22 agree with the emphasis on retaining employment sites. But it is important that where there is a case to switch from employment to residential that the tests are realistic and do not hold development of redundant sites back.
- CS does not comply with EC12.1 of PPS4 nor NPPF para 113.

- Policies that start section are encouraging and then the following risk falling into a conventional land use planning trap. This could be avoided with a combined policy that addressed economic development rather than additional or existing employment sites. The key points should include: a) removal of the reference to B class uses (or the tempering or qualification of its use) b) or specific provision should be included for other and wider forms of employment generating activity or the physical and social infrastructure that will support them c) the drafting of a list of key sites (although this could support policy) and the clearer categorisation of the sites within it. d) the sectors that these sites might support e) the criteria that additional site will have to meet the criteria for the release of sites The list of sites could then feed the Community Area Strategies (and could be a better alternative to a series of shorter lists for each area.
- Council should define what it considers economic development to be.
- Policy should be positive towards all economic uses even if they do not fit neatly in B use classes. This would be consistent with PPS4 and the draft NPPF. Policy should therefore be reworded to reflect this.
- Object to CP22 it is inconsistent with draft NPPF para 75 as this states that council's should not seek long term protection of employment sites.

3.10 Core Policy 23

- Economic regeneration policies need to be strengthened and specific settlements should be named where relevant, together with specific visions for town centre regeneration sites.
- Malmesbury post office closure has an opportunity to see how effective CP22 and 23 are
- Prioritise regeneration rather than support this.
- Core Policy 23. The utilisation of town centre brownfield sites should be actively encouraged both for housing and employment uses
- Widen CP23 to include all PDL just not those in main towns.
- CP23 - reword so that there can be some conflict rather than be permanently derelict.
- Core Policy 23 – rephrase as follows: “Regeneration of brownfield sites will be prioritised in the principal settlements and market towns, where the proposed uses help to create sustainable employment, and help to deliver the overall vision for that town and/or enhance its vitality and viability.”
- Supports CP23, however there are regeneration opportunities in smaller towns / villages to support the rural economy. This is supported by 2001 census which shows that around 37% jobs are provided outside of the main settlements.
- With respect to Policies 23 and 24, the key points are that economic regeneration (as set out in policy 23) may provide a more useful model to promote economic development. This policy does not limit uses and provides a helpful reference (or test) that proposals should deliver the overall vision for the town and avoid activities or uses that will compete with town centres. This provides a useful model for all development activity to follow.

3.11 Core Policy 24

- Support CP 24 and 25.
- Wiltshire planners have no duty in honour or interest of its residents to make it easy for Crown Estates to make a fast buck out of selling their land for commercial development.
- CP24 - support policy, but consideration should be given to policy to ensure linkages etc
- Support this chapter.
- CP 24 - MOD sites can have higher biodiversity and thus policy should read 'retaining existing biodiversity and measures for reversion of parts of the site to a natural state'.
- CP24 is too limited in stating that redevelopment should exceed the existing building footprint unless they lie within a settlement boundary. There is no justification of this.
- CP24 use of MOD camps as business parks is not suitable and would involve inward travel. Para 6.1.17 final bullet over simplifies matters as not much of the UK is in its natural state. Policy should require a landscape management strategy instead.
- CP24 is inadequate, gives it to whim of developer. Masterplans should be produced when the MOD is known to be closing rather than when it has been sold off. It should be reworded to give more guidance. Sentence regarding footprint is too restrictive.
- CP24 should make reference to protecting landscape features of economic and environmental value such as orchards.

- CP - 24 -Changes to MOD facilities should be addressed in a timely manner. It is also essential that wider defence and economic requirements are taken fully into account in order to comply with national policy.
- CP24 does not comply with adopted or draft national policy. It does not comply with policy as set in the Plan for Growth. Unclear why Wiltshire Council seek to distinguish military sites so unfavourably and disproportionately when viewed against any other previously developed brownfield sites.
- CP 24 should be rewritten so it is more positive. MOD sites should be retained for employment uses.
- Does not offer sufficient protection to former MOD sites nor for sustainable development.
- Employment sites are protected and similar principles should apply to former MOD sites with emphasis on employment rather than mixed use scheme. The following sentence should be added to the end of the first paragraph of this policy: 'The focus will be on employment-led development proposals. Housing will only be allowed where justified by a viability assessment and where the site is well related to a market town in terms of access by walking, cycling and public transport.'
- English Heritage recommended change nclude reference to ensuring the cultural and historic significance of Wiltshire's military establishments are understood to inform the scope and form of any future use and signpost HE policy 38.
- Support development of additional employment land however these should be directed towards brownfield sites. Support CP24 however all applications should be supported by a robust TA and TP.
- Policy 24 also provides effective guidance for sites requiring a comprehensive approach. It suits the MoD sites at Corsham and allows a flexible but controlled approach to redevelopment. Given the knowledge that exists about the sites that may come forward some more precision may be possible and desirable (in terms of uses, issues and timescales) to ensure the proper release of sites, although this is largely for others to comment on.
- Council has picked selectively from para 10 of PPS4 as highlighted in para 5.16 of TP17.
- CP22 is contrary to dNPPF para 75.
- Policy should also include residential use in cases where the site in question lies adjacent to the existing settlement. Such development should not be confined to market towns and principle settlements but also consider where former MOD sites adjoin larger villages anc can be integrated with the settlement particularly where on-going employment development has failed.
- CP24 - unclear how the re-use of military establishments for housing would relate to other proposals. WCS should identify those MOD sites where residential is expected and when by community area.
- There is no reference in Core Policies 21 and 24 make no reference to the specific constraints of land within AONBs and general landscape considerations. To conform to national guidance on the protection of AONBs Core Policies 21 and 24 should be amended accordingly

3.12 Core Policy 25

- Support CP 24 and 25.
- CP25 unacceptable levels of traffic should be defined.
- CP25 should include reference to biodiversity.
- More people in Wiltshire live in rural areas and therefore the rural economy needs to be recognised.
- CP25 should be more flexible and needs to acknowledge that some sites will not be viable. This would be consistent with PPS4.
- Expand CP25 so it addresses economic potential of rural areas (farm diversification, home working, recreation, tourism, green tech). Where appropriate increase houses which would benefit from access to the jobs and services indicated above. Should be a clear policy on rural development as crucial for the delivery of homes particularly affordable housing and rural housing in line with PPS3.
- Expand CP25 so it addresses economic potential of rural areas (farm diversification, home working, recreation, tourism, green tech).
- CP25 should explicitly consider the AONB. Farm buildings should remain attached to farms.
- 6.1.3 Suggest full stop after 'economy'. Delete 'As'; Suggest Insert 'Among other things,' it reduces leaks.

- CP25 fails to recognise the importance of economic development to the welfare of rural communities. Can only be considered with sighting of evidence base.
- CP25 should do more to promote the expansion and diversification of the rural economy.
- Appropriate workspace is a key driver to aid diversification.
- Shared facilities to support home working should be provided.
- CP25 should give specific reference to the AONB. AONBs should be added to 6.1.25.
- More forward thinking is required in relation to MOD sites specifically Corsham. Corsham requires more employment land and redundant MOD sites should be recognised as potential employment sites. All Mod sites that come onto the market are brownfield sites.
- Support CP25 but add bullet stating 'extend, upgrade and / or intensify existing tourism accommodation and facilities'.
- Council should allow some growth in rural settlements to help sustain their vitality. This will need to be housing, employment and live/work.
- Opposes lack of flexibility in CP25 and fails to provide adequately for sustainable development opportunities.
- Many of these businesses now include tourism, food production and processing, educational facilities, sport and recreational facilities and many other types of diversification. In addition, the re-use of existing buildings has enabled many land managers to provide offices and light industrial units to local entrepreneurs whilst generating rental income to support the rural business. This diversification is in line with government guidance provided in PPS7.
- The document should include policies related to the de-allocation of sites. If land is not coming forward and a more appropriate use is identified, a policy should be in place to support this.
- CP25 seems to deny potential on sequential basis to reuse existing rural buildings for any purpose other than employment. However not all buildings are suitable or viable for such uses. Such buildings should be preferred ant to total exclusion. Live / work has not been properly addressed. PPS4 encourages live work.
- Agriculture is not properly represented for such a rural community

3.13 Bradford on Avon Community Area

- Would be useful to quantify the number of jobs Winsley should aspire to create over the plan period.
- Loss of employment land should be resisted, and this should be explicitly stated in CP9.
- New housing should only be permitted when it is employment led.
- It is unclear how many jobs would be provided at the strategic site, and whether these would genuinely be for local people.
- Need an assessment of likely impact of the allocation on the Cotswolds AONB, and comparison with other sites in this regard (Natural England)
- 50 dwellings, up to 45,000 square foot of employment, and associated community facilities should be accommodated at Land North of Holt Road – sharing the allocation with Kingston Farm
- Employment provision under consideration for the Kingston Farm site is not 2-3ha of additional employment but rather in the form of replacement premises for an existing employer on site, with scope for future expansion.
- Suggested amendments (from promoters of Kingston Farm site) to wording of CP9: “development is expected to deliver” rather than “development must deliver”; “space for existing local firms to expand”; “up to 40% affordable housing subject to demonstrable need and economics of provision”.
- Shouldn't allocate a site at BoA now: wait for Neighbourhood Planning
- Objections to Kingston Farm site due to traffic impacts
- Objection to Kingston Farm site: this will urbanise the eastern side of Bradford, with other developers making subsequent approaches
- Access to Kingston Farm should be shared with new access to Kingston Mill
- Would be better if employment were located at the town end of the Kingston Farm site, near existing employment sites
- Workshops should be provided, e.g. for carpenters
- Proportion of site used for employment should be higher

3.14 Calne

- Station Road is no longer an industrial estate – it should removed as a Principal Employment Area.

- There is an inconsistency in identifying Calne as a location suitable for strategic employment growth, but then severely limiting the overall scale of residential growth proposed.
- "Core Policy 2: Porte Marsh Industrial Estate and Station Road Industrial Estate", Station Road is no longer an Industrial estate.
- Replace last sentence with "Development should be phased so jobs will be delivered before any more housing is permitted." Reason: To address the imbalance which is causing a lot of commuting. The number of jobs needs to be set out in the Policy. Energy needs to be provided.
- It is considered that Calne is able to accommodate more development than has been allowed for, particularly in sustainable locations well related to the town centre as this will attract new employment and retail uses that will in turn achieve a greater level of self containment for Calne which is the overarching aim.
- We have identified the following changes: Due to significant housing development in the town over the past decades and the failure of this to lead to any economic stimulus contributing to significant town regeneration, there is a severe imbalance between the two. Any housing remainder should be focussed towards the end of the development plan period when economic growth can be shown to deliver local jobs.
- There is a pressing need for new homes and the provision of new employment (at Porte Marsh Industrial Estate and an allocation of 3.2 hectares) should be not be used to restrict housing delivery.
- Does not fully reflect the feelings of Calne Town Council and does not relate to the councils policy, which is to "consolidate and improve existing facilities and infrastructure before agreeing any new development".
- Tourism is booming countywide and in Calne it is felt more impetus on improving and developing the tourist industry in Calne, specifically, enhancing the Castlefields Canal area would attract more visitors.
- Calne Town Council does not support this as there is a large area of land in Calne already designated as employment land.
- Calne Town Council believes that Calne is 'Strategically' important to the economic employment development of the County. In fact the town council would support an out of town supermarket serving the north of the town in the hope that this might go some way to alleviate the traffic congestion in Curzon Street and be of community benefit to residents in the north.
- Employment Land 5.31 The Council states that they are looking to provide 3.2 hectares of employment land over the plan period. This is scaled back significantly from the 15 hectares proposed in the previous consultation document. As the Council correctly states, the provision of further employment opportunities will help to reduce levels of out-commuting. However, the Council should recognise that other developments outside of the B1/B2 and B8 use class can provide a significant number of jobs. This includes care and accommodation for older people. These types of development provide a large number and variety of jobs due to the range of services that are provided on site and the care needs of the residents.
- The phasing of the remainder of the allocated employment land and housing delivery should be towards the end of the Plan period not over the Full Plan period to allow the current imbalance of jobs to housing to rectify. New development should only go ahead once the Nitrogen Dioxide level is reduced to the safe limit level.

3.15 Chippenham

- Do not allocate land around Chippenham for B8 use. B8 jobs will not address out commuting, nor secure high paid jobs as detailed in the HTP. B8 takes up land and provides few jobs. Already empty B8 units in North Wiltshire. B8 units are visually intrusive.
- Proposal to allocation 90% proposed strategic land for Chippenham at Showell Farm is misguided and will not serve the business community. There need to be a more creative approach to the use of brownfield sites.
- Whilst Langley Park is an important employment location, Core Policy 5 should be refined in order to avoid any confusion between core policies 4, 5 and 22. In particular, refine Core Policy 5 to acknowledge that Langley Park is not just a principal employment area and is instead a key area of redevelopment opportunity alongside this employment function. Otherwise redevelopment opportunities could be stifled by Core Policy 22.
- Class B8 usage (Storage and Distribution) is inappropriate for Showell Farm.
- Who are the employers who wish to locate onto Showell Farm?

- The scope to extend the existing employment site at Kingston Park, Kingston Langley should be considered. The land extends to some 3.1 hectares (7.6 acres) in a single block located to the north and west of the existing business park and is ideally suited to Class B1 employment uses.
- Factual inaccuracies relating to Showell Farm Current data relating to Showell Farm appear confused. The site would appear to have a usable area very significantly lower than the estimated 28.85 hectares. This begs the question 'how much land is actually needed?'
- Chippenham is, or should be, a natural choice of town to expand my business into, since I grew up and still live primarily in Malmesbury (a town too small for our business' needs) but never the less where my business started and near where most of my staff live; but I have to admit that I never go there except to use the Railway Station. Since using the local shops and superstores and my teenage years visiting venues such as the Gold diggers nightclub I have watched the town nose dive into its current state of, in my own opinion, neglect in terms of commuter attractiveness and access. I am 28 years old and have had been lucky to enjoy a degree of entrepreneurial success in establishing and building my company Prescription Eyewear Ltd. which trades as Glasses Direct. We started in 2004 from small premises near Malmesbury and grew rapidly such that we needed to find bigger, better located premises for the business. It would have been natural to come to Chippenham but the negative feeling about the availability of space, the current state of the town, with its poor shops, bad traffic affecting recruitment prospects and limited parking led us to go to Swindon where we now and employ 70 people. The company in total employs 150 people. I have been privileged over the last year to part of the Prime Minister's team helping the No.10 Policy Unit with its young entrepreneurial initiatives such as "StartUp Britain" and am also aware of the Prime Minister's concern to regenerate Town Centres and High Streets up and down the country, and also the government's determination to re-locate many of its Civil Service employees out of London. Chippenham could be looking at such an exciting future if it understood the opportunity. Reading the Core Strategy Consultation and seeing its conclusions to disperse development where it will be least noticed in enclaves off the western ring road to the south of the town strikes me as a missed chance to improve things. Surely the time is now to seize this opportunity and do something positive to turn around the town's fortunes? I strongly object to the current proposals to expand to the south which will only make matters worse.
- Core information has been presented as 'facts' whereas it is often data that is open to interpretation. For example it has been claimed that there is large scale out-commuting from Chippenham. This may be the case, but the 'facts' are based on the 2001 national census, now 10 years out of date. Furthermore, as is identified later in the Showell Protection Group response, this data is directly contradicted by at least two other Council sponsored technical reports that claim Chippenham is 'self contained'.
- 4000 new houses will just add to the idea of Chippenham as a dormitory town for Swindon, Bath and Bristol. There must first be substantial employment in Chippenham.
- The Highways Agency acknowledges the position of Chippenham relative to the M4 and the fact that this encourages out commuting due to its distance by road from Bristol and other centres of employment. This is facilitated by the town's location on the main Bristol to London railway line. We welcome the recognition that employment development is important to the town which will increase self containment. We support proposals for mixed use developments in the town because this should reduce the need to travel. We support the Council's recognition that the net flow of commuters out of Chippenham needs to be redressed where possible by future development and that essential infrastructure improvements are required to deliver benefits from improved movement of traffic around Chippenham.
- The Agency wishes to point out that any improvements to junctions with the SRN will need to be wholly funded by developer contributions and that planning applications would need to follow the policy and technical requirements set out in Circular 02/2007 and the Guidance on Transport Assessments respectively
- There are still many empty Industrial Units in the existing Commercial Sites. All Brownfield Sites and unattractive sites should be redeveloped before encroaching into the Green Belt.
- Many residents travel in to Swindon, Reading or London on over-crowded and expensive trains with often standing-room only; a point which highlights that there are already too few local jobs to support the current population. How would bringing even more residents to Chippenham improve the facilities, transport systems and infrastructure of the town and its surroundings for existing or new residents?
- Encouraging the development of business parks and industrial zones is also completely unnecessary, one only has to drive past Bumpers Farm on the A350 bypass and see the "To Let" signs for industrial units to see that there's no demand for businesses to relocate to Chippenham.

Let's see empty units used and brownfield sites developed before considering new developments and destroying acres of beautiful countryside which is now enjoyed for leisure by people of the town.

- In proposing 28 hectares of employment land at Showells Farm the Core strategy fails to recognise that development needs a USP and a developer or development company that is promoting the opportunity.
- Showells Farm has very few benefits and little to offer Chippenham. It provides the Council with the ability to claim that they are promoting employment - but it does not offer a very attractive solution for employers.
- Chippenham suffers from out commuting and a population who spend elsewhere. For the same reasons as many people who live in Chippenham spend their money in Bath, Bristol and Swindon why would an employer not choose Bristol or Swindon where there are numerous employment sites available on the motorway junctions?
- It would appear that the only USP of Showells Farm is that it is close to Lacock. Lacock does not want it on its doorstep, and it does not benefit Chippenham.
- Increased traffic congestion is most definitely not needed on an already congested A350, Bath Road, and Avenue la Fleche. Not to mention the destruction of some incredibly beautiful and wildlife filled countryside around the Chippenham and Lackham area.
- Chippenham is already only half as good as it once was, and I believe that by spreading out away from the town centre with more housing, the suggested '28 ha + of employment land' would kill off what's left of our beautiful town. The town centre needs investment, not the surrounding areas
- We do need more employment in the town, especially for our younger residents who struggle to pay travel costs on low wages.
- The Group accepts that new housing will be required to accommodate changing demographics and that employment opportunities will be needed to provide jobs for local people. The Showell Protection Group does not however accept the need for Chippenham to be classified as a 'Principal Settlement' where growth is targeted significantly over and above the needs of the local population.
- The proposal to allocate approximately 90% of the proposed strategic land allocation to Showell Farm is misguided and will not best serve the business development of Chippenham
- At a recent planning meeting in Lacock, Alistair Cunningham stated that the site would "accommodate 20 hectares of employment as the rest would be landscaped etc". I subsequently have understood that the constraints of the site now mean that the site can only accommodate 18 hectares of employment. Is 18 hectares a figure that is with or without landscaping and therefore are the council offering a site that can proportionately provide only 12 hectares of building? The further reinforces the evidence that this is a poor strategy in promoting an unresearched, unpopular and untested site so far from the town centre. I therefore object.
- Please consider employment land adjacent to the station at Langley Park and a link road to connect the eastern side of the town to the M4 A4.

3.16 Corsham

- 10ha is needed at Corsham rather than 3ha.
- Spring Park should be included in any list of sites to reflect its status.
- With this strategic policy for Corsham it is clear that additional employment land must be identified to keep pace with the level of housing currently available and to be provided in the future within Corsham, and to mitigate against excessive out-commuting for people living in and around Corsham.
- The recently completed Basil Hill site which provides employment for MoD staff has led to a large amount of in-commuting giving rise to local infrastructure problems, parking issues and a lack of employment opportunities for the local population. This representation provides an ideal opportunity to identify a brown-field site within a pattern of employment and residential development alongside Westwells that would provide a balanced level of local employment opportunities and help minimise outcommuting, known as Sands Quarry located to the southern end of Westwells Road. There is the opportunity for a number of support and service industries linked to the nearby MoD uses that would ideally locate within this site. This site is currently subject to an outline planning submission for B1, B2 and B8 uses, with an associated limited level of affordable housing forming a link to the adjoining permitted care village with associated health, retail, service and care facilities. The site is surrounded by recently permitted schemes providing large levels of built form but with limited associated employment opportunities: a care home, data storage and MoD use. We wish to put forward this site as a suitable location for a mixed use

development in response to the Strategic Objective 1 and Core Policy 11 through provision of employment and affordable housing land for Corsham.

- After "Trading Estate" add new sentence "Jobs must be delivered before any new greenfield housing comes forward in order to fulfil the aim for greater self-containment." Object that the number of jobs to be provided is not set out.
- So, although there is to be no strategic allocations for Corsham Community Area, the Core Strategy includes for up to 1500 homes and 28 hectares of land for employment use. This can only be classed as misrepresentation. The late inclusion of the SW Chippenham sites has led to inadequate consultation with the Corsham community Area, within whose it falls.
- Para 5.7.5 - 5 th bullet "opportunities for Corsham to be promoted as a tourist destination should be explored". Is difficult to reconcile this with the Council's withdrawing funding from cost-effective Corsham Information Point and Heritage Centre.
- The impact such proposals will have on the tourism trade which helps to keep Lacock and many more small hamlets alive. There is little employment opportunities already for our children and if tourism, a necessary part of living in Lacock, is reduced what local employment will there be? What impact will this have on our children's social skills, knowledge of their roots and history?
- An allocation of 3.3 ha employment land (not Showells Farm) is totally inadequate for the needs of Corsham's workforce. I am told that the 3.3 ha to be provided under Core Policy 11 will not be a "new" allocation, but refers to a greenfield site adjacent to the Leaffield industrial estate (Leaffield) which has already been allocated in the current development plan, and yet remains undeveloped. 4.104. The problem with Leaffield is that it has no rail transport link, and the road infrastructure which serves Leaffield is woefully inadequate. Unless the bottleneck of Potley Lane is resolved, particularly the crossing over the railway line, then the "allocated" land is poorly located.
- 4.1.5. It is to be hoped that, if the waste transfer station proposal is implemented, the opportunity will be taken to improve the railway bridge and the access to Leaffield. This may assist in bringing forward the greenfield site for development.
- The Chamber would like to see the brownfield site at Sands Quarry allocated for primarily B1 uses. The site is adjacent to existing employment sites, and is well served by the highway network and public transport. Its redevelopment would assist in the redevelopment of the adjacent Royal Arthur site. Its ecological and archaeological interest could be sustained through good design and appropriate conditions. Nimbyism should not be allowed to continue to sterilise this brownfield site.
- Core Policy 11 proposals for the redevelopment of former MOD sites at Rudloe and Copenacre are likely to be overtaken by events, particularly in relation to the Copenacre site, which is already being marketed. Its redevelopment is more likely to be dictated by the whims of the purchaser rather than in the interests of the community.
- A substantial allocation of redundant MOD sites for employment would contribute to Corsham's need for more than 3.3ha employment land.
- The allocation of employment land at Corsham should be increased substantially. Redevelopment of redundant MOD sites should be for uses proportionate to the uses which existed during the active MOD occupation of the site. Exceptions to this general redevelopment policy should only be allowed where there is a demonstrable need for a facility which cannot be provided on a brownfield site elsewhere within the community area.
- Priority should be given to the development of brownfield sites, including Sands Quarry, for predominantly employment purposes (there being sufficient housing allocation).
- am concerned as resident of Lacock that our village is gradually being squeezed by the planned development of the 3 small market towns surrounding us, namely Chippenham, Corsham and Melksham. All of these market towns have areas of brown field sites which are up for sale and empty industrial space on existing sites as well as a number of empty residential units which have been unoccupied for a number of years, together with new residential homes which have remained unsold for a number of years. With some creative thinking surely there is some provision staring at us without building on green fields.
- My Client welcomes the opportunity to work with your Authority and the local community to bring forward a successful redevelopment of this extensive brownfield site which is well related to the established built up area of Corsham. The provision of new economic development will assist in broadening employment opportunities within Corsham, and increase the range of services / facilities that are available to the local community. Specific reference is made to the provision for 'economic development' rather than the provision of employment land as relating to uses within Class B1, B2 or B8 (Core Policy 2). While Copenacre will not become a ' strategic employment allocation ' the concept that jobs are only to be sourced from uses within Classes B1 , B2 or B8 is with respect outdated. Such an approach is not consistent with the provisions of PPS 4 or more

particularly the emerging NPPF. Local Planning Authorities should not assume that the return to economic growth and the provision of new job opportunities for local communities is confined to development within the Class B use - classes. Many of the forms of economic development can deliver significant and sustainable new job opportunities.

- We acknowledge the provision of 3.3ha of employment land and 1,200 dwellings in the community over the plan period (2006-2026). We support the wording of this policy because it encourages mixed use developments and prioritises Brownfield sites.
- In general we would support the issues and opportunities identified for the Corsham Community area.
- Corsham wants strategic growth, but would seek to ensure a balance of housing and employment along with improvements to infrastructure such as roads, health, leisure and education. Corsham Town Council is keen that Corsham develops in a sustainable way with a good balance between social, economic and environmental issues.

3.17 Devizes

- Remove strategic employment site at Devizes as it does not have the infrastructure to support additional development, especially road infrastructure.
- The proposed 8.4 ha employment site lies at the very foot of the North Wessex Downs AONB. Although this is recognised to an extent, this site has the potential to result in substantial damage to the setting of the AONB at this very important gateway site into this nationally recognised and protected landscape. The Council need to undertake further work to justify this location so close to the AONB, to explain whether alternative sites in less potentially harmful landscape impact locations have been considered. Only then if this is shown to be the most viable site, detailed landscape and visual impact assessment work should be prepared, which again should have suitable reference to be able to discount this site if too damaging. Then finally if this site is still shown as having some potential, strict limitations and mitigation should be put in place, preferably with a Development Brief that the AONB could comment on. Without these mechanisms in place the North Wessex Downs AONB would be likely to object to any scheme that comes forward on this site if found not to conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB.
- no details are provided for the 8.4 hectare site at the junction of Horton Road and London Road; there is great concern on the access to and from the site, which can only realistically be onto the Horton Road, and also on the visual impact to the only approach to Devizes from the north; and in any case, the existing Hopton industrial area is far from full; the proposed developments would generate significant additional commercial traffic and create further traffic pollution which is already above allowable limits;
- Object strongly to the allocation of employment land between the A361 and Horton Road. Roads are already too busy. There is a bottleneck at the roundabout where vehicles leave Hopton Industrial Estate and frequently traffic tailing back onto the A361 to Marlborough. The quality of life in Devizes has deteriorated.
- There still appear to be some unused plots on Hopton Industrial Estate. In addition, housing was allowed on the Old Bureau West site because there was not enough interest in it's sole use for employment land.
- Where is the demand for employment?
- There are quite a few properties within my hamlet and nearest village owned by the Crown that have been empty for some time. Pressure needs to be exerted to bring these into occupation.
- The proposed employment site is less than 400m from the edge of the North Wessex Downs AONB. There does not appear to be any statement regarding the acceptability of the likely impact of the allocation on the AONB.
- In the absence of such an assessment (including comparisons with other locations), we advise that the strategy may be unsound in that this policy is unjustified, not having had due regard to the AONB. We recognise that the policy requires the development to provide landscape screening, but there is no information to demonstrate that screening is capable of adequately addressing the site's landscape impacts. We note and welcome the statement in the Site Selection topic paper that "a detailed landscape assessment of the sites will be completed." However, this assessment will be too late in the process to ensure that the site's impact is acceptable and is deliverable.
- 5.8.3 does recognise that past employment growth has tended to be small to medium businesses catering for local networks. Devizes is not known for having a good pool of highly educated or highly skilled labour, most local people work in relatively low paid service industries and local state education standards are perhaps adequate rather than first class.

- Devizes may well continue to attract a wide range of smaller industries, in the IT and specialist furniture manufacturing sectors say, but is unlikely to attract larger industries that rely on a good transport infrastructure. It is therefore not a good location for strategic employment growth to support a wider area
- We support Core Policy 12 (Spatial Strategy: Devizes Community Area) which seeks to support Devizes' role as a significant service centre providing jobs, homes and attractive retail opportunities within east Wiltshire.
- Support the identification of the town as a location for strategic employment growth which seeks to further diversify the existing employment offer in the town, ensuring that it remains an area of key economic importance in Wiltshire in the future.
- We support the identification of Devizes as a location for strategic employment growth and we are encouraged by the strategy to ensure that employment is not lost.
- We also support the acknowledgement that congestion on the local highway network is seen as a constraint to future growth and welcome the intention to upgrade junctions in parallel with future and committed housing sites.
- The Agency acknowledges the intention to provide 9.9ha of employment land and 2,150 dwellings in the community over the plan period (2006-2026). We would request that when the sites come forward for development that a comprehensive Transport Assessment (TA) and travel Plan (TP) form part of the planning submission. The HA will require a TA and TP before it can make any comment on the proposals.
- Object to 8.4 hectares being used as an employment site between A361 and the Hopton Industrial Estate because of the visual adverse impact of warehouse development on entering the historic town of Devizes.
- Propose Caine Hill or Nursteed and note that the Hopton Industrial Estate is not full.
- The strategy acknowledges that future development in the Devizes area must be employment led and that the town has the best prospects in Mid-Wilts for attracting further employment. However, the topic paper and the strategy document are inconsistent and lacking precision (an issue for the whole of the predictions for the county). The inconsistency relates to the paucity of land identified for development (Core Policy 12, table 5.13) - 8.5 hectares (915 000 sq feet) between the A361 and Horton Road and 1.5 hectares (160 000 sq ft) on Nursteed Road. Following the identification of this site as a potential waste management location, release for employment use by the land owner must be questionable. The lack of identification of any local skills sets which would be attractive to potential employers in Devizes, e.g. cabinet making and advanced wood-working, was disappointing, while declaring aspirations elsewhere for the development of biosciences, green technology and advanced engineering!
- Claims of good levels of education in the county are not matched by employer opinions, which suggest (still) and absence of numeracy and literacy, poor communication and presentations skills among young applicants. Meanwhile, the low level of unemployment in the community area masks the extent to which low/semi-skilled employment predominates.

3.18 Malmesbury

- Would like to see more local industry in and around Malmesbury
- There should be more clarity on the amount of employment land that should be identified in the community area. The level of employment growth proposed is not in line with the level of housing proposed.
- There should be more clarity on the type of employment that will be provided in the community area.
- Lucent Park should be identified as a Principal Employment Site.
- The term 'economic diversification' should be defined.
- More land is needed at Malmesbury as Dyson is located there.
- I believe this assessment of Malmesbury and surrounding area is broadly correct.
- The proposed diversification of the employment base is long overdue.
- Little to suggest that economic or employment challenges can be met locally. 1ha of land set aside for business development is view woefully short of the scale of economic development required to ensure newcomers to the town will have any hope of local employment.
- Currently the strategy will ensure Malmesbury continues to grow as a dormitory town from an economic and employment viewpoint whilst otally failing to deal with the challenges of taking an ancient town centre into the C21.

- The land allocated in the Plan to employment in Malmesbury is less than a third of that allocated to Wootton Bassett, for example, so more traffic will be generated by commuters from Malmesbury as they drive to work elsewhere - hardly consistent with a green agenda, and suggesting that Malmesbury is being regarded as a dormitory by Wilts Council. The conclusion must be that further expansion of this small market town is unsustainable. If more housing must be built, let it be after the necessary infrastructure has been planned.
- The Secondary School and Dyson are the main employers in the town but a large percentage of those employed do not live in or close to the Town. What is needed is an up to date survey to provide the real nature of employment in the Town, otherwise the presumptions and projections in the Core Strategy remain flawed.
- With growth in the economy currently stalled a much better evidence base is required to inform policy making.
- When you designate employment land are you planning (or able) to designate what types of employment? The kind of employment that is right for a large town is not right for a market town.
- Future commercial developments in Malmesbury should be sited in the centre of the town - making use of the station yard area for example, or expanding the existing coop store
- There are not enough jobs in the town,
- The post office sorting depot is closing
- Para 5.9.2. Dyson in Malmesbury is not a manufacturer and the workforce is radically different from that in a manufacturer.
- Since 2006, several employment sites have been reallocated as housing sites, e.g. Sussex Arms, Custom Transformers, Cowbridge, etc. Moreover, the original work-live units at Cowbridge in the development that replaced the employment site have been quietly dropped. In addition, the employment land on the A429, north of the Whychurch roundabout is no longer in the Plan. How does the Core Strategy turn words into deeds and reverse this trend?
- The need to encourage more employment (rather than instituting a dormitory town population that will be obliged to commute elsewhere (if there are any jobs in the area beyond the town).
- Malmesbury is not only a tourist attraction. It is also a place for living in.
- There is very little employment in our town for young people as well as older people.
- The area allocated for new employment opportunities is not specific enough and does not estimate numbers.
- There is a difference between 'out-commuting' to Bristol or London, and 'out-commuting' 6 miles into an adjacent county. The balance of the community is therefore influenced more by employment and services which are not within this Strategy. Our recent survey of the Oaksey residents revealed that 87% saw Cirencester as their main centre for local services and shopping. Strategies for this Malmesbury area may therefore be incorrectly skewed if this is not taken in to account.
- Employment: Apart from allocating land, it is not clear what the plan to develop increased high-value employment in the area actually is
- What types of future jobs are envisaged for the area, and how will they be generated? Can we not generate the jobs first, provide sensible public transport to them from places where housing is not under such pressure, and THEN revisit the possible development plans when there is more confidence that they are actually needed
- Surely the employment offered by Dysons has significantly decreased in recent years. 5.9.2 says "there is small employment here
- Malmesbury needs steady economic growth. A priority, before housing is considered, is to ensure support for such growth that will establish businesses in the area that can provide a range of jobs for local people and incomers. This will need land, premises and financial support.
- There are effectively false levels of employment figures due to the mass influx of Dyson employees on a daily basis. Dyson aside, Malmesbury is most definitely a dormitory town, forcing residents into their cars to commute elsewhere.
- See the importance of the promotion of tourism and particularly hotel space in Malmesbury as the gateway to the Cotswolds. There is a requirement for more to do in Malmesbury.
- The proposed plan is too restrictive on the development of Malmesbury's surrounding villages and the rural communities. These villages need to evolve and to develop within their existing framework and not just remain as they are in some sort of 'time warp'.
- Charlton Park Estate puts forward the following detailed proposals for inclusion in the Core Strategy: Employment Opportunities Employment opportunities and employment land. This should include the development of land for employment following on from the development of retail sites.

For example the land numbered 1 on the attached plan. Equally this area of land could be identified for a hotel or leisure use. The estate has numerous redundant buildings and farmsteads - it is much better to develop sites than allow them to fall into disrepair and to provide employment or living accommodation to allow the rural areas to thrive and evolve. We would refer particularly to: Brokenborough Farm, Brokenborough. Brook Farm, Hankerton. Buildings within Charlton Park.

3.19 Marlborough

- Why is there no employment land at Marlborough or Cricklade?
- The Marlborough and Pewsey Community Areas have a zero allocation - this seems unfair - development is very heavily biased towards the west and central parts of Wiltshire despite (or because of) the huge amounts of building already undertaken. Could it not be more evenly spread?
- The Wilts & Berks Canal will provide employment and economic benefits in many locations along the route - as the Kennet & Avon does already. 5. In some areas it will offer an attractive asset to residential developments . These benefits cover several of the strategic objectives included in the document. Please give some recognition of the importance of the protection and restoration of the route
- he Council should include a strategic site allocation on "land west of Salisbury Road , Marlborough " [1] as part of the policy for delivering growth at the town. The site has potential for up to 230 dwellings plus a range of other uses as part of a mixed use scheme.
- lthough Marlborough is not identified for new strategic employment growth this seems to ignore the possibilities of home working via the internet and the improved Broadband.

3.20 Melksham

- Town Council supports identification of Melksham as location for strategic employment growth
- Link road between the A350 and Bowerhill industrial estate is key factor in promoting additional employment opportunities (Town Council).
- Concern that development strategy for Melksham is a work in progress, particularly with regard to identification of employment land, as only 4 ha identified
- Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Strategy recommends that 12.6 ha of employment land should be provided in Melksham – why is only 4 ha identified?
- Concern about small amount of employment land identified – not enough and not in line with neighbouring settlements
- All existing land used commercially should be protected for employment uses
- Cooper Tyres site in town centre should be protected for employment use
- Concern that allowing employment development towards the east of Melksham is as likely to attract workers from Trowbridge as from Melksham
- Concern about lack of substance as to how Wiltshire Council will develop employment.
- Further strategic employment land should be allocated to the south of Melksham, with good access to the A350.
- 7.5 ha site at Upside Park is unsuitable for development solely for employment purposes: designation as Principal Employment Area should be deleted or amended to mixed use.
- Objection to more employment as this will generate more heavy traffic, and the traffic strategy outlined is insufficient to cope with this.
- Question about type of employment to be provided.
- Emphasis should be placed on regenerating established employment sites prior to new development
- A strategic site should be identified to the south of Melksham
- The Highcroft Farm site (8.98 ha immediately to the south of Melksham town boundary) should be included in Core Policy 15.
- Land to the north of the A3102 (Sandridge Common) should be allocated for future development in Melksham.
- The potential to enlarge the East Melksham Strategic Site to the south should be investigated. This would offer the opportunity to secure key highway and sustainable linkages at Melksham.
- Development on the other side of the A3102 is an obvious logical progression from the east of Melksham and could help finance more of a future Melksham Eastern Bypass
- The Town Council supports the restoration of the Wilts & Berks Canal in principle

3.21 Pewsey

- The Marlborough and Pewsey Community Areas have a zero allocation - this seems unfair - development is very heavily biased towards the west and central parts of Wiltshire despite (or because of) the huge amounts of building already undertaken. Could it not be more evenly spread?
- Rural employment area-reference the Manningford Bohune Estate industrial units/employment area. It should be stated in the consultation document or plan that this employment area is confined to its existing boundaries in order to maintain the amenity of the residential. Areas/does not detract from the amenity of the residential area including visual intrusion, character/appearance and landscape impact, traffic or access implications, noise, disturbance, and other environmental effects, only the re-use of suitable existing rural buildings permitted (eg existing footprint only). With modest extensions (limited ancillary, eg minor extensions in terms of scale and impact to existing buildings). Use in this industrial area should be restrict to light industrial (as as present) and only during normal working hours.
- Pewsey will benefit from additional development which will provide employment and housing to meet market demand. Promotion of suitable sites located adjacent to the existing urban area is supported. It is suggested that 100-150 new homes be realistic at Pewsey within the plan period. Land at Milton Road/Dursden lane could provide a suitable location for this. (See attached plan)

3.22 RAF Lyneham

- CP24 – What use can be made of the Lyneham Base for Employment land?

3.23 Tidworth

- The old vehicle depot is potentially very important for the local economy as Castledown Business Park will not sustain the local employment needs on its own if the land beyond Empress Way and the vehicle depot were to be sold for housing. It must, therefore, be at least a mixed development or just industrial. Both areas can only be looked at as a joint venture as singularly they will worsen Ludgershall's road problems. Moving to Tidworth itself, if the MOD does not require site 19 for housing, this should be a reserve housing site for civilian growth in the town.
- The most important aspect is to create substantial local employment in Ludgershall as we cannot rely on Andover or Amesbury providing increased employment needs for the area.
- The Castledown Business Park must be developed to accommodate labour intensive businesses.
- Whilst we note the reference to the low concentration of employment sites, it should also be noted that the Castledown Business Park is significantly under utilised and has capacity to accommodate substantial growth.
- There should be policy support to new development which will help support the future phases of employment development at Castledown Business Park;
- It should be recognised that to reach a balanced military and civilian community; fulfil the current housing requirement c 1200 private houses; that more employment land may be required. To cover the longer term it would be sensible to start to identify potential employment land now.
- Tidworth/Ludgershall is not identified as a location for new strategic employment growth and would encourage any employment proposals in the town to contribute to self containment. We are pleased to note that where housing and employment growth have been mentioned that one of the objectives is to reduce out commuting. The Agency acknowledges the intention to provide 12ha of employment land, the supporting of Principal Employment Areas and 1,900 dwellings in the community over the plan period (2006-2026).

3.24 Trowbridge

- The business community is missing from Trowbridge town centre and is perceived as a 'bit of a dump'.
- It is clear that land at Bradford Road, has remained undeveloped over the local plan period and should not be retained in line with PPS3 and PPS4. Site owners have advised that the scheme is not viable.
- 5.3.2 The proposed development areas do not, to my mind, constitute truly mixed development, which should be provided to be most effectively sustainable. You should revisit the definition of these areas and mix the development up a little.
- Support policy to strengthen the role of Trowbridge as an employment, administration and strategic service centre

- Brownfield sites - Bowyers industry & employment near transport links and in town to support town centre business. Peter Blacks - Riverside leisure development. Cinema, bars and restaurants around park. Visitors would again support town centre business and the area would be easier to police if not fragmented around Trowbridge.
- Policy 6 the Council should be aiming to encourage businesses into the town by using derelict and old industrial sites to build office blocks and affordable housing for business employees. This would also bring customers into the Trowbridge shops and cafes that are closing because there are so few workers in the town centre during the day.
- This is pure wishful thinking wrapped up in consultancy jargon. Where is the analysis that shows what type of firms could be attracted & why? Of course development will be permitted on brownfield sites. The fact is they have been empty for years & this strategy does nothing to change that.
- If we apparently need so much (...?) let us develop all the Brown Field sites first
- In reality, the focus of business development has changed dramatically over the past two to three decades thus negating any connection with the past. Likewise, although Trowbridge has been a centre of local government for many years, the move to a Unitary Wiltshire Council and the major cut-backs in spending forced by the current economic climate will reduce the public sector employment in the town. Indeed, given the need for the closure and/or refurbishment of Council facilities, it is not obvious why Trowbridge should continue as a centre for local government business.
- Looking at recent evidence indicates that, for whatever reason, Trowbridge does not appear to be a natural choice for the development of high tech /professional business.
- The White Horse Business Park, which is an excellent example of an environmentally and ecologically designed environment, is suffering massively from business closure and job losses, and many premises are now vacant. It is not clear whether improvements to the town centre and to educational and medical facilities will reverse this trend. Certainly, the solution is not to build yet more residential houses in the area until real demand necessitates it.
- Indeed, it could be argued that a better strategy would be to re-designate Trowbridge as a market town, limit its growth, and focus on quality rather than on quantity.
- It is argued therefore, that much of the growth intended for Trowbridge should be directed towards Chippenham, and that some local government activities could be transferred to Chippenham or Salisbury.
- I was amazed to see the amount of housing and employment growth proposed for North and West Wiltshire! particular concern is the disproportionate amount of development shown on the very valuable green fields between Trowbridge and the villages of West Ashton, Yarnbrook and North Bradley.
- Idea of "Bigger is Better" hasn't worked in the past with Trowbridge, and it certainly wont work in the future!
- Good Town Planning would concentrate on regenerating the town centre and developing the many brownfield sites in and around Trowbridge.
- Wiltshire is a beautiful county and between 1996 and 2010 nearly 10,000 dwellings were built in the West Wiltshire area, an area which councillors still refer to as rural. If these properties have not encouraged new business into Trowbridge why is there the idea that an even bigger development will. We have empty buildings on the White Horse Business Park and other Business Parks in the area, brown fill sites within Trowbridge and surrounding area
- key feature that must be included is a requirement to place greater emphasis on identifying and developing brown field sites for housing and employment opportunities in and around Trowbridge instead of proposing such developments on existing green field sites.
- Brown field sites must be developed before any further encroachment on greenfield sites. There are enough empty units for industrial/office units as there is without building more on greenfield sites. Develop within the area that makes up Trowbridge rather than develop on our countryside.
- There are currently a number of vacant commercial sites in and around Trowbridge and so the provision of 30ha of commercial land seems excessive and unnecessary. On what basis has the figure of 30ha been derived? The conversion of large quantities of green space into housing cannot be allowed to proceed until the centre of Trowbridge is much improved. This includes the old Tesco site, the Peter Black site and the Bowyer site. Once improved, Trowbridge will become a more attractive place to live in and any future residential development will be more lucrative for the developer as Trowbridge will be a more desirable town to live in. However until that point is reached any green space development must be placed on hold for the benefit of all concerned.

- We urgently need more jobs in this area.
- Points 1-18 sound desirable when taken together, but one wonders where the necessary resources will come from, to bring all this about, unless priority is given to them.
- How can the Principal Employment Areas be supported?
- There should be no site specific proposals for housing or employment development in greenfield areas for either Bradford on Avon or Trowbridge included in the core strategy, pending the evolution of Neighbourhood plans.
- The proposals to the South East of Trowbridge would have a negative impact on the town-until relatively recently the area was ancient woodland and it should be used to provide growth space for the inhabitants.
- Many industrial units are already available for sale or rent. Concentrate on filling up these and developing brownfield sites only.
- There are already empty units in the White Horse Park and Virgin and Vodaphone are moving to another location. Surely it would make sense to fill these existing units rather than building new ones.
- Why all these houses when there is no employment in the area
- Already enough business parks. Two major employers leaving one of them, so ample office space available there.
- Why more houses? There are no jobs. White Horse Business park already underused- why build more?
- The Core Strategy fails to make adequate employment land provision for Trowbridge, failing to meet the Draft RSS requirement.
- Core Strategy provides little evidence that the strategic allocation at Ashton Park is deliverable and that a five year supply of employment can be provided.
- The sites immediately to the south and west of White Horse Business Park are available and deliverable now and would provide much needed employment land within the short term. They are both well related to the built-up area, are easily accessible and would provide a natural and logical extension to White Horse Business Park. The market interest for both sites has been significant, in particular the land to the west, which has generated interest from Hitachi Capital (UK) PLC who are an important local employer within the town. If they are unable to relocate to this site then they will have to move away from the town.
- The Core Strategy needs to address the short term requirements for employment land within the district (not just the longer term) and allocate smaller sites that can contribute to overall supply and reduce the shortfall over the next five years. Waiting for the Council to adopt their Site allocations DPD is not an option.
- Whilst there remains uncertainty in the level of employment land that is required (see footnote 16 to Core Policy 7) and that is deliverable, then all potential employment sites should be re-considered by the Council, including those to the south and west of White Horse Business Park.
- Trowbridge is a town of strategic significance. It requires a 'fit for purpose' portfolio of employment sites, if it is to remain central to achieving the objectives of the Core Strategy. The allocation of smaller employment sites within the town is therefore entirely justified. (see attached documents for further comments and supporting information)
- Object to building on Greenfield sites surrounding Trowbridge and villages
- We believe that the " brown field" sites within the town should be re-developed with new leisure facilities and businesses before green field sites are considered for use.
- I object to the provision of 30 ha of employment land and 5860 homes on the outskirts of Trowbridge as shown in Core Policy 2 and hinted at in Map 5.5.
- Trowbridge transport links are inadequate to allow the development of a quality business area which will attract viable long term employment. Such investment would better and more profitably be carried out in the M4 corridor or near the A303.
- There are existing sites in and around Trowbridge which would satisfy a reduced demand:
- There are half a dozen business parks already in existence within 5 miles of Trowbridge, most of which have both vacancies and plots yet to be developed. The environmental consequences of business are more easily dealt with near major transport links. The A350 is not such a link. Trowbridge has declined in importance, partly for unavoidable economic and geographic reasons and partly because of bad management. The bad management can be put right at a cost but the economic and geographic reasons are permanent land should be recognised.
- There are so many derelict industrial sites in Trowbridge already (the old Tesco site, Peter Black's, Bowyers, sites in Mortimer St, Court St and Castle St, as well as all the empty units and

sites on the White Horse Business Park in North Bradley. Where will the takers be for the proposed new developments.

- The Parish Council strongly disagree with the statement that the land proposed for development to the South East of Trowbridge is relatively unconstrained - the proposed residential allocation of 2650 dwellings, and 30 hectares of employment land would be located in the vicinity of two Ancient Woodlands –
- Your plans to develop yet more housing and infill between West Ashton and Yarnbrook we strongly oppose:- a) There should be no more development on green field sites. b) There are still many brown field sites which should be developed for residential for example:- the former Peter Black site & Tesco's site to mention just a few. c) There is insufficient employment in the area to support yet more residential development.
- Business parks not needed. In the existing business parks there is plenty of space free. Massive housing estates not needed. Paxcroft Mead was developed outside the County Structure Plan. Trowbridge needs the green area surrounds. Development up to the surrounding woodlands would be disastrous.
- We don't need a business park on West Ashton Road. You will ruin the only decent part of Trowbridge.
- West Ashton Road area is a sought after 'residential' area you will ruin it with a business park. Beautiful natural area abundant wildlife will be destroyed.
- Before we ruin any more countryside we should pull down all the disused buildings in the centre and surrounding areas.
- Attention should be given to making use of the brownfield sites in Trowbridge. Using these sites for dwellings, offices and leisure purposes would revive the centre, with a beneficial effect on businesses already in situ, and attracting new business into an area which desperately needs more people, if the quality of Trowbridge is to be improved. In particular, the proposal for a business park on the West Ashton Road would harm the environment, as well as building over green fields and necessitating upgrading of roads - and possibly the building of new roads to the E. of Trowbridge, which will lead to more traffic congestion and pollution, and will use up irreplaceable countryside. Far better to make better use of existing business areas such as the Riverway area and the vacant accommodation in the White Horse Park.
- I would like to register my disapproval to build yet more houses and business premises on the green fields between Trowbridge and West Ashton. We have so many brown sites in Trowbridge,
- Employment land and jobs created in out of town sites such as West Ashton Road in Trowbridge will not necessarily improve the town centre and are not necessarily creating jobs for Trowbridge residents.
- The Agency welcomes the proposed employment and residential development within Trowbridge, however where possible this should be directed towards Brownfield land. We are encouraged to see that improvements to the A350 particularly at Yarnbrook and West Ashton and a sustainable transport solution to through town traffic are identified as being essential infrastructure.
- OBJECT The employment and housing allocations are excessive. The justification for these allocations has not been made. The scale of development proposed should be reduced to a level providing organic growth.
- The Trowbridge Community Area Strategy is, in our view, seriously flawed in regard to the proposed large scale development at South-East Trowbridge. Since the original outline permission was granted, the economic and employment situations have both changed considerably.
- There are vacant brown field sites in Trowbridge where development can be undertaken to advantage.
- Trowbridge is losing employers -eg Focus and Vodaphone, and the White Horse Business Park is nowhere near full.
- There is no infrastructure in Trowbridge, which makes it unattractive to quality employers and employees. There is: a) No hospital, no cinema, no large scale up-market non-food retailers, no entertainment, and the only good restaurant is about to move out.
- The greenfield site currently provides a much needed buffer zone between Trowbridge and nearby villages.
- The decision not to build the Westbury bypass has meant that traffic builds up along the A350.
- There is an internationally important rare bat colony in the woodland next to the proposed site.

3.25 Warminster

- Confirms that 18.06 acres of land at Folly Lane, Warminster is available for development.

- There is support for 6 hectares of employment land for Warminster but the plan has omitted land at 44 & 48 Bath Road which was previously included. We refer you to the information presented to you on the initial consultation made on the 31st December 2009 reference ID1893 which remains valid. It is necessary to resolve the conflict between the existing residential use of the above properties with the adverse impact created by the industrial use at Crusader Park by allowing the employment use to take over the land in question. We ask for the land in question to be re-allocated as land for employment use. The area of land can be deducted from the 6 hectares (table 5.24) allocated to employment on the other side of Bath Road. The area of land is approximately 1.7 hectares in size with an access mid way on the western boundary. We ask for this land to be taken into the employment development land already planned and outlined in red on the above copy of the same plan. An 'Ecotech' type of business park with small workshops, offices or maybe live/work units would be well supported in Warminster, as would the opportunity to create owner occupiers.
- We support the identification of Warminster as a principal location for increasing levels of housing, employment, retail and service provision
- The Agency welcomes the delivery of sustainable employment growth opportunities alongside an appropriate mix of housing which will help improve the self containment of the town.
- Confirm our support in general for the Warminster Community Area Strategy
- Core Policy 18 - largely supported but considered to be inappropriately worded in some areas. Hannick Homes and Developments Ltd notes that the early delivery of employment land is a key issue as set out in paragraph 5.17.4. Given the inability of the allocated site to deliver such uses, it is suggested that the early delivery of the identified 6ha employment site with commensurate residential development of up to 500 units should be prioritised within Core Policy 18.

3.26 Westbury

- Priority must be given to development of the Station Road site (H14). WTC agrees in principle with the de-allocation of the employment site at Station Road providing any existing employment use is retained and protected.
- Accepts that expansion of H 14 for additional housing will help enable delivery of the bridge over the Westbury avoiding line and provision of a distributor road connection to the station and on to Station Road; basically supports that any additional sites for residential development can only be brought forward if allocated in a community led Neighbourhood Plan.
- The roads leading to this site are not good enough to take any extra traffic, they are already over-used. Furthermore, what about all the empty buildings on West Wilts Trading Estate, the area of some of these is enough to house a complete business park. There is also un-developed land on West Wilts Trading Estate. Why is it necessary to open-up green-belt land when an adjacent trading estate is degenerating, with such large buildings empty.
- I strongly suggest that members of any planning committee should take a trip to the Trading Estate and look around.
- The Fund considers that Westbury can accommodate significantly greater employment and residential development than is identified in Core Policy 19.
- considers that the West Wiltshire Trading Estate should be identified as a 'Strategic Employment Site'.
- The Fund supports the identification of land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge as a 'Strategic Employment Allocation' and considers that it should be extended to include all that land to the south, between Mill Lane and the railway line. This will give a critical mass of development which would be sufficient to bring forward the necessary infrastructure to open up the site for development.
- Westbury Area view; to designate that the land south of Hawkeridge village, to the east of the B3097, to its boundary with the dismantled railway as a rural buffer to be protected from development and encroachment from the West Wilts Trading Estate. and to support the 10 landscape character assessments (LCA's) in support of the current Special Landscape Areas (SLA's).
- Westbury is fast becoming an annex of Trowbridge. This is not what the people of Westbury want.
- Object to allocation of new employment land at Mill Lane Hawkeridge.
- I object to employment land at Mill Lane Hawkeridge. This is an unsustainable location on GREEN FIELD LAND.
- The following recommendations were approved at Westbury Town Council's Highways, Planning & Development committee meeting held on Monday 18th July 2011: 1) Proposed allocation of Employment Land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge -Any development should: be for high quality

employment uses only (ie: not open storage, warehousing, scrap/recycling or any heavy industrial use etc.) provide a proper road junction on to Hawkeridge Road, preferably a roundabout; and must include high quality landscaping to the perimeter.

- Object to employment land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge. This is an area of green space and should not be transformed into an industrial estate, especially as there are many empty premises on the existing estates in Westbury.
- Object to the proposal of employment land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge. As a first port of call the many empty units on the West Wilts Trading Estate and White Horse Business Park should be looked at and restored to a usable condition to encourage employment in an already developed area before building yet another 'trading estate' on green field land.
- Concerned that the new employment site at Hawkeridge will result in loss of open space and further blurring of town boundaries, ending up with one huge industrial park from Westbury to Trowbridge.
- Why has there been the de-allocation of an employment site near the station- why cannot this site be used instead.
- Object to employment land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge. The proposed development surrounds our family home at Hawkeridge Farm and is on green field land. The area is residential and will negatively affect all the residents of Mill Lane and Hawkeridge. Our house is Grade 2 listed and would surely be devalued as a result of such a development. Having restored our home at great expense over the past 20 years, we would expect considerable compensation if this was to go ahead.
- In the 37 years our business has been on the West Wilts Trading Estate, it has NEVER been filled to capacity. Surely this estate could be improved as was promised in years gone by with the removal of Nissen huts and better workshops provided without building yet another estate. The four units at the top of Mill Lane mistakenly created as a result of so called "diversification" have never been even 50% occupied and are currently ALL empty. Even the barn-like office, strangely passed by council planning and newly built recently is now EMPTY. So who are these businesses that will fill another 30 acre business park?? Would this be new employment or simply the relocation of existing employment ultimately achieving nothing.
- Look at the Whitehorse Business Park which has recently lost Virgin and Vodafone. Do we really need another half used business park in West Wiltshire? Traffic would be increased and yet we still have no bypass.
- Object to the allocation of 14.7 hectares of land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge as employment land. This site did not form part of the spatial growth options promoted in the WWDC Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper (December 2007) and we believe that the case for allocating such a significant area of additional employment land in the Westbury Community Area has not been adequately justified.
- In order to support the Wiltshire Core Strategy's spatial vision for "a much more sustainable pattern of development" (Paragraph 3.1, Page 17), the methodology used to calculate the potential employment land contributions should recognise and follow the amount of housing to be identified in the Core Strategy in other similar towns viz. 1,088 additional dwellings and 6 ha of additional employment land at Warminster, and 736 additional dwellings and 4ha of additional employment land at Melksham. On that basis at Westbury, where the number of additional dwellings to be identified is 499, there should be no more than a pro-rata provision of about 2.7 ha of additional employment land. Otherwise, the excess allocation of employment land at Westbury merely encourages "out commuting" from Warminster and Melksham (and indeed elsewhere). c.
- Rather than there being a shortage of employment land at Westbury, there is in fact an adequate amount already available. In the West Wilts Trading Estate (WWTE) in Heywood Parish and the nearby Northacre Trading Estate (NTE) (in the town of Westbury) this is evidenced by the long term vacancy of large sites (such as "The Comet Site") and other areas not yet taken up, and the current trend for further large areas to be taken over by vehicle breaking enterprises that are in reality no more than open storage scrapyards
- The strategic allocation of land at Mill Lane, Hawkeridge will provide 14.7ha of employment land and we are encouraged that as part of this effective public transport links should be provided into Westbury town centre.

3.27 Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

- Need new employment sites out of control of 1 landowner
- Business development allocated to the community area should be increased as it seems to provide an ideal site, certainly better than Trowbridge

- Make clearer in the text that Wiltshire Council cannot directly create jobs but has to rely on the private sector to do so.
- Why is there no employment land at Marlborough or Cricklade?
- We wish to see inclusion of the Thames and Severn Canal in the last bullet point of 5.20.9, without which the restoration of the Wilts & Berks Canal will not be fully effective.
- Cricklade PC - The lack of emphasis on tourism, in the current document the emphasis is still very much on Wootton Bassett in terms of new housing and employment land.
- Core Policy 20 Wootton Bassett After "business park" add new sentence "Jobs must be provided before any further housing comes forward in Wootton Bassett." The number of jobs needed must be set out, ensuring there is no continuing imbalance."
- The jobs lost due to the closure of Lyneham are mainly highly skilled ones and there are no similar jobs available in the area making relocation highly likely. Any jobs generated in Wootton Bassett will almost certainly be of the unskilled warehouse type and most of the people employed will be unable to afford to buy a house, and therefore it is more than likely that if any of the vacant or new properties are sold they would be purchased by commuters.
- Suggested Changes to Core Policy 1. Recognise that building more houses in the Area will only result in more commuting since most jobs created will be low paid ones. 2. There are no jobs available in Wootton Bassett of any kind, e.g. a minimum wage job for a part time shop assistant attracted over 100 applicants. Also Swindon cannot at present provide any employment opportunities.
- After "business park" add new sentence "Jobs must be provided before any further housing comes forward in Wootton Bassett." The number of jobs needed must be set out, ensuring there is no continuing imbalance."
- 5.20.4 - The proposal to locate strategic employment growth at Wootton Bassett is welcomed as it has the potential to reduce commuting into Swindon and could stem the increase in traffic on Swindon's road system. Given the close proximity of the two settlements, it must also be recognised that it has the potential to have the opposite effect if significant new jobs are taken up by Swindon residents, particularly if this employment land competes with the offer in Swindon. However, the intention is supported as it meets sustainability objectives.
- Wootton Bassett is identified as a strategic location for employment growth; in order to support the growth we consider that there is a need for further new housing, as if this does not keep in step with new jobs then this could constrain economic growth.
- Welcomes the strategic employment growth. However we would want to ensure that as far as possible this did not bring about increased in commuting via the M4. All schemes will need to give full consideration to the impact of traffic upon the SRN including junction 16 of the M4.

3.28 South Wiltshire

- UKLF, Wilton should be sold as a University of Wessex.

3.29 Analysis of responses

This section identifies what areas / options could be considered for amendment as a result of the consultation. In addition since the draft WCS was published further local evidence has been compiled with respect to the economy in Wiltshire that is summarised in the re-drafted topic paper and this work has informed any amended options now being proposed in this next section together with the consultation responses. This updated evidence should cover some concerns expressed by representors about the quality of the evidence base to inform the Wiltshire Core Strategy including: economy evidence is either scant or out of date, what is the rationale behind the sizes of proposed employment land allocations, information on which is new land and what is existing land, looking in more detail at the needs of existing business, and representing agriculture in more detail.

3.30 General

- Strengthen commitment to secure employment (particularly high skilled / creative) in town centres
- Promote establishment of and provide support for employment clustering
- Protect existing employment uses
- Explore ex-MOD sites for economic potential especially when adjacent to settlements
- Consideration should also be given to the opportunity for some additional employment in suitable rural areas.

3.31 Evidence base

- Evidence base is scant or out of date
- Need better evidence base.

3.32 Green economy

- Green economy should be defined.

3.33 Tourism

- Strengthening SO1 in respect to tourism, it does not highlight the added value that tourism jobs provided across Wiltshire.
- Cotswold Water Park provides economic and tourism benefits that is not mentioned in the CS.
- Restoration of the Wilts and Berks Canal would have beneficial impact.
- No detail on tourism - this is needed.
- Devizes Marina should be specifically recognised.
- WCS should support measures that promote tourism throughout the county including improved as well as new tourism facilities and attractions and the provision of a range of good quality accommodation including hotels.
- Should be a section on tourism in the Cs.
- Should be a tourism topic paper
- WCS should have tourism policies that cover those in the Local plans,

3.34 Employment space

- Need to provide for small businesses

3.35 Sectors

- No reference to those employed by the armed forces, farming and agriculture
- Wiltshire does not qualify for advanced technologies and knowledge based enterprise

3.36 Core Policy 21

- Widen policy so not just focussed on main settlements
- Ensure that certain areas such as inward investment or start-up businesses are also welcome.
- Encourage small scale rural employment on PDS (here or CP25)
- Include reference to AONB.
- Need to acknowledge that some existing employment sites are subject to redevelopment proposals elsewhere
- Provision implies that additional employment land will be the exception not the norm and it should be amended so it is the norm.
- Ensure CP21 and 22 tie **u** and complement each other not contradict each other

- CP21 is trying to support existing businesses and enable expansion and modernisation within Wiltshire, but it doesn't really achieve this. It needs to emphasise how important business is and to meet unforeseen demand from existing employees whilst meeting other policies of the CS / LP.

3.37 Core Policy 22

- Ensure links to requirements of sustainable construction
- Ensure based on up to date evidence
- Ensure policy is in line with PPS4 and NPPF – restricting the uses to B1, B2 and B8 is inflexible and contrary to PPS4 including para EC12.1 of PPS4 and para 113 of NPP and para 75
- Possible option to add 'in circumstances where historic employment allocations in previous Local Plans, or unimplemented planning permissions have not been taken up and where viability evidence can demonstrate that the inclusion of an element of non-employment development is essential to deliver the allocation as a mixed-use scheme comprising employment and compatible non-employment uses.
- Look at possibility of combining policies that address economic development rather than additional or existing employment sites.
- Remove references to B uses or include wider forms of employment generating activity
- Provide list of key sites
- Be positive towards all economic uses

3.38 Core Policy 23

- Strengthen policy and name specific settlements where relevant, together with specific visions
- Regeneration should be prioritised rather than supported
- Town centre brownfields sites should be actively encouraged for housing and employment
- Widen CP23 to include all PDL not just that in town centres.
- rephrase as follows: "Regeneration of brownfield sites will be prioritised in the principal settlements and market towns, where the proposed uses help to create sustainable employment, and help to deliver the overall vision for that town and/or enhance its vitality and viability."
- There are also regeneration opportunities in smaller centers to support the rural economy.
- Corsham – allocate sands quarry.

3.39 Core Policy 24

Analysed within Topic Paper 15: Military Issues

3.40 Core Policy 25

- Include reference to biodiversity
- Include reference to AONB
- Policy should be more flexible and acknowledge that some sites will not be viable to be in accordance with PPS4.
- Expand CP25 so it addresses the economic potential of rural areas (farm diversification, home working, recreation, tourism, green tech etc).
- Make it a clear policy on rural development
- Policy is more general diversification of the rural economy rather than farm diversification.
- Fails to recognise the importance of economic development to the welfare of rural communities.
- Enhance tourism element of rural economy, including accommodation and facilities
- Ensure diversification policy is in line with PPS7.
- Denies reuse of existing rural buildings for any purpose other than employment.

3.41 Employment strategy in the community areas

Although this looks at identifying amendments to the WCS in terms of the economy, this also gives the general feeling from consultation feedback whether too much, too little or about right amount of employment land has been identified. However, employment levels within the main settlements has been suggested in the options later based on both consultation responses and more up to date local evidence prepared recently.

3.42 Bradford on Avon community area

- Change wording referencing principal employment areas to make it clear that loss of employment will be resisted.
- Consider option of allocation at Land North of Holt Road
- Kingston Far is for an existing employer and is therefore not additional employment land with cope for their expansion
- State 'development is expected to deliver' rather than 'development must deliver'
- Provide workshops
- Increase amount of employment.

3.43 Calne

- Station road is no longer an industrial estate – it should be removed as a from Principal Employment Areas
- Inconsistency identifying Calne for strategic employment and then limiting housing.
- Phase employment first
- Calne could accommodate more development
- Consolidate and improve existing facilities and infrastructure before agreeing any new development
- More impetus on improving and developing the tourist industry in Calne, enhance area around Castlefields Canal
- Do not support additional employment land there is land already allocated
- Recognise that other developments outside of the B1/2/8 use class can provide a significant number of jobs, including care homes.

3.44 Chippenham

- Do not allocate employment land around Chippenham
- Allocating over 90% employment land at Showell Farm is misguided
- Confusion over Langley Park should be ironed out it is a key area for redevelopment not
- Consider extending existing employment site at Kingston Park, Kingston Langley
- Showell farm has a useable area much less than 28 ha
- Commuting data is now 10 years out of date
- Develop all brownfield sites before green field
- There is no demand for business to locate to Chippenham
- Showell farm is un-researched, unpopular and untested.

3.45 Corsham

- 10 ha is needed at Corsham rather than 3 ha
- Spring Park should be included of sites to reflect its status
- Sands Quarry, Westwells roads should be allocated there is currently an outline planning application submitted for B1, B2 and B8.
- Tourism is very important to the Corsham area
- Allocation of just 3.3ha at Corsham is inadequate and should be increased substantially
- Do not squeeze Lacock by development at Chippenham Corsham and Melksham

3.46 Devizes

- Ensure proximity of AONB to land between A361 and Horton road is considered
- Need further landscape work to justify allocation which is acknowledged in the site selection paper but this evidence will be too late
- Identify demand for employment

3.47 Malmesbury

- Would like to see more local industry
- Lucent Park should be identified as a Principal employment site
- 1ha is woefully short required to ensure newcomers
- Define economic diversification
- Use station yard for employment
- Dyson in Malmesbury does not manufacture now
- Malmesbury is not just a tourist attraction

- Jobs should be phased first
- Important to promote tourism in Malmesbury and particularly hotel space, Malmesbury as the gateway to the Cotswolds.
- Too restrictive on the development of Malmesbury's surrounding villages.
- Charlton Park estate promotes a few sites for employment as well as redundant farm buildings – particular Brokenborough Farm, Brook Farm, Hankerton, Charlton Park.

3.48 Marlborough

- Why is there no employment land in Marlborough
- Protection and restoration of canal route is important
- Include land West of Salisbury road

3.49 Melksham

- Not enough employment land identified, why only 4 ha??
- Cooper tyres site should be protected for employment
- 7.5 ha site at Upside park is unsuitable for development solely for employment purposes
- Identify a strategic site to the south of Melksham
- Including Highcroft Farm (8.98 ha) to the south of Melksham.
- Potential to enlarge the east of Melksham strategic site
- Support restoration of the Wilts an Berks canal

3.50 Pewsey

- Unfair to have a zero allocation of employment
- Manningford Bohune Estate should be confined to its existing boundaries and restricted to light industrial
- Pewsey would benefit from additional development which will provide employment and housing to meet market demand

3.51 Tidworth

- Castledown business park must be developed to accommodate labour intensive businesses
- Help support the future phases of Castledown.
- More employment land may be required.

3.52 Trowbridge

- The business community is missing from Trowbridge Town Centre.
- Bradford road has not been developed and should not be retained in line with PPS3 and PPS4
- Encourage businesses into the town by using derelict and old industrial sites to build office blocks
- Where is the analysis that shows what type of firms could be attracted and why?
- Brownfield sites in the town centre first.
- High tech and professional services does not seem to be a natural choice in Trowbridge.
- White Horse Park is suffering massively from business closure, do not need more employment land until there is real demand
- Direct growth to Chippenham and public sector to Chippenham and Salisbury
- Lack of evidence on deliverability for Ashton Park
- Put forward site to the south and west of the White Horse Business park
- Use smaller sites in the town centre.
- Jobs on out of town sites will not improve the town centre

3.53 Warminster

- 18 acres at Folly Lane is available
- Plan omitted land at 44 – 48 Bath road that was previously included
- Allocated site in CP18 cannot deliver the employment first should be alongside 500 of the homes.

3.54 Wesbury

- Agree with de-allocation of employment site at station road providing any existing employment is retained and protected
- Empty buildings on west Wilts trading estate is enough to house a complete business park
- Do not open up green land when the adjacent trading estate is degenerating

- Westbury can accommodate more employment land
- Extend proposed allocation to include all land to the south
- Area around Hawkeridge should be designated as a rural buffer to be protected from development and encroachment from the West Wilts trading estate.
- Westbury is becoming an annex to Trowbridge
- Hawkeridge should only have high quality business units
- Do not allocate the proposed Hawkeridge site due to impact on Hawkeridge village / farm and grade 2 listed buildings
- West Wilts trading estate is not full so we do not need more employment land at Westbury
- Pro-rata compared to other settlements in the CS if you look at the amount of proposed development Westbury has been allocated far too much employment land.

3.55 Wootton Bassett and Cricklade

- Increase business development allocated
- Need new employment outside of the control of the 1 landowner.
- Include reference to the Thames and Severn Canal in the last bullet of 5.20.9
- Needs to be an emphasis of tourism especially for Cricklade
- Jobs need to come before housing.

4.0 Follow-up work required as result of consultation

- 4.1 The updated evidence through the Roger Tym Employment Land Review has informed the updated options put forward below. A summary of key new evidence is provided within the Topic Paper 8: Economy and where detail of where employment land in community areas has changed is detailed below. In some instances the employment land options diverge away from the Employment Land Review. The Roger Tym evidence is based on a predominantly statistical analysis of need, divergence tends to be associated with more local knowledge, strategies and aims or greater functional understanding locally. This is explained within the main topic paper.
- 4.2 Beyond this little additional employment work appears to be needed, however some work is necessary that pulls together and makes it clear the evidence used to identify the employment sites.

5.0 The identification of possible revised options for this topic area

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
1	Introduce policy to encourage and facilitate tourism within Wiltshire together with strengthening tourism within Strategic Objective 1	Yes, consultation responses together with up to date evidence through the south west tourism's 'Value of Tourism in Wiltshire' survey. Tourism is also identified as a key sector in the Swindon and Wiltshire LEP proposal	Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17 (economy and enterprise).	Unless specifically identifies land and sites, that the option does not, it is unlikely to have a significant effect.	In line with the GPG on Tourism, PPS4, however PPS4 does direct such uses to town centres in the first instance. For tourist development PPS4 advises LPAs to support tourist development ideally in existing buildings where outside of settlements but where justified in other locations, subject to impact on landscape and of statutory designations. NPPF provides support for sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural businesses, communities and visitors and which respect the character of the countryside.	A positive policy can be implemented.		Take tourism policy option forward to SA and develop policy to strengthen tourism sector in Wiltshire.
2	Introduce policy that directs, protects and encourages hotel and bedspaces accommodation within Wiltshire.	Evidence has identified the importance of tourism to the Wiltshire Economy, especially in the south of the county.	Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17 (economy and enterprise).	Unless specifically identifies land and sites, that the option does not, it is unlikely to have a significant	As above. Broadly in line with PPS4, however NPPF is a more positive framework towards sustainable development and encourage a more flexible form of land use that attaches significant			Maintain policy on hotels etc in the SWCS but do not expand across Wiltshire as little evidence exists. Policy on tourist accommodation

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
				effect.	weight to the benefits of economic and housing growth.			for rest of Wiltshire can direct rather than protect due to limited evidence outside of south Wiltshire – Take forward to SA.
3	Do not include a policy on tourism in line with the draft WCS June 2011	No, evidence shows that tourism is a key sector of the Wiltshire's economy.	Option would not fully support SA objectives 16 and 17.	Unless specifically identifies land and sites, that the option does not, it is unlikely to have a significant effect.	Although not contrary to GPG Tourism, PPS4 and NPPF the Core Strategy would be more aligned if a tourism policy was included.			Take forward to SA.
4	Strengthen commitment to secure employment (particularly high-skilled / creative) in town centres (including clusters)	More up to date evidence and the Swindon and Wiltshire LEP proposal identifies important sectors that should be planned for.	Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17 (economy and enterprise).	Unless specifically identifies land and sites, that the option does not, it is unlikely to have a significant effect.	Option would be in accordance with PPS4 and NPPF.			Amend economy text in draft WCS to ensure securing employment in town centres in strengthened. However this does not form policy itself as such.
5	Maintain CP21 as written in draft WCS supports		Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17	As above	In line with PPS4 however potential to be contrary to NPPF if not positive enough.			Option was subject to SA to support draft WCS.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	additional employment development within or adjacent to principal settlements and market towns		(economy and enterprise).					
6	Re-write Core policy 21 to widen it so it does not just focus on the larger settlements and can emphasise how important existing business is and meet unforeseen demand from existing employers. Policy should also be more positive so additional employment is the norm	Need for a flexible approach is provided through more qualitative evidence from businesses within Swindon's and Wiltshire LEP proposal desire to encourage and enable business to improve its performance. Such an approach was also suggested through consultation on the draft WCS	Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17 (economy and enterprise). However care must be taken to ensure there are not adverse effects on other SA objectives such as air quality. Landscape etc.	As above.	In line with PPS4 policy EC2 to plan positively for economic growth. Also in line with NPPF. However some criteria will be needed to ensure for example landscape is considered and we plan for 'sustainable economic growth'.			Amend policy to make it more positive towards sustainable economic development – subject this to SA
7	Provide policy or text to support Wiltshire's small business and start-ups.	Up to date evidence provided by Roge Tym identifies that	Would be in line SA objectives 16 and 17 (economy and		Help achieve sustainable economic growth, planning proactively and supporting existing			Take policy or text wording forward to ensure that the small

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
		Wiltshire's economy consists of a large number of small businesses that are not provided for and that struggle to find 'follow' on space once they are trading. The SW LEP proposal identifies that outside of the M4 corridor Wiltshire mainly has a diverse SME community	enterprise).		business in line with NPPF and PPS4.			businesses in Wiltshire and start-ups are provided for. However this does not need to be within policy itself.
8	Do not provide policy or text to support Wiltshire's small business and start-ups.	No evidence suggests that our small businesses and start-ups do need support.	Although not contrary to SA, would not be as support of SA objective 16 and 17.	As above.	Although not contrary to NPPF and PPS4 would not be as aligned with their objectives.			Although not having a policy / text is a possibility the council should have a policy or wording that encourages small businesses / start / ups to achieve sustainable economic growth.
9	Keep CP22 as	Evidence	Supports SA		Consultation suggests			Policy could be

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	drafted in WCS	identifies that existing policies to protect employment land are out of date and need to be made clearer	objective 16 and 17 as aims to maintain employment land.		not in accordance with PPS4 EC12.1. This policy refers to the re-use of buildings in the countryside. CP 22 could be amended to ensure it is clear which settlements it is referring to in the settlement strategy. Policy is in accordance with EC2.1h of PPS4. Policy is contrary to NPPF para 75 and if this para is maintained in the final NPPF policy may need to be removed to make the plan sound.			taken forward as drafted in dWCS however some amendments could be made to make the policy clearer and to which settlements it refers to. Policy may need to be removed / amended depending on final wording of NPPF.
10	Amend CP22 to make it clear evidence required to support planning application.	Yes, all planning applications and policy should be backed up by evidence. Making it clear as to what is required should help applicants. As above.	Supports SA objective 16 and 17 as aims to maintain employment land.		As above.			CP22 should be amended to make the requirements clear.
11	Amend CP22 to remove reference to B uses as it has been suggested as inflexible in consultation	As above.	Supports SA objective 16 and 17		As above.			None, policy should make it clear that this refers to employment sites currently in B1, B2 and B8

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	responses.							employment uses. Other employment uses such as retail / leisure should be delivered through other policy means. Policy may need to be removed depending on outcome of final NPPF.
12	Amend CP23 to strengthen in and also highlight smaller centres where there maybe regeneration opportunities.		Supports SA objective 16 and 17.		Widening policy to also support regeneration of brownfield sites to other settlements such as the Local service centres would be a further positive move towards encouraging sustainable economic growth as desired by PPS4 and NPPF. It would also be in accordance with EC6.2 that requires us to identify local service centres and locate most new development in or on the edge of existing settlements.			Possible option to amend policy to also include Local Service Centres – take forward to SA.
13	Do not amend CP23.		Although not contrary to SA, would not be as		Would not be so aligned to PPS4 compared to amending policy as			Take forward to SA (SA will have already been

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
			support of SA objective 16 and 17.		suggested above.			undertaken).
14	CP24	Detail of CP24 can be found within the Military Topic Paper.						
15	Maintain CP25 as written Or amend in line with PPS4 / PPS7 / NPPF	Wiltshire is a mainly rural area and the rural economy is vital. Such a policy is therefore needed.	Supports SA objective 16 and 17. Although policy needs to be carefully worded to also ensure compliance with SO1 biodiversity, SO8 Historic environment, SO9 Landscapes,		Although in accordance with PPS4, policy could be amended to be more aligned to PPS4's requirements. PPS7 requires LPA's to set out a supportive framework to farm diversification which the policy / Core strategy fails to do. However this element could be achieved through later DPD's. To be in accordance with NPPF policy should be more positive and in favour of sustainable development it should support sustainable growth of rural businesses, promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses, support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit the rural businesses, communities and visitors which respect the			CP25 - Policy could stay the same however amendments could be introduced that would make the policy more consistent with national policy – take forward to SA.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
					character of the countryside. Including provision and expansion of visitor / tourist facilities in appropriate locations. Where identified needs are not met by existing facilities.			
16	Amend CP25 to ensure the environment such as AONB and biodiversity is protected.	Yes, in addition Wiltshire is fortunate to have a high quality environment much of which is statutorily protected and this must be maintained.	Would ensure the policy is more aligned with SO1 Biodiversity) , SO8 (Historic environment) and SO9 (Landscape) as well as in accordance with SO 16 and 17.	Would ensure that the policy considers biodiversity in rural areas.	Would be more aligned with both PPS4 and NPPF.	Yes		Ensure the environment, such as AONB, biodiversity and heritage is protected. Take forward to SA.
17	CP 25 - Amend policy so that it deals with the economic potential of rural areas eg farm diversification	Yes, Wiltshire is predominantly rural and farming is important to its rural communities.	Would ensure the whole economy is considered and be more in accordance with SO16 and SO17.		NPPF requires LPA's to promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses. PPS7 requires LPA's to set out the criteria to be applied to planning applications for farm diversification projects;			Amend policy to ensure that the economic potential of rural areas eg farm diversification is considered correctly. Take forward to SA.
18	CP 25 Amend so that buildings can be used for		Although may not be so aligned with SO		Policy should support re-use for economic development but not			Amend policy so that it is more positive towards

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	other uses apart from economic development		16 and 17 has potential to be more aligned with SO 9 landscape and SO8 historic environment.		eliminate other uses in line with other PPS's. In addition NPPF says that LPA's should avoid isolated homes unless it is where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting;			the re-use of buildings in the countryside not just for economic development in line with NPPF. Take forward to SA.
19	CP 25 Enhance tourism element of rural economy including accommodation and facilities	Yes, Wiltshire is a largely rural county and tourism is an important element of the economy that is not dealt with in great detail in CP25.	Supports SA objective 16 and 17.		Would be more aligned with PPS7 and NPPF that encourage rural tourism.			Amend policy to ensure support for rural tourism is supported more strongly. Take forward to SA.
20	Bradford on Avon : Amend policy wording slightly to take into account of: Make it clear that loss of employment on principal employment sites will be resisted. Provide workshops in B on Avon.	Evidence suggests that because of the Green Belt and landscape issues for example the range of 2 – 3 ha of employment land is appropriate. However policy is clarified in	Possibility would make policy wording stronger in line with SO 16 and 17.		Clarification of policy would be in line with PPS4, however the notion of protecting employment sites is not in line with the draft NPPF and depending final wording of NPPF the concept of Principal Employment areas may need to be removed.			Wording can be clarified through supporting text. It is not appropriate to allocate more employment land in Bradford on Avon on top of that in the draft WCS.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	Increase employment land.	other parts of the CS to ensure that smaller units for example are provided in Wiltshire in lien with needs identified through more up to date evidence.						
21	Bradford on Avon – Consider option of allocation of Land North of Holt Road.	Please see strategic sites work for consideration of this proposal.						
22	Calne – Possibility to accommodate more employment development, however infrastructure should be improved and consolidated before agreement by the community.	Yes, quantitative evidence suggests that Calne could deliver more employment – however on a more qualitative basis the amount suggested in the draft WCS is appropriate to allocate at this time with flexibility for the community to	In line with SO 16 and 17 although more employment land would need to be carefully managed in line with community aspirations and environmental constraints.		Yes, would be in line with PPS4 and NPPF as justified through evidence base.	Yes, 3.2 has found to be deliverable and available.	Delivery of site.	Amend policy so that it is flexible and allows up to 6 ha but ensuring that in line with infrastructure is improved alongside. Take forward to SA.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
		find more (up to 6 ha is total) if felt appropriate through Neighbourhood Planning and infrastructure provided in consultation with desires of the community.						
23	Calne – maintain policy in line with draft WCS.	More up to date evidences suggests that more employment should be directed towards Calne.	In line with SO 16 and 17 but not as much as directing more employment to Calne.		Evidences suggests that more employment land should be provided in Calne than within the dWCS.			Calne – maintain policy in line with draft WCS – take forward to SA (should be within dWCS SA)
24	Calne - improve and develop the tourist industry.	Importance of tourism will be taken forward in new policy dealing with tourism as detailed earlier in this table.						
25	Calne - Station Road is no longer an industrial estate and should be removed as a Principal Employment Area.	Noted, Calne does no longer function as an industrial estate and therefore should be removed as a Principal Employment Area.	As the site is not longer functioning as an Industrial estate it would not be in lien with SA 16 and 17.		This would be in line with PPS4 and NPPF as the site is no longer functioning as a PEA.			Calne – remove Station Road from list of Principal Employment Areas.
26	Chippenham – Reduce Showell	Yes, more up to date evidence	The reduction of site area		This would be in line with PPS4 and NPPF to	Yes	Site delivery.	Reduce size of Showell farm to

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	Farm in line with useable area.	identifies that there is only 18 ha of developable land at Showell Farm	would be more in line with SA objectives especially SO 8 historic landscape and SO9 Landscape.		ensure sites are deliverable and developable.			18 ha in line with up to date evidence – take forward to SA.
27	Chippenham – Maintain Showell Farm at 30 ha.	No, more up to date evidence identifies that only 18 ha is developable.	Maintaining site are would not necessarily be so in line with SO8 and SO9.		Would not be in lien with PPS4 and NPPF to ensure sites are developable.	No all of the site would be deliverable.		Maintain Showell Farm at 30 ha – take to SA.
28	Chippenham - Extend site at Kingston Park.	No. however if there is demand for such an extension there may be opportunities through other re-drafted policies of the WCS.	May not meet SA objectives 8 and 9.		Site selection has identified other more preferable sites within the Chippenham area.			None.
29	There is no demand for businesses to locate in Chippenham. Do not allocate employment land at Chippenham	No, up to date evidence identifies that there is demand for business in Chippenham	Would not meet SA SO 16 and 17 if no land was allocated at Chippenham.		Would be contrary to NPPF and PPS4.			Do not allocate employment land at Chippenham. Take forward to SA.
30	Corhsam – allocate 10 ha rather than 3.	Yes, more up to date evidence identifies that it	Supports SA objective 16 and 17,		Would be in line with PPS4 and NPPF to allocate more	Would need to be delivered through		Increase employment land provision in

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
		could be appropriate to locate more employment in Corsham.	although other considerations such as landscape would also need to be considered.		employment land at Corsham.	neighbourhood plans.		line with latest evidence – 6 ha. however this will need to be found through the neighbourhood planning process. Take forward to SA.
31	Corsham – Maintain employment allocation at 3 ha.	More up to date evidence identifies that a higher level of employment would be more appropriate at Corsham	Supports SA objective 16 and 17.		Would be less in line with PPS4 and NPPF as is not supported by up to date evidence			Corsham – maintain employment level at 3 ha. Take forward to SA (will be within dWCS SA).
32	Corsham - Sands quarry should be allocated as it has outline planning permission for employment.	No. however if an outline application has been approved (Wiltshire council web implies application withdrawn) this site could be delivered without an allocation. Application also seems to have a large amount of community objection.	If option was taken forward more work with regard to landscape etc would need to be undertaken to determine site suitability.					Do not take forward.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
33	Corsham - Tourism is important.	Importance of tourism will be taken forward in new policy dealing with tourism as detailed earlier in this table.						
34	Devizes – Ensure proximity of AONB has been considered in allocation of land between A361 and Horton Road.	Yes, the policy of allocation is backed up by evidence, however AONB and landscape will be reconsidered to ensure assessed in enough detail.	Policy ins in lien with SA SO 16 and 17. However wording can be strengthened to ensure AONB is protected.		Although aligned with NPPF and PPS4 it could be strengthened if the AONB is highlighted as a specific area to consider within policy.			Ensure that AONB is considered as a specific component of the development template / allocation.
35	Malmesbury – Identify Lucent Park as a Principal Employment Area.	No, the suggestion is not backed up by evidence. Lucent park is now a mix of uses.			The site is not fully an employment site and therefore should not be protected as such.			Do not take forward.
36	Malmesbury – allocate more land. 1 ha is not enough. Policy is too restrictive for villages surround Malmesbury.	Yes, more up to date evidence identifies that more than 1 ha employment land is needed in Malmesbury.	Would be in line with SA SO 16 and 17 although other SA objectives would also need to be considered in the actual allocation of any site.		Would align with NPPF and PPS4.			Increase the employment land target in Malmesbury to 3 ha in line with more up to date evidence. This will need to be found through Neighbourhood planning – take forward to SA.
37	Malmesbury –	No, more up to	Would be in		Would not be so aligned			Malmesbury –

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	Maintain employment land levels in line with WCS.	date evidence identifies that Malmesbury would benefit from more employment land.	line with SA SO 16 and 17.		with SA SO 16 and 17.			maintain employment level at 1 ha (as in dWCS). Take forward to SA (will be within dWCS SA).
38	Marlborough – There should be more / some employment land in Marlborough	Yes more recent evidence has identified that some employment land should be identified at Marlborough. This can also ensure more sustainable patterns of development through mixed use development.	Would be in line with SA SO 16 and 17 although other SA objectives would also need to be considered in the actual allocation of any site.		Would align with NPPF and PPS4.			Increase the employment land target in Marlborough to 3 ha in line with more up to date evidence. This will need to be found through Neighbourhood planning – Take forward to SA.
39	Marlborough – Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 0 ha	No, more up to date evidence identifies that Marlborough should provide some employment land in the future.	Would not be in line with SO 16 and 17.		Would not be so in line with NPPF and PPS4 as more up to date evidence identifies that some employment land is required at Marlborough.			Marlborough – Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 0 ha – Take forward to SA.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
40	Melksham – There should be more employment land allocated in Melksham	Yes more recent evidence has identified that some employment land should be identified at Melksham , this can also more close match the levels of housing proposed.	Would be in line with SA SO 16 and 17 although other SA objectives would also need to be considered in the actual allocation of any site.		Would align with NPPF and PPS4.			Melksham - Increase the employment land target in Melksham to 6 ha in line with more up to date evidence – Take forward to SA.
41	Melksham - Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 4 ha	More recent evidence identifies that Melksham needs a higher level of employment.	Would not be so in line with SA SO 16 and 17.		Would not be so aligned with SA SO 16 and 17.			Melksham – Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 4 ha – Take forward to SA.
42	Melksham – Upside park is unsuitable for employment, identify strategic site to the south of Melksham, Include land at Highcroft Farm, include land to the east of Melksham	Please see strategic sites work for consideration of this proposal.						
43	Pewsey – would benefit from additional	Yes more recent evidence has identified that	Would be in line with SA SO 16 and 17		Would align with NPPF and PPS4.			Pewsey - Increase the employment

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	employment development.	some employment land should be identified at Melksham. This can also ensure more sustainable patterns of development through mixed use development.	although other SA objectives would also need to be considered in the actual allocation of any site.					land target in Pewsey to 2 ha in line with more up to date evidence. This will need to be found through Neighbourhood planning. However the existing LP allocation should be investigated to see if deliverable? – Take forward to SA.
44	Pewsey – Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 0 ha	No, more up to date evidence identifies that Pewsey should provide some employment land in the future.	Would not be in line with SO 16 and 17.		Would not be so in line with NPPF and PPS4 as more up to date evidence identifies that some employment land is required at Pewsey..			Pewsey – Maintain employment level in line with dWCS – 0 ha – Take forward to SA.
45	Tidworth – More employment land may be required in Tidworth.	No the latest evidence does not identify that Tidworth needs more employment land than that identified in the draft WCS.	Too much employment land at Wiltshire would be contrary to SA SO 1 (biodiversity), 9 (landscape), and 6 (air quality)		More employment land at Tidworth would be contrary to PPS4 and NPPF as not in line with up to date evidence.			None.

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
46	Trowbridge – Brownfield sites in the town centre should be built on first	Yes, town centre brownfield sites should be used first and should accommodate town centre uses such as offices. This is detailed within the WCS – Trowbridge Vision Areas of Opportunity.	In line with SA SO 2 (efficient use of land).		- the redevelopment of the town centre brownfield sites in Trowbridge are supported through the Trowbridge Vision Area of Opportunity policy and this will include town centre uses inline with PPS4 and NPPF.			None- the redevelopment of the town centre brownfield sites in Trowbridge are supported through the Trowbridge Vision Area of Opportunity policy and this will include town centre uses in line with PPS4.
47	Trowbridge does not need any further employment land as the White Horse Park is already suffering business closure	No, the up to date evidence identifies that there is demand for employment land in Trowbridge, however this is slightly less than envisaged at 24 ha and this can help with concerns regarding size of employment at Trowbridge.	Not to allocate any employment land in Trowbridge would be contrary to SA SO's 16 and 17.		Would not be aligned with PPS4 and NPPF to not locate any employment at Trowbridge due to its position on the settlement hierarchy however, land allocation can be reduced slightly.			Trowbridge - Amend WCS to allocate (or save Local plan allocation) just 24 ha rather than 30 originally proposed.
48	Trowbridge Allocate site to the south and west of the	Please see strategic sites work for consideration of this proposal.						

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action****
	White Horse business park.							
49	Warminster – Other sites available at Warminster are 18 acres at Folly Lane and 44 – 48 Bath road that was previously included.	Please see strategic sites work for consideration of this proposal.						
50	Warminster CP18 – cannot deliver employment first unless 500 houses are delivered alongside, phase housing and employment together.	Yes, deliverability evidence identifies that housing needs to be delivered alongside employment to enable the employment development to occur.	Delivering housing alongside employment as well as being in line with SA SO 16 and 17 would also meeting SA SO 10 – population and housing.		Would deliver more sustainable communities in lien with NPPF and PPS.	Amendment would ensure deliverability of housing and employment.		Warminster - Amend CP18 to ensure that employment is delivered alongside 500 houses to ensure delivery of both employment and housing.
51	Westbury – do not allocate new land at Westbury when there is space on existing trading estate, impact on Hawkeridge village / farm and its grade 2	No, the most up to date evidence identifies that employment land is needed at Westbury. However impact on setting of listed buildings and Hawkeridge	Not allocating employment land at Westbury would be contrary to SA SO's 16 and 17 however care needs to be taken to limit		Not allocating employment land at Westbury would be contrary to PPS4 and dNPPF.			Westbury – do not allocate employment land at Westbury - Take forward to SA. Policy / development template should

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	listed buildings.	Farm will need to be considered. As such evidence identifies that maybe a range of employment land should be identified of between 11 and 18 ha.	impact of heritage assets to ensure alliance with SO 8 and possibly SO9 (landscape)					be amended to ensure the impact on heritage assets are taken into account. WCS could be amended to identify a range of employment land in Westbury that is released based on concerns over heritage and amount agreed with the local community.
52	Westbury – Westbury can accommodate more employment land	No, the most up to date evidence identifies that enough employment land is being proposed in Westbury.	Identifying more employment land at Westbury could be contrary to SA SO's regarding landscape and the historic landscape and transport.		Allocating more land at Westbury would be contrary to PPS4 and dNPPf. If more land is needed through demand this can be realised through other proposed policies in the WCS.			Westbury – Westbury can accommodate more employment land – don ot take forward to SA would be contrary to NPPF / PPS4 and SA SO's.
53	Westbury – extend proposed Hawkeridge allocation to	No, the most up to date evidence identifies that enough	Identifying more employment land at		Allocating more land at Westbury would be contrary to PPS4 and dNPPF. If more land is			Westbury – extend proposed Hawkeridge allocation to

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment **	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability*** *	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action*****
	include all land to the south.	employment land is being proposed in Westbury.	westbury could be contrary to SA SO's regarding landscape and the historic landscape and transport.		needed through demand this can be realised through other proposed policies in the WCS.			include all land to the south – take forward to SA.
54	Westbury – Maintain employment allocation as in dWCS.	Yes the level of employment proposed at Westbury is supported by evidence.	In line with SA SO 16 and 17.		Would be in line with PPS4 and NPPF.			Westbury – Maintain employment allocation as in dWCS – 18.8 ha – Take forward to SA.
55	Royal Wootton Bassett – Increase business development allocated.	Yes, more up to date evidence identifies that more than 3.7 ha of employment land is needed in the Royal Wootton Bassett Community Area.	Would be in line with SA SO 16 and 17 although other SA objectives would also need to be considered in the actual allocation of any site.		Would align with NPPF and PPS4.			Increase the employment land target in Royal Wootton Bassett to 5 ha in line with more up to date evidence. This will need to be found through Neighbourhood planning – take forward to SA.
56	Royal Wootton Bassett – Maintain employment allocation as in dWCS 3.7 ha	No the most up to date evidence identifies that more employment land is needed	Would not be so line with SA SO 16 and 17.		Would not be so in line with PPS4 and NPPF.			Wootton Basset – Maintain employment allocation as in dWCS – 3.7 ha – Take forward

No	Proposed policy option	Is the policy backed up by evidence	Sustainability Appraisal*	Habitats Regulations Assessment**	Alignment with national and regional policy (inc draft NPPF)***	Deliverability***	Monitoring How will the policy be monitored?	Other and action****
		at Royal Wootton Bassett.						to SA.
57	Royal Wootton Bassett – Need emphasis on tourism	Importance of tourism will be taken forward in new policy dealing with tourism as detailed earlier in this table.						

****With the Sustainability Appraisal rank from Positive, neutral or negative (will need to check the final or draft SA once completed)***

*****Can the policy be appropriately mitigated against within the HRA? (will need to check the draft HRA once completed)***

****** does it accord with strategic policy say yes or no***

******* Is it a realistic goal in the timeframe's predicted – we need to be sure of this.***

******** Any other influencing factors and given the assessment should it be p[pursued as a preferred option***

6.0 Moving consultation responses and updated evidence forward to the submission draft Core Strategy

Tourism – now CP27 and CP28

- Introduce policy to encourage and facilitate tourism within Wiltshire together with strengthening tourism within Strategic Objective 1
- Maintain policy on hotels etc in the SWCS (subject to its own SA) but do not expand across Wiltshire as little evidence exists. Policy on tourist accommodation for rest of Wiltshire can direct rather than protect due to limited evidence outside of south Wiltshire – Take forward to SA
- Do not include a policy on tourism or tourist development in line with the draft WCS June 2011

The first two were taken forward as options. Lack of policy in draft WCS was an omission, evidence identifies tourism as an important sector for Wiltshire. Policy has been introduced based on consultation responses and evidence.

Core Policy 21 (now CP22)

- Core Policy 21 - Amend policy to make it more positive towards sustainable economic development to enable flexibility to business, especially those currently within our communities.

Policy amended as a result of consultation response and more up to date evidence.

Core Policy 22 (now CP23)

- CP22 should be amended to make the requirements clearer this is to align with the SWCS policy and evidence supporting that policy – note policy may have to be deleted depending on final NPPF.

Core Policy 23 (now CP24)

- CP23 - Option to amend policy to also include Local Service Centres – based on consultation responses.

Core Policy 25 (Now CP36 – Supporting rural life)

- -Ensure the environment, such as AONB, biodiversity and heritage is protected, amend so that buildings can be used for other uses apart from economic development, enhance tourism element of rural economy including accommodation and facilities, amend policy so that it deals with the economic potential of rural areas eg farm diversification

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses.

Calne

- Amend policy so that it allows up to 6 ha (from 3.2 ha) but ensuring that in line with infrastructure is improved alongside.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Chippenham

- Reduce size of Showell farm to 18 ha in line with up to date evidence – take forward to SA.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Corsham

- Increase employment land provision in line with latest evidence – 6 ha (previously 3.3ha)

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Malmesbury

- Increase the employment land target in Malmesbury to 3 ha (from 0.9 ha) in line with more up to date evidence.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Malborough

- Increase the employment land target in Marlborough to 3 ha (from zero) in line with more up to date evidence.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Melksham

- Increase the employment land target in Melksham to 6 ha (previously 4 ha) in line with more up to date evidence

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Pewsey

- Pewsey - Increase the employment land target in Pewsey to 2 ha (from 0 ha) in line with more up to date evidence.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Trowbridge

- Trowbridge - Amend WCS to allocate (or save Local plan allocation) just 24 ha rather than 30 originally proposed justified through more up to date evidence and consultation response.

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.

Westbury

- Westbury – Maintained as in draft WCS - 18.8 ha

Royal Wootton Bassett

- Increase the employment land target in Royal Wootton Bassett to 5 ha (from 3.7 ha)

Amendment suggested as a result of consultation responses and more up to date evidence.