

## COUNCIL

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2012 AT CIVIC CENTRE, TROWBRIDGE.**

#### **Present:**

Cllr Desna Allen, Cllr Richard Beattie, Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr John Brady, Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Rosemary Brown, Cllr Liz Bryant, Cllr Allison Bucknell, Cllr Jane Burton, Cllr Trevor Carbin, Cllr Nigel Carter, Cllr Chris Caswill, Cllr Ernie Clark, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Christopher Cochrane, Cllr Peter Colmer, Cllr Linda Conley, Cllr Mark Connolly, Cllr Christine Crisp (Vice-Chair), Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Paul Darby, Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Peter Davis, Cllr Tony Deane, Cllr Christopher Devine, Cllr Bill Douglas, Cllr Mary Douglas, Cllr Peggy Dow, Cllr Peter Doyle, Cllr Nick Fogg, Cllr Peter Fuller, Cllr Richard Gamble, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Howard Greenman, Cllr Mollie Groom, Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE, Cllr Brigadier Robert Hall (Chairman), Cllr Russell Hawker, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr Malcolm Hewson, Cllr Alan Hill, Cllr Charles Howard, Cllr Jon Hubbard, Cllr Chris Humphries, Cllr Keith Humphries, Cllr Peter Hutton, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr David Jenkins, Cllr Julian Johnson, Cllr John Knight, Cllr Jerry Kunkler, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Alan Macrae, Cllr Howard Marshall, Cllr Laura Mayes, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Jemima Milton, Cllr Francis Morland, Cllr Bill Moss, Cllr Christopher Newbury, Cllr John Noeken, Cllr Jeffrey Ody, Cllr Stephen Oldrieve, Cllr Helen Osborn, Cllr Jeff Osborn, Cllr Mark Packard, Cllr Graham Payne, Cllr Nina Phillips, Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philippe, Cllr Pip Ridout, Cllr Bill Roberts, Cllr Ricky Rogers, Cllr Judy Rooke, Cllr Jane Scott OBE, Cllr John Smale, Cllr Carole Soden, Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cllr Julie Swabey, Cllr John Thomson, Cllr Dick Tonge, Cllr Anthony Trotman, Cllr Fred Westmoreland, Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Cllr Roy While, Cllr Christopher Williams and Cllr Graham Wright

---

#### 1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Mike Cuthbert-Murray, Simon Killane, Leo Randall, Stephen Petty, Mark Griffiths, Rod Eaton, Sheila Parker, Jonathon Seed, Bridget Wayman, Ian West and Tom James.

#### 2. **Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman referred to the previously circulated letter dated 27 January 2012 from the Monitoring Officer which gave specific advice to Councillors in relation to declarations of interest on items on the agenda for this meeting.

The following declarations of interest were made:

Cllr Francis Morland – personal interest - in respect of items on this agenda by virtue of his registerable interests as previously submitted including land holding; member of Dilton Marsh, Chapmanslade and Heywood Parish Councils and Westbury Town Council; having been lobbied and made representations on items on this agenda particularly those referred to at minute no.s 7 and 9. He confirmed that his judgement had not been clouded and would therefore participate in the debate and voting.

Cllr George Jeans – prejudicial interest – minute no.s 8 and 9 - Social housing payments with reference to Mere – would leave the room at the appropriate stage in the meeting.

Cllr Chris Caswill – Personal interest – minute no. 7 in relation to the Lower Compton site and minute no. 9 - strategic sites identified for the North Wiltshire area and would participate in the debate and voting.

Cllr Judy Rooke – Prejudicial interest – Wiltshire Core Strategy - her property backed on to Rowden Lane, Chippenham which was very close to the Country Park and strategic site proposed for development.

Cllr Julie Swabey – Personal interest – in items on the agenda.

Cllr Christopher Devine – Personal interest – minute no.s 8 and 9 – he had been lobbied by Bloor Homes which was owned by Triumph and he owned a Triumph Scrambler.

Cllr Josie Green – Personal interest – minute no. 8 and 9 - in so far as they related to Bloor Homes in respect of her registerable interest as previously submitted.

Cllr Toby Sturgis – Personal interest – minute no. 9 in so far as it related to land at Great Somerford which he had previously owned and currently lived adjoining the site.

Cllr Tony Deane – Personal and prejudicial interest – minute no.s 8 and 9 – would leave the room.

Cllr Christopher Newbury – minute no. 7 – by virtue of having made representations on the document.

### 3. **Announcements by the Chairman**

#### **(a) Royal Wootton Bassett Signs**

The Chairman reported that four old road signs welcoming people to Royal Wootton Bassett had raised £3,320 for Help for Heroes on the auction website ebay. The Council sold two original signs reading 'Welcome to Wootton Bassett' – which were in place at the Town before

it received its Royal patronage – and two created for the Town's renaming ceremony, which read: 'welcome to Royal Wootton Bassett'.

The town had become known for the dignified way residents lined the High Street to pay their respects when the bodies of troops killed in Afghanistan were repatriated. In October 2011 Wootton Bassett became the first town in more than 100 years to get the Royal prefix.

**(b) Staff Awards**

The Chairman congratulated the winners of this year's Staff Awards. With more than 300 nominations, many categories had been closely contested. He extended his congratulations not only to the winners but to all those who were nominated and shortlisted.

The awards were an opportunity for the Council to recognise and thank those staff and teams that went the extra mile to improve the quality of life for so many people, be they colleagues or communities. A round of applause was given as a mark of appreciation for the staff.

**(c) New Year Honours List – Wiltshire Recipients**

The Chairman was delighted to announce that a number of Wiltshire residents had received national recognition in the recent New Year Honours List, the names of which he read out at the meeting.

He drew Council's attention to one recipient in particular, namely, HM Lord Lieutenant for Wiltshire, John Bush, who was made a Commander of the Victorian Order.

Councillors joined him in congratulating them all on receiving national recognition.

**(d) Mr John Bush – Lord Lieutenant**

On behalf of the Council, the Chairman paid tribute to Mr John Bush, who retired as Her Majesty's Lord Lieutenant for Wiltshire on 5 February 2012.

Mr Bush had lived most of his life in Wiltshire and had made an enormous contribution to Wiltshire in so many ways over the years which included being Chairman of the Magistrates' Courts Committee, member of the Police Authority, a former High Sheriff of Wiltshire and the founder and first Chairman of the Wiltshire Bobby Van Trust, which still continued to care for elderly victims of crime.

His knowledge of Wiltshire was outstanding and he had totally devoted himself to his County since his appointment as Lord Lieutenant eight years ago.

The Chairman thanked Mr Bush for all he had done for Wiltshire and commented that he would be greatly missed in this role across the whole County. His successor was Mrs Sarah Rose Troughton from Wanborough. Mrs Troughton had had a close association with the Community Foundation and Community First. Mrs Troughton would have the Council's complete support across the County during her time as Lord Lieutenant and on behalf of Council, the Chairman wished her well as she took up her role.

**(e) Salisbury Civic Society New Buildings Awards Scheme 2011  
Park And Ride Building At Petersfinger, Salisbury**

The Chairman was pleased to announce that the Petersfinger Park and Ride Building was given a commendation by the Salisbury Civic Society recently.

The Chairman had received the award on behalf of the Council, which took the form of a certificate, at an awards ceremony held at the Guildhall in Salisbury last month. The overall result of the building was "deemed to be an attractive small building, which created the desired facilities in a way that went beyond the merely utilitarian, and provided the site with a well thought-out focal point".

**(f) Former County Councillor Mr Alan Joel**

With the Chairman's permission, Cllr Brian Dalton drew the Council's attention to the sad passing of Mr Alan Joel in November 2011. Mr Joel had served on the Council from 1993 – 1997 and had been a tireless local campaigner who would be greatly missed.

Council stood in a moment of silence as a mark of respect for Mr Joel.

**4. Public Participation**

It was noted that with this being an Extraordinary meeting of Council, public participation was restricted to items on this agenda only. The Chairman reported receipt of questions and statements in connection with items on this agenda which he would deal with at the corresponding stage in the meeting.

**5. Notices of Motion**

No notices of motion had been received for this meeting.

6. **Councillors' Questions**

With this being an extraordinary meeting of the Council convened specifically to determine items on the agenda for this meeting, questions were similarly restricted to items on the agenda. The Chairman reported receipt of questions from Councillors Chris Caswill and Judy Rooke which would be addressed at the corresponding stage in the meeting.

7. **Wiltshire & Swindon Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document - Proposed Submission Arrangements**

Public Participation

The Chairman reported receipt of a question from Mr Edward Nicholson, Dr Peter Alberry and Lynne Eddy, details of which were presented along with a response from Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe, Cabinet member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning – question and response attached as Appendix A.

Mr Nicholson addressed Council and asked the following supplementary question:

Sought confirmation that the time limited strategic nature of the Lower Compton site is specifically confined to waste treatment (excluding waste to energy) and that the site is excluded from the list of appropriate locations for strategic MRF/WTS facilities as identified in the draft Waste Site Allocations DPD.

Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe undertook to provide a written response.

The Chairman reported receipt of a statement read out by Mrs Neal on behalf of Chitterne Parish Council, details of which were presented.

-----

The Chairman introduced the item and reminded Council that it was being asked to consider and approve the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations DPD for submission to the Secretary of State for the purpose of Examination. He advised that whilst Councillors might wish to ask questions on the Document's development and proposals within it, the Document had previously been considered to be 'sound' by Council at its meeting on 17 May 2011. He noted that following pre-submission consultation, changes had been proposed to remove a number of sites based on new evidence.

At the Chairman's invitation, Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe presented a report which set out:

- A summary of the plan preparation process to date;

- The key issues that have emerged through the recent consultation undertaken June to August 2011;
- The arrangements for submitting the draft DPD;
- The implications of the Examination process; and
- Next steps.

It was noted that Cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2011, in considering the draft DPD had recommended Council to approve the Document (incorporating minor amendments it had made) for the purpose of formally submitting it to the Secretary of State. A copy of the relevant extract of minutes of the Cabinet meeting was presented.

Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philipe presented the draft DPD for Council's consideration.

During debate, a number of Councillors spoke on the draft DPD making general points and specific points relating to their respective electoral division areas to which Cllr de Rhé-Philipe responded.

Cllr Howard Marshall proposed the following amendment (amending part of the original motion as indicated) which was duly seconded and on being put to the vote, was LOST:

- i) approves the submission draft Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document and its Submission to the Secretary of State, [but after the removal of the Hills Resources Recovery Centre Proposal \(pages 18-21\);](#)

A recorded vote having been requested on the voting on the above amendment, the voting was recorded as follows:

For the amendment (21)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Brian Dalton, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Stephen Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke and Graham Wright.

Against the amendment (53)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Ernie Clark, Richard Clewer, Christopher Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Andrew Davis, Fleur de Rhé-Philipe, Tony Deane, Christopher Devine, Mary Douglas, Peter Doyle, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Russell Hawker, Mike Hewitt, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Keith Humphries, Peter Hutton, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, William Moss, Francis Morland, Christopher Newbury, John Noeken, Sheila

Parker, Nina Phillips, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Jane Scott, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Christopher Williams.

Abstentions (12)

Cllrs Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Peter Colmer, Christine Crisp, Peter Davis, Nick Fogg, Howard Greenman, Alan Hill, George Jeans, Jacqui Lay, Jeff Ody and Tony Trotman.

In the discussion which ensued, Cllr Bill Douglas sought an explanation of why the development of 285 houses at Sandpit Lane, Calne had not been referenced in the draft DPD and sought clarification over what constituted a strategic site. Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe undertook to provide him with a written response.

During the course of debate, three minor amendments to the draft DPD were approved as referred to in resolution (a) below. At the Cabinet meeting, changes were agreed to the Traffic and Transportation section in respect of the section on Land at Valley Farm, Chitterne. This section had since been further refined to better achieve the desired outcome as incorporated into the document presented to Council.

Following debate, it was

**Resolved:**

**That following recommendation by Cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2012, Council:**

- a) **incorporating the following minor amendments, approves the submission draft Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document and its Submission to the Secretary of State:**

**Page 82 - under 'Traffic and Transportation' (Chitterne Site) – delete the word "unnecessary".**

**Pages 14 and 17 - delete reference to 'village' when referring to Cricklade**

**Page 100 - under Water Environment' (Tidworth site) be amended as follows:**

**In addition, the assessment ~~should~~ will need to ensure that foul water discharges from any development can be connected**

**to the public sewer system, where available, subject to a capacity appraisal and agreement upon a point of connection.**

- b) **delegates to the Service Director, Economy and Enterprise, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning authorisation to make minor amendments to the draft DPD (Appendix A of the report presented) in the interests of clarity and accuracy and to make appropriate arrangements for submission of the documents to the Secretary of State and any consequential actions as directed by the Inspector relating to the Examination.**

Declarations of interest

Please refer to minute no. 2 above for details of interests declared in this item.

8. **Adoption of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy**

The Chairman in introducing this item reminded Council that the Inspector's Report into the South Wiltshire Core Strategy was binding on the Council. Council was invited to consider whether the Inspector's findings were palatable and acceptable to this Council and on that basis whether Council was minded to accept the report as a whole.

At the Chairman's invitation, Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe, Cabinet member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning presented a report for Council's consideration along with the Inspector's Report and draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy.

The report invited Council to consider the views of Cabinet which had considered both documents at its meeting on 17 January 2011 and recommended Council to adopt the South Wiltshire Core Strategy as amended by the changes identified in the Inspector's Report. The relevant extract of minutes of Cabinet was presented.

Cllr de Rhé-Philippe summarised the history of the development of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy and explained that should the Council be minded to adopt the Strategy as she was proposing, it had been subsumed into the draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Pre-Submission document which would be considered later in this meeting (minute no. 9 below). This would, subject to Council's approval, ensure delivery of a single Core Strategy for Wiltshire.

During debate, a number of questions were asked to which Cllr de Rhé-Philippe responded. Cllr Jeans specifically expressed concern over the number of affordable houses that would be built in the Mere Community Area and asked if the remaining allocation of 25 houses were not built in the Mere Community Area if they could be provided for in the Town of Mere. Cllr de Rhé-Philippe



explained that Core Policy 17 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy would not preclude what he was seeking if demand dictated it in the future.

Following debate, it was

**Resolved:**

**That following recommendation by Cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2012, Council:**

- a) **adopts the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, as amended by the changes identified in the Inspector's Report, as part of the statutory development plan for Wiltshire and**
- b) **agrees that the Service Director for Economy and Enterprise in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning, undertakes the final stages associated with the formal adoption of the Core Strategy.**

Cllr Ian McLennan requested that his vote against the above decision be recorded.

Declarations of interest

Please refer to minute no. 2 above for details of interests declared in this item.

9. **Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document**

**Public Participation**

The Chairman reported receipt of questions from Mr David Scane, on behalf of Curtin & Co, acting on behalf of Bloor Homes as circulated along with responses from Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe, Cabinet member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning – question and response attached as Appendix A.

Mr Scane asked the following supplementary question:

What evidence exists to show that the strategic sites put forward in the draft Strategy within Chippenham are better equipped than Hunters Moon to deliver 'other benefits' to the town, other than meeting the strategic housing requirement, and what further evidence exists to show that these sites can start to be delivered in the short term?"

Cllr de Rhé-Philippe explained that the evidence was in the documentation which would be published alongside the Core Strategy for the forthcoming consultation. The Council's priority as reflected in the draft Core Strategy, was

to promote economic development to secure employment opportunities and this was also confirmed by the Leader of the Council.

The Chairman reported receipt of separate statements from Mr Michael Orr, Director of CSJ Planning Ltd on behalf of Chippenham 2020 and Ms Clare Ward, a Chippenham resident.

Mr Duncan Hames MP for the Chippenham Constituency addressed Council on this item in the main, objecting to the scale of development around Chippenham.

---

### Councillors' questions

The Chairman reported receipt of questions from Cllrs Chris Caswill and Judy Rooke which were circulated along with responses from Cllr de Rhé-Philipe – attached as Appendix B.

As a supplementary question, Cllr Caswill sought information on what measures would mitigate the Rawlings Farm development. Cllr de Rhé-Philipe undertook to provide him with the latest information she had on this particular issue. Cllr Caswill welcomed the changes made at the Cabinet meeting on 17 January 2012 and the commitment reflected in the draft Strategy to ensure it was employment rather than housing led.

Cllr Judy Rooke emphasised the point made in her question over the allocation of green fields and agricultural land around Rowden and Patterdown in Chippenham for housing. She reiterated her point that green field sites should only be used when brown field sites were not available and that this view was supported by the Highways Agency. Cllr Rooke sought further clarification of the response given to her second question and Cllr de Rhé-Philipe agreed to provide this.

---

In introducing this item, the Chairman explained that Council was being asked to consider the draft Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (draft Strategy) with a view to approving it for public consultation.

The Chairman explained that following consultation, the draft Strategy along with an analysis of responses to the consultation would come back to Council with a view to its adoption. The Chairman advised that an extraordinary meeting of Council was being arranged for Tuesday 26 June 2012 for this purpose.

The Chairman advised on how he proposed to structure the debate on this item in order to go through the document systematically. This would also enable those Councillors who had declared a prejudicial interest to be able to leave the

meeting at the appropriate time, but not disenfranchise them from being able to participate in the debate on other parts of the document.

At the Chairman's invitation, Cllr de Rhé-Philippe presented a report for Council's consideration along with the draft Strategy.

The report invited Council to consider the views of Cabinet which had considered the draft Strategy at its meeting on 17 January 2012 and recommended Council to approve it for the purposes of consultation. It was noted that Cabinet had agreed a number of minor amendments to correct drafting errors, improve clarity and/or to strengthen the document which had been incorporated into the document before Council. Details of these amendments together with the relevant extract of the Cabinet minutes were presented. A further schedule of changes required was circulated at this meeting.

Cllr de Rhé-Philippe moved the recommendations of Cabinet together with the further changes proposed and this was duly seconded. Cllr de Rhé-Philippe also clarified that this also included deletion of the last bullet point on page 61. Following queries raised on this deletion, it was confirmed that this bullet point had not formed part of the proposals as considered and therefore recommended by Cabinet and had been included inadvertently. Cllr Caswill moved an amendment to retain this bullet point and this was duly seconded. On being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST.

During debate, a number of Councillors spoke on the draft Strategy making general points and specific points relating to their respective electoral division areas to which Cllr de Rhé-Philippe responded.

Cllr Jon Hubbard expressed concern that the 400 homes provided for in the Strategy for Melksham when not coupled with a strategic site allocation could result in Melksham being at the mercy of speculative planning applications. Cllr de Rhé-Philippe explained that this was not the case as this Strategy, together with national policy, sets out a clear framework for these to be delivered either through community-led planning policy documents, including neighbourhood plans or a site allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

Cllr John Thomson, Cabinet member for Adult Care, Communities and Housing moved changes to the wording as shown below as a variation to the Cabinet recommendation and this was seconded by Cllr Bill Douglas:

Paragraph 6.47 – page 186

The policy has regard to the practicalities of provision on small sites. While developments of 5 units and above will be expected to make provision on-site; ~~for sites of 4 dwellings or less no contribution will be sought~~. Where the policy generates a requirement which does not equate to a whole unit the calculation will be rounded to the nearest whole affordable housing unit. For sites of 4

dwellings or fewer, a financial contribution will be sought. This could be for on-site or off-site delivery. The level of financial contribution for sites of 4 dwellings or fewer will be set within detailed guidance to be produced by the council.

Core Policy 43 – page 187

Provision

Affordable housing provision of 40% (net) will be provided on sites of 5 or more dwellings. Only in exceptional circumstances, where it can be proven that on-site delivery is not possible, will a commuted sum be considered. On sites of 4 dwellings or fewer a financial contribution will be sought towards the provision of affordable housing.

There was general support for the above changes and for the avoidance of doubt, Cllr de Rhé-Philipe agreed to incorporate these changes as part of her motion to approve the draft Strategy for the purposes of consultation.

Cllr George Jeans having declared a prejudicial interest in this part of the draft Strategy, withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the debate on this matter and was not present when the vote was taken.

An amendment was proposed by Cllr Chris Caswill and seconded by Cllr Jon Hubbard as follows:

**(That following recommendation by Cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2012, Council:)**

Insert:

- (i) welcomes the opportunity for further consultation, challenge and improvement to the current draft, and the forecast changes to the draft National Policy Planning Framework.

On being put to the vote, the above amendment was LOST.

A further amendment was proposed by Cllr Chris Caswill (amending part of the original motion as indicated) and seconded by Cllr Jon Hubbard as follows:

- (ii) approves the Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy for publication for a final ~~tensix~~ week statutory consultation period commencing on or around 20 February 2012 to allow account to be taken of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

On being put to the vote, the above amendment was LOST.

Following debate and Cllr de Rhé-Philipe responding to points made, it was

**Resolved:**

**That following recommendation by Cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2012, Council:**

- (i) approves the Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy as amended to incorporate the changes agreed at this meeting as detailed in Appendix C to these minutes, for publication for a final six week statutory consultation period commencing on or around 20 February 2012**
- (ii) authorises the Service Director for Economy and Enterprise, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Strategic Planning to make any necessary changes to the Draft Core Strategy in the interests of clarity and accuracy before it is published, and to make arrangements for consultation.**

Cllr de Rhé-Philipe thanked officers, in particular, Alistair Cunningham – Service Director for Economy and Enterprise and Georgina Clampitt-Dix – Head of Spatial Planning for the considerable work undertaken to reach this stage. In agreeing, Councillors also paid tribute to Cllr de Rhé-Philipe for the exemplary manner in which she had dealt with presenting all three items on this agenda.

**Declarations of Interest**

Please refer to minute no. 2 above for details of interests declared in this item.

Cllrs Tony Deane, George Jeans and Judy Rooke, having declared prejudicial interests as recorded at minute no. 2 above withdrew from the meeting when their respective areas of interest were under discussion and did not vote or in the case of Cllr Rooke, had left the meeting before voting took place.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Public questions

Appendix B – Councillors' questions

Appendix C – Schedule of changes to the Wiltshire Core Strategy

(Duration of meeting: 10.30am – 5.10pm)

(Meeting adjourned at 1.00pm – 1.45pm for lunch following consideration of items recorded at minute nos. 7 and 8 and then again during consideration of the item recorded at minute no. 9 between 3.55pm and 4.10pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Yamina Rhouati, of Democratic & Members' Services, direct line 01225 718024, e-mail [yamina.rhouati@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:yamina.rhouati@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

Council

7 February 2012

---

**Public Participation**

**Question From Edward Nicholson, Dr Peter Alberry & Lynne Eddy**

**To Councillor Fleur De Rhé-Philipe, Cabinet Member For Economic Development and Strategic Planning and Councillor Toby Sturgis, Cabinet Member For Waste Property, Environment And Development Control Services**

**Question**

In the Draft Waste Allocation Site Document, Lower Compton is not identified as a strategic Materials Recycling Facility or Waste Transfer Station site (MRF/WTS). It is also noted that a single centralised MRF/WTS Facility is inefficient compared to local MRF/WTS's close to the SSTIs and that Lower Compton is only identified as a strategic "waste treatment site", excluding waste to energy. Given these points drawn from the strategic document, in addition to the fact that the existing strategic waste treatment (landfill) permission at Lower Compton will expire in 2022, will Wiltshire Council confirm that Lower Compton will cease to be a strategic site when the expiry of this permission happens?

**Response**

The existing facilities at the Lower Compton site operate in a strategic manner by virtue of scale and geographic catchment. The draft Waste Site Allocations DPD identifies the site as having the potential for accommodating treatment uses to compliment the current permitted operations. Therefore, the definition of scale applied to the proposed site allocation reflects the current operational context.

In terms of the long-term status of the Lower Compton site, it is an accepted fact that the existing waste management permissions covering operations are time limited. The adopted Waste Core Strategy presents a clear commitment to the principles of '**plan, monitor and manage**'. Therefore, as with all planning policy documents adopted by the council(s), the Waste Site Allocations DPD (and allocations therein) will be kept under review and monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report process. If monitoring evidence concludes that the Lower Compton site no longer serves a strategic-scale role in the overall framework of waste facilities (at the time of expiry of the current permission), then a change in status will need to be considered as part of any subsequent plan review process.

**Question From David Scane, On Behalf Of Curtin & Co, Acting For Bloor Homes**

**To Councillor Fleur De Rhé-Philippe  
Cabinet Member For Economic Development  
and Strategic Planning**

**Question 1**

**Issue 1**

Today the Council will be asked to vote on the Cabinet's recommendation to support the Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document for delivery of up to 37,000 homes over the next 14 years.

We would firstly point out that the proposed plan period to 2026 is inadequate. PPS3 requires development plans to identify specific sites and broad locations to enable the continuous supply of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption. This would suggest a plan period of at least until 2028.

**Response**

The Core Strategy plans for a twenty year period from 2006 to 2026, as with many Core Strategies the changes to the planning system has influenced the timing of their preparation. Although the draft National Planning Policy Framework, which will replace PPS3 in due course, states that it is preferable to cover a 15 year period, this is not a requirement and 14 years is considered reasonable. The Council will have the option to undertake an early review.

**Issue 2**

For several years, our clients Bloor Homes have made representations to Wiltshire Council to support the delivery of a sustainable strategic site on the southern side of Chippenham at Hunters Moon.

This site offers a number of significant advantages for both the Chippenham area, and wider core strategy process, which our clients feel are in danger of being discounted should members see fit to approve the document before them today.

- The Hunters Moon site has already been tested at examination – it was assessed as being suitable for mixed use development by the Planning Inspector in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011 inquiry in 2005.

**Response**

The Hunters Moon site was considered for inclusion in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011. Although the site wasn't allocated, the Inspector did conclude:



*“The site is undeveloped and consists mainly of rough grazing land. If there were a need to consider the allocation of greenfield urban extension sites in order to provide sufficient capacity to meet the agreed housing capacity, I accept that the objection site, in conjunction with other land in the wider ‘Hunters Moon’, is in principle appropriate for mixed-use development. It is located on the edge of the principal town within the District and the land is well-contained by clearly defined physical boundaries. There are no significant constraints in terms of agricultural land or landscape features. Development would, in my view, be seen as a logical extension of the Methuen and Turnpike employment estates and the Cepen Park development to the north of the A4.” (Paragraph 9.111 Inspectors Report)*

Old-style local plans are being replaced with Local Development Frameworks, which includes Core Strategies. PPS12 states that “Core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy” (paragraph 4.6), therefore it is not appropriate for the North Wiltshire Local Plan Inspectors comments to be given precedence in determining whether this site should be allocated in the Core Strategy. The Site Selection Process set out in Topic Paper 12 has assessed all the promoted sites including Hunters Moon at Chippenham against a number of factors including the delivery of the overall strategy for the town and for Wiltshire.

### **Issue 3**

- Unlike the large sites currently identified for strategic housing growth around Chippenham, our client’s site is not reliant on significant infrastructure which can delay the delivery of housing.
- The site could start to deliver housing within 2-3 years to help meet the council’s short term housing requirement and protect it from unplanned development.

### **Response**

For all strategic sites included in the Core Strategy, work has taken place to ensure they are viable and deliverable. Templates have been prepared for all strategic sites setting out criteria to be met as part of the masterplanning for the sites.

The strategic sites identified in the Core Strategy including for Chippenham will help to deliver the housing requirement in the short term. Trajectory information has been obtained for all the sites to ensure this is the case.

The deliverability of sites is not the only consideration in determining how a settlement should be developed.

### **Issue 4**

- Our site is not located in an area of flood risk, or ecological sensitivity; points which have understandably led to widespread local opposition

and objection from local people at other sites in the Chippenham area which remain as locations for large-scale housing growth.

- Our clients recognise the council's commitment to promotion of mixed-use development to encourage job creation, and are eager to work with Wiltshire Council if some employment use is considered to be desirable at part of a mixed use allocation at the Hunters Moon site.

## **Response**

Part of the site is an outstanding employment allocation in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2011. There haven't been any detailed proposals or planning applications for employment on this site. In 2005 employment provision was promoted as part of a mixed use development. More recently, the site been promoted for housing only.

The employment site was reviewed as part of the Workspace and Employment Review 2011. The report concluded that "*Hunters Moon, Chippenham, is located close to Methuen Business Park. It is unsuitable because it is currently accessed via narrow roads, is sloping and is relatively detached from the town. Even with significant investment on road links and site levelling it is only likely to be seen as a secondary business location which will not generate sale and rental levels to make development viable for employment uses. The site owner has not demonstrated any intention to develop this site for employment use in the last 10-15 years.*"

The delivery of employment land to enable jobs to be provided is an important part of the strategy for Chippenham. Alternative sites now included in the Core Strategy at Chippenham offer better opportunities for employment provision early in the plan period with housing and community uses alongside.

In the Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document (June 2011), it was considered that the Hunters Moon site could provide an opportunity to deliver housing and contribute to meeting the strategic housing requirement for the town. This was on the basis that the strategic employment provision at Showell Farm is located nearby and it was felt that that the site could be included as part of a sustainable urban extension linking Showell Farm and Patterdown with the town centre.

Following the consultation, further consideration has been given to this issue. The Hunters Moon site topography is in particular very challenging as it contains a hill which presents a physical, visual and perceived barrier from the western side. Access to the site is currently poor and it is considered that the railway line and road to the east create barriers to the connectivity of Hunters Moon and Saltersford Lane sites with Showell Farm/Patterdown/Rowden and the Methuen park employment site and A4 to the north create barriers to connectivity with Cepen Park and the town centre. Therefore, it is now considered that the site is separated from the remainder of the area of search.

Although the Hunters Moon site could help meet the strategic housing requirement for Chippenham, it is unclear as to what other benefits this will have for the town, the strategy set out in the Core Strategy and the vision objectives. Therefore, it is considered that Hunters Moon and Land at Saltersford Lane should not be taken forward as part of the South West Area of Search at present.

### **Issue 5**

In short, our clients feel that their site at Hunters Moon is able to provide the Council and Chippenham with a more balanced strategy for housing growth than is currently being considered. The submission Core Strategy currently relies on large strategic sites dependant on significant infrastructure projects, but excludes Hunters Moons in spite of its acknowledged potential to deliver housing and employment uses in a sustainable location.

### **Response**

Work has taken place to ensure that all strategic sites in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy are viable and deliverable. The proposed sites for Chippenham will ensure that the community has a better balance of jobs, services and facilities and homes.

### **Issue 6**

We would urge the council to reconsider the sites put forward in the latest Core Strategy draft document for consultation and examination by an Inspector as a result of today's meeting, and would ask in respect of Agenda Item 9: "Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document":

- a) Given the inspector's comments at the Local Plan review and its inclusion in all previous rounds of the Wiltshire Core Strategy; when was it decided, by whom and on what basis to exclude the Hunters Moon site from the Core Strategy put before members today?
- b) Given that the council has indicated the intense public opposition to development to the north, east and southwest of Chippenham, whilst acknowledging that there is comparatively little opposition to development at Hunter's Moon, why are the views of local people not being listened to?
- c) Do councillors not agree that it would be sensible to have Hunters Moon included in the core strategy, as a site that could come forward in a short time frame, to help the council to maintain a 5-year housing supply?

## **Response**

As explained above, the views of the Inspector expressed in his report regarding the North Wiltshire Local Plan are not a consideration which can be given any significant weight in the site selection process for the Core Strategy. The site selection process for Chippenham is set out in Topic Paper 12 and has had regard to previous consultations and evidence gathered as part of the core strategy process. This fully explains why the site is not included in the Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy. The inclusion of Hunters Moon is not necessary to meet the 5 year housing supply.

The development of Chippenham has been the subject of significant public consultation including a number of workshops. The Strategy as now proposed takes a balanced view of the consultation and evidence underpinning the merits of the different sites. Cabinet has endorsed the Core Strategy at its meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2012 and recommends that Council approve the document for consultation.

**Councillors' Questions**

**Questions From Councillor Chris Caswill**  
**Chippenham Monkton Division**  
**On Item 9 – Wiltshire Core Strategy**

**To Councillor Fleur De Rhé-Philippe**  
**Cabinet Member For Economic Development**  
**and Strategic Planning**

**Question 1**

- a) What assumptions have been made about population growth in the Chippenham community area for the Core Strategy period?
- b) Given the well-known uncertainties about in- and out-migration flows to a local area of this kind, what locally researched data has been drawn upon for the Chippenham population and housing projections in this Core Strategy draft?

**Response**

Wiltshire Council has projected the population and resulting housing requirement for Wiltshire as a whole assuming four different policy scenarios (natural change, population led, economic led and job alignment led). This is summarised within Topic Paper 15. These scenarios were used to inform the development of the requirement for 37,000 homes over the plan period.

These scenarios were also applied to the Chippenham Community Area and produced the following results:

- (i) The natural change from 2009 scenario assumed that births, deaths and headship rates (persons per household) would align with the national projections (i.e. the trends from the recent past would continue) and that there would be no migration in or out of the area. This is unrealistic in a free market economy, as migration will continue and cannot be prevented. If the number of dwellings resulting from this scenario were built, they would not cater to a local need, but rather to more affluent in-migrants (largely from the South East), requiring the local population to find accommodation elsewhere. Nevertheless this scenario is considered useful as it provides a baseline. This produces a requirement for 3,100 homes.

- (ii) The population led scenario assumes that births, deaths, migration and headship rates align with the national projections. This produces a requirement for 5,600 homes.
- (iii) The economic led scenario assumes that births, deaths, and headship rates align with the national projections, and places a further requirement that the future population should be sufficient to support a proportionate growth of jobs (according to the Cambridge Econometrics economic projections) assuming that the 2001 proportionate commuting flows are maintained. This produces a requirement for 4,900 homes.
- (iv) The job alignment led scenario assumes that births, deaths, and headship rates align with the national projections, and places a further requirement that the future population should be sufficient to support a proportionate growth of jobs (according to the Cambridge Econometrics economic projections) assuming that there will be no net commuting flows to or from the area (so that local jobs provide for local residents and vice versa). This produces a requirement for 2,600 homes.

These scenarios, when considered at the Community Area level should be used with caution, as projections are inherently less robust at a smaller geography.

Nevertheless, on balance, the identified requirement for 4,500 homes for the Chippenham Community Area provides sufficient homes to support economic growth, but would not allow for recent levels of migration to continue. This level of growth is considered appropriate as it ensures the sustainability as well as the economic prosperity of the area.

## **Question 2**

It appears that the Council not reduced its housing requirement for Chippenham by a single dwelling relative to the proposals put forward in the last consultation. This appears to be based on a failure to recognise a current and predicted decline in in-migration into North Wiltshire. Should that decline prove to be substantiated, would the Council agree that these housing numbers should be significantly reduced downwards in order to avoid the damaging consequences of over allocation, such as an unnecessary loss of high quality Grade 1 and 2 farmland, green open space and, more formally, an environmental and infrastructure deficit?

## **Response**

The housing requirement identified in the June consultation was based upon the most recent national population projections and no further evidence has come to light that would negate these. These most recent national projections (2008 based) actually identify an increase in both in-migration and net in-migration to North Wiltshire. The housing requirement for the Chippenham

Community Area (4,500 homes) already assumes that in-migration will decrease, in order for the area to become more sustainable. The plan will be monitored and reviewed, as and when substantive evidence arises to demonstrate that existing policies are not achieving their objectives.

### **Question 3**

With reference to the Rawlings Farm site, to the North East of Chippenham:

- a) Does she accept that Wiltshire Council's own Sustainability Appraisal highlights a number of key 'significant adverse environmental impacts' in relation to this, for which "there are no mitigation or inadequate mitigation has been proposed or for which mitigation is considered unachievable."
- b) Why does the latest Core Strategy draft not acknowledge that proposed development on this site is in direct conflict with Wiltshire Council's out-commuting and climate change policies, and would generate more congestion and carbon emissions than alternative sites to the north and west of Chippenham of which in recent months several have come forward with a more rational basis for local employment.
- c) Given the lack of evidence as to how the Sustainability Appraisal has informed the appraisal of reasonable alternatives, which is required by the SEA Directive under Article 5(1), should not the Council reconsider the overall costs and benefits of this site, relative to more sustainable alternatives?

### **Response**

The Sustainability Appraisal has considered the social, environmental and economic effects of developing the strategic sites identified in the Core Strategy. Where significant adverse impacts have been identified, mitigation and enhancements measures have been suggested where appropriate.

The more significant strategic sites within the Core Strategy, including those in Chippenham, have been assessed as likely to lead to significant adverse effects against particular sustainability objectives where mitigation is considered difficult. This is by virtue of the scale of these developments and the fact that they need to take place on greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement rather than more sustainable brownfield sites. Inevitably growth will also lead to increased demands on energy use in the construction of the houses, through their occupation and as a result of residents' travel. This is an inherent consequence of growth and as such will be identified within the Sustainability Appraisal.

The Rawlings Green site is not in conflict with out-commuting and climate change policies. Indeed the site provides for employment land alongside housing, community uses and greenspace achieving a sustainable pattern of development in alignment with the Core Strategy's objectives.

Alternative employment sites to the west and north of Chippenham do not form part of a sustainable mixed use urban extension to the town and therefore are less able to contribute to achieving a sustainable pattern of development in order to reduce carbon emissions (paragraph 2.13, Pre-Submission Draft Wiltshire Core Strategy).

A Sustainability Appraisal Report will be published alongside the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy to enable the soundness of the document to be considered. The Appraisal has considered all reasonable alternatives as required by the SEA Directive.

**Questions From Councillor Chris Caswill**  
**Chippenham Monkton Division**  
**On Item 9 – Wiltshire Core Strategy**

**To Councillor Jane Scott**  
**Leader Of The Council**

**Question 4**

With reference to the designation of Chippenham as a Wiltshire ‘Principal Settlement:

- a) On what basis was Chippenham designated as a Principal Settlement rather than a Market Town?
- b) Does this not have its origins in the assessments of the regional development process and the Regional Spatial Strategy proposals, which I hope she will agree were flawed and unhelpful to Wiltshire?
- c) Given the implications of this designation, not least in terms of expansion in the built environment that seems to follow from this designation, should not the residents of Chippenham have been consulted and their aspirations listened to?
- d) Will she acknowledge that the shortfall in that consultation has contributed significantly to the extensive and widespread opposition to developer-led expansion of the town that has emerged in every consultation that has since been carried out.
- e) Taking all this into account, should the Core Strategy not be adapted to take account of the stated preferences of local people for Market Town status?

**Response**

Chippenham is commensurate in terms of employment, housing, facilities, infrastructure and potential for sustainable development with the other Principal Settlements of Salisbury and Trowbridge. It is significantly better served than the largest Market Town identified in Core Policy 1. For example:



- Chippenham provides employment for 16,000 persons (the third highest in Wiltshire after Salisbury), which is some 55% greater than the largest Market Town.
- Chippenham is well served in terms of facilities – it has the third largest number of schools of any settlement in Wiltshire (some 60% greater than the largest Market Town); it has the third highest comparison retail turnover; it has the second highest number of comparison retail units; its mainline railway station, with direct access to London and proximity to the M4 makes it one of the most attractive location for investment, which should be maximised.
- Chippenham is only one of three settlements of this scale in Wiltshire.

The designation of Chippenham within the RSS as an SSCT did not in itself influence the designation within the Core Strategy. The Settlement Strategy (Core Policy 1) has been developed in the national policy context (as was the RSS), with development being focussed at the most sustainable settlements. The identification of Chippenham as a Principal Settlement arises from its role and function which holds true irrespective of the planning framework. The strategic importance of Chippenham was also identified in the adopted Structure Plan, which was locally derived planning policy.

It is recognised that concerns have been raised by the local community regarding the scale of growth at Chippenham. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the local community and the level of growth revised with a reduction from the 5,500 new homes proposed for the town in the RSS and Wiltshire 2026 (October 2009) to 4,000 new homes now proposed. Chippenham is one of the few Wiltshire settlements where growth has been reduced. Core Strategies must be based on robust and credible evidence and there is no compelling evidence to justify a lower scale of growth at the town.

### **Question 5**

I believe we are in full agreement about the need for the Wiltshire Core Strategy to be “employment-led”. If so, will she outline the steps that are being, and will be, taken to embed this within the draft Core Strategy?

### **Response**

The Core Strategy is employment led, this is reflected within the strategic objectives and a significant number of Core Policies within the document, particularly the Delivery Strategy (Core Policy 2) which priorities the release of employment land and at mixed use strategic sites ensures that employment land is phased for delivery at the early stage of a site’s development. The new Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership will work alongside the Wiltshire Strategic Economic Partnership and the Council to ensure successful implementation of the Core Strategy.

**Questions From Councillor Judy Rooke**  
**Chippenham Lowden And Rowden Division**  
**On Item 9 – Wiltshire Core Strategy**

**To Councillor Fleur De Rhé-Philippe**  
**Cabinet Member For Economic Development**  
**and Strategic Planning**

**Question 6**

I am extremely disappointed that 800 houses have been proposed to be built on green fields and grade 1 agricultural land around Rowden and Patterdown.

One of the many challenges for this development is going to be traffic from this large estate pouring onto already congested roads in the area.

The Highways Agency supports the use of brown field land wherever possible and suggests amending proposals if suitable additional brown field becomes available. Their general position is that green field development should only take place where suitable brown field sites are not available (para.9.12 Appendix 3, Topic paper 12).

In the recent Wiltshire Core Strategy Consultation Document, (para. 5.1.21) it was made clear from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that there were brown field sites in Chippenham that could accommodate housing, a potential of 545 houses.

The breakdown was Langley Park – 250, Middlefield - 55, Hygrade - 55, Cocklebury Road - 25 and 160 on small sites in Chippenham.

The Cabinet Member has responded, in a reply to my question at Cabinet on January 17th 2012, only 150 houses are to be considered for Langley Park as it is an important employment site. I understand that the total area of Langley Park is 20ha and that 250 houses would cover about 7ha. It is clear that Chippenham will have an ample supply of employment land from the proposed sites in the Core Strategy at least 26.2 ha. The Workspace and Employment Land Review 2011, suggests only 13.2ha is required for Chippenham and goes on further to comment that Wiltshire Council will need to carefully consider apparent over supply of land (para 10.8, Appendix 3, Topic Paper 12).

In the light of this evidence, will the Cabinet Member now agree that it would be possible for at least 250 houses to be built at Langley Park, with a plentiful supply of employment land remaining?

Will the Cabinet Member also agree to reduce the development in Rowden and Patterdown by the amount of housing brought forward from the brown field sites in Chippenham?

## Response

One of the specific issues to be addressed in planning for the Chippenham Community Area is that *'new employment provision in Chippenham is a priority and will help to redress the existing levels of net out-commuting. New employment provision will be supported on the allocated strategic sites and on identified town centre regeneration/ brownfield opportunity sites.'*

Langley Park is an identified regeneration site, which retains a number of employers and its proximity to the railway station and town centre offers potential to secure its long term use as an important employment site for the town. The Core Strategy supports the redevelopment of the site to *"deliver a mixed use site solution for a key redevelopment opportunity area to support the retention of significant business uses on part of the site."* (Core Policy 9).

The Workspace and Employment Land Review (2011) suggests a greenfield employment land figure of 13.2ha employment land at Chippenham. However the Core Strategy provides for a higher figure in order to provide choice and encourage inward investment to help redress the high levels of out-commuting and rebalance employment and employee numbers within the town.

Langley Park is an existing site. The report acknowledges that *"that there is little developable space remaining on the existing sites and limited availability of good quality built premises... There is a requirement for new allocations, particularly around the larger settlements, to meet demand for leaseholds and also to provide space for larger design and built options."*

Therefore, whilst the continued provision of employment land at Langley Park is supported, to ensure that demand from existing and new employers are met, it is necessary to allocate new employment land as part of the strategic sites at Chippenham. The number of dwellings for the site was revised from 250 down to 150 following detailed site assessment which concluded that a lower number of dwellings were more appropriate for the site. However, in bringing forward development on the site, in line with Core Policy 9, it is recognised that the mix of uses may change depending on the viability of differing options. This could result in a higher or lower number of houses being brought forward on the site.

### Question 7

Natural England, a government body which advises on the natural environment, noted that one area of the South West Chippenham site was visibly more prominent, and that consideration should be given to this sensitivity and possibly used as additional parkland (para 9.10 Appendix 3, Topic Paper 12).

Did Natural England specify in their comments to the Council where that area was and if they did, could the Cabinet Member give a specific indication of the area?

### Response

The comments from Natural England refer to land south west of the site within the Chippenham Community Area. Details of the exact area weren't provided, although the land referred to is **not** included as part of the site. The development template for the South West Chippenham site includes landscaping criteria which are required to be addressed in the masterplanning for the site, one of which will address the concerns of Natural England:

*“Development should consider the views from Public Rights Of Way and the high visual sensitivity of the Lacock to Lyneham limestone ridge. Development should maintain the visual integrity, open views and characteristics to the east and avoid harsh urban edges fronting open countryside.”*

**Schedule of changes to Wiltshire Core Strategy Pre-submission Document, required by Full Council**

**(a) Major Changes**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Core Policy 43, page 187	revised to include the words 'On sites of 4 dwellings or fewer.....'.	To ensure contributions for affordable housing are maximised in view of the Viability Study
Paragraph 6.47	should be revised to delete the phrase 'for sites of 4 dwellings or fewer.' But a sentence should be added at the end that reads 'On sites of 4 dwellings or fewer a financial contribution will be sought.....'.	As above
Throughout document	Bradford on Avon should not be hyphenated	To be factually accurate
Page 112	Salisbury misspelling	To correct drafting error
Page 159	Change shopping arcade in Westbury to shopping precinct	To be factually accurate
Appendix f	Redraft sub-heading to add clarity to exactly which boundaries are being removed	Improved clarity required
Page 61	Last bullet (Junction 17) to be removed)	To correct drafting error.
Final bullet page 124	Substitute bullet for that of paragraph 9.18 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy	To ensure consistency with adopted version.
Page 139 second bullet	Check why existing school allocation is not mentioned	To ensure consistency with saved allocations.

**(b) Minor changes**

<b>Paragraph number</b>	<b>Change required</b>
Page 38, introduction to Area Strategies,	Revised to reflect new format
Core Policy 35, page 172	'or allocated for' removed from second paragraph
Area Stratgeies	'larger and smaller' settlements replaced with 'large and small'
Core Policy 1	Misleading footnote removed
1.2	Remove the full stops at the end of some the lines in the bulleted list
Figure 1	Shouldn't there be a line connecting the 3rd box "Area strategy" to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> box entitled "neighbourhood plans", instead of two lines leading from the 4 <sup>th</sup> "neighbourhood plans" box?
1.10	Full stop missing at end of paragraph.

1.12	There are 2 full stops at end of the first sentence and also second sentence. In the second sentence, it would read better if it said "business community representatives" instead of just "business community".
2.0	4 <sup>th</sup> line from the bottom – 2 full stops.
2.0	Map following paragraph 2.0 needs a title and map number. None of the maps appear to be numbered apart from the very first map after paragraph 1.12. Either all the maps need to be numbered, or none of the maps – in which case, delete "Map 1" title after para 1.12.
2.9	Paragraph indenting
2.14	5 <sup>th</sup> line down – full stop is needed just before sentence beginning "Particular".
2.15	Last line to be amended as follows "is a also a challenge"
3.2	Strategic objective 2 and 4 don't line up with the start of the other strategic objectives
3.6	In the heading for Strategic Objective 3, remove full stop at end of line
3.6	Commas and full stop at the end of some of the bulleted lines to be removed. 4 <sup>th</sup> bulleted point – spacing is out.
3.7	Bulleted list – remove the full stops at the end of some of the lines.
3.8	In the heading for Strategic Objective 5, need to remove one of the colons (:)
3.10	In the heading for Strategic Objective 6, remove full stop at end of line
3.10	Bulleted list – remove the full stops at the end of some of the lines.
4.13	Insert full stop at end of last sentence.
4.14	Should a definition for a "small employment site" be included? A definition is provided for a "small housing site".
4.19	Map following paragraph 4.19 doesn't have a title or map number.
4.23	Bullet point 5 should read "plans" not "pans". Bullet point 6 remove full stop.
Core Policy 2	Under "Outside the defined limits of development" should be a colon (:) not a semi-colon after "and"  Reference to 800 dwellings at Longhedge should read "450"
4.35	Remove full stop at end of some of the bulleted lines.
Core policy 3	5 <sup>th</sup> line down, insert apostrophe to read "council's"
5.7	Amend first line to read "will change" instead of "to change"
5.13	4 <sup>th</sup> line down. Insert "is" as follows: "it is close to..."
5.14	5 <sup>th</sup> line down. Delete "it" as follows: "Durrington, in spite of its size it lacks..."
5.16	Paragraph numbering is out. Para 5.16 is followed by para 5.19. Need to check referencing in core policies for

	community areas, as these refer to paragraph numbers*.
5.19	Last line, remove apostrophe from “centre’s”
5.20	Remove full stops at the end of some of the lines in the bulleted list.
5.23	Full stop missing from last sentence.
5.23	Amesbury Community Area Map is not numbered or titled
Core Policy 4	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, delete wording “There will be no strategic housing sites allocated within the Amesbury Community Area.” Reference to paragraph 5.20 will change to reflect above*
Table 2 (and all other “Delivery of Housing” tables)	There are 3 columns under the main heading “Housing already provided for”. But should the first column “Requirement 2006-26” be under “Housing already provided for”? The requirement sets out what is required – and some of that hasn’t been provided yet....
5.27	Insert “and” at the end of the first line, after “Natural England”
Core Policy 5	3 <sup>rd</sup> line down. Reference should be to strategic objective 1, not strategic objective 3.
5.35	1 <sup>st</sup> line, delete “in” as follows: “The strategy for in”
5.36	5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point “....transport assessments is are required for major applications and”
5.37	No title or number for Map
Core Policy 7	Reference to paragraph 5.37 will change to reflect above*
5.40	1 <sup>st</sup> line: insert space between “iscarefully”
5.42	3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point: insert “is” and “and” as follows, and space between “includeinvestigations”: “a transport assessment is required for major applications and should includeinvestigations”
5.42	Last bullet point: policy number is missing as follows: “in accordance with CP ???”
5.43	Map – no number or title
Core Policy 8	Reference to paragraph 5.42 will change to reflect above*
5.48	Remove full stops from end of stop bullet points.  Bullet point 14. Delete: “the need for additional cemetery provision and” – (according to the Town Council, the new extension to the Town Council Cemetery has estimated capacity for another 25 years. This also applies to the development templates for the strategic sites in Chippenham)
5.52	Map – no number or title
Core Policy 9	Reference to paragraph 5.48 will change to reflect above* Map following CP9 – no map no.
Core Policy 10	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, add “s” to following: “The strategic allocations”  Reference to paragraphs 5.48 and 5.54 will change to reflect above*
Table 5	Under “housing to be identified”, the table indicates 2400

	<p>houses to be provided on strategic sites. This includes the 100-150 houses to be provided at Abbeyfield school which isn't referred to as a strategic site in Core Policy 10. Can a footnote be added to the table explaining this?</p> <p>Also, shouldn't "605" in this table read "600"?</p>
5.59	3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line down: remove one of the full stops
5.60	Map following paragraph 5.60 has no number.
Core Policy 11	Reference to paragraph 5.59 will change to reflect above*
Table 6	The completions, permitted sites, and remainder to be identified total 1440. This is more than the requirement for this community area over the plan period (1200). Is this correct? If so, should there be an explanation for this?
5.66	Map following this para has no number
Core Policy 12	3 <sup>rd</sup> para. Replace colon : with full stop after "Appendix A".
	Reference to para 5.65 will change to reflect above*
5.71	Map following this para has no number
Core Policy 13	Referece to para 5.70 will change to reflect above*
5.75	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point, last line. Amend as follows:  <del>the</del> There is a need to ensure that a balance of employment and housing opportunities is achieved into the longer term</p> <p>9<sup>th</sup> bullet point, 4<sup>th</sup> line down – delete underscore</p>
5.76	Map following this para has no number
Core Policy 14	3 <sup>rd</sup> para. Replace colon : with full stop after "Appendix A".
	Reference to para 5.75 will change to reflect above*
5.81	Map following this para has no number
Core Policy 15	Reference to para 5.80 will change to reflect above*
5.5 – suggest minor amendment as maps don't show flood risk	A map is presented, which shows the main settlements in the community area (Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres, and Large and Small Villages), as described in Core Policy 1. The map also shows selected constraints in the Community Area, such as areas Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB's)and Green Belt.
5.6 – suggest minor amendment as CA maps don't show areas in strategic sites for different types of development	Specific development sites have been identified in some community areas, where new jobs and homes will be provided. In those community areas where new employment land and housing is proposed in the form of strategic sites, the location of these is shown on the map. More detailed maps are provided in appendix A, showing indicative areas within each site for different types of development (employment, housing, mixed-use), and for areas of green space where built development will not take place. However, these maps are purely indicative, and each site will be subject to a master-planning process which will have community input.



Para 5.36, 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a transport assessment is required for major applications and must include an assessment of the likely future impacts of the Kingston Mills development and demonstrate how development will not exacerbate the existing AQMA.</li> </ul>
Para 5.36, 10 <sup>th</sup> bullet point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>developer contributions will be sought towards the expansion of the primary and secondary schools , and expansion or relocation to larger premises of one or both of the GP surgeries in the town</li> </ul>
Map of Melksham CA, p.93	<p>Amendments needed to map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The settlement boundary for Seend is shown in the wrong location.</li> <li>The Hampton Park district plan employment allocation is not shaded on the map as an allocation (it is shown as a Principle employment area, but there are some areas which aren't built out so I think it would be worth showing the allocation as well).</li> <li>The map of Melksham town does not have the same shape as the District Plan Town Policy Limits – may be confusing.</li> </ul>
Para 6.29 (p. 176-177)	<p>Suggest adding footnote at end of paragraph:</p> <p>Footnote: Policies TR6 (Tourist facilities in the Avebury World Heritage Site) and TR8 (Visitor accommodation in the Avebury World Heritage Site) of the Kennet Local Plan 2011 will continue to be saved, and should be referred to alongside Core Policies 39 (Tourist development) and 40 (Hotels, Bed and Breakfasts, Guest Houses and Conference Facilities).</p>
Core Policy 47, p.195	Refers to 20011 in two places – should be 2011
6.95, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence	The canal network in Wiltshire includes part of the Kennet and Avon Canal, and parts of the partially restored Thames and Severn Canal and Wilts and Berks Canal (including the North Wilts Branch).
6.104, last sentence	However this will need to be delivered in a sustainable manner which addresses the Cotswold Water Park's unique combination of land use pressures, environmental and heritage sensitivities, and community aspirations for the area.
6.108, first sentence	Several settlements within the Cotswolds Water Park are of significant heritage value as recognised through Conservation Area designations, while all settlements have a unique character which contributes to the area's sense of place.
Appendix A: Land at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon development pro-forma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To deliver an exemplar for sustainable development and renewable energy for development in the rest of Wiltshire, including the provision of renewable energy generation to meet carbon neutral standards (to be</li> </ul>

Key objectives – re-write third bullet and add additional bullet	<p>defined by Government) and development that meets high sustainability standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate the retention and expansion of an existing local employer, already located in close proximity to the site.</li> </ul>
<p>Appendix A: Land at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon development pro-forma</p> <p>Transport – first bullet point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate public transport, walking and cycling links should be provided to the town centre. This should include provision of a safe pedestrian/cycling route avoiding the B3107 (Holt Road).</li> <li>Financial contribution required to assist in the provision of an innovative sustainable transport solution for the town centre.</li> </ul>
<p>Appendix A: Land at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon development pro-forma</p> <p>Social and Community – first bullet point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial contribution required towards childcare provision. This includes expansion of the area and matching affordable childcare to the amount of affordable housing being provided.</li> </ul>
<p>Appendix A: Land at Kingston Farm, Bradford on Avon development pro-forma</p> <p>Green infrastructure – first bullet point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land between housing and the railway line should be safeguarded as public open space; opportunities to make this as accessible as possible to the wider community must be explored.</li> </ul>
<p>Appendix D: North Wilts policy CF1: Community Facilities (p. 333)</p> <p><i>(The first paragraph of the policy is in conflict with CP2 – therefore suggest amending text to make it clear that the first paragraph will be superseded).</i></p>	<p>Note that the first paragraph of the policy will be superseded by CP2 (Delivery Strategy).</p> <p>Continue to safeguard the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land off Blackwell Hams, Pewsham Way, Chippenham (proposed community hall)</li> <li>Stoneover Lane, Wootton Bassett (proposed school)</li> <li>Barn at Derriads Farm, Chippenham (proposed community use)</li> </ul> <p>Do not continue to safeguard the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land between Knockdown Lane and Sopworth Lane (proposed school) - a new school has been built in Sherston on a different site</li> </ul>
5.40	The strategy for Calne is to ensure that housing growth is carefully balanced with job creation
5.42	Additional space at the beginning of bullet 3
5.42 bullet 4	should include investigations
5.42 last bullet last word	Add policy number

CP12, CP14, CP29, CP31, CP32	Amend to full stop after reference to Appendix A (about half way down – currently a colon).
Appendix A: Land at the Maltings and Central Car Park, Salisbury, p.301	<b>Renewable Energy:</b> 10% renewable energy generated on or near the site
Appendix A: Land at the Maltings and Central Car Park, Salisbury, p.301	<b>Place Shaping Requirements - 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet the requirements of core policies 68 (water resources) and 69 (protection of the River Avon SAC) of this Core Strategy.</li> </ul>
Appendix A: Churchfields and the Engine Sheds, Salisbury, p.304	<b>Land Uses and Quanta of Development – 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 1100 dwellings of which a minimum of 40% will be affordable. The breakdown will be as detailed in Core Policy 6.</li> </ul> <p><i>Core policy 6 of the SWCS is to be replaced by CP45 (meeting Wiltshire's housing needs) of the WCS. However, CP45 doesn't provide a detailed breakdown of size/type to be provided. Possibly remove ref to CP6?</i></p>
Appendix A: Churchfields and the Engine Sheds, Salisbury, p.304	<b>Transportation:</b> Any major infrastructure requirement outcomes identified by the Salisbury Transport Model or subsequent Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. A Transport Assessment which sets out how the modal shift promoted at the national level will be achieved, including improved, bus, cycle and walking routes. The site's proximity to the city centre and railway station provides opportunities for the implementation of strong demand management techniques to be applied
Appendix A: Churchfields and the Engine Sheds, Salisbury, p.305	<b>Renewable Energy:</b> 10% renewable energy generated on or near the site
Appendix A, pages 312, 316 and 320	All include reference to RSS policy in relation to renewable energy provision – suggest removing as above.
Appendix A: all South Wilts development proformas	<i>General comment – the south Wilts pro-formas all require 10% renewable energy provision to be generated on or near the site- may be worth also adding reference to CP41 (Sustainable Construction and Low Carbon Energy) which sets targets for development to meet certain levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes (in full). E.g. could state:</i> <b>Renewable energy and sustainable construction:</b> 10% renewable energy generated on or near the site, and development to meet the requirements of Core Policy 41 (Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy). <i>Not sure if this would be changing requirements which are already found sound through the SWCS though.</i>

This page is intentionally left blank