

Phase 2 Housing Allocations Review – Summary of consultation

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
General Comments				
1	SW Regional Assembly	Neutral	None	-
4	Environment Agency	Neutral	No comment	-
Downton Specific				
2	Pegasus Planning on behalf of the Longford Estate (Site owners)	Support	1. Housing is needed to meet the district requirement 2. Wick Lane site is ready and available for development as allocated	1 & 2. Noted
Wilton Specific				
11	Defence Estates (Site owners)	Support	1. MOD holds the freehold to the Bulbridge Site 2. Support for the review findings 3. Much work has already been undertaken on the release of the site including highways and environmental matters	1. The point is noted 2. The support is noted 3. The progress of work is noted
Tisbury Specific				
3	Tisbury Parish Council (2 Letters dated 27/3/06 & 24/4/06)	Object	1. Asks that the review paper be revised to reflect the fact that the agricultural machinery fabrication (referred to in section 3.3 of the review paper) has ceased 2. Asks that it be noted that there are 60 employees in a truck repair business on the site and an office users 3. Considers that local democracy has consistently indicated a preference for smaller scale development which will not be affordable housing which is of little benefit to families in need. 4. Any large scale development will lead to unacceptable traffic increases on local roads. 5. The review suggests that the station works site is	1 & 2. The information provided is welcome and will be incorporated within the review paper. 3. Larger development sites have the potential to deliver a wider range of community benefits. On the issue related to affordable housing provision, all evidence available points towards a significant housing need in Tisbury and its surrounding villages and so affordable housing provision should not be dismissed in this way 4. All development will lead to some increase in propensity to travel, however the location of a greater proportion of new housing in large centres (such as Tisbury) is that there are more opportunities to walk and cycle for a range of basic needs. 5. The distinction being made in this case is that the loss of

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>unacceptable because of traffic generation. Surely this would apply to Hindon Lane too ?</p> <p>6. SDC is disregarding a perfectly acceptable brownfield site</p> <p>7. Raises issues relating to the Hindon Lane site - i) Serious problems of road access in Tisbury ii) Pedestrian safety along Hindon Lane</p> <p>8. The review appears to be setting out a position with consultation being a cursory extra.</p>	<p>employment to housing has a dual effect of increasing commuting by former employees (who have to seek work elsewhere) as well as generating new commuting demands from the new residents.</p> <p>6. The review process has been undertaken to objectively review the provision of housing and sources of supply. This process is not, however, undertaken in isolation from the basis of the local and national policy framework. A balance of employment, housing, services and other requirements within communities is essential and thus the debate is not just purely one of brownfield v greenfield.</p> <p>7. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. Should the sites be released these matters will be fully addressed in the preparation of a development brief for the site. Nevertheless on the two points raised i) The Local Plan inspector concluded that road access was satisfactory ii) The natural walking route to the centre from the Hindon Lane site is not via Hindon Lane, instead one would probably descend using the pavement on Weaveland Road to the High Street.</p> <p>8. There was no obligation for the council to consult on this matter, however, given the sensitivity of the issue, particularly in Tisbury it chose to do so in order that views could be sought and any details could be clarified. The draft conclusions do set out a position and the consultation was undertaken to understand whether there are any fundamental reasons why the approach suggested should not be pursued.</p>
5	D M Carter (Hindon Lane)	Neutral	1. Raises concerns about wildlife interests on the Hindon Lane site.	1. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. Nevertheless, the badger sett on the site was addressed by the Inspector who set out a clear requirement to accommodate this and appropriate foraging areas. Any further interests will be examined in the process of preparing a development brief for the site.
6	D Carroll (Old Farmyard)	Object	<p>1. Concern at local consultation arrangements and choice of venue at the library in Tisbury.</p> <p>2. Considers that the Station Works site is a redundant industrial site which is no longer needed</p>	<p>1. The exhibition session was advertised and held in the most accessible location in Tisbury. Whilst a little crowded for short periods, there was sufficient space and time for contributors to view and make enquiries with the attending officer.</p> <p>2. Full marketing of the site, for both reuse and redevelopment, has not been undertaken. It cannot therefore be assumed</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>for that purpose and that the transport infrastructure is ill suited to heavy vehicles. Light industrial units are really what is needed.</p> <p>3. Highlights the vacancy of other nearby units as an indicator of demand.</p> <p>4. Station Works site would be better for housing as it is nearer to the village centre, and be less isolated.</p> <p>5. Traffic would not need to come through the village and use Hindon Lane if the Station Works site was developed.</p>	<p>that the site is no longer needed for employment purposes. There is no disagreement with the statement that light industrial units are needed.</p> <p>3. During consultation much was made of the vacancy in the industrial units on the eastern side of Station Road and that this was an indication of the state of the market. These units have remained empty for a considerable period, although in recent months have been occupied by 2 users. It has subsequently been found that lengthy vacancy of the units concerned was related to a legal clause which came into effect should a single occupier purchase of the whole building for use. Negotiation on this issue appears to have caused the sale to fall through, and during this negotiation the buildings were not on the market.</p> <p>4. There is very little difference in distance between the two sites and the whole range of facilities in Tisbury (shops, school, leisure centre). Perceptually, it is unreasonable to suggest that the Station Works site is not isolated given the geographical barriers imposed by the river and railway. In many ways these factors contribute to the Station Works site not being in accordance with Local Plan policy H22(ii)</p> <p>5. Whichever site is developed, there is likely to be increased traffic on Hindon Lane depending upon the choices made by new occupants and businesses.</p>
7	R Beattie Gaston Manor	Object	<p>1. Housing targets are meaningless and supply can be better provided through the conversion of non-residential uses in urban areas</p> <p>2. Why does a brownfield site need to be found in the same community.</p> <p>3. Considers that the reasons for rejecting the Station Works site are out of date</p>	<p>1. The council is charged with making provision for housing development through the planning system. The planning system does allow for the conversion of non-residential uses, however there is also a need to maintain a balance of uses to maintain the vibrancy of community living.</p> <p>2. In planning for the district, the aim was to provide a balanced distribution of development which responds to the needs in terms of housing and employment. The Local Plan Inspector was very clear that in Tisbury, growth should not be provided for on an ad hoc basis and that the allocation proposed an appropriate balance of social and economic development.</p> <p>3. The principal reasons for refusal of the previous planning application related to the Station Works (quoted in Appendix B) do remain valid, although some can be overcome with further work. The updated review paper addresses the ongoing relevance of these reasons.</p>
8	R Frankland	Support	<p>1. What is the point of having a planning process if decision makers are not going to follow it.</p>	<p>1. The Local Plan is pre-eminent in decisions on land use. This review exercise is concerned with allowing the plan to be</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Concern that subjective local opinion is misleading and by-passing the objective analysis of professional judgement 3. The Station Works site remains a vital employment resource to underpin the social and economic progress of Tisbury 	<p>responsive to changes in circumstance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The decision on the outcome of the review process will be made by councillors and based upon the planning issues present in this summary, the review paper and the covering report. Without such regard the any decision will be subject to legal challenge. 3. In strategic terms, it is agreed with the respondent that the Station Works site has a role to play in the long term future of Tisbury.
9	J Pope	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Station Works site is an essential employment resource for the long term well being of our village 2. Could investment in employment at Hindon Lane not be directed towards the Station Works site and a greater proportion of affordable homes be provided instead 3. Quotes that "If such Housing is to be thrust upon us, in the strong opinion of 49% of the 1018 persons answering the TISVis Questionnaire, it should not be built at Station Works...There was no specific mention of the Hindon Lane site...One can only surmise why it was the question was not put" 4. Expresses concern that despite involvement, the TISVis exercise and the involvement of the Parish Council is being unduly influenced by those with interests on Hindon Lane. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In strategic terms, it is agreed with the respondent that the Station Works site has a role to play in the long term future of Tisbury. 2. This is not an option being considered at the moment, although there is potential to investigate this if the owners of the Station Works could be brought into discussion. 3. The survey information provided provides an interesting perspective on local opinion in this matter although one must be cautious about the use of statistics in isolation. (Also see representation 16 below) 4. The views expressed are interesting within the context of the review and whilst not raising relevant planning issues, are of relevance to the political process.
10	A Kenney Herbert	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The noise associated with rail does not make the Parmiter site the most attractive site for residential development 2. The Parmiter site is the one site where there is an opportunity to develop employment. Why restrict future opportunities ? 3. Expresses concern that the Chairman of the Tisbury Parish Council is using her position to campaign. Also raises concerns about the TISVis questionnaire referred to at the public meeting – needs proper analysis before using it for decision making 4. Much has been made of the increase in traffic flows on Hindon Lane but there appears to be no evidence for this - where are the jams and parking 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise will be an intermittent issue for potential residents, however modern building techniques can mitigate against this problem 2. In strategic terms, it is agreed with the respondent that the Station Works site has a role to play in the long term future of Tisbury. 3. The views expressed are interesting within the context of the review and whilst not raising relevant planning issues, are of relevance to the political process. 4. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. However, it is fair to observe that County Highways were satisfied with traffic flows in the area

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			problems site ?	and supported an access on Hindon Lane. The inspector recognised some issues regarding the poor alignment of the road and recommended traffic calming measures to be delivered on the back of the development. Should the site be released these matters will be fully addressed in the preparation of a development brief.
12	J & B Bell	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the loss of employment land in Tisbury given its limited supply locally. 2. Expresses concern about access to the Station works site, particularly in times of flooding 3. Building on Hindon Lane would allow better access to the B3089 and reduce travel demands through the centre of Tisbury. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In strategic terms, it is agreed with the respondent that the Station Works site has a role to play in the long term future of Tisbury. 2. There are some concerns about access to the station works site – particularly in times of flood however these could be overcome. The more significant concern is pedestrian access as the rail crossing – whether by tunnel or bridge faces a number of engineering challenges 3. The point is noted although there is likely to be increased traffic in the centre of Tisbury depending upon the choices made by new occupants on either of the sites .
13	S Sykes (Hindon Lane)	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understands the need to retain an employment land and can see the potential of the site, however highlights the vacancy on the site since 2003. 2. Considers that access to the Station works site (Reason 4 for refusal previously) could be overcome with the right proposal 3. Considers that Reason 5 can apply to any large site in Tisbury in that it will generate more traffic. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It remains unclear whether the manner in which the site has been made available is unattractive to potential occupants looking to lease. 2. Accepted - although there are significant challenges in any solution 3. The distinction being made in this case is that the loss of employment to housing has a dual effect of increasing commuting by former employees (who have to seek work elsewhere) as well as generating new commuting demands from the new residents.
14	J Young (Hindon Lane)	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It must be preferable to build new housing on a brownfield site 2. The type of buildings and limited access means this is not a good site for employment 3. That the relocation of employment to another site 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The review process has been undertaken to objectively review the provision of housing and sources of supply. This process is not, however, undertaken in isolation from the basis of the local and national policy framework. A balance of employment, housing, services and other requirements within communities is essential and thus the debate is not just purely one of brownfield v greenfield. 2. The access to the site has served a peak load of around 200 employees and accommodated large lorries delivering heavy machinery. As far as the buildings go there has been no marketing as is and as a redeveloped site for employment, it would be surprising to find no demand. 3. Whilst the businesses have left, the potential to provide a

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>is no longer valid given that most businesses have left the site.</p> <p>4. That a footbridge over the railway should be constructed</p> <p>5. Considers that Reason 5 can apply to any large site in Tisbury in that it will generate more traffic.</p> <p>6. There are services on the Station Works site to meet the demands of a mixed use development</p>	<p>number of jobs locally remains if the site were offered for lease or sale competitively - as has been requested for the last 3 years. Until evidence to the contrary – as required by PPG3 and Policy E16 of the Local Plan – is provided the release of the site should not be considered if the council is serious about maintaining and promoting balanced communities.</p> <p>4. Access over (or under) the railway is a key issue and faces significant challenges.</p> <p>5. The distinction being made in this reason is that the loss of employment to housing has a dual effect of increasing commuting by former employees (who have to seek work elsewhere) as well as generating new commuting demands from the new residents.</p> <p>6. Point is noted</p>
15	Bell Cornwell Partnership on behalf of St Modwen Properties Plc (Station Works Site Owners)	Object	<p>1. Sets out brief details of a proposal for a mixed use development of 3500m² of employment space and 60 houses.</p> <p>2. Highlights the proximity of the station and services in the town centre to the Station Works site which has the potential to reduce car borne travel.</p> <p>3. Statistics point towards net out commuting of 245 each day in 2001 which will have increase in light of the uses on the Station Works ceasing. The redevelopment will bring in around 70 new economically active people and create about 100-150 new jobs – in effect reducing net out commuting</p> <p>4. Quotes para 23 of PPS1, para 30 of PPG3 and para 12-13 of PPS1 which all refer to the promotion of brownfield development and the reuse of vacant/underused buildings.</p>	<p>1. These fact are noted, however any comment on the suitability of any proposal must be subject of a planning application.</p> <p>2. Depending upon how access arrangements to the Station works site are secured the potential for greater rail use is accepted. However, by the same logic any new development within Tisbury has the potential to generate more demand for rail transport – a point highlighted at the time of the local plan inquiry</p> <p>3. The logic used is reasonable, however given that the reuse/ redevelopment of the whole Station Works site could create between 300-400 jobs (using the same calculation) there is a far greater potential to reduce net outcommuting without even considering the supply of employment land premises forthcoming from the Hindon Lane site were it to be developed.</p> <p>4. As stated in response to previous points this exercise is not concerned solely with a greenfield v brownfield argument. There are many aspects of guidance which could be cited, however it is the weight that is given to each which is important. Officers would argue, based on the core objectives of planning expressed in PPS 1and the Sustainable Communities agenda that the long term aim of planning (as set out in PPS1, Para 5) is “to facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural development”. In the case of Tisbury, can the release of the</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>5. The redevelopment of the Station Works would achieve benefits for the AONB in removing an eyesore building and prevent the need for new development in an exposed location within the designated area.</p> <p>6. Quotation of Structure Plan Policies a) <i>DP1 - promote patterns of land uses which minimise the need to travel and support increased use of public transport, cycling and walking</i> – At the Station Works a mixed use scheme can link housing and jobs to reduce travel demands. b) <i>DP3 – select extract “The development of [previously developed] land should not be inhibited on the grounds that housing requirements can be met on other sites”</i> c) That the site – based on para 4.24 of the Structure Plan - would increase employment and use a brownfield site.</p> <p>7. Quotation of Local Plan Policy G1 (iv) – “make effective use of land in urban areas, particularly on previously developed sites.”</p> <p>8. Considers that Local Plan Policy E16 is not flexible enough to consider a mixed use development</p>	<p>only significant employment site without evidence of marketing be a prudent step to in securing a balanced mix of uses which can reduce travel demands and promote a more diverse economy within this local centre ?</p> <p>5. It is accepted that the existing building is a significant within the setting of Tisbury and recent neglect has increased perception that it is an eyesore. However, the relative benefits of a redevelopment of the site in broad landscape terms is limited. In terms of the Hindon Lane site, the inspector considered that this land was an “unused piece of land that lies generally within the framework of the built up area” and that careful design with some mitigation would enable any development not to be intrusive within the setting of the landscape and within Tisbury.</p> <p>6. Officers would agree entirely with the intentions of DP1 and are surprised that it is being used to support the release of the Station Works given its citation in the reasons for refusal of the last planning application. The release of employment land at the Station Works without any solid justification in terms of market demand is fundamentally contrary to DP1 in that it is eroding the balance of land uses which are required to promote sustainability in Tisbury. Furthermore, the supporting text of policy DP3 makes it clear (in para 4.24) that the redevelopment of previously developed land for housing should not be at the expense of the supply of employment land locally.” It must be highlighted that the release of the Station Works for mixed use development would mean that the potential supply of employment land would be reduced from 2.4ha to 1ha. A further point to note is that should the allocated site at Hindon Lane be sidelined, the proposed 1.4ha from that site would not be provided – in all amounting to a net loss of 2.8ha of local supply as well as reduction in choice.</p> <p>7. As stated in points 4 and 6 above this is not a pure brownfield v greenfield argument. The first criteria of policy G1 reflects core national, regional and county policy in promoting sustainable patterns of development. This is not rejecting brownfield re-use, but instead setting it in the context of a broader expectation to focus on the long term function of communities.</p> <p>8. Policy E16 does allow for that flexibility, however the key issue is whether the site is no longer need for employment use. The revision to PPG3 published in 2005 and draft PPS3</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
				<p>both encourage the reuse of previously developed land but make it clear that this is subject to the land no longer being needed. Policy E16 is applied to act as a test to ensure that no demand exists prior to releasing sites and its requirements were made very clear in the course of the last planning application relating to the Station Works. The advice given was not applied and the application was rejected partially on this basis. Further work to demonstrate this has not been submitted and the agent for the site has made it clear that such work has yet to be undertaken as required. Additionally, it is that case that an offer to buy the site and provide it entirely for employment use was made in 2004 and this was rejected on the basis that the owners (St Modwen) – quote - “are currently seeking to obtain planning consent for a mixed use redevelopment scheme.”</p>
16	B Woodcock (Hindon Lane)	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Plan process is inflexible to change 2. The closure of Nadder Middle School, the commitment to dual the railway and the closure of Parmiters represent changes which should be considered. 3. Considers that the rate of growth in a community has a great influence on the nature of a place. Swamping the community with housing will change the balance. 4. Accepts the need for affordable housing but considers that younger people benefit from moving away from an area to gain experience. Those who 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is accepted that the Local Plan process has been quite inflexible in the past, however the review process built in to assess greenfield housing allocation allows the council to re-examine alternatives. 2. All three matters do not fundamentally alter the role of Tisbury as a local centre and a location which is suitable for the accommodation of new housing. 3. The point is accepted; however figures dating back to 1986 show that on average Tisbury has accommodated around 17 new homes per year. In 5 year groupings the following is the case <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1986-1991 24 per year 1991–1996 10 per year 1996-2001 18 per year 2001-2005 14 per year <p>For the remainder of the plan period – i.e. to 2011 Tisbury can expect a large site (either Hindon Lane or the Station works) and a degree of Windfall development which together may amount to around 120 houses which over 6 years will average out to 20 per year. This is not vastly in excess of recent trends and is a reflection of national and local policy which since the late 1990s has tightened up on the amount of development in isolated village locations.</p> 4. The view expressed here is difficult to reconcile. The council, though its planning and housing policies, is providing affordable opportunities for people to remain within their

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>gain their objectives [of living in places like Tisbury] without having to struggle are poorer for it. Appears to suggest that only those achieving success have the sense of pride and belonging to a community.</p> <p>5. Considers that the council should be more pragmatic than just expecting employment to replace employment. A new enterprise business park is desperately what is needed and a scheme on this site mixed with housing and open space can deliver this.</p> <p>6. Considers that the Station Works site could include provision of an underground car park to meet the chronic parking need at the station.</p> <p>7. Access over the railway is not an insurmountable obstacle.</p> <p>8. Access by foot to the town from the Station Works will restrict two way movement in the river bridge and introduce traffic lights which are both unsatisfactory. A simple footbridge adjacent to the road bridge would suffice.</p> <p>9. Cannot understand why traffic movements from a mixed use scheme are significantly different from traffic movement from the historic use of the site.</p>	<p>home community if that is their choice and this constitutes help, not a handout. The suggestion that only those who have achieved success have the right to live in a location such as Tisbury is concerning.</p> <p>5. The council have not opposed the concept of a mixed use redevelopment of the Station Works site per se. The key issue in this case is the ongoing need for employment land. Tisbury is a local centre within the context of a very rural district and thus it is reasonable that it provides not only for services, but also jobs. Evidence points towards a large number of small businesses in small premises the surrounding rural area. There are consistently applications seeking change of use of buildings for employment purposes. For business to grow larger premises are needed and local centres like Tisbury can provide for this. The alternative is that small businesses move to sites further away (to Salisbury, Amesbury, Gillingham, etc) which in turn requires existing employees to travel further. Thus until it can be shown that demand does to exist – in response to a proper marketing exercise – the site cannot be considered redundant.</p> <p>6. Parking is an issue at the station, and the dualling of the line means that the Station Works site has a role to play in meeting this need. The comment that the car park should be underground is not explained and on face value would appear to be highly expensive.</p> <p>7. Agreed. A means to replace the pedestrian crossing of the railway can be achieved; however it poses significant difficulties in the form of either a bridge (visual intrusion and land requirement of the ramped structure which must accommodate disabled access) or a tunnel (flooding).</p> <p>8. County Highways have indicated that foot access is deficient using the road bridge and have suggested a traffic light controlled single lane arrangement enabling a proper footway to be built within the carriageway. The construction of a secondary footbridge does raise concerns in relation to the setting of the listed bridge however the resolution of this will be part of any future planning application</p> <p>9. This point appears to relate to refusal reason 5 from the previous planning application. The distinction being made in this instance is that the loss of employment to housing (as</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>10. The matter of drainage (reason 6 for the previous refusal) is just a negative point to justify the conclusion at the time.</p> <p>11. Salisbury District Council responded in detail to an outline application to paint the blackest picture of the site to justify its Greenfield allocation for housing.</p> <p>12. In summary, respondent draws some comparisons between the Hindon Lane site and Station Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Shorter walk to Tisbury Shops without the ascent of a hill home ii) Brownfield before Greenfield, iii) Light industrial and commercial uses would be a better use of the site than existing iv) Environmental and landscape benefits to be gained a from comprehensive scheme set out in an SDC Development Brief for the site <p>13. Highlights findings of TISVis local consultation do not support development at Hindon Lane/Weaveland Road.</p>	<p>part of a mixed use scheme) has a dual effect of increasing commuting by former employees (who have to seek work elsewhere) as well as generating new commuting demands from the new residents.</p> <p>10. There was insufficient evidence provided at the time in respect of drainage, however the informative details following the reasons for refusal (included within appendix 2 of the review paper) make it clear that this can be resolved with more data.</p> <p>11. This is not accepted. All the points addressed amount to 'in principle' issues which needed to be resolved at the outline stage. Provision of suitable access, impact on flood risk as well as the strategic concerns about the loss of employment are macro issues which go to the very heart of the matter.</p> <p>12. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. Should the sites be released these matters will be fully addressed. Nevertheless, in this instance it is fair to comment on the points raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The distances from the Station Works to the nearest shop in the High Street are accepted, but no comment is made regarding access to the school, library, sports centre and other facilities at the top of the High Street where the comparison is less favourable . ii) As stated above this is not a purely Greenfield v Brownfield argument. iii) Agreed – there is not restriction on the type of employment to be provided. iv) Accepted, subject to the fundamental issues being addressed. A redevelopment for employment can also deliver such benefits. <p>13. The survey information provided provides an interesting perspective on local opinion in this matter although one must be cautious about the use of statistics in isolation. (Also see representation 9 above)</p>
17	I & M Howcroft (Hindon Lane)	Object	<p>1. Considers that despite intensive advertising the site has remained vacant for a number of years.</p>	<p>1. The site has enjoyed use by a number of businesses, and according to the Parish Council employed up to 60 people until quite recently. It is unclear whether the vacancy on the site is the product of the restrictive marketing terms offered combined with the expressed intentions of the site owners to seek redevelopment. Until a full and reasonable marketing exercise is undertaken the true demand for use of the site cannot be assessed.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Large or medium sized companies will not be relevant in Tisbury. Why retain such a site ? 3. Access over the railway is not an insurmountable obstacle. 4. Traffic is a problem whichever way you approach Tisbury 5. There is better foot access from the Station Works site than from Hindon Lane to the centre of Tisbury 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The key issue in this case is the ongoing need for employment land. Tisbury is a local centre within the context of a very rural district and thus it is reasonable that it provides not only for services, but also jobs. Evidence points towards a large number of small businesses in small premises within the surrounding rural area. There are consistently applications seeking change of use of buildings for employment purposes. For business to grow larger premises are needed and local centres like Tisbury can provide for this. The alternative is that small businesses move to sites further away (to Salisbury, Amesbury, Gillingham, etc) which in turn requires existing employees to travel further. This is contrary to the overall objective of reducing the need to travel. 3. Agreed. A means to replace the pedestrian crossing of the railway can be achieved; however it poses significant difficulties in the form of either a bridge (visual intrusion and land requirement of the ramped structure which must accommodate disabled access) or a tunnel (flooding). 4. This point appears to relate to refusal reason 5 from the previous planning application. The distinction being made in this instance is that the loss of employment to housing (as part of a mixed use scheme) has a dual effect of increasing commuting by former employees (who have to seek work elsewhere) as well as generating new commuting demands from the new residents. 5. The distances concerned are relatively similar when the whole High Street is taken into account. Access to the school, library and leisure centre appears to have been overlooked. In terms of pedestrian safety, the natural walking route to the centre from the Hindon Lane site is not via Hindon Lane, instead one would probably descend using the pavement on Weaveland Road to the High Street.
18	Southern Planning Practice on behalf of CG Fry & Sons (Hindon Lane Site)	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Democratic deficit – the Hindon Lane site has been fully examined through the local plan process which concluded the site would provide for balanced housing and employment. Given the significance of the Station works, it should be considered in the same way as part of the LDF process. 2. Development on the Station Works site would need to be much denser to achieve a similar level of housing at Hindon Lane. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The point made is fair, however in the context of this review a degree of pragmatism must be taken in respect of considering alternatives. Nevertheless, the council is aware that if its reasons for rejecting the fully tested allocated site are arbitrary and founded on poor information it will be subject to legal challenge. 2. Noted, although the relative density of development is a product of the site setting and the design solution proposed. Both sites will face challenges (although not insurmountable)

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>3. The Hindon Lane site makes greater provision for Affordable Housing.</p> <p>4. Employment supply would be substantially reduced if a mixed use scheme on the Station Works site was agreed and would contribute to Tisbury being consigned to dormitory status</p> <p>5. Remnant employment on the Station works would be encumbered by conflict with residential properties restricting the types of business uses able to be accommodated</p> <p>6. The picture painted by those promoting the Station works for mixed use redevelopment is one of vacancy. This is not true. There is evidence of use throughout the period since the Parmiter business ceased. (Details set out).</p> <p>7. There is strong demand locally for small units and the need for growth space for expanding business. Cites the example of Place Farm (12,000sq ft), which since completion in the last few years has been consistently fully let. Reference to the other units let by the Fonthill Estate suggests that the longest vacancy period experienced in the last 10 years was 4 months. Evidence therefore points towards demand if property is let at sensible terms and using proper marketing</p>	<p>in integrating development within the setting of the town and the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>3. A proportion of 20% affordable housing was offered in respect of the Station Works proposal – equivalent to 12 units . The Hindon Lane site can provide at least 33% amounting to 25 units, although this reflects the relative cost of provision on a differing site types.</p> <p>4. It is accepted that the release of the Station Works for mixed use development would mean that the potential supply of employment land would be reduced from 2.4ha to 1ha. A further point to note is that should the allocated site at Hindon Lane be sidelined, the proposed 1.4ha from that site would not be provided – in all amounting to a net loss of 2.8ha of local supply as well as reduction in choice. The role of Tisbury as a local centre within its rural catchment would therefore be undermined and local businesses in need of expansion on sites like the Station Works would be required to move further afield to grow – in turn contributing to increased outcommuting.</p> <p>5. The point is accepted. Given the linear nature of the site, any employment development would be restricted in type to ensure that residential amenity is not unduly affected. Whilst light industrial/commercial and office uses may be preferable in this location, the opportunity to provide for some heavy uses would be severely compromised.</p> <p>6. It is fair to observe that there has been a reasonable level of economic activity on the site, however concerns have been expressed that this has been quite transient in nature on account of the lease terms offered. The key issue is that there has been insecurity amongst business regarding their short to medium term prospects on account of the speculation about the site future. In such a climate investment is not secure.</p> <p>7. The information set out confirms the anecdotal evidence which has been provided from a number of sources. The need for a proper marketing and letting arrangements to address issues as set out in the response to the previous point.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>8. The Hindon Lane site was assessed to have a strong interrelationship with the settlement and have no significant impact on the wider landscape subject to effective supplementing of existing indigenous landscaping. The Station Works site is isolated by the river and railway and has the potential to have significant impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>9. There are no outstanding constraints to be resolved at Hindon Lane.</p> <p>10. There are significant issues to resolve at the Station Works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) scheme to redevelop the Station Works would result in the loss of 14 parking spaces at the station which already has insufficient capacity. The proposal did not include any additional parking to replace this. ii) footbridge is poorly conceived iii) impact of railway noise on potential residents iv) Station Road can flood leaving the site cut off from town <p>11. Accessibility – both sites are peripheral to the settlement in terms of distances to services and facilities. On balance this favours Hindon Lane.</p> <p>12. The development of the Station Works would</p>	<p>8. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. However, the Inspector considered that this land was an “unused piece of land that lies generally within the framework of the built up area” and that careful design with some mitigation would enable any development not to be intrusive within the setting of the landscape and within Tisbury. In the case of the Station works, there is certainly a perceptual isolation caused by the natural barriers of the river and railway. In terms of visual intrusion the Station works is significant in the setting of Tisbury and in previous discussions regarding the provision of a pedestrian railway bridge the impact on the Conservation Area was a consideration.</p> <p>9. Subject to detailed aspects being addressed in a development brief, it is accepted that there are no significant “unknowns” which would hold back development at Hindon Lane and is therefore seen as being more deliverable within the context of this review.</p> <p>10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) This observation is fair, however a future scheme on the Station Works could make use of a tunnel access (i.e. reducing land take for a bridge) or make provision for parking in association with the new platform. ii) Crossing of the railway can be achieved; however it poses significant difficulties in the form of either a bridge (visual intrusion and land requirement of the ramped structure which must accommodate disabled access) or a tunnel (flooding). This will need to be resolved in any future application. iii) Railway noise may be an issue, however modern designs and materials can mitigate against this effect if it were seen to be significant. There are many examples of housebuilding adjacent to railways. iv) There are instances of Station Road being flooded which may mean residents of any future Station Works housing might be isolated from the town. This matter will need to be fully considered and allowed for in any future planning application. <p>11. The distances from either site under consideration are relatively similar when the whole High Street is taken into account. There is better access to the school, library and leisure centre from the Hindon Lane site.</p> <p>12. There is a serious question as to the longterm impact of the</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>undermine the functions of the town and be contrary to the objectives of the local plan</p> <p>13. The Hindon Lane site will provide land for a swimming pool</p>	<p>loss of the last remaining significant employment site on the functional future of Tisbury. In reflecting the aims of the local plan in the Introduction, as well as the advice set out in national and regional guidance, any decision on this matter will need to take into account the need to promote a balanced pattern of land uses.</p> <p>13. Point noted</p>
19	Symonds and Sampson on behalf of M Harris (Hindon Lane)	Support	<p>1. The Station Works retains the potential to deliver a wide range of employment, including B2 uses which would not be compatible in a mixed use scheme. The employment potential of the site has yet to be fully explored in its current form or through redevelopment</p> <p>2. If the Hindon Lane site is deleted in favour of the Station Works for Housing, there will be a loss of employment land which will be detrimental to Tisbury</p> <p>3. The Station Works site is a poor location for development in that it requires a bridge or other access to link it to the village.</p> <p>4. The Hindon Lane site makes greater provision for Affordable Housing.</p> <p>5. Is a mixed use scheme at the Station Works really viable.</p> <p>6. The Hindon Lane site makes provision for a Swimming pool</p> <p>7. The prospective developers at Hindon Lane are committed to delivering a quality development in a similar fashion to other sites (e.g. Poundbury, Mere) which will be of credit to Tisbury.</p> <p>8. The Hindon Lane site is immediately available.</p>	<p>1. Agreed</p> <p>2. Agreed</p> <p>3. A solution is not insurmountable to provide access to the site, however it poses significant difficulties in the form of either a bridge (visual intrusion and land requirement of the ramped structure which must accommodate disabled access) or a tunnel (flooding).</p> <p>4. A proportion of 20% affordable housing was offered in respect of the Station Works proposal – equivalent to 12 units . The Hindon Lane site can provide at least 33% amounting to 25 units, although this reflects the relative cost of provision on a differing site types.</p> <p>5. The viability of any scheme will need to be demonstrated as part of a planning application. The delivery of housing and employment <u>together</u> will need to be strictly conditioned as is required on the Hindon Lane site should it go forward.</p> <p>6. Point noted</p> <p>7. Point noted.</p> <p>8. Agreed.</p>
20	M Knight (Received Late)	Object	<p>1. Raises issues related to Hindon Lane</p> <p>i) Need for major road improvements on Hindon</p>	<p>1. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. However</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>Lane to enable satisfactory movement and will exacerbate parking and congestion on the High Street.</p> <p>ii) Relative remoteness of the site from the centre of Tisbury.</p> <p>2. Station Works can provide housing, a footbridge, protection of the land for a second platform.</p> <p>3. The industrial buildings can be replaced by something more in keeping with the employment needs of the area</p> <p>4. Highlights the fact that the Parmiter business is closed</p> <p>5. There is no use for such a large buildings - would be better developed for light industrial or wholly residential.</p> <p>6. Evidence was submitted to the appeal process concerning the provision of a bridge access – this can be achieved.</p>	<p>i) County Highways concluded that road access was satisfactory in Tisbury and the only limited traffic calming measures are required to improve traffic safety and flow.</p> <p>ii) The distances from either site under consideration are relatively similar when the whole High Street is taken into account. Access to the school, library and leisure centre appears to have been overlooked.</p> <p>2. Point noted. Should the site be clearly shown to be no longer needed, in part or in full, for employment, any proposal will be considered as part of a new planning application.</p> <p>3. It remains that the market for the use of this employment land (in its current for or redeveloped) remains untested.</p> <p>4. This fact has been noted and will be corrected in the final report upon which a decision will be made.</p> <p>5. see 3 above</p> <p>6. A solution is acknowledged to be possible to provide access over the railway; however it poses significant difficulties in the form of either a bridge (visual intrusion and land requirement of the ramped structure which must accommodate disabled access) or a tunnel (flooding). The termination of the appeal process in 2004/05 means that revised detail on this matter was never fully assessed. Should the site come forward again the matter will be examined through the application process.</p>
21	Frankl + Luty Architects and Urban Designers on Behalf of the Tisbury Action Group (Received Late)	Object	<p>1. The review is based on a review of the period from 1999 to 2005, not to 2006 as set out in the Local Plan</p> <p>2. Considers that the updated figures should be consulted upon.</p> <p>3. States that the authority must not be prejudiced by unreal expectations of the developability of particular sites nor by the arbitrary prioritisation of development sites as set out in para 34 of PPG3.</p>	<p>1. The review was always programmed to take place on or around April 2006 to ensure that it pre-empted speculative applications from the developers of the phase 2 sites. In terms of figures, it was always envisaged that the review would take on board latest 2005/06 figures when they became available. Accordingly, the review paper has been updated to reflect the position at April 2006 following the release of monitoring figures in mid May.</p> <p>2. The update to the paper is purely factual in this respect. Given that there has been broad acceptance of the figures during the consultation, further delay in decision making on this matter does not appear to provide any benefit.</p> <p>3. The council has approached the review in a purely objective manner. The fact that the process has been subject to consultation (when it was indicated by Government Office that this was not necessary) shows that there has been openness</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Considers that there should be a breakdown in section 2.0 of the delivery of sites in the period 1999-2005 to be consistent with the data provided in table 2. 5. Considers that the increase in housing requirement expected from the RSS has not been taken into account in section 2.2 of the review paper. 6. Considers that there should be analysis of the shortfall in housing for Salisbury city and the rest of the district. 7. What will the council do to address the shortfall predicted to exist at 2011. 8. In its timing of the review, the council have prejudiced the ability of the Station Works site owners to undertake a proper marketing exercise. 	<p>in the whole exercise. In quoting this section of PPG3 the objector may be overlooking the fact that there is no evidence to suggest the Station Works is available (i.e. there is an unreal expectation of the deliverability of the site).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Section 2.0 of the paper is concerned with setting out recent performance and it factual and already available form previously published WCC monitoring reports. Table 2 is drawing conclusions about the likely level of development in the period to 2011 where detail about the assumptions being used need to be explained hence the greater level of detail. 5. The data underpinning figure 3 does include the increased requirement set out in the emerging RSS 6. Section 2 of the review paper makes it clear that there is a district wide shortfall in housing delivery which is the key issue. Nevertheless it is reasonable to comment that there a significant part of the housing shortfall will be derived from Salisbury city as a number of large allocated sites have not commenced development. Table 2 shows the effects of this. Nevertheless, in the rest of the district, there is a need to maintain housing supply from allocated sites to maintain the smaller gap between actual and required provision and this will be more important in the latter part of the plan period when more stringent controls over dispersed rural housing development (coming from national and regional guidance) will act to further reduce the supply of windfall in the rural parts of the district. 7. Work on the Local Development Framework has commenced and in autumn 2007 the whole issue of land supply will be reopened to roll forward provision to 2021. That process will not be concluded for at least 24 months. During this process the council will need to respond to the Structure Plan, and more significantly the RSS (which will have been through its examination by that time) to provide sufficient housing. The shortfall in supply, as it exists at that time, will be a factor to be considered. 8. This is not accepted. The council had made it clear that it would undertake its review around April 2006. The owners and former agents representing the Station Works site were made aware of this in pre-application discussions in 2003 and 2004. In terms of the ability to undertake effective marketing, there has been ample time for this to be completed given that

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>9. Indicates that a B2 (Heavy Industrial) use is unreasonable to pursue on this site.</p> <p>10. The council must have regard to PPS1, PPG3 and emerging PPS3 to pursue a satisfactory proposal at the Station Works site</p> <p>11. Raises issues related to Hindon Lane and suggests, in light of para 34 of PPG3, that more time is set aside to ensure "unreal expectations of the deliverability" of the site are not being made</p> <p>i) Hindon Lane is not safe for vehicles and pedestrians.</p>	<p>concerns were expressed over the quality of marketing as early as spring 2004. In February 2005, following the lodging of an appeal against the refusal of the application, an email setting out clear instructions for marketing was sent by SDC to the planning agent which if acted upon could have produced results at the end of 2005. This work was not undertaken and recent contact with the site owners confirms that such work has still not commenced.</p> <p>9. The council has not sought the reuse of the site for solely B2 uses. Given the lack of nearby residential properties the site has potential for some ongoing B2 uses, however employment use can encompass light industrial/commercial, office use and even storage and distribution. The road network is acknowledged to impose some constraints on the listed used (particularly intensive distribution), however broadly speaking the site has the potential – if allowed – to provide a range of jobs which are needed in a part of the district which was previously identified to have a narrow employment base and low incomes.</p> <p>10. It is unclear whether the vacancy on the site is the product of the restrictive marketing terms offered combined with the expressed intentions of the site owners to seek redevelopment. The site has enjoyed use by a number of businesses, and according to the Parish Council employed up to 60 people until quite recently. Until a full and reasonable marketing exercise is undertaken the true demand for use of the site cannot be assessed. Whilst officers would acknowledge the intentions of the sections of guidance referred to – namely the promotion of brownfield sites - it remains that there are more fundamental components within each piece of guidance which seek to promote balanced communities where there is a better balance between housing, service provision and jobs. At this time, a mixed use redevelopment of the Station Works appears to provide for required housing, but will precipitate a significant net loss in the supply of employment land without any firm evidence to justify this.</p> <p>11. The review is not concerned with assessing details related to the sites already allocated. However, there is no basis to suggest that the Hindon Lane site is not deliverable without delay. On the points raised -</p> <p>i) County Highways concluded that road access was satisfactory in Tisbury and the only limited traffic calming</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) The distance of the Hindon Lane site from the centre will make people more car dependant. iii) The new access onto Hindon Lane will change the character of the lane. iv) Suggests that overhead powerlines may produce magnetic fields in excess of recommended safety levels 	<p>measures are required to improve traffic safety and flow which would be provided as part of any scheme to develop the site allocated in the local plan. As far as pedestrian safety goes, the natural walking route to the centre of Tisbury from the Hindon Lane site is not via Hindon Lane, instead one would probably descend using the pavement on Weaveland Road to the High Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) In addition to the points raised in i) above, the distances from either site (Hindon Lane or the Station Works) are relatively similar when the whole High Street is taken into account. The shorter distances to the school, library and leisure centre appears to have been overlooked in the comparison made. iii) Creation of anew access here will constitute change, however this access was considered by both County Highways and the Local Plan Inspector to be the most suitable location. Aspects of the junction design can be considered as part of the preparation of development brief for the site should the allocation be confirmed. iv) Power lines were noted in the allocation of the site, however these would be placed underground as part of the development (in common with many other developments) and hence there is no basis to consider this a significant negative impact.
22	Richard Burden (Planning & Landscape Officer) Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB Office	Neutral	<p>Station Works : The employment areas at the railway station seems an appropriate use linked to a transport route. Clearly the car parking could be larger. The views of the roofs of the shed-like buildings from across town is not very sympathetic, however, they are located down from the skyline even though in absolute terms they are located above the river corridor. There are methods available to integrate them rather better into the local scene. It has even been suggested in this office that a more intensive use of the area around the railway / station for employment would be contribute to sustaining economic viability within the AONB. Indeed, rather than residents commuting out of the AONB the railway might bring workers in.</p> <p>Southwestern Hotel Site : I have to say I am concerned about the possible incursion of housing into the flat valley floor, particularly in the vicinity of the South Western Hotel. Not only could that provide an</p>	The comments made are noted. The views expressed represent a purely objective appraisal of the AONB implications of the three sites.

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>unnatural intrusion into the open areas around the river but it could also adversely influence the setting of established parts of the town. Furthermore, I sense that development would involve a much greater area being built upon – at the moment, eg, the car park is relatively open – creating a much increased mass and extent of vertical, built, features. I feel the river valley and the flat grasslands beside the river are very significant features of character that contribute positively to the environment of Tisbury.</p> <p>Hindon Lane : I tried to get to the sites H14 and E14A but found access, even to the school, rather tortuous! Clearly access to these sites is going to be an issue. Although I did not view the sites from all possible angles or viewpoints I sensed, so long as buildings are only two storey, suitably laid out, and utilising local materials, that development could be achieved without being particularly intrusive. However, given the limited nature of the roads in the area, I would suggest that the greatest use of the railway is made for business / employment activities, and that any new employment allocations be associated with the railway. It appears to me that employment opportunities associated with Hindon Lane could create transport difficulties and with that in mind I would suggest that development off Hindon Lane should be limited to domestic uses.</p>	
-	<p>Western Area Committee Meeting on 13/4/06</p> <p>Recorded Minutes</p>	Support (Vote Held)	<p>During the consideration of this item, Members of the Committee raised the following points :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should consistently aim to achieve its target of 458 (on average) completed new homes each year. • A shortfall in housing will inflate prices in Salisbury District. • A more proactive approach should be adopted by SDC to encourage and assist Parishes in their identification of potential development sites (including provision for affordable housing). This could be achieved via Local Development Frameworks and Community Planning. • In order to facilitate the process, pre application discussions with developers should be encouraged. • Current planning guidance is inflexible and does not encourage landowners of agricultural land to pursue the development of small sites, which already have an existing infrastructure. • In terms of building social housing, more money from Regional Government does seem to be invested in larger urban areas and less in areas such as Salisbury District. Despite this, the Committee recognised that SDC has received £8.3million in the past five years from the Housing Corporation. This is a great achievement and credit for this must be attributed to the Head of Strategic Housing, Andrew Reynolds and his officers. • Some houses in rural areas are not suitable for families. Perhaps these properties would be more appropriate for shared ownership schemes. 	

Rep No.	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Officer Comment
			<p>The Principal Planning Officer (Forward Planning) then went on to explain how alternative brownfield sites in Wilton and Tisbury had been assessed. During the consideration of this part of the Officer's report, the Chairman invited comments from members of the public and Parishes present at the meeting.</p> <p>Mr Frankland of West Tisbury spoke in support of the proposed development at Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Mrs Henderson of Tisbury Parish Council informed the Committee that the Parish Council continued to object to this proposed development.</p> <p>Members of the Committee made the following comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The take up on Village Design Statements is low; could more be done to encourage Parishes to pursue this? • Regard should be had to the fact that some existing estates could comfortably incorporate additional housing. The Council should take a more imaginative approach in relation to the development of existing sites. The Principal Planning Officer (Forward Planning) advised that this approach would indeed make sense, but regard would need to be had to the existing infrastructure (e.g. highways), which may not be able to accommodate further development of existing housing sites. Furthermore, small extensions to existing housing sites would result in small developer contributions, which in turn would limit the contribution to the development of local amenities. • Would it be possible to revisit development at the Fugglestone Red site? The officer advised that it was likely that this site would be reconsidered. • Before releasing employment land for future housing development, the Council should be absolutely certain that the land is no longer required for employment purposes. • The Station Works Site, Station Road is a site that lends itself to mixed employment use, for businesses both large and small. <p>Resolved – That the Forward Planning Department be informed that the Western Area Committee supports the release of the sites identified for development in the second phase of the plan period (i.e. 2006-2011) subject to the granting of planning consent.</p>	
-	<p>Southern Area Committee Meeting on 6/4/06</p> <p>Recorded Minutes</p>	Neutral	<p>The Committee discussed a number of matters in relation to the report, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The shortfall in the supply of houses in the district arose because developers were not following through their plans and building the original number of houses proposed. The period of planning consent has been reduced from 5 years to 3 years, which had the effect of encouraging developers to progress their projects and meet their targets. • There was an urgent need for more low cost housing in the rural areas. Many developers build larger, higher cost houses for a greater return, instead of low cost housing. There was a need for a planning policy which guards against this. • Perhaps Salisbury District Council should actively identify potential sites for rural exception housing, instead of waiting for developers to come forward. The Officer confirmed that the council would be producing clearer guides to encourage parishes to identify and bring forward sites for housing. • The council should re-use redundant buildings for affordable housing, and not just look to allow the construction of new buildings. The Officer confirmed that, where such redundant buildings were in a sustainable area, there were policies to allow this conversion. <p>Resolved – that the above comments be submitted to the Forward Planning Department as part of the consultation process for the Review of Second Phase Housing.</p>	