

Draft Development Brief, Hindon Lane, Tisbury – Summary of consultation and resultant amendments.

Please note: The response to Wiltshire County Council, representation 122 has been placed both here and in its numerical order to make it easier for readers.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
122	Wiltshire County Council Highways	Object.	<p>p32, last para on “Road Access”. The change in the position of the 30 mph limit (including new road treatment to highlight the speed limit) and the mini-roundabout will be the traffic calming, there will be no additional measures. Therefore change last sentence to “These traffic calming measures are to be implemented prior to any development of the site.”</p> <p>p36 – The roundabout and the change in position of the 30mph limit, including road treatment, will be the traffic calming measures on Hindon Lane – this should be clarified.</p> <p>“The development should provide a new access to the sports centre off Hindon Lane to avoid traffic travelling through the former Tisbury School”- it is acceptable for a small amount of traffic to the sports centre to pass through the development but we feel it should not be the only access to the sports centre. For those accessing the centre from Tisbury itself, the existing access via the school would be more convenient; if this route was retained, it would</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed, A link road will be provided to the sports centre and primary school as this was originally committed to by the developer many years ago. The layout of the development should ensure this does not become a ran run due to the time it will take to navigate through the proposed development</p>	<p>Page 32, amend to last paragraph, last sentence under road access ‘Traffic calming measures along Hindon Lane are to be implemented prior to any development on the site <u>The mini-roundabout and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development.</u></p> <p>Change point 1, page 36 to read ‘ The principal access to the site is to be off Hindon Lane via a new mini-roundabout. Traffic calming measures are to be introduced to Hindon Lane prior to the development. <u>This and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development.’</u></p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>help to “spread the load” of traffic accessing the sports centre. The route through the development is quite tortuous compared to the alternatives, so it is unlikely to lead to rat-running through the site if the school access was left open.</p> <p>p36 – “A new bus route should be provided through the development to reduce the reliance upon the car”. It is not clear what route the bus service would run – is it suggested a diversion to existing services or a separate route? Also, it is not clear whether a link road could be created without the use of third party land. A link road could provide an alternative route for local traffic only, and is supported, subject to further consideration of the safety implications for the local roads. The development road will be designed for traffic speeds below 20mph, and a 20mph speed limit will be imposed.</p> <p>p40 – if the bus route ran through the site, there should also be stops located at the north end of the development site too. If the route does not run through the site, stops should be provided near to the Hindon Lane access into the site and should include safety improvements for pedestrians to stand clear of the road. Therefore, the mini-roundabout should also include sections of footway linking to bus stops on both side of the road, shelters and raised kerbs.</p>	<p>On further discussions with Wiltshire county council Highways it is suggested that buses do not travel through the development but bus stops instead will be provided on Hindon Lane for everyone to use. A link road will be provided to the sports centre and primary school as this was originally committed to by the developer many years ago. The layout of the development should ensure this does not become a ran run due to the time it will take to navigate through the proposed development.</p> <p>Agreed, bus stops will be provided on Hindon Lane near to the access and provide safety improvements for pedestrians to wait for buses.</p>	<p>Page 7, bullet 6, Provision of off-site traffic calming measures on Hindon Lane <u>‘The mini roundabout and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development’</u></p> <p>Amend page 7 bullet 5 to read ‘Creation of a new access through the site to the sports centre complex and primary school; including a bus route and stops.</p> <p>Page 36 bullet 7(new bullet 8) to read ‘A permeable layout with good pedestrian and cycle linkages to the village town centre should be provided to encourage sustainable means of travel. A new bus route should be provided through the development to reduce the reliance upon the car.</p> <p>Page 40 – amend bullet points 3, 4</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>p41 – cycle parking should be secure, ie if there is a block of flats in the development a specific cycle store should be provided – it is not sufficient to provide open air cycle stands</p> <p>p40 – the “principal pedestrian/cycle route” is too indicative to mean much and there are too many of them to be the “principal” routes. Unless all these routes are to be shared use, suggest diagram should be altered to show which should be shared</p>	<p>Agreed. The local plan requires covered cycle parking places. However it may not be possible to provide cycle stores in all instances.</p> <p>There is only one principal route going through the development.</p> <p>The footpaths have been integrated into the design.</p>	<p>and 5 to read – Bus stops are located within a 300m radius of all but a very few dwellings; well within the accepted 400m radius walking distance.</p> <p>Bus route located along main street and to take advantage of the proximity of higher residential densities.</p> <p>Pedestrian-only streets protected by bollards and/or planters may be appropriate. Some areas may be designated as Home Zones with pedestrians having priority over vehicle users</p> <p><u>New bus stop and layby proposed for southern side of Hindon Lane near entrance to development.</u> <u>New bus halt to northern side of Hindon Lane.</u></p> <p><u>Pedestrian-only streets protected by bollards and/or planters may be appropriate. Some areas may be designated as home Zones with pedestrians having priority over vehicle users.</u></p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Amend key on diagram on page 40.</p> <p>‘Existing public footpath / <u>bridleway</u>’</p> <p>Remove bus route from diagram in</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>and which should be peds only. As development will be subject to a 20 mph zone, it will be sufficient for cycles to use the spine road only, so all the other routes could be for pedestrians only.</p> <p>there is one link that comes off the north-south public footpath, this should be ped only to minimise the likelihood of cyclists following it then going along the footpath.</p> <p>the route heading west from the site is a bridleway not a footpath.</p> <p>Both routes should be integrated into the design and may require to be suitably upgraded. The design of the bridleway where the development road crosses its route should be carefully designed (also refers to P47).</p> <p>P42 -- Last bullet point - "Design speed of 20mph within residential areas will be reduced to 10mph within Home Zone" – add "by design".</p> <p>p49 – suggests a Home Zone element should be incorporated in the middle of the scheme. It would seem odd to have only a small part of the development as a home zone as you drive through, as it is a relatively small development suggest that the whole of it should be treated as a home zone with a 20 mph speed limit. This would help to reduce the concerns that are likely to arise from residents due to the traffic accessing the sports centre and would further reduce the likelihood of it being used as a rat-run if the route via the school was kept open as recommended above.</p> <p>Lastly, it is considered necessary that a Transport Assessment should be submitted in support of the development at the planning stage and the scope of the Assessment should be agreed prior to the planning submission. Of particular concern will be the effect of the development traffic on the local</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>page 40.</p> <p>Amend diagram on page 40 to show which surfaces will be shared and which are pedestrian / cycle only.</p> <p>Page 42, last bullet point amend to read 'Design speed of 20mph within residential areas will be reduced to 10 mph within Home Zones <u>by design</u>'</p> <p>Amend page 49 under home zone:</p> <p>Paragraph 1, 1st sentence 'the development should<u>could</u>.....'</p> <p>Paragraph 2, sentence 1 amend 'A home zone should <u>could</u>.....'</p> <p>Paragraph 2, sentence 2 amend 'The design of a Home Zone <u>could</u> should be</p> <p>Add to page 42 '<u>A Transport Assessment will be required to accompany any planning application for the site. A Travel Plan will also be required.</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			road network and on Hindon Lane, where parked cars currently restrict the flow of traffic. Also, construction traffic should be considered. The Transport Assessment should also consider the implications of the development for sustainable transport and the possibility of additional contributions which would support the use of sustainable modes. A Travel Plan will be required for this development.		
1	Mr R Williams	Object	<p>Hindon Lane is too narrow for additional traffic, the lack of footpaths would deter people from walking which would result in more people driving through the Churchill Estate.</p> <p>The development brief proposes to improve access to the school and sports centre. Is this the middle school which has just closed? Isn't the sports centre in danger of closure. Why do we need improved access to precarious facilities.</p> <p>The impact of development outside existing village boundary would be too big especially with the rush to use smaller building plots in Tisbury, which are made up of 3 storey townhouses.</p>	<p>This issue of traffic was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and in the lead up to the adoption of the local plan.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122. This is the response received from Wiltshire County Council Highways and requests a Transport Assessment to accompany any planning application and identifies that a link to the swimming pool / school should not create a rat run due to the tortuous road layout through the development.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p> <p>This again was discussed at public inquiry. The Inspector concluded that he did not consider that small scale redevelopment or infill would adequately address identified need, nor did he consider ad hoc developments outside the defined Housing Policy Boundary to be a satisfactory method of attempting to meet a requirement of the scale of housing need in Tisbury. For this reason he found it necessary to identify land for housing and employment use.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				With regard to 3 storeys being built in Tisbury, please see response to representation 41.	Please see response to representation 41.
2	Mr G Beecroft, British Railway Board	Observation	BSB does not own any land in Salisbury District, consultations should therefore be sent to Network Rail.	Consultations are already sent to Network Rail. BSB will therefore be removed from our consultation database.	None required.
3	S Williams	Object	<p>Hindon Lane is too narrow and dangerous to accommodate exiting traffic let alone additional traffic this development would generate.</p> <p>Area would destroy a beautiful green area of countryside with great views when there is a large piece of land adjacent to railway station waiting to be developed.</p>	<p>This issue of traffic was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and in the lead up to the adoption of the local plan, during which no objection was raised by Wiltshire County Council highways. Please see response to representation 122. This is the response received from Wiltshire County Council Highways and requests a Transport Assessment to accompany any planning application</p> <p>This issue was again considered at the Local plan Inquiry and in the lead up to the adoption of the Local Plan. The inspector concluded that he did not consider development on the land would appear as an extension to the settlement into the countryside, but rather utilisation of a unused piece of land that lies generally within the framework of the built-up area of Tisbury. He considered the field itself to be land that is not cultivated and is criss-crossed with informal paths and has the appearance of a grassed amenity space. The school and sports centre occupy the crest of a ridge and consequently there are no significant views of the site from the south. Views from the north are mainly at a distance from the footpath network on the opposite site of Fonthill Brook. From this direction the site is partly</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				<p>visible but contained between the school/sports centre which appear as large structures above it on the skyline and houses in Hindon Lane which together with foreground trees mask the lower part of the site.</p> <p>This consultation exercise asks for comments on the content of the draft development brief and sustainability report and it is not intended to compare this site to other sites in Tisbury. However please see response to representation 8.</p>	See response to representation 8.
4	Mr H Clark	Object	<p>Applications to develop this site have been turned down by SDC three times in recent years? Why.</p> <p>Site slopes up to the ridge on the 300ft contour and new housing will be an eyesore over 50sq miles on the AONB.</p> <p>Housing would be 1km from the village centre, up 200ft of hill. New residents would shop in Tisbury by car not foot, creating parking chaos and more traffic on the narrow, crooked and dangerous and pavement-less 480 yards of Hindon Lane. Accidents are inevitable.</p> <p>Other less obtrusive sites, creating fewer traffic problems are available closer to the village centre. Please tell us about the alternatives.</p>	<p>Having undertaken a planning history search on the site, officers are unable to find record of such an application on the site.</p> <p>This issue was addressed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector concluded that he did not consider that development on the land would appear as a extension of the settlement into the countryside that surrounds it, but rather the utilisation of an unused piece of land that lies generally within the framework of the built-up area of Tisbury. Please also see response to representation 3.</p> <p>The housing would be approximately 500 m from the local facilities in the village and approximately 900 m to 1km from the station. Although it is acknowledged that some residents will use there cars for short trips. PPG13 encourages trips of less than 2km to be made by foot.</p> <p>The LPA is not currently aware of any other available sites in Tisbury. At the local plan inquiry the inspector will have</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				assessed the other available sites in Tisbury, and based his conclusion on this site was allocated.	
5	Ms L Young	Object	Our front garden has been described as an amenity area. Please could this be amended accordingly.	We are sorry for this mistake, all plans will be amended accordingly.	Page 34, habitat plan, remove area to north west of map from Amenity. Page 48 environmental opportunities, change the open space within the development to a different green to the fields and gardens beyond.
6	Mr Frankland	Support	The whole of Tisbury functions as a main settlement serving its own needs and those of the surrounding hamlets and villages. To do that we need to grow and provide more employment and trade for the entire area. The guarantee of 25 affordable homes is welcome. The draft development brief offers an excellent opportunity for those who have until now assumed that such a development was inconceivable, unnecessary and unacceptable, to inform themselves about the likely benefits for the entire Tisbury community.	Noted.	None required.
7	Highways Agency	No comment	Having reviewed the document the Highways Agency have no comments to make	Noted.	None required.
8	Ms A Ralphs	Object	It will finally breach the sky line for Tisbury, and almost inevitably herald more development turning Tisbury into a dormitory settlement. This development will increase the chance of further development. Tisbury will be like so many settlements in Hampshire, Oxfordshire and Hertfordshire which have overgrown their natural boundaries and sprawled across the countryside.	Please see response to representations 3 and 4. Most development proposed on this site would not fall higher than the line of the schools and sports centre which are already visible because of their scale and hill-top location. Providing employment opportunities and housing in Tisbury should make the village more viable for the future. Development on this site, if allowed, does not pre-empt or set precedence for further development in Tisbury. The Inspector at the local plan inquiry identified the site as being generally within the built up area of Tisbury, which would suggest the closing	Please see response to representations 3 and 4. None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The sewage works will require extension to cope with the additional sewage.</p> <p>It is pie in the sky to think that business opportunities will follow this development. IT businesses require much larger premises than are envisaged.</p> <p>Not against appropriate development, however theirs is a brownfield site available – The Station Works. It is extraordinary that the council should prefer to despoil tracks of countryside.</p> <p>The expectation that the station works will be leased/purchased by an industrialist who will provide employment is totally erroneous and shows little grasps of the IT linked employment opportunities.</p>	<p>off of any further development in this immediate area.</p> <p>This again was addressed at the local plan inquiry, where Wessex Water indicated that foul sewers do not pose a fundamental constraint. Please see Wessex Water's representation 34 for an update from Wessex Water.</p> <p>It was identified at the local plan inquiry that housing growth in Tisbury has not been matched by increased employment opportunities, and that indeed several employment sites have been lost. If no attempt is made to encourage employment in Tisbury there is a danger that the village will become a dormitory village that is a ghost town especially during the day.</p> <p>The consultation exercise asks for comments on the draft development brief for Hindon Lane not on the Station Works Site. However, it should be reiterated that the Hindon Lane site will not be released by the Council until the comprehensive marketing exercise on the Station Works site to prove demand for it or not has been completed.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 12.</p>
9	Ms P Macnaghten	Object	<p>Hindon Lane is a very narrow and dangerous road. There are parked cars all along and with so many more cars entering and existing the estate this would be impossible, please reconsider.</p> <p>Before building anything a good car park should be provided to take all cars off the road. Could this be put behind Alexandra Terrace. I see you also</p>	<p>Please see response to rep 1 and 122.</p> <p>As noted, some residents on Hindon Lane will be provided with rear vehicular access to their properties. However, the</p>	<p>Please see response to rep 1 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>provide rear access to the council houses nearby, but not enough.</p> <p>The type of houses most needed here is that for first time buyers. No 3 storey dwellings.</p> <p>A friend has monitored the traffic who noted 7 or tractors with trailers, passing each day and additionally a car transporter and some delivery lorries. 3 large lorries were also parked outside of the co-op. A further 75 houses will only exacerbate this situation.</p>	<p>moving of the 30mph speed limit and the introduction of a mini roundabout is seen as sufficient traffic calming by WCC Highways.</p> <p>As detailed in the development brief. At least 33% of the dwellings (25 units) will be affordable. It is still to be determined whether these will be affordable rent or other forms of affordable housing such as shared ownership. The council is currently undertaking a housing needs survey which should be able to determine the mix of affordable housing required. A 3 storey dwelling is not necessarily unaffordable as this might contain some smaller flat / apartment units, which are more affordable.</p> <p>Although it is accepted that further development will increase the level of traffic movements on Hindon Lane, it will not result in an increase in Tractor movements nor should it encourage lorries to further park on Tisbury High Street. A traffic survey should be undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment required by Wiltshire County Council Highways. Please see representation 122.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p>
10	Mr and Mrs Bell	Support	<p>This development is well thought of with easy access to the A303 and Fonthill Bishop without the difficulty of driving down Tisbury High Street.</p> <p>We love the idea of a new swimming pool which will provide well for the health of the area, we approve of the plans and infilling on Hindon Lane.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Although land for anew swimming pool can be provided, due to the running costs of such a facilities, it will be up to the community as to what they wish to do this site. The delivery of this facility therefore may not be guaranteed. This</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				still needs to be explored in greater detail. Please see response to representation 19.	
11	Defence Estates	No comment	As the MOD does not have any land in the vicinity of the proposed development at Tisbury they do not wish to register any comment on this Planning Brief.	Noted.	None required.
12	Mr C Davies	Objection	<p>Brownfield sites should be used before Greenfield sites.</p> <p>I feel that Parmiter and other sites (infill site) should be looked at.</p> <p>Tisbury is in an AONB.</p> <p>Before any decisions are made, and environmental impact study will need to be done, as this is an area that contains a population of Skylarks, who are protected by law and are on the RSPBs Red list for endangered birds.</p>	<p>The Council's preference is to build on Brownfield sites before Greenfield sites. However it has not yet been shown that a brownfield site is available in Tisbury. The marketing exercise that is being undertaken on the Station Works / Parmiters site will ascertain whether the Station Works is a viable employment site or not. .</p> <p>The Local Plan Inspector addressed the issue of small scale and redevelopment or infill development and concluded that it would not adequately address the identified affordable housing need in the Village, nor could this be addressed by ad-hoc 'exception' developments outside of the Housing Policy Boundary.</p> <p>This issue was again addressed at local plan inquiry where the inspector concluded that the site is 'well contained and capable of accommodating development without resulting in undue harm to the landscape of the AONB.</p> <p>The ecological survey which was undertaken in 2004 on the site has been recently updated. However, the sky lark was not identified during this survey, however the report does advise that nesting birds must be considered if the breach in the central hedge and small</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				<p>patches of scrub on the edges of the site are to be cleared during the bird-nesting season which runs from March to August.</p> <p>A copy of the ecological survey can be found on www.salisbury.gov.uk</p>	
13	Mrs D Carter	Object	<p>Object to removal of half an ancient hedge on the western edge of Parcel A. Threat to a colony of dormice in the hedge in Parcel A.</p> <p>Traffic hazards to badgers that have several active setts in the vicinity and would need to cross the new development to reach foraging areas.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is already a narrow road with no footpaths and there have been accidents on it. The development would cause a dramatic increase in traffic along the lane.</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that new residents would walk or cycle to the shops in the High Street due to the</p>	<p>An update to the 2004 ecological study has recently been undertaken. This confirmed the presence of dormice on the site. Therefore any removal or breaching of the hedgerows on the site will require a licence from Defra /RDA.</p> <p>Again the updated ecological study identified a number of badger setts adjacent or on the site. A licence will again need to be sought from English Nature to carry out works within thirty metres of the Setts.</p> <p>It is also advised in the same report that a 'wildlife friendly' crossing point is created where the central hedge is removed. Key features should include minimising the amount of hedge removed in the first instance, narrowing the road to a single carriageway, planting up to either side of the cross as far as safely possible and ensuring that there is arboreal connectivity across the road, installing flush kerbs, low level lighting and traffic calming to slow vehicles where badgers cross.</p> <p>Please see response to representation and 122.</p> <p>As advised in the response received from</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			distance. Indeed most would probably drive to Salisbury or Shaftesbury.	Wiltshire County Council highways, a Travel Plan will be required for this development which will include initiatives to try and get more people walking and cycling.	
14	Mrs E Curzen	Object	<p>Traffic at the narrow points of Hindon Lane is gridlocked several times a day. With additional traffic movements this could become critical.</p> <p>The main sewerage channel is already barely coping. Additional outload would cause serious overload.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 3 and 122.</p> <p>Wessex Water are consulted on all development in areas where they are responsible for sewage infrastructure. They have responded to the consultation which suggests that the foul sewerage system should have adequate capacity to accommodate the development. However, the developer will need to provide flow calculations for approval by Wessex Water, which should confirm this, or not, if not the Local Planning Authority will ask for developer contributions to pay for improvements.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 3 and 122.</p> <p>See change made as a result of representation 34 (Wessex Water).</p>
15	R Dearden	Object	<p>The main drainage system serving Tisbury is at its maximum capacity. There have been several occasions when the collecting tanks overflow.</p> <p>Is there sufficient mains water available and electrical power.</p> <p>Without some major improvement, Hindon Lane cannot cope with the expected increase in vehicle movements because it is a narrow lane with extensive car parking especially between 'the Cross' public house and the proposed entrance to</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 14.</p> <p>Again, Wessex Water confirms in their representation that there are water mains in the vicinity of the site. However hydraulic modelling of the existing network is required to determine the adequacy of the system, to serve the proposed development. This again will be written into the development brief.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 14.</p> <p>Amend development brief as detailed in our response to Representation 34.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 3 and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>the development.</p> <p>Less houses to be built – several years ago we were told the site would provide a maximum of 75 houses. Since then a number of suburban houses have been built in Tisbury.</p> <p>A bus route – where too / from. Any bus would be limited use and therefore not viable and add to congestion.</p> <p>How would Hindon Lane be traffic calmed, one cannot speed down Hindon Lane.</p>	<p>Although it is accepted that a number of houses have been built in Tisbury since this site was first proposed for housing, the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry considered that small scale redevelopment or infill would not address the identified affordable housing need in Tisbury. It was also allocated to support reducing school numbers and local service</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29 and 52</p> <p>The roundabout and the change in position of the 30 mph limit, including road treatment, will be the traffic calming measures on Hindon Lane. Please also see response to representation 122.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29 and 52</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p>
16	Mr P Brighten	Object	<p>The number of dwellings will create a large increase in traffic.</p> <p>This is not a suitable area for employment due to the access on to Hindon Lane. Therefore remove the employment to another area. The Station Works / Parmiters site would be a far better site for employment and could support some workplace homes for smaller units and similar dwellings as those proposed on Hindon Lane.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>See response to representation 8.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>See response to representation 8</p>
17	Miss C L Prior	Object	<p>Access via Hindon Lane is already narrow and dangerous.</p> <p>The site opposite the station, would be much more suitable for access and aesthetic reasons.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>See response to representation 8.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>See response to representation 8.</p>
18	Mr R S Corner	Object	<p>At a consultation meeting held in Tisbury a few years ago, it was stated that as far back as the 1950's an official report said that Hindon Lane,</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>	<p>See response to. representation 1, 3 and 122</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Tisbury could not cope with increased vehicular traffic. 75 new houses will mean 150 new vehicles for Tisbury.		
19	Mr J Taylor	Object	<p>Object to the whole scheme. To suggest over 100 dwellings will damage the village badly. An additional 200 cars in Hindon Lane is grotesque Hindon Lane cannot be widened. Many residence park there. Traffic calming is nonsense.</p> <p>Object to provision of land for a pool. Tisbury cannot afford it.</p>	<p>The proposal is for 75 dwellings, not 100. This is the minimum density allowed through government guidance (PPG3).</p> <p>For traffic issues please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site only provides land for a new pool and that Tisbury may not be able to afford to build and run such a facility. However, the land still remains for the community in Tisbury and discussions should commence as to the benefits the community might wish to see on this land. Several options were suggested during consultation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking the developer to build a few more houses on the land and Tisbury taking the profit in order to cover the existing swimming pool or negotiating for the developer to construct this for them. • Extending the existing sports centre onto this land which could make it more viable • Using R2 monies from other developments to construct some tennis courts. <p>Page 49 does already suggest that a swimming pool may not be the most appropriate use and states that 'If the community consider that this community land can be put to another more beneficial use, this will be supported by the developer and Salisbury District Council'.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>Add to page 6 last paragraph after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Amend page 7, bullet point 4 to read 'Provision of land for a new swimming pool <u>or other community use</u> with associated'</p> <p>Add to page 8 second paragraph after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Add to page 32 second paragraph after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Add to page 35 bullet 5 after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Add to page 35 amend key after swimming pool add '<u>or other community use</u>' (2 instances)</p> <p>Add to page 45 paragraph 1 after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Amend page 49 under swimming pool, paragraph 1 to read 'Land for</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
					<p>a new indoor swimming pool <u>or other community use</u> is proposed.....'</p> <p>Add to page 54 paragraph 1 under phasing of development after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p> <p>Add to page 62 bullet 6 after swimming pool '<u>or other community use</u>'</p>
20	Cllr David Canoll	Object	<p>Why are leaflets given now. What about the Station Works marketing period?</p> <p>You have not taken account of the Local community Survey where 98% were against this development.</p> <p>Who are you representing? Not the people of Tisbury.</p>	<p>The consultation exercise asks for comments on the draft development brief for Hindon Lane. It should be reiterated that the Hindon Lane site will not be released by the Council until the comprehensive marketing exercise on the Station Works site to prove demand for it or not has been completed.</p> <p>The Tis Vis Questionnaire does not appear to specifically address development at Hindon Lane.</p> <p>The site has been allocated within the adopted Local Plan. The responses received as a result of consultation on this draft development brief, will result in changes to it and any proposed development that are in line with those requested by the residents of Tisbury and surrounding villages.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
21	Mrs M du Pre	Object	Object to great increase of traffic this would bring to Hindon Lane. The scheme should be abandoned or another access should be planned.	For traffic issues please see response to representation 1 and 122.	For traffic issues please see response to representation 1 and 122.
22	Mrs J Ferguson	Object	Traffic congestion on Hindon Lane is already a serious problem as the lane is too narrow to cope with heavy vehicles. Any development will cause	For traffic issues please see response to representation 1 and 122	For traffic issues please see response to representation 1 and 122

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			gridlock. The use of my driveway is often the only means of relieving traffic jams.		
23	Mr G Tomsett (Environmental Health)	Support	<p>Pleased to note that the area currently used for lorry and vehicle storage will be accompanied by a contaminated land investigation.</p> <p>Businesses included within class B1 Class may have detrimental impact on amenity and possibly result in nuisance to neighbouring residential property. Each application will therefore be judged on its own merits and comment reserved on the application received.</p>	Noted.	None required.
24	C Titcombe	Object	<p>Build on Parmiters Site.</p> <p>Extra traffic on Hindon Lane will increase the danger for all that walk along it.</p> <p>You give no details of what type of houses are proposed two or three storeys.</p> <p>What type of employment will be encouraged.</p> <p>Big statement about land for a new swimming pool, however such a facility won't be able to survive.</p> <p>We already have a back entrance onto the field, why would I want one that opens onto a pavement. I already have off road parking.</p> <p>You would be destroying a beautiful meadow that is used by a large number of people as a recreational area for dog walking and exercise, there are numerous species of wildlife in the field that includes owls and field mice.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>The plan on page 46 of the development brief identifies the proposed height of buildings on the site. A copy of the brief can be download on www.salisbury.gov.uk</p> <p>The employment opportunities proposed are detailed on page 48 of the development brief.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Although you state that you have off road parking many of the terraces may not. The provision of off-road parking could assist in taking some of the parked vehicles off Hindon Lane and make the lane safer for pedestrians. Additionally the back access onto the field, whether this is vehicular or pedestrian is not an official right of way. Currently the use of the field by the Tisbury residents apart</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				<p>from the Public Rights of Way is through the permission of the land-owner. The proposal aims to provide a large off-site open space for the public to the south of the Former Nadder Middle School. Although I understand that this site is also used for recreation use by the residents of Tisbury, this is again out of the goodwill of the landowner. The provision of housing on the Hindon Lane site would enable the recreation land provided to the south of the school to be protected into the future for recreational purposes.</p> <p>With respect to the wildlife please see our response to 13</p>	With respect to the wildlife please see our response to 13
25	Mr J Pope	Support	Tisbury needs the Station Works to be retained for Commercial Use. If houses have to be built please don't build them on the Station Works.	Please see response to representation 8.	None required.
26	Mr and Mrs Sammons	Object	<p>Object to development brief on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Alexandra Cottages would be affected by the Office/B1 employment buildings to the East. Evening sunlight will be diminished. The Masterplan should be redesigned to increase the distance between existing development and proposed new development.</p> <p>Building here will damage the views that we have in relation to the backs of our properties and considerably increase the noise levels in our vicinity. No other properties seem to have buildings so close to their boundaries.</p> <p>Object to access off Hindon Lane. The Lane is</p>	<p>Accepted. The masterplan will be redesigned which will remove the south eastern side of the proposed B1 employment building. This should prevent loss of sunlight. This will make the distance between the building and the cottages considerably larger.</p> <p>See above paragraph. B1 employment consists of offices, research and development and light industry. These kind of employment uses should not create noise. If required when a planning application is submitted the objector should suggest limited hours of operation are placed as a condition on the planning permission to ensure that this is achieved.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,</p>	Amend masterplan on page 44, page 46, page 48, page 57.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>already heavily congested. The Lane cannot be widened. The numbers should be rethought in relation to the traffic that Hindon Lane can viably accept.</p> <p>The swimming pool seems to be an attractive proposition. It is a struggle to keep current facilities open. My concern is that we will see more houses on this site.</p> <p>The Parmiters site be used first.</p> <p>Some development on the field between the Sports centre and existing properties may be feasible, but scaled down. Should be more affordable housing and key worker housing.</p>	<p>3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>representation 1, 3. and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>None required.</p>
27	Mr B Dalton	Object	<p>The map showing the proposed roundabout on Hindon Road, ignores the presence of two property accesses within a few yards et. Staddles and Hill Street Farmhouse.</p> <p>Concern over the increased traffic on Hindon Lane and the safety of pedestrians.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The diagrams will be reassessed and redrawn to include the entrances.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p>	<p>Amend page p65.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p>
28	Mr J Hugo	Object	<p>Tisbury is steadily becoming a small town, access is only possible through minor roads. Flow of traffic on Hindon Lane is already problematic, pedestrian access is dangerous. Scale of proposed development would put a strain on the road system.</p> <p>Parmiters sit is a brownfield site. This would provide residents with immediate real facility and easier access to the A30.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8.</p>
29	Ms E Young	Object	<p>Several inaccuracies:</p> <p>P31 - There is now only a primary school in the village.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>P31 will be amended to just reflect that there is just one state run primary school in Tisbury.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Difficult to identify the '100 local firms and 400 business within in 8km area of Tisbury. There is little employment in Tisbury. Development brief should be amended to reflect that there is little employment in Tisbury.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is not a wide lane – it is not wide enough to have line markings in places.</p> <p>There is no regular bus service – we are now having to pilot a voluntary scheme.</p> <p>The Council needs to agree if Tisbury is a village or a Town. P16/17 there are several references to Tisbury being a Town.</p>	<p>This information was provided by the District Council to the local plan inquiry in 2001 to identify the facilities and services within a settlement. It is accepted that these figures may be slightly different today.</p> <p>Hindon Lane, which is made narrower by the virtue of the presence of parked cars is felt to be wide at the point of access in comparison to a large number of other rural lanes. However, reference to this can be removed.</p> <p>There are five bus services daily, Monday to Saturday, serving Tisbury which takes residents to Salisbury and the inter-B route 26/27 which services Tisbury to either Gillingham/Shaftesbury or Salisbury runs from Tisbury at least 7 times a day on weekdays and 6 times on a Saturday, with a similar number of return journeys. The 84 and 86 provides a further service between Tisbury and Salisbury on Tuesday's and Saturdays a and between Tisbury and Shaftesbury on Thursday's respectively. There is also a school bus service between Tisbury and Wardour School. This is regarded as a regular bus services, especially compared to many other rural parts. Therefore the statement 'There service runs at varying intervals throughout the day with regular services between 9.15am and 4.30pm is felt to be a correct interpretation of the public services provided.</p> <p>Tisbury is a Village. All references to Tisbury being a Town will therefore be amended.</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Page 31, paragraph 2 under 'accessibility' amend to read 'Hindon lane is a relatively wide land that links back to.....'</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Amend development brief to ensure all references to town are changed to village.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The development will put severe strain on the infrastructure of Tisbury especially the sewerage plant.</p> <p>The roads in the village are narrow and are badly congested.</p> <p>If Tisbury is to survive the plan needs to encourage businesses to flourish here with minimum further house development.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and issues raised by representation 34 by Wessex Water.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122 (Wiltshire County Council Highways)</p> <p>Agreed. For this reason employment use is also being encouraged on this site and that is the reason why planning policies insist on the marketing exercise for employment sites that the Parmiters / Station Works site is currently being put through.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation and 34 (Wessex Water).</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122 (Wiltshire County Council Highways)</p> <p>None required.</p>
30	Miss F Corps	Support	<p>Question the necessity for employment, when there are derelict employment sites in Tisbury. Station Works should be used for employment prior to this site. If you removed the employment density could increase or the development could be softened on the edge of the development.</p> <p>Buildings should not rise above 3 storey.</p> <p>Housing and affordable housing has long been a problem in Tisbury, no objection to this or the location of the site. The site would be welcomed by the bulk of population who are likely to be living in it.</p> <p>No shops should be allowed on the site.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the site has been allocated and phased to include employment space to support the social and economic well-being of Tisbury.</p> <p>In order to reach the minimum housing density required by government of 30 dwellings per hectare, it is necessary to build to 3 storeys. However, some of these will be what is termed 2 ½ storey's whereby the roofspace is used as living space. This keeps the actual height of the buildings lower.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>It will be ensured that no pure retail use will be allowed on the site. However, workshop units such as artist studio's</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Page 48, add new paragraph <u>'The business use allowed will consist of predominantly B1 (business).</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>There is little call for offices with flats above – there are plenty of empty shop units on the High Street which could be used for this purpose.</p> <p>I believe the problem of access has been resolved through this brief.</p> <p>Such a large development might become a suburb of Tisbury.</p>	<p>should be allowed. Page 48 will be re-worded to ensure this.</p> <p>This was addressed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspectors Report suggests that that employment is necessary as there has been a reduction in the local employment base and to address the economic and social well-being of the area. It is felt that smaller scale economic development in the form of B1 (business) is preferable on this site rather than more industrial processes.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The intention is not to create a suburb of Tisbury, but to gain an integrated development. Retail units should not be allowed on this site and therefore harm should not be made to Tisbury High Street.</p>	<p><u>Change of use to A1 (retail) should not be incorporated'</u></p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
31	J W Bunce	Object	<p>Hindon Lane is already a dangerous road because of parking of vehicles.</p> <p>In addition we thought this is a conservation area which should remain enhanced.</p> <p>We cannot understand how such a massive increase in local traffic in a protected area can be proposed. Why is a road widening scheme not considered.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Although your property is within the conservation area, the properties to the west of the conservation area are not within this area.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required.</p>
32	A Wilson	Support	<p>Density.</p> <p>Pleas use money to refurbish the existing pool and money left over to form an emergency fund.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
		Object	<p>Where is sustainability context?</p> <p>Houses don't seem to be built into the Hill</p> <p>No renewable energy visible, not even a solar panel.</p> <p>Where are the parking facilities.</p> <p>Where is disability access.</p>	<p>Page 52 of the brief describes the sustainability criteria which should be incorporated into the development. These are felt to be acceptable.</p> <p>Although not built into the hill, the height of the buildings across the site are designed to have reduced impact on the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Parking is discussed on page 41 of the development brief. Parking provision will be provided in line with the Adopted local plan. Parking will be provided so as not to dominate the streetscape.</p> <p>All dwellings constructed have to be constructed to Part M of the Building Regulations which allow all dwellings to be 'visitable' by a disabled person.</p> <p>Furthermore 5% of dwellings will be constructed to the 'Lifetime Homes' standard which is described on page 51 of the brief.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Amend page 52 of the development, add paragraph 'Renewable energy – Renewable Energy will be considered wherever appropriate or reasonably practicable'</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
33	Mrs J Archer	Object	<p>There has already been considerable recent development in Tisbury. No more is needed.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is too narrow.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector concluded that he did not consider that small scale redevelopment or infill will adequately address the identified housing need in Tisbury, nor did he consider ad hoc development outside of the housing policy boundary would to be a satisfactory</p>	<p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The building of houses will cause noise and disruption.</p> <p>The village cannot afford to build or maintain a new swimming pool.</p>	<p>method of attempting to meet a requirement.</p> <p>It can be conditioned through a planning application to limit working hours of workman to ensure noise and disturbance is not caused in the evenings and at the weekends.</p> <p>Noted Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
34	Wessex Water	Support	<p>Foul Sewerage –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a public foul sewer in the vicinity of the site • Connection should be made to the existing public foul sewer in Hindon Lane at the northern boundary of the site. • The foul sewerage system should have adequate capacity to accommodate the development. However, the developer should provide flow calculations for approval. <p>Surface Water Drainage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No public surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site • Use of Soakaways may be possible • Discharge to watercourse or ditch via a SUDS system may be possible <p>Sewage Treatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is sewage treatment capacity available • There is adequate capacity at the terminal pumping station <p>Water Supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are water mains in the vicinity of the site • Hydraulic modelling of the existing network is required to determine the adequacy of the system to serve the proposed development. 	Accepted.	<p>Page 32, under 'Drainage and Services' will be amended. To read:</p> <p>Enquiries made with Wessex Water have revealed that there are public sewers available running along Hindon Lane and also to the rear of properties on Weaveland Road. <u>The developer will be required to agree a foul and potable water strategy with Wessex Water.</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
35	Defence Estates	No comment.	No Comment.	None.	None required.
36	Capt Chatterton	Object	<p>Objections are primarily concerned with Transport.</p> <p>Parking at Tisbury railway station is under strain and is often full.</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>There is no plan currently to increase parking provision at Tisbury railway station. A further demand on space may encourage residents to walk or cycle to the station rather than drive.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
37	V O'Sullivan	Object	<p>Will this set a precedent for more housing to be allowed on Greenfield sites around Tisbury.</p> <p>With reference to the statement 'no more than half the houses are to be constructed until an agreed proportion of the employment buildings have been constructed' will give an opportunity to the developers to appeal for and be granted more houses?</p>	<p>This will be decided through the future Local Development Framework process. The Core strategy should set out the strategic spatial goals, with the Site Specific Allocation, allocating more specific sites. Please see www.salisbury.gov.uk for further details.</p> <p>No, this is to ensure that community benefits of employment is provided in line with the housing.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
38	R Little	Object	<p>Will the transport infrastructure be able to cope with the additional load.</p> <p>The road network around the area is very constricted. The road network is dangerous in places. The provision of the mini roundabout on Hindon Lane merely alleviates the immediate access problem to the site.</p> <p>There will be an increase of cars going to the station, the bus service is not good enough to take people to the station. The current bus service is very sketchy. People from Hindon Lane will no walk or cycle to the station.</p> <p>Document glosses over the impact of the additional 100 cars that will be associated with the</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>development</p> <p>The document requires a far more detailed exploration of the issues around the impact of the development and the vehicles it will attract on the road network area.</p> <p>Straight line distance from the Sports centre to the library is 800 m beyond the 400 – 700 metres feasibility stated.</p>	<p>Disagree. The housing would be approximately 500 m from the local facilities in the village and approximately 900 m to 1km from the station. Although it is acknowledged that some residents will use there cars for short trips. PPG13 encourages trips of less than 2km to be made by foot.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
39	Ansty Parish Council	Object	<p>Concerns over highway implications around Ansty.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like any extension to the Sewerage Treatment Plant to include provision for Ansty.</p> <p>There is a lack of adequate public swimming pools in the area.</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see representation 34. If the flow calculations / test submitted do show that increased capacity is required it would be inappropriate to request the developer to pay for capacity over and above the proposed development in order to give capacity to Ansty as Planning Obligations have to be 'reasonable and appropriate' to the development proposed. Ansty would be deemed to be too far away for this benefit.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
40	Southern Water	No Comment	No comment – the site is outside of Southern Water's operational area.	None.	None required.
41	C and M Campbell	Object	Object to the density of the buildings and the 3 storeys.	In order to reach the minimum housing density required by government of 30 dwellings per hectare, it is necessary to build to 3 storeys. However, some of these will be what is termed 2 ½ storey's	None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>There will be nowhere for the residents to park.</p> <p>It looks more like a town than a village and has no facilities.</p> <p>Where will the children go to school.</p> <p>What will happen to the Sports Centre in the future. When will the pool be provided.</p> <p>Build on the other site.</p> <p>Tisbury is a village, not an overspill from Salisbury.</p>	<p>whereby the roofspace is used as living space. This keeps the actual height of the buildings lower.</p> <p>Parking is discussed on page 41 of the development brief. Parking provision will be provided in line with the Adopted local plan. Parking will be provided so as not to dominate the streetscape.</p> <p>The indicative design provided has been taken from the vernacular design within Tisbury itself. It is intended that the new development would have no facilities such as a shop so as not to damage the viability and vitality of Tisbury High Street itself.</p> <p>The children will go to school at the local primary school which has capacity and to Gillingham and Salisbury and other schools currently used by residents of Tisbury.</p> <p>Forward Planning is not responsible for the Sports Centre in Tisbury. However, agreement may be able to be reached where planning obligations could be used to improve facilities at the sports centre to make it more viable. Please see representations Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Agreed. Tisbury is not an overspill of Salisbury. The site was allocated in order to address housing need in Tisbury as well as addressing the local employment</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				base and the economic and social well being of the area.	
42	J Bacon	Object	Buildings are too tall, they should be 2 storey, not enough gardens. Roads / rights of way are unclear. Will the traffic to school and sports centre pass right through the 'home area' that is ridiculous. Ensure major road access steers clear of home are to give a viable alternative rout to school and sports centres.	Please see response to representation 41. Proposed roads are highlighted on page 42 and the public right of way is shown on page 40 of the development brief. The traffic will pass through the development including the 'home zone' if incorporated. However the level of traffic created is not felt to be detrimental to the home zone.	None required. None required. None required.
		Support	More houses and employment in Tisbury	Noted.	None required.
43	R Osborne	Object	The business should be much smaller and keep the emphasis on Tisbury High Street rather than creating 'another village'.	Employment use was also identified for the site, to try and address the reduction in the local employment base and the need to address the economic and social well being of the area. It is intended that the new development would have no facilities such as a shop so as not to damage the viability and vitality of Tisbury High Street itself. It is certainly not the intention to create 'another village'.	None required. None required.
44	Ansty Parish Council	Object	Concern that the development would put further pressure on the minor road systems of this area, making traffic a good deal worse, especially through Ansty.	Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.	Please see response and amendments proposed under representation 1, 3 and 122.
45	M Howcroft	Object	Tisbury is not suitable for development outside its present bounds, therefore this development within the AONB should be rejected. Government requirements are to develop brownfield sites before any consideration is given	Please see response to representation 4. Agreed, please see response to representation 12.	None required. None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>to Greenfield sites. Parmiters site should be developed instead.</p> <p>The word urban is used throughout, urbanisation will ruin the village community.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. It is not intended to urbanise the village, however any new development will have an element of urban feel to it. Amend page 58 and 59.</p>	<p>Amend page 58 paragraph 1, sentence 3 to read 'The higher density development is concentrated around the square to help create spatial enclosure and create an urban character'.</p> <p>Page 58 bullet 1 amend to read 'Urban character with three storey development'.</p> <p>Page 59 – amend title 'Key Plan 2 – Urban Square <u>Key Space</u>'.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1 'the urban square <u>key space</u>.....'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 2 'The square <u>key space</u>.....'</p> <p>Amend bullet 1 'Urban character <u>Key space</u></p>
46	I Howcroft.	Object	<p>Tisbury is not suitable for development outside its present bounds, therefore this development within the AONB should be rejected.</p> <p>Government requirements are to develop brownfield sites before any consideration is given to Greenfield sites. Parmiters site should be developed instead.</p> <p>The word urban is used throughout, urbanisation will ruin the village community.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Agreed, please see response to representation 12.</p> <p>Acknowledged. It is not intended to urbanise the village, however any new development will have an element of urban feel to it. Please see response to representation 45. .</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 45. .</p>
47	Mr and Mrs Carter	Object	<p>Within the garden of Rosebank adjacent to the proposed development site there is a quarry with a</p>	<p>This will be provided for within any planning application submitted.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>15 ft sheer rock face. This also extends into the adjoining property. Although there is a three-strand barbed-wire fence within the hedge, the quarry face presents a real danger to anyone who inadvertently or deliberately gets into Rosebank's garden along its southern boundary. New properties along this wall will require some form of fence to avoid this danger. The nature of the fence and position of it should be discussed with the owners of Rosebank before it is put up.</p> <p>Badger sett – The area of the quarry in Rosebank contains a live badger sett and the developer is bound by law to provide egress from the sett through the development to the open countryside and are not permitted to excavate within 25 feet of the sett.</p> <p>The hedge on the West Side of the development Contrary to the statement made in the Ecology section of the development brief, positive signs of dormice have been found in the hedge between parcel 1 and 2. Expert opinion has it that the hedge itself is over 500 years old and should be preserved. Both problems could be resolved if the access to the new estate is at the southern sports centre end of the hedge where there is an existing gap.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Please see page 33 of the development brief which details the ecology of the site. It identifies that a licence will be required from Natural England (Formerly English Nature) in order to undertake works. The study identified on page 33 has furthermore now been updated, this identifies how the development could mitigate against impact to the Badgers. The same study also now identifies the presence of dormice on the site and advises that a licence will also be required with respect to them. As a result page 33 with therefore be amended.</p> <p>A copy of the updated study can be found on www.salisbury.gov.uk</p>	<p>Amend page 33 paragraph 1 to read:</p> <p>An ecological survey, concentrating on protected species, was carried out on the land between Weaveland Road and Hidon Lane, Tisbury, Wiltshire by Michael Woods Associates on 14 September 2004, <u>an update has now been prepared dated September 2006</u></p> <p>Page 33, bullet point 1 after sentence 1 insert sentence reading:</p> <p><u>There is additionally an active main settlement in the small area of woodland / disused quarry in the north west corner of the main field (forms part of the garden of Rosebank).</u></p> <p>Bullet point 4, page 33.</p> <p><u>No positive signs of dormice were found. The presence of dormice were identified in the central hedge. Dormice are additionally a</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Proposed Property on east side of Rosebank boundary.</p> <p>Draft Masterplan shows small building very close to Rosebank's eastern boundary...The boundary vegetation consists of chesnut, beech, copper beech and prunus trees. It would be helpful if there was a sensible space between this building and the tree line. It would be even more sensible to move it away completely.</p> <p>Seems that the Sustainability Assessment has not been properly applied. At section 6.5 under policy H14 for instance should it not be scored negatively against such items as reducing crime/fear of crime etc. All these deficiencies against the template should therefore score zero or negatively. Instead, only the much few positive outcomes are scored. Unless the assessment criteria are applied even-handedly across the board, the exercise lack credibility.</p>	<p>Accepted. Remove property on east side of Rosebank boundary.</p> <p>A draft sustainability report will now accompany all planning policy documents to determine how sustainable the proposal is. As policies within the local plan were not tested against such a frame work to inform the local plan, as this at the time was not a legal requirement, the policies also need to be tested. The policies themselves contain very little information regarding how such items as crime, accessibility to services, increased energy efficiency and reducing pollution and waste etc may be addressed and for this reason they were scored as 'uncertain or insufficient information on which to</p>	<p><u>protected species through EU legislation and a licence will be required from Defra / RDS (Rural Development Service) prior to any work is undertaken.</u></p> <p>Page 33 add to end of last paragraph '<u>and extended Phase 1 Survey dated September 2006</u>'.</p> <p>Amend page 36 last bullet to read '<u>A proper scheme for the protection of badgers and dormice.....</u>'</p> <p>Amend plans on p 57, 48, 46, 44 to reflect removing the property on the east side of Rosebank's boundary.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				determine the assessment at this stage'. The development brief commits the developer to build to Eco homes very good standard, for example, thereby guaranteeing a high level of energy efficiency beyond the policy which does not even address the situation. The construction process is relatively energy intensive and therefore the efficiency of the site will increase into the longer term. Therefore it is felt that the appraisal report has been applied even-handedly and does show that the brief provides for a more 'sustainable' development.	
48	D Lacey	Object	<p>Seems to be conflict between the overall site layout and the actual position of houses on the plan. Reference is made 4 or 5 times in the brief about placing higher buildings in the lower part of the site. However, on the plan most of the higher buildings seem to be towards the top of the site. The plan should be amended to set out the heights using the actual contours.</p> <p>The road access is not good. Could it help to aim for maximum off road parking of Hindon Lane, and put double yellow lines on the road with a pavement along the stretch with priority flow sections on this part of the lane.</p> <p>Lack of imagination on sustainability section re: heating of homes. It would be good to have an innovative scheme with a central boiler or utilising wind / sun / local wood fuels / straw / biofuels, could then sell heat to the sports centre, school etc. – could you make this development special and a national lead.</p>	<p>The lower storey buildings have been positioned nearer the outside of the development to ensure that there is a more rural character on the edge of the settlement.</p> <p>Please see representations Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122</p> <p>It is proposed that the dwellings will be built to Eco homes 'Very good' standards. This is accepted as being of an acceptable environmental standard.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required. Please see response to representation 32.</p>
49	D Sharman	Object	Should not develop Greenfield when brownfield is available.	Agreed, please see response to representation 12.	None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Roads within the area are inadequate.</p> <p>Sewerage works are unable to cope.</p> <p>Development should be integrated with Tisbury, not separate, to support fragile economy and services.</p> <p>3 storeys are not acceptable on a high contour in a rural landscape and not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Dormice on the site and are protected.</p> <p>Redevelop stations works site.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122</p> <p>Please see representation 29 and 34.</p> <p>The design of the development is not to produce a separate development. The units that may appear to look like shops are not and are to be work units. This should assist in supporting Tisbury's fragile economy.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 48.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 12</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122</p> <p>Please see representation 29 and 34</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 48.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 12</p>
50	Mrs Johnson	Object	Hindon Lane is not capable of taking extra traffic. Pedestrians and cyclists will be in danger. The site should be of a reduced scale.	Please see to representation 1, 3 and 122.	Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
51	Mr S Sykes	Object	<p>Accessibility of the site is poor.</p> <p>Development does not respect the development of the area.</p> <p>Object on grounds of Visibility. The scale of the proposed development is inappropriate in terms of density and building height.</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>The indicative drawings have been developed through a thorough analysis of the built context of Tisbury (pages 22 – 32 of the development brief). It is felt that the character of Tisbury has been correctly identified and incorporated into this proposed development.</p> <p>Unfortunately the density of this site is the minimum density allowed through government guidance (PPG3) and this cannot be reduced. Please also see response to representation 48.</p>	<p>Please see representations Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 48.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
52	P Woolsey	Object	<p>Hindon Lane will become more dangerous. Hindon Lane is too narrow. Lorries and cars cannot pass. The new development will make this worse.</p> <p>The Sewerage works need updating.</p> <p>The regular bus services is not very frequent. Am sure Wilts and Dorset won't be very happy to provide a further bus services through the development.</p> <p>Can the council provide assurances that the leisure centre will remain open. Tisbury needs guarantee that the old swimming pool will not close.</p> <p>The numbers of schools identified in the village is inaccurate as the Middle School is closed and is now a private school. The closure appears to be a lack of planning.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representations 14, 29 and 34.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29. The issue of a bus passing through the proposed development site has been re-addressed.</p> <p>The planning department is not in a position to guarantee the continued opening of such facilities. Please see response to representation 19. .</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29. The school closed due to a general change in the education system across Wiltshire.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representations 14, 29 and 34.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19. .</p> <p>None required.</p>
53	R Farrell	Object	<p>Proposed development is dense and overpowering.</p> <p>The road system is inadequate.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used first. Develop the station works instead.</p> <p>The development will spawn applications for small shops which will damage the viability of the High Street.</p> <p>Who will pay for the pool? The brief should honestly state what will happen with the proposed site for the swimming pool.</p> <p>The council have decided to undertake an expensive study which complicates matters.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>The council do not pay for the production of a development brief, it is produced by the proposed developer in conjunction</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>A meeting was held where it was agreed that if the number off new houses permitted elsewhere within the village could reach 75 then the site off Hindon Lane would not be used. This agreement was not minuted.</p>	<p>with the Council The aim of it is to try and negotiate a better development for the village or town concerned and to give the residents a say prior to receiving a planning application.</p> <p>The issue was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector concluded that he did not consider that small scale redevelopment or infill would adequately address the identified need. The inspector found it necessary to identify land for employment and housing in Tisbury, in the interests of the economic and social well being of the settlement.</p>	None required.
54	English Nature	Object	<p>This site is near to a watercourse which feeds into the River Avon SAC system. No consideration has been given as to whether there could be any impacts on the river system either during construction, post construction or to water abstraction.</p>	<p>Officers spoke to Julie Swayne at English Nature before the determination of a scoping opinion on the site was determined. This was due to the knowledge that the tributaries within Tisbury flow into the River Avon SAC system. The Council were advised that this 'Schedule 2 development' should not have a significant effect on the environment and that any effects could be mitigated against. We were also advised to bring to the developers attention the proximity of the River Avon SAC tributaries and the brochure entitled 'Protecting the Hampshire Avon – Essential Habitats Directive advice notes for developers', a copy of which was sent to the developer. Furthermore as a result of this a paragraph was written into the draft development brief on page 62 that states that the scoping opinion will be reviewed again at the planning application stage and that should any environmental issues arise associated with the River Avon systems as a result of the development, mitigating action against</p>	None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The draft development brief is based upon an older version of the ecological survey. This needs to be updated and the draft development brief amended accordingly.</p> <p>PD3 should be amended to take account of PPS9 in that development should achieve a net gain for biodiversity,. Enhancement of existing habitats, and the addition of new, could benefit reptiles, bats and birds using the area.</p>	<p>any short term or longer term effects will be taken.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend page 43</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Add to page 38 after PPG7 <u>Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</u></p> <p>Add bullet to page 33 '<u>Where possible a net gain for biodiversity should be achieved</u>'</p>
55	B Farrell	Object	<p>Will mean there will be too many extra vehicles on the already dangerous roads.</p> <p>Urban style and density of proposed development, 3 storey is inappropriate, one house is too close to the boundary of Rosebank.</p> <p>Parmiters should be developed instead as it is a brownfield site.</p> <p>Who will pay for the swimming pool to be built.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Pleas see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Pleas see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
56	A & A Ruston on behalf of 2, 3 and 4 Alexander Cottages and Rosebank	Object	<p>The Station works is preferred to Hindon Lane as it is brownfield.</p> <p>Brief should state that houses with gardens should be located along the eastern boundary where there are existing houses and gardens. This would not compromise the adjoining existing houses and their gardens. Recommended amendments to layout are suggested.</p> <p>B1 light industrial should be moved so as to</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>There is a reasonable space between the buildings on the eastern side of the proposed development. Furthermore please see response to representation 26. Houses with the larger gardens have been placed on the western edge of the development to enable the edge to have a more rural feel.</p> <p>Please see response to representation</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 26.</p> <p>Please see response to</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>minimise the effect on adjoining houses both new or existing. Works hours for industrial development should be set at 9am to 5pm.</p> <p>Design brief should state that the three storey buildings should be limited to less than 10% of overall numbers. Should state that there should be no three storey buildings along the boundary of the site. Otherwise this could compromise the privacy of existing homes.</p> <p>Further measures need to be set out to protect pedestrians on Hindon Lane. A traffic management proposal is needed to stop a 'rat run' developing between the new development and Weaveland Road via the school.</p> <p>The brief should set out that the eastern boundary, to provide for privacy and safety, should have a solid fence / wall and landscaping and a two meter safety and maintenance strip on the side facing the adjoining quarry.</p>	<p>26.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 26.</p>	<p>representation 26.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 26.</p>
57	Mr and Mrs Anstee	Object	<p>Object to more cars and lorries on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>We don't want another Gillingham</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>There is no intention to create another Gillingham.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>None required.</p>
58	C Spencer-Smith	Object	<p>Concerns of the dishonesty of the swimming pool. We all know it is never going to happen.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
59	W Spencer-Smith	Object	<p>Council should not build in Tisbury until it starts making firm commitments regarding facilities in the village – Nadder Middle School, Free denominational transport, sports centre under threat.</p> <p>Site for new swimming pool pointless unless is going to be built.</p>	<p>Additional residents should help to support the facilities in the Village.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
60	P and H Turner	Object	<p>3 storey 'town houses' not in keeping with present dwellings.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Traffic calming measures may create problems for present residents on-street parking.</p> <p>Do not approve of building in the AONB.</p> <p>Why should it have its own character and identity. Should blend in with the village.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 5.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 51.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 5.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 51.</p>
61	R Handley	Object	<p>Development is too big. It will destroy the character of a quiet, country town in a beautiful landscape.</p> <p>Ecological effects: The additional noise and bustle will threaten wildlife struggling to survive.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is already heavy and a danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>Does Tisbury need a further 75 houses? A Tisbury survey of residents concluded that most oppose expansion.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 5.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>The issue was addressed by the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry. He concluded that he did not consider that small scale redevelopment will adequately address identified affordable housing need and therefore it was necessary to allocate a site of this size. Therefore the size should not be reduced.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 5.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>
62	J Phipps	Object	<p>The drawing in the appendices of the proposed junction improvements does not include the entrance to Hillstreet Farm. The design is therefore lacking accuracy and has not yet been approved by the County Highways Authority.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is too narrow and dangerous. A comprehensive traffic survey should be carried out to confirm the effect of increased traffic along Hindon Lane as a result of this planned estate. The results of the survey should be made available</p>	<p>It is agreed that this drawing should include the entrance to Hillstreet Farmhouse.</p> <p>The design was produced in conjunction and with agreement of Wiltshire County Council Highways.</p> <p>Agreed. This will be carried out as part of the Transport Assessment for the site, which will be required to accompany any planning application. Please see response to representation 122.</p>	<p>Amend drawing on page 65 to include entrance to Hillstreet Farmhouse.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>to the general public.</p> <p>Architect has chosen a design supposedly based on the characters of existing buildings in Tisbury. However the result is not in keeping with the local area. Mr Fry and his architect must carry out an extensive review of the proposed design of the estate in light of the widespread criticism from the Tisbury residents and Western Area Committee.</p>	<p>As identified between pages 22 and 30 of the development the character of the proposed dwellings, including, layout, design, building form and detailing and street patterns have been taken from Tisbury itself, including Hindon Lane. It is therefore felt that the indicative design does respond to the character of Tisbury.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
63	R Turner	Object	<p>Priority should be given to building on Parmiters site, not a Greenfield site.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is not suitable to cope with any more traffic.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is the direct route to the A303 for emergency vehicles. Traffic calming has been turned down in the past because of this.</p> <p>There is no mention of the public bridleway which runs alongside the sports centre.</p> <p>The brief highlights urban development, development should be of a village nature.</p> <p>In the past planning permission for a small golf course in Tuckingmill was turned down because of access to the village.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 29.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see representation 122.</p> <p>The public right of way is identified on page 14,35, 40 and 47 of the brief. Page 47 states that 'The existing bridleway along the southern side of the site would also be retained and new hedgerow planting would be implemented in order to enclose the bridleway and create an attractive pedestrian route. This has therefore been addressed.</p> <p>Any development tends to create a more urban nature, and for this reason the term urban has been used. On page 35 it details that there will be low density development on edge of the open country-side and this will very much of a village nature.</p> <p>This consultation exercise is to discuss the draft development brief for Hindon Lane. Please see response to</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see representation 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Infrastructure is not capable of supporting a development of this size and nature.	representation 1, 3 and 122 with regard to highway considerations. Please see response to representation 34 with regard to water and sewerage infrastructure and representations 1, 8 and 122 with regard to Highway infrastructure.	Please see response to representation 34, 1, 8 and 122.
64	M Ward	Object	Road structure in Tisbury cannot take the additional traffic. Why should the local community relinquish village status to town status for non local housing developers?	Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122. There is no plan to change Tisbury into a town.	Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122. None required.
65	A P Preece	Object	Tisbury has already been overdeveloped for its size. The roads into the village, especially Hindon Lane are already dangerous and over busy. This development would create a greater problem	Please see response to representation 1. The Inspector further identified that Tisbury functions as a local service centre for a large rural hinterland and has a wide range of facilities relative to its size. Therefore together with the loss of employment and identified housing need, it was felt necessary to allocate a housing site. Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	Please see response to representation 1. Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
66	R Preece	Object	Tisbury has already been overdeveloped. There is no further scope for major exploitation like this. The road traffic alone is proof of this.	Please see response to representation 65. Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122	Please see response to representation 65. Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122
67	A Johnson	Object	Object due to road safety and problems of congestion. Hindon Lane is already congested, especially the large vehicles going up and down the lane. Traffic calming will not eradicate the problem. I trust the traffic authority will be required to look into the network again.	Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
68	G Matthews	Object	Hindon Lane is not wide enough. Widen Hindon	Please see response to representation 1,	Please see response to

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Lane.</p> <p>Don't need any more employment sites, we already have enough. The Parmiter site is unused and brownfield and should be used.</p> <p>Why do we need the new open space when we have King George V playing field, sports centre and cricket pitch.</p> <p>The large buildings are not necessary. The new Churchill estate should be a role model, it has been excellently planning.</p> <p>We can't afford the swimming pool.</p>	<p>3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 29.</p> <p>Policy R2 of the local plan requires housing developers to make provision for open space. In this instance the developer is proposing to provide a large off-site open space for the use of all residents of Tisbury. I understand this area is already used casually for recreational purposes (dog walking etc) by residents of Tisbury. This would enable this area of open space to be preserved through planning policy as open space for the village. New open space is provided to address any shortfall that additional populations might create.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47, 48 and 49</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 29.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47, 48 and 49</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
69	V Hopkinson	Object	<p>75 dwellings is out of proportion to Tisbury. We need small development of affordable housing for local families.</p> <p>Will produce traffic chaos on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Badgers and Dormice should be protected.</p> <p>The site is in AONB</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p>
70	H Herbert	Object	<p>Every road into Tisbury is unsuitable for further traffic. Hindon Lane is already dangerous and</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>cannot cope with further traffic.</p> <p>Local estate agents have had 61 units on its books for 3 years and say there is no evidence based need for further demand.</p> <p>Building will endanger small mammals and birds that live in this area. It will also increase pollution and noise. Land will be needed for future food production.</p> <p>This building plan will completely block my views of the AONB and virtually restrict all the light I receive in my cottage. Local estate agents say it would reduce my property value by at least 1/3 and it would be impossible to sell.</p>	<p>The inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry identified that the Affordable Housing Study identified Tisbury as one of the settlements having the highest proportion of low incomes and is only exceeded by Downton as having the most expensive 2 bedroom terraced houses. 105 of households were also living in accommodation which failed to meet its current needs. The inspector considered that small scale redevelopment or infill development would not adequately address identified need and therefore a housing allocation site was needed to address this. The identified need in Tisbury is therefore as a result of affordability. 33 % of the proposed development will be affordable units amounting to 25 units, which will begin to address the shortfall desperately needed in Tisbury.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 56 and 26.</p>	<p>None Required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 56 and 26.</p>
71	Tisbury Parish Council	Object	<p>Enhancing the urban feel – a theme running throughout the design brief.</p> <p>Traffic on Hindon Lane – a proper study needs to be worked through. Measures are needed to ensure the speed of traffic on the lane is slowed</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>down.</p> <p>Cars and car parking. It has to be recognised that most households have more than one car. The lack of provision for cars in this development will not make cars go away. There should be proper provision for on-site parking and evidence of collaborative working with South West Trains to ensure further provision by the station and near the high street, otherwise new people will not use the local facilities.</p> <p>Through route for vehicles – there needs to be a proper route through to Hindon Lane for residents in Weaveland Road, otherwise cars will cut through the sports centre / primary school.</p>	<p>Car and cycle parking is identified on page 41 of the development brief. This identifies that parking will be provided in line with Policy G2 and appendix V and VI of the Local Plan. This identifies that for dwellings up to 4 beds 2 car parking spaces per unit will be provided plus 1 space per 5 units and for dwellings with five or more bedrooms 3 per unit will be provided with 1 extra space provide per 5 units for visitors. Details of parking provision for employment use is also identified in appendix V. Provision of cycle parking is identified in appendix V1 of the Local Plan. This requires 2 covered cycle parking places per unit and 2 covered spaces plus 1 spacer per each 500m2 above 1000 m2 gross floor area. Therefore although the indicative drawings have been provided without any cars on them it does not mean that no parking will be provided. Please also see response to representation 36.</p> <p>The issue of a through route between Weaveland Road and Hindon Lane was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The inspector identified that formal consultation with the County Highway Authority indicated they would object if the site were to be served from Weaveland Road. The Highways Authority again do not object to their not being a through route. It would be the intention to design the route so as to prevent 'rat running'. Furthermore discussion with residents on Weaveland Road at the public consultation events held in Tisbury confirmed that residents on Weaveland</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Speed limit throughout the development should be 20mph.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be covenanted to it so that dwellings remain properly affordable. They should not be able to be extended so the value increases. Local people to Tisbury must have priority over others.</p> <p>Street lights should be limited to minimise light pollution. Lights used should limit a lightening of the night skyline. Provision should be made in property deeds that any outside lighting must not stay on permanently.</p> <p>Development mix – Proposal for the mixed development should include for rural type employment opportunities. There should not be any retail units that would threaten the viability of the current High Street / shops</p> <p>Provision of a bus route would promote travel</p>	<p>Road did not want a link through to Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Agreed. As detailed on page 42, last bullet point there will be a design speed of 20mph within the development. This means that roads will be designed so that speeds greater than 20mph cannot be reached.</p> <p>As detailed on page 49 of the development brief, the affordable housing is tied through a section 106 agreement. The affordable housing, once complete will be negotiated by the Council and transferred to a Housing Association which will ensure it remains affordable housing into perpetuity.</p> <p>It is agreed that street lights should be limited to minimise light pollution. Lights provided can be of a design that are low level and minimise light pollution, however this will be subject to standards required by Wiltshire County Council highways in adopted areas. Unfortunately we cannot place on deeds that outside lighting must not stay on permanently.</p> <p>It is intended with the design of the employment areas proposed, as detailed on page 48 of the brief an area of employment buildings is proposed to be designed as a 'farmyard' type complex which should provide suitable units for rural type employment opportunities. Please also see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Agreed. This will be looked into and liaison will be made with bus providers</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Add to page 36 point 3 '<u>Lighting should where possible be low level and minimised to respect the AONB, subject to meeting standards required by Wiltshire county Council Highways in adopted areas</u>'.</p> <p>Please also see response to representation 30</p> <p>No amendments to development brief, however, discussions will be</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>to/from Hindon. Liaison would be needed with Tisbus to provide a service which links the development of the High Street and Railway Station at peak times. Other initiatives such as the provision of bicycle racks at the railway station would also be welcomed.</p> <p>All mention of the swimming pool should be removed as this will never happen. The land should be re-defined as 'land set aside for a suitable community use' such as allotments or outdoor recreation provision linked to the sports centre or parking for the adjacent Nadder Hall and Sports Centre.</p> <p>Ongoing responsibility for the open space should be clearly defined. Financial provision would need to be set aside for maintaining such areas, not just capital funding.</p> <p>Sewage works has limited capacity.</p> <p>The re-use of grey water should receive more emphasis as well as other sustainability issues.</p>	<p>and Tisbus. Discussions will also be had with Network Rail as to the feasibility of place bike racks at the station.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>It is generally intended that a Parish Council take on areas of open space provided by new development once the open space is complete (for example if play equipment is to be provided this should be fitted prior to the parish council adopting the site). The District Council also negotiate through a section 106 agreement a maintenance charge for maintaining the open space, this is calculated in order to last into perpetuity if spent correctly. This sum would also be transferred to the parish council on adoption of the open space by the parish council. Discussion will be had with the parish if the site is released for development as to the play equipment etc the parish wish to see on the site.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 34.</p> <p>Sustainability issues are discussed on page 52 of the development brief which addresses grey water.</p>	<p>had with bus providers and Network Rail regarding bus services and the provision of bike racks at Tisbury Station.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 34.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>At least 10% of energy on the development should be provided by renewables on site in line with indicative target in PPS22.</p> <p>Insufficient note has been taken of the natural history of the area. The site is home to many rare and endangered species both birds and mammals. Dormice in the ancient hedgerow should be retained.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 32.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13 and 47.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 32.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13 and 47.</p>
72	J B Naish	Object	<p>Can the utilities cope with increased demands.</p> <p>Can the first school cope with additional children.</p> <p>Concern of traffic on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Leisure facilities would be stretched as I understand there is a waiting list for classes at the leisure centre.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 34.</p> <p>This was discussed at the local plan inquiry, where it was identified that there was sufficient space within the school system. However, as detailed on page 62, education contributions will be requested if it is shown that demand exceeds capacity.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>New development should support services. More people should ensure that the sports centre is more profitable and perhaps may even create a higher demand to ensure that further classes are put on in order to satisfy demand.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 34</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>
73	W A Longland	Object	<p>Development will make the railway station car park and Nadder close car park worse. Provision must be made to increase the capacity of these car parks. Parking on the high street is a serious matter.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is too narrow for to take additional traffic. There is also great danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>Building on Greenfield is not desirable. A better</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>solution would be a continued use of brownfield sites and infilling, limited to a maximum of 5 dwellings in one place. This would achieve a better balance within the village and its surrounds. 75 dwellings in one place is not the best solution for Tisbury in order to meet the requirements of the County or the government.</p>		representation 1.
74	S Jonas	Object	<p>Is there a need for this development? There is an undeveloped brownfield site in Tisbury.</p> <p>Urban concept of the development, redesign to make more rural in feel. There is not need for small business units / shops within the residential area.</p> <p>Transport issues, smaller less dense development could create less traffic. The brownfield site would create not traffic congestion problems.</p> <p>Participation in sport and recreation. – provide funds for the development of the existing swimming pool.</p> <p>Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and energy from renewable resources. Further improvements could be made by the use of ecologically friendly / non petro-chemical based paints. The government' Low Carbon Buildings Programme suggests the incorporation of in the micro – generation from renewables in all new developments.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122. Building a similar number of houses and employment on the 'brownfield' site next to the station, which has not yet been to be proven to be available for housing would result in a similar number of car trips being produced as this site would.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 32.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 32.</p>
75	Tisbury Action Group (A Carter)	Object	<p>Traffic too and from Tisbury, traffic on Hindon Lane, lack of pavement, narrowness of Hindon Lane. A comprehensive traffic survey is required. The results should be published so it can be resolved once and for all.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Parking in the development. SDC Officers have told us that the maximum car parking allowance is 2.2 per dwelling. This is unlikely to be enough. There is no provision in the design for overspill parking.</p> <p>Parking in the village and at the station is a problem. Is there any early prospect of a large extension of the station car park. We think not.</p> <p>Brief shows a quasi urban confection supposedly drawing from the character of Tisbury. It is wholly inappropriate for a pseudo mini down centre to be erected on the edge of the village.</p> <p>The developer is lowering their build costs by building upwards rather than horizontally. Is the developer assuming so many will be happy cooped up in flats without their own small garden. This seems to be highly experimental in a rural environment and puts at risk SA objective of reducing social exclusion, reducing crime and improving health and well-being. The original plan proposed back in 1999 was better.</p> <p>The urban square and 3 storey buildings will be visible from most directions adversely impacting upon the AONB.</p> <p>Developer should be required to use downward facing low level external lighting throughout the</p>	<p>This provision is in line with the Council's adopted Local Plan. As stated in appendix V standards will be applied having regard to the accessibility of individual development sites to alternative modes of transport to try and reduce reliance on the car. For this reason maximum car parking spaces should be adhered too.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 45 and 30.</p> <p>In order to reach the minimum housing density required by government of 30 dwellings per hectare it is necessary to build upwards to 3 storeys and also to build flats. Furthermore, apartments/ flats without gardens can be cheaper than houses with gardens. Tisbury has a proven housing affordability issue and this should go to some way in resolving this. Furthermore there is not reason why flats should result in social exclusion, increased crime and worsening health, especially given the proximity that the site is to the countryside.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 45 and 30.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>estate to minimise impact.</p> <p>Creation of an alternative hub to Tisbury's existing village centre.</p> <p>The parcel of land to the south of the school appears good, but it is not entirely clear that it is part of the package.</p> <p>No one has offered to pay for the construction costs for a new swimming pool or the running costs. The land will end up as more housing.</p> <p>The publication of the brief has given Tisbury the impression that this is the Council's preferred proposal. SDC now has a public duty to dispel that impression. It should publicly state that an alternative and equivalent site may well come forward, and that SDC will continue to honour its promise to delay a decision on the Hindon Lane until February 2007.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Agreed. Amend paragraph 2 page 47 to make it cleared that the site would be transferred to the parish council.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>The cabinet report of 7th June 2006 recommended three scenarios in respect of the Review of the Phase 2 Housing Allocations. Scenario 3 stated that [regarding the release of the Hindon Lane site]:</p> <p><i>'A decision is made to delay any decision until the outcome of an effective marketing exercise of the Station Works site is undertaken – Officers would need to monitor any marketing exercise undertaken which as indicated above, would be likely to take no less than 6 months. A clear decision one way or the other on the future demand for the Station Works site could then be reached, although there is a risk that late intervention or an uncooperative approach may cloud decision making. Depending upon the outcome of this, reference can be made to the previous two scenarios as regards the courses of action to be taken by each party. Nevertheless, it is fair to point out that a planning application for the Hindon Lane site could be submitted during the extended marketing period'.</i></p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 2 page 47 <u>'and would be transferred to the parish council on completion of the proposed development.'</u></p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				<p>The recommendation made by Cabinet was that:</p> <p><i>‘Scenario 3 be pursued, namely to delay any decision in respect of Tisbury until the outcome of an effective marketing exercise on the Station Works site is undertaken, such delay shall be for no more than 6 months’.</i></p> <p>This recommendation therefore does not prevent the council from continuing to work on either the Hindon Lane or the Station Works site, what this decision does is delay the ‘release’ of the Hindon Lane site for development.</p> <p>As you are aware what is currently out for consultation is a draft development brief for Hindon Lane. At this stage there is no basis to hold this exercise back otherwise it may invite the developer to make a planning application. A developer who holds an interest in a site is entitled to produce a development brief for a site, on the assumption that a site has yet to be released for development, and the assumption that it might not be released. This process has already occurred elsewhere in the district through the adoption some time ago of a development brief for the site at Wick Lane, Downton.</p> <p>The Cabinet decision further allowed enough time for the owners of the Station works site to market their site for economic purposes. Policy E16, of the</p>	

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				<p>local plan protects land currently used for, or allocated for, employment purposes from change of use or redevelopment or for other purposes unless, amongst other things, the owner is able to show that the premises or land is no longer viable for an employment use. The council has certain requirements which must be satisfied in order to identify if a site is no longer viable. This process takes a minimum of 6 months. Cabinet delaying this decision for 8 months provides the owners of the Station works site time to determine, finally, if this site is viable for employment use, or not.</p> <p>The draft development brief (Hindon Lane) if adopted may be used to inform a planning application at the conclusion of the marketing exercise on the Station Works site. If the marketing exercise reveals no demand at the Station Works, Cabinet will not release the Hindon Lane site and so the Development Brief becomes superfluous. The developer is correspondingly aware of this risk, but considers he must be prepared if the site is released.</p> <p>Additionally, for clarification, this would mean that, as detailed under scenario 2 of the phase 2 allocation report, if a planning application were to be submitted to the council 'any grant of consent would need to be rejected by the council'.</p> <p>If the owner / developer of the Station Works site were also wishing to pursue a development brief on the station works site, whether for employment, mixed use or residential, the council would also wish</p>	

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
				to work with this party to try and achieve better development for Tisbury.	
76	F Noble	Object	<p>Not enough thought has been given to transport issues.</p> <p>Provision of land fro a new swimming pool is a meaningless statement.</p> <p>The proposed development will not help develop a vibrant and sustainable community. Most people who live in Tisbury have to work in other towns as there are insignificant employment opportunities.</p> <p>Area is within the AONB and should not be developed. The Station Works site is better suited to high density development.</p> <p>Local public transport is inadequate.</p> <p>Badgers will be destroyed.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>It is agreed that there is insignificant employment opportunities in Tisbury. Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 9 .</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 9 .</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p>
77	N Jennings	Objection	Please see response to representation 76.	Please see response to representation 76.	Please see response to representation 76.
78	Mr Pope	Support	<p>Not in favour of any housing in Tisbury.</p> <p>Prepared to see houses almost anywhere providing they do not go to the Station Works Site. On the understanding that Station Works remains available for its current usage there seems little reason to include work units on the Hindon Lane site.</p>	The site was allocated in order to provide both employment and housing in Tisbury. The Parmiters site was still in use for employment at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry when the issue was discussed. Therefore even if the Parmiters site was redeveloped for employment uses, employment would still be needed on this site to accompany the housing.	None required.
79	Hindon and Fonthill Bishop WI	Object	Object due to the omission of any provision for a proportion of energy to be generated from renewable resources. Add to page 25 'Provision of micro-generation of renewable energy throughout the development.	Please see response to representation 32.	Please see response to representation 32.
80	S & N Mather	Object	2 ½ and 3 storeys are completely inappropriate for Tisbury. What is needed is an estate that	Please see response to representation 1 and 30.	Please see response to representation 1 and 30.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>integrates into the village rather than competing with it.</p> <p>Light pollution. There should be strict rules aimed at restricting light pollution to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Flats are not suitable for a rural estate like this as it has no private outdoor space. If houses or bungalows are not built with small gardens social problems for the village will be stored up.</p> <p>It is not clear if the large piece of land suggested for recreational activities is definitely available or not.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is already too busy and dangerous.</p> <p>The site is too far from the centre of Tisbury and the railway station for people to walk.</p> <p>Station Works site should be used instead.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 72.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 75.</p> <p>Agreed. Please see response to representation 75.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>Pleas see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 72.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 75.</p> <p>Agreed. Please see response to representation 75.</p> <p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>Pleas see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>
81	A Blake	Support	<p>Support the development, however would like to see:</p> <p>A link to Nadder Hall which is hoped will become a thriving community centre. A link to Weaveland Road.</p> <p>A shuttle bus service from Hindon via the new development, Weaveland Road, the Churchill estate linking with trains.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>Please see representation 71.</p>	<p>Please see response tot representation 1,3 and 122</p> <p>Please see representation 71.</p>
82	W Blake	Support	<p>Parmiters site is not suitable and should be kept for future employment.</p> <p>Tisbury is in need of a larger housing development to attract families to the village to help keep local amenities.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
83	E Young	Object	<p>Proposals are too suburban.</p> <p>The hill makes is unsuitable for people without cars.</p> <p>In time shops will open in the new square and Tisbury High Street will die.</p> <p>The houses are too high.</p> <p>The initial proposals did not have houses in the land used as the entrance, this only had industrial building. Now houses are on this land too.</p> <p>Some of the proposed houses in the field bordering Hindon Lane face our leylandii hedge and are very close to it. Under new legislation leylandii can be cut down it too tall</p> <p>The increase traffic on Hindon Lane is the reason why 45 dwellings were turned down some years ago by the council. Hindon land has not altered and cars are now parked on it.</p> <p>Will the bus route be linked to the Churchill Estate.</p> <p>How can an entrance road with the necessary legal splay be made and a house built right on Hindon</p>	<p>Please see representation 45, 46 and 63.</p> <p>The housing would be approximately 500 m from the local facilities in the village and approximately 900 m to 1km from the station. Most people apart from the very old or disabled should be able make it up the hill without a car.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 41.</p> <p>This detail will be dealt with at a planning application stage. The hedge currently acts as a screen which should be beneficial to the developer. However the development brief further highlights that structural landscaping will also be grown . Details of the High Hedges legislation can be found at the following location: http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1127822</p> <p>Having undertaken a planning history search on this site, I am unable to locate this planning application.</p> <p>It is not intended to have a bus route through to the Churchill Estate.</p> <p>The masterplan is indicative it is not finalised. The developer is confident that</p>	<p>Please see representation 45, 46 and 63.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 41.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Lane in the small area on the proposal.</p> <p>What use can be made of the off site open space? This is on a slope. Can children play football here or hit a tennis ball or will it end up in Tuckingmill?</p>	<p>the visibility spays can be accommodated.</p> <p>Although the site might not be suitable for formal sports, this land will provide an informal area of open space for the Tisbury residents. This is, I understand, already used by residents of Tisbury for recreational purposes, through the goodness of the current landowner, this arrangement could, with this development be more formalised.</p>	None required,
84	J Young	Object	<p>Object to development of this scale in Tisbury.</p> <p>Build on the brownfield site / Parmiters site instead.</p> <p>The design is inappropriate.</p> <p>Insufficient room for the roundabout on Hindon Lane. WCC need to look at the suitability of Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Gifting of land for a swimming pool sounds good, but Tisbury cannot support this.</p> <p>Why build a central square other than for shops.</p> <p>Need assurance that the conifers at the end of our garden will not be affected by the high hedges legislation.</p> <p>Conifers have a limited life. Require assurance new hedges are planted at edge of the development.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 62.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 3.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 83.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 83.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 62.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 3.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30 and 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 83.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 83.</p>
85	M Marshall	Object	<p>Object to more housing in Tisbury.</p> <p>Traffic congestion is a problem</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Build on parmiters site instead.	122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12	and 122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12
86	I McGowan	Object	Hindon Lane does not have enough width and capacity. Weaveland Road does not have capacity either.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
87	K Harris	Object	What about the electric cables over this field Hindon Lane cannot take the additional traffic.	The electric cables over the field do not affect the development. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	None required. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
88	J Keet	Object	Hindon Lane cannot support the additional dwellings with respect to traffic, parking etc. Residents want assurance that the affordable housing will be suitable for first time buyers or young families. Existing bus service is inadequate. Sewerage plant is inadequate. Development would cause destruction of natural habitat including established badger setts. Build on parmiters site.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 9. Please see response to representation 29 and 38. Please see representation 29 and 34. Please see response to representation 47. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.	. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 9. Please see response to representation 29 and 38. Please see representation 29 and 34. Please see response to representation 47. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.
89	D Knight	Object	Safety of pedestrians, extra cars. Build on the Parmiters site.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.
90	M Neal	Object	Explain clearly the provenance of an allocation. The brief should talk about the Parmiters site. Omit reference of swimming pool as a benefit.	It is not felt that this is necessary. Please see response to representation 8 and 12. Please see response to representation	None required. Please see response to representation 8 and 12. Please see response to

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The final brief should state when various assessments are to be conducted and the community consulted and by whom.</p> <p>The road link through the site should be clarified.</p> <p>'The site is allocated to address the economic and social well-being of the area' implies that such well being is inadequate in some way'.</p> <p>What benefit is provided by a new access to the recreational centre?</p> <p>What does investment in sustainable transport mean?</p> <p>There is already access to significant areas of open space. Does this benefit mean that there will be more access than present?</p> <p>The brief labels parts of the infrastructure where constraints may exist, it does not define these constraints nor does it assess their impact on the locality.</p>	<p>19.</p> <p>Assessments will need to be produced to inform any planning application submitted. The public will therefore be able to comment upon any aspect at this time.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. It is agreed that this needs clarification and relevant amendments will be made throughout the development brief.</p> <p>This was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry. It was identified that Tisbury had a lack of housing affordable to most people and there was a lack of employment in Tisbury, which together add up to a diminishing well-being of the area, resulting in younger people and those that have grown up in the village not being able to afford to stay.</p> <p>This should reduce the amount of vehicle movements going through the school and to the recreational centre.</p> <p>This means that investment in cycle shelters, buses etc will be made.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 68.</p> <p>It is not for a development brief to assess the impact of a constraint but to identify the constraints that will need to be resolved when a planning application is submitted. The brief has achieved this.</p>	<p>representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response representation 68.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>On previous occasions the Council have rejected planning applications for the site for access reasons.</p> <p>Transport issues.</p> <p>Page 38 what do you mean by 'making public transport publicly available'.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 83.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>This means making public transport more accessible to more of the population.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 83.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>
91	M W Knight	Object	<p>Create housing and employment of less density.</p> <p>Relocate the affordable housing to somewhere else and nearer the centre of Tisbury.</p> <p>The proposals are not sustainable for traffic reasons. Traffic calming is an issue.</p> <p>People will not walk and cycle to the village.</p> <p>The topography is too high.</p> <p>A lot of reference to a regular bus service, but services are not frequent.</p> <p>There is limited parking at the station.</p> <p>The situation regarding the swimming pool needs to be clarified.</p> <p>There is no sewage facility in Hindon Lane, the sewage works cannot cope.</p> <p>Water pressure will be low due to height of development.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Affordable housing is delivered alongside the market housing and therefore this cannot be relocated.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 48.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see representation 34 which shows there to be both sewage and water facilities on Hindon Lane. Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 24.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 48.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 29.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 36.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 24.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Buildings will impact on the AONB</p> <p>There is a supposed link between the use of water butts and the use of grey water. This would cause a hygiene problem.</p> <p>Why is there reference to education provision when the middle school closed.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Disagree. Rainwater is regarded as greywater as well as other forms of greywater and therefore there is not felt to be a conflict here.</p> <p>Although Wiltshire County Council reorganised the education system in Wiltshire which resulted in the closure of all middle schools, education is still an important aspect. With greater population increased facilities maybe needed in both the primary school and the secondary school system and it is important that these facilities are provided.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
92	C Maycock and A Frame	Object	<p>The scale is not appropriate for Tisbury. Smaller infill sites would be better. Our understanding is that a recent survey shows that there is not a need for new housing on this scale.</p> <p>This is a Greenfield site which provides an established amenity to the village.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is inadequate for a development of this size.</p> <p>TisVis shows that there was an overwhelming rejection of this site.</p> <p>Build on parmiters instead.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1. The District Council is unaware of such a study.</p> <p>Although the people of the village appear to use this site for dogwalking etc, it is through the goodness of the landowner that this is currently allowed. The public rights of way which are protected will remain through this development.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>The TisVis questionnaire did not appear to ask directly if residents anted to see development on the Allocation site at Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
93	G Quirke	Object	The village do not want Tisbury to become a Town. The roads around Tisbury cannot cope with increased traffic. Parking on Hindon Lane is an issue.	Please see response to representation 64. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	Please see response to representation 64. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
94	Redman Heenan Properties Limited	Object	Surprised and concerned to see the release of the draft brief for the Hindon Lane site in that the Council has yet to make a final decision on the Station Works / Parmiters site.	Please see response to representation 75.	Please see response to representation 75.
95	M F Ranson	Object	Hindon Lane is too narrow for existing traffic. High Street congestions. Churchill Estate cannot take any further traffic. However create a link between the new development and the Churchill Estate. The material is misleading in this respect. There is a brownfield site available in Tisbury.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Agreed. It is not intended to create a link between the new development and the Churchill Estate to stop 'rat running'. Please see response to representation 8 and 12	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. None required. Please see response to representation 8 and 12
96	G P Francis	Object	70+ houses is too many for the site and Tisbury, building smaller developments instead. Hindon Lane will not be able to support the huge increase in construction and subsequent traffic. Road widening would be needed. Infrastructure such as sewers will not be able to support the development. The general Greenfield environment would be harmed. Build on the station works site instead.	Please see response to representation 1. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 34. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.	Please see response to representation 1. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 34. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.
97	J Farrer	Object	This is a Greenfield site, houses should be built on the Station Works site instead. The road network cannot cope. Weaveland Road and Churchill housing Estate are not suitable for further traffic either. There is no extra parking planned at the station.	Please see response to representation 8 and 12 See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 36.	Please see response to representation 8 and 12 See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 36.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Infrastructure, including sewage and water will not be able to cope.	Please see response to representation 34.	Please see response to representation 34.
98	T Frost	Object	<p>Volume of traffic on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>The proposed gift of land for a swimming pool sounds lovely, but who will pay for the pool?</p> <p>What about he infrastructure – sewage etc.</p> <p>There are times when pot holes etc have remained for several days without attention. More traffic will exacerbate this.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>This is the responsibility of Wiltshire County Council Highways. Potholes can be reported to 'CLARENCE' (an acronym for Customer Lighting And Roads Enquiry Centre) which is a Wiltshire County Council provided service centre set up to allow you to quickly and easily report road and lighting defects and hazards. The contact details are: Freephone: 0800 23 23 23. Mobile phone users and for calls outside Wiltshire please telephone: 01225 777234 or email clarence@wiltshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>None required.</p>
99	J Frost	Object	<p>Object to 3 storey development.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is unsuitable for increased traffic. Parking on Hindon Lane is dangerous.</p> <p>Where will vehicles in the development be parked?</p> <p>A link to Weaveland Road will cause it to become a 'rat run'.</p>	<p>Pleas see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Although an access to the sports centre and primary school will be provided, it is not felt that this ill create a rat-run due to the tortuous nature of moving round the proposed development. Please see representation 122.</p>	<p>Pleas see response to representation 47, 48 and 49.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>None required. Please see representation 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Scrap the entire plan. Tisbury has been filled with houses will less employment over the last 20 years. It will lead to more commuters.	The provision of this site with employment provision aims to try and redress some of this imbalance.	None required.
100	J Akeroyd	Object	<p>Area is a village green space that is rich in biodiversity and ancient hedgerow.</p> <p>Badgers and dormice are legally protected. Until the main part of the site was recently ploughed it was a wildflower meadow with butterflies, even orchids.</p> <p>Hindon Lane already has too much traffic.</p> <p>Build on parmiters site instead.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 24.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 24.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 47.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p>
101	R Beattie	Object	<p>Proposed scale and density. 3 storey development is inappropriate.</p> <p>Development on this scale will open the way for further phases.</p> <p>The road network cannot cope.</p> <p>The site is too far from the village centre.</p> <p>The parking standards will create overflow parking.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>This was addressed at the local plan inquiry. The inspector concluded that the development would not appear as an extension to Tisbury but the utilisation of an unused piece of land that generally lies within the framework of the built up area. Therefore it would not pre-empt further development.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>The parking standards as adopted within the Salisbury District Local Plan and are derived from the then consultation draft PPG13 and the joint county wide approach to car parking, with the intention of trying to minimise car use. They are</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			There is no likelihood of a swimming pool being built.	therefore felt to be appropriate. Please see response to representation 19.	Please see response to representation 19.
102	R Richardson	Object	<p>The site will provide too many additional cars for Tisbury. I do not think that either the development brief or the sustainable report have properly considered the extra strain on Tisbury's Infrastructure, such as the need for extra school places. There needs to be an impact assessment on the infrastructure Tisbury etc where will the extra children be schooled.</p> <p>SA states that the site for a swimming pool can add to general fitness to residents of Tisbury, this is not true as it is just the land being provided.</p> <p>Money should be put into converting the swimming pool into a covered pool.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3, 34, and 122. As detailed on page 62, education contributions will be requested if it is shown that demand exceeds capacity.</p> <p>If the swimming pool is built it could add the fitness and well-being of the residents of Tisbury. As suggested, if money is in fact put into covering the existing pool this again will improve Tisbury's fitness.</p> <p>It is accepted that any money could go into covering the existing swimming pool rather than providing the land. Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3, 34, and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required. Please see response to representation 19.</p>
103	J Roberts	Object	<p>Parmiters site should be developed first.</p> <p>75 houses will generate a lot of traffic, the village already has traffic problems.</p> <p>Industrial units by the station are not currently used and farms are providing small work units so the employment is not needed.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>
104	J Ings	Object	<p>Object to 3 storey dwellings and the density.</p> <p>Building in an AONB.</p> <p>Hindon Lane is dangerously busy, it has no pavements and has parked cars along it. Little scope for traffic calming measures.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			No one will walk / cycle to the village centre.	Please see response to representation 13.	Please see response to representation 13.
105	P Argo	Object	<p>Large estate not in keeping with village development.</p> <p>Parmiters site should be developed instead.</p> <p>Tisbury's road's cannot cope with an increase in traffic. Emergency vehicles might not be able to get to the A303.</p> <p>Employment units unnecessary as many farms have units to let and there are empty units in the Station Works.</p> <p>Build on other sites with planning permission first.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Unfortunately, even if a site has planning permission it does not mean that it will necessarily come forward. .</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>None required</p>
106	Relph Ross Partnership	Object	Make sure this is where you want the development to go.	Please see response to representation 1.	Please see response to representation 1.
107	S M Quirke	Object	<p>Large development would have a detrimental effect on the village.</p> <p>Increased population would put strain on support services.</p> <p>Extra traffic would cause chaos on the roads around Tisbury.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p>
108	C M Deane	Object	<p>All access roads are lanes, the wear and tear caused by extra traffic would be costly.</p> <p>You will upset the delicate balance of a rural community.</p> <p>The proposed site is a long way from the village centre, occupants or the proposed development will drive to the shops.</p> <p>The development will be an eyesore in an AONB.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>The design is too urban.</p> <p>The development would cause too much light pollution.</p> <p>Concern over burden placed on water treatment works.</p> <p>Will the electricity supply be affected.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>There should not be a problem with electricity supply.</p>	<p>representation 4.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>None required.</p>
109	G C Deane	Object	<p>All access roads are lanes, the wear and tear caused by extra traffic would be costly.</p> <p>You will upset the delicate balance of a rural community.</p> <p>The proposed site is a long way from the village centre, occupants or the proposed development will drive to the shops.</p> <p>The development will be an eyesore in an AONB. The design is too urban.</p> <p>The development would cause too much light pollution.</p> <p>Concern over burden placed on water treatment works.</p> <p>Will the electricity supply be affected.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>There should not be a problem with electricity supply.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>None required.</p>
110	M Hulland	Object	<p>Increase traffic is not practical on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Too many houses.</p> <p>Build on parmiters first.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p>
111	C Knight	Object	Encroaches on AONB.	Please see response to representation 4.	Please see response to representation 4.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Cannot cope with increased traffic.</p> <p>Increased light pollution.</p> <p>3 storeys are incompatible with a rural setting.</p> <p>Build on Station Works site instead.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p>
112	D Rear	Object	<p>Stations works should be built on instead.</p> <p>3 storeys</p> <p>Light pollution</p> <p>Effect of extra traffic on roads.</p> <p>Density</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 30.</p>
113	V Rose	Object	<p>Sewerage infrastructure cannot cope.</p> <p>The road network cannot cope</p> <p>We suffer from regular power cuts – can the electricity infrastructure cope.</p>	<p>Please see representation 34. If this is a problem you need to complain to Wessex Water to make them aware of this problem.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>There should not be a problem with electricity supply. The utility companies are statutory consultees. If there is a problem you need to make the utility companies aware of the issue so the situation can be improved.</p>	<p>Please see representation 34.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>What facilities will be provided for the additional children. The Council shut the middle school and the sports centre and swimming pool are threatened.</p> <p>Why not put the housing in the towns?</p> <p>The cost of the infrastructure – sewage, drainage, roads are not mentioned, where will this come from.</p>	<p>The County Council restructured the whole of the school system within Wiltshire, this is not the responsibility of the District Council. The developer will be required to contribute to the open space and play provision. Please see representation 19 for information regarding the swimming pool.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>If improvements are made this should come from the developer. This is detailed on page 62 and page 32 of the development brief.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1</p> <p>None required.</p>
114	D Morgan	Object	<p>The proposal is completely out of scale.</p> <p>Saturation has been reached in terms of population.</p> <p>They myth of a dying village.</p> <p>Landscaping won't soften the edges.</p> <p>Traffic on Hindon Lane.</p> <p>A demographic experiment on the countryside.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>Although Tisbury may not currently appear to be dying, more and more residents need to commute out due to the lack of employment in the village. This was identified during the Local Plan Inquiry. Without more employment there is a danger that Tisbury might become a 'ghost town' during the day.</p> <p>Although landscaping may take time to grow it should eventually soften the edge of the village.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>This is not a demographic experiment on</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Build on the Parmiters site.	the countryside. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.	Please see response to representation 8 and 12.
115	P Morgan	Object	Increased traffic on Hindon Lane will make it even more dangerous. Do we need this development?	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 1.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representation 1.
116	V Pittam	Object	There is not the infrastructure to cope. The roads around Tisbury are unsafe. Some of us have to park on Hindon Lane. Necessity to provide a bus should be retracted – very few people travel by bus. Parmiters site should be developed instead.	Please see response to representation 34. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representations 29, 52, 71 and 122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.	Please see response to representation 34. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. Please see response to representations 29, 52, 71 and 122. Please see response to representation 8 and 12.
117	Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB.	Object	Concerned that the development could be an intrusion into the AONB. Traffic on Hindon Lane. Can the structural landscaping really be achieved? Buildings seem narrower and taller than those in the rest of Tisbury. Concerned that the design does not reflect local distinctiveness. Open space provision does not seem to satisfy PPG17. Does not appear to be any attempt to blend the proposed buildings into the landform. Little commitment to sustainable construction.	Please see response to representation 4. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. There is no reason why this cannot be achieved in time. Please see response to representation 41. PPG17 requirements are satisfied through off-site provision, not far from the development site. Please see response to representation 4. Disagree, there is a commitment to	Please see response to representation 4. See response to representation 1, 3 and 122. None required. Please see response to representation 41. None required. None. None required. Please see

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Keen to see genuine sustainable drainage and solar energy.	sustainability, this is detailed on page 52 of the development brief. Sustainable drainage is to be provided if possible complying with guidance provided by the Environment Agency. All homes are additionally to be built to the Ecohomes 'very good standard'. Please see response to representation 32.	response to representation 32.
118	C Shirley	Object	Traffic generated will be too great. Hindon Lane cannot cope and will be further used.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.	See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.
119	TisVis Parish Planning Group	Object	<p>90% think that Tisbury should not expand beyond its current housing boundary.</p> <p>Against road widening.</p> <p>80% felt that the village did not need new large housing estates.</p> <p>While little over a quarter of respondents are in favour of the development at the Station Works, other than for commercial purposes, those who actually support the Hindon Lane development amount to a mere 22%.</p>	<p>The proposed development is within the Housing Policy Boundary for Tisbury.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Although this is acknowledged, in order to deliver essential facilities for Tisbury such as Affordable housing and the retention of facilities and services, housing beyond small scale infill is required. Without this Tisbury may well find that services and facilities close and that further facilities cannot be provided.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 8 and 12.</p>
120	Mr and Mrs Amos	Object	<p>Enhancing the urban feel – a theme running throughout the design brief.</p> <p>Traffic on Hindon Lane – a proper study needs to be worked through. Measures are needed to ensure the speed of traffic on the lane is slowed down.</p> <p>Cars and car parking. It has to be recognised that most households have more than one car. The lack of provision for cars in this development will</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>Car and cycle parking is identified on page 41 of the development brief. This identifies that parking will be provided in</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 45.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1,3 and 122.</p> <p>None required. Please also see response to representation 36.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>not make cars go away. There should be proper provision for on-site parking and evidence of collaborative working with South West Trains to ensure further provision by the station and near the high street, otherwise new people will not use the local facilities.</p> <p>Through route for vehicles – there needs to be a proper route through to Hindon Lane for residents in Weaveland Road, otherwise cars will cut through the sports centre / primary school.</p> <p>Speed limit throughout the development should be 20mph.</p>	<p>line with Policy G2 and appendix V and VI of the Local Plan. This identifies that for dwellings up to 4 beds 2 car parking spaces per unit will be provided plus 1 space per 5 units and for dwellings with five or more bedrooms 3 per unit will be provided with 1 extra space provide per 5 units for visitors. Details of parking provision for employment use is also identified in appendix V. Provision of cycle parking is identified in appendix VI of the Local Plan. This requires 2 covered cycle parking places per unit and 2 covered spaces plus 1 spacer per each 500m2 above 1000 m2 gross floor area. Therefore although the indicative drawings have been provided without any cars on them it does not mean that no parking will be provided. Please also see response to representation 36.</p> <p>The issue of a through route between Weaveland Road and Hindon Lane was discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry. The inspector identified that formal consultation with the County Highway Authority indicated they would object if the site were to be served from Weaveland Road. The Highways Authority again do not object to their not begin a through route. It would be the intention to design the route so as to prevent 'rat running'. Furthermore discussion with residents on Weaveland Road at the public consultation events held in Tisbury confirmed that residents on Weaveland Road did not want a link through to Hindon Lane.</p> <p>Agreed. As detailed on page 42, last bullet point there will be a design speed of</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>Affordable housing should be covenanted to it remains properly affordable. They should not be able to be extended so the value increases. Local people to Tisbury must have priority over others.</p> <p>Street lights should be limited to minimise light pollution. Lights used should limit a lightening of the night skyline. Provision should be made in property deeds that any outside lighting must not stay on permanently.</p> <p>Development mix – Proposal for the mixed development should include for rural type employment opportunities. There should not be any retail units that would threaten the viability of the current High Street / shops</p> <p>Provision of a bus route would promote travel to/from Hindon. Liaison would be needed with Tisbus to provide a service which links the development of the High Street and Railway Station at peak times. Other initiatives such as the provision of bicycle racks at the railway station would also be welcomed.</p> <p>All mention of the swimming pool should be</p>	<p>20mph within the development. This means that roads will be designed so that speeds greater than 20mph cannot be reached.</p> <p>As detailed on page 49 of the development brief, the affordable housing is tied through a section 106 agreement. The affordable housing, once complete will be negotiated by the Council and transferred to a Housing Association which will ensure it remains affordable housing into perpetuity.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>It is intended with the design of the employment areas proposed, as detailed on page 48 of the brief an area of employment buildings is proposed to be designed as a 'farmyard' type complex which should provide suitable units for rural type employment opportunities. Please also see response to representation 30.</p> <p>Liaison will be made with bus providers and Tisbus. Discussions will also be had with Network Rail as to the feasibility of place bike racks at the station.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 71.</p> <p>Please also see response to representation 30.</p> <p>No amendments to development brief, however, discussions will be had with bus providers and Network Rail regarding bus services as the provision of bike racks at Tisbury Station</p> <p>Please see response to</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>removed as this will never happen. The land should be re-defined as 'land set aside for a suitable community use' such as allotments or outdoor recreation provision linked to the sports centre or parking for the adjacent Nadder Hall and Sports Centre.</p> <p>Ongoing responsibility for the open space should be clearly defined. Financial provision would need to be set aside for maintaining such areas, not just capital funding.</p> <p>The re-use of grey water should receive more emphasis as well as other sustainability issues.</p> <p>Insufficient note has been taken of the natural history of the area. The site is home to many rare and endangered species both birds and mammals. Dormice in the ancient hedgerow should be retained.</p> <p>Measures need to be taken to ensure the existing bridleway is retained.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>It is generally intended that a Parish Council take on areas of open space provided by new development once the open space is complete (for example if play equipment is to be provided this should be fitted prior to the parish council adopting the site). The District Council also negotiate through a section 106 agreement a maintenance charge for maintaining the open space, this is calculated in order to last into perpetuity if spent correctly. This sum would also be transferred to the parish council on adoption of the open space by the parish council. Discussion will be had with the parish if the site is released for development as to the play equipment etc the parish wish to see on the site.</p> <p>Sustainability issues are discussed on page 52 of the development brief which addresses grey water.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13 and 47.</p> <p>The maps within the development brief clearly show that the bridle ways will be preserved. Furthermore these are</p>	<p>representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 13 and 47.</p> <p>None required</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Growth should be incremental.	protected through the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. Please see response to representation 1.	None required..
121	Environment Agency	Object	<p>Sustainability appraisal report section 5.4 - add to this the Planning Response to Climate Change – Advice on Better Practice. If policies don't take climate change into account they are not fully sustainable.</p> <p>Once the above is included the following should be amended within the development brief.</p> <p>Built Form, page 43 - Should specify robust and tough building design what has a better chance of withstanding more severe weather and more frequent storms predicted as a result of climate change.</p> <p>Page 52 – paragraph on <i>sustainable drainage</i> – Recommend that this paragraph is expanded. It should explain that a future planning application must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which focuses on the flood risk posed by surface water run-off and how this risk will be mitigated for by using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS. This is a requirement of PPG25.</p> <p>It may be useful to outline that to be acceptable as an FRA the applicant must confirm as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That it will be feasible to balance surface water run-off to the Greenfield run-off rate and volume for all events up to the 1 in 100 year storm (including climate change) and set out how this will be achieved. • How SUDS will be used with any obstacles to their use clearly justified. 	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The developer has a reputation for building high quality developments. The quality of build will be covered by building regulations.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Add to section 5.4 of the sustainability appraisal report '<u>The Planning Response to Climate Change – Advice on Better Practise</u>'</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Amend p 52 under '<u>Sustainable drainage</u>' to read '<u>A Flood Risk Assessment which focuses on the flood risk posed by surface water run-off will be required by the Environment Agency to accompany any planning application. This will explain how any flood risk will be mitigated against by using Sustainable Urban drainage Systems (SUDS). The SUDS will comply with the guidance provided by the Environment Agency</u> It is proposed to incorporate some sustainable drainage systems within the site to reduce surface water run off, together with areas of porous road surfaces. Sustainable drainage systems should comply with the guidance provided by the Environment Agency'.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p><i>Water conservation</i> Only dual flush toilets are installed so that the maximum water-saving option is available. The water efficiency options should go further.</p> <p>Spray taps should be used in wash hand basins. Low flow showers (no power showers) should be installed and white goods, as well as being A rated for energy efficiency, should also have the maximum water efficiency rating. Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered.</p> <p>Page 53 – Materials This should specify the use of renewable and recycled materials with greater emphasis. Appreciate that a particular character is necessary but modern methods of construction can make using renewable materials compatible with this. At present it is proposed to use mainly mineral materials (brick, stone etc) which are not usually a renewable resource. We question the sustainability of the construction materials proposed.</p>	<p>It is felt that the development brief already commits to a high level of water efficiency. Building regulations will assist in ensuring such efficiency. However a sentence will be added to the development brief to ensure that such items as spray taps are used.</p> <p>The materials to be used are in order to ensure the development fits into the local vernacular of Tisbury. However as stated within the development brief 'the selection of raw materials and construction techniques will wherever possible favour those with the lowest ecological impact over their projected lifetime'. Therefore if recycled materials are deemed to be more appropriate they may be used. Please see response to representation 32.</p>	<p>Page 52, under 'Water Conservation' add paragraph '<u>Other measures such as spray taps and low flow showers will be incorporated where possible</u>'.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 32.</p>
122	Wiltshire County Council Highways	Object.	<p>p32, last para on "Road Access". The change in the position of the 30 mph limit (including new road treatment to highlight the speed limit) and the mini-roundabout will be the traffic calming, there will be no additional measures. Therefore change last sentence to "<i>These</i> traffic calming measures are to be implemented prior to any development of the site."</p> <p>p36 – The roundabout and the change in position of</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Page 32, amend to last paragraph, last sentence under road access 'Traffic calming measures along Hindon Lane are to be implemented prior to any development on the site <u>The mini-roundabout and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development.</u></p> <p>Change point 1, page 36 to read '</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>the 30mph limit, including road treatment, will be the traffic calming measures on Hindon Lane –this should be clarified.</p> <p>“The development should provide a new access to the sports centre off Hindon Lane to avoid traffic travelling through the former Tisbury School”- it is acceptable for a small amount of traffic to the sports centre to pass through the development but we feel it should not be the only access to the sports centre. For those accessing the centre from Tisbury itself, the existing access via the school would be more convenient; if this route was retained, it would help to “spread the load” of traffic accessing the sports centre. The route through the development is quite tortuous compared to the alternatives, so it is unlikely to lead to rat-running through the site if the school access was left open.</p> <p>p36 – “A new bus route should be provided through the development to reduce the reliance upon the car”. It is not clear what route the bus service would run – is it suggested a diversion to existing services or a separate route? Also, it is not clear whether a link road could be created without the use of third party land. A link road could provide an alternative route for local traffic only, and is supported, subject to further consideration of the safety implications for the local roads. The development road will be designed for traffic speeds below 20mph, and a</p>	<p>Agreed, A link road will be provided to the sports centre and primary school as this was originally committed to by the developer many years ago. The layout of the development should ensure this does not become a ran run due to the time it will take to navigate through the proposed development</p> <p>On further discussions with Wiltshire county council Highways it is suggested that buses do not travel through the development but bus stops instead will be provided on Hindon Lane for everyone to use. A link road will be provided to the sports centre and primary school as this was originally committed to by the developer many years ago. The layout of the development should ensure this does not become a ran run due to the time it</p>	<p>The principal access to the site is to be off Hindon Lane via a new mini-roundabout. Traffic calming measures are to be introduced to Hindon Lane prior to the development. <u>This and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development.</u></p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Page 7, bullet 6, Provision of off-site traffic calming measures on Hindon Lane <u>'The mini roundabout and the moving of the 30mph zone will form the traffic calming measures which are to be implemented prior to the commencement of the development'</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>20mph speed limit will be imposed.</p> <p>p40 – if the bus route ran through the site, there should also be stops located at the north end of the development site too. If the route does not run through the site, stops should be provided near to the Hindon Lane access into the site and should include safety improvements for pedestrians to stand clear of the road. Therefore, the mini-roundabout should also include sections of footway linking to bus stops on both side of the road, shelters and raised kerbs.</p>	<p>will take to navigate through the proposed development.</p> <p>Agreed, bus stops will be provided on Hindon Lane near to the access and provide safety improvements for pedestrians to wait for buses.</p>	<p>Amend page 7 bullet 5 to read 'Creation of a new access through the site to the sports centre complex and primary school, including a bus route and stops.</p> <p>Page 36 bullet 7(new bullet 8) to read 'A permeable layout with good pedestrian and cycle linkages to the village town centre should be provided to encourage sustainable means of travel. A new bus route should be provided through the development to reduce the reliance upon the car.</p> <p>Page 40 – amend bullet points 3, 4 and 5 to read – Bus stops are located within a 300m radius of all but a very few dwellings; well within the accepted 400m radius walking distance.</p> <p>Bus route located along main street and to take advantage of the proximity of higher residential densities.</p> <p>Pedestrian-only streets protected by bollards and/or planters may be appropriate. Some areas may be designated as Home Zones with pedestrians having priority over vehicle users</p> <p><u>New bus stop and layby proposed for southern side of Hindon Lane</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>p41 – cycle parking should be secure, ie if there is a block of flats in the development a specific cycle store should be provided – it is not sufficient to provide open air cycle stands</p> <p>p40 – the “principal pedestrian/cycle route” is too indicative to mean much and there are too many of them to be the “principal” routes. Unless all these routes are to be shared use, suggest diagram should be altered to show which should be shared and which should be peds only. As development will be subject to a 20 mph zone, it will be sufficient for cycles to use the spine road only, so all the other routes could be for pedestrians only.</p> <p>there is one link that comes off the north-south public footpath, this should be ped only to minimise the likelihood of cyclists following it then going along the footpath.</p> <p>the route heading west from the site is a bridleway not a footpath.</p> <p>Both routes should be integrated into the design and may require to be suitably upgraded. The design of the bridleway where the development road crosses its route should be carefully designed (also refers to P47).</p> <p>P42 -- Last bullet point - “Design speed of 20mph within residential areas will be reduced to 10mph within Home Zone” – add “by design”.</p>	<p>Agreed. The local plan requires covered cycle parking places. However it may not be possible to provide cycle stores in all instances.</p> <p>There is only one principal route going through the development.</p> <p>The footpaths have been integrated into the design.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p><u>near entrance to development. New bus halt to northern side of Hindon Lane.</u></p> <p><u>Pedestrian-only streets protected by bollards and/or planters may be appropriate. Some areas may be designated as home Zones with pedestrians having priority over vehicle users.</u></p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Amend key on diagram on page 40.</p> <p>‘Existing public footpath / <u>bridleway</u>’</p> <p>Remove bus route from diagram in page 40.</p> <p>Amend diagram on page 40 to show which surfaces will be shared and which are pedestrian / cycle only.</p> <p>Page 42, last bullet point amend to read ‘Design speed of 20mph within residential areas will be reduced to 10 mph within Home Zones <u>by</u></p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<p>p49 – suggests a Home Zone element should be incorporated in the middle of the scheme. It would seem odd to have only a small part of the development as a home zone as you drive through, as it is a relatively small development suggest that the whole of it should be treated as a home zone with a 20 mph speed limit. This would help to reduce the concerns that are likely to arise from residents due to the traffic accessing the sports centre and would further reduce the likelihood of it being used as a rat-run if the route via the school was kept open as recommended above.</p> <p>Lastly, it is considered necessary that a Transport Assessment should be submitted in support of the development at the planning stage and the scope of the Assessment should be agreed prior to the planning submission. Of particular concern will be the effect of the development traffic on the local road network and on Hindon Lane, where parked cars currently restrict the flow of traffic. Also, construction traffic should be considered. The Transport Assessment should also consider the implications of the development for sustainable transport and the possibility of additional contributions which would support the use of sustainable modes. A Travel Plan will be required for this development.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p><u>design'</u></p> <p>Amend page 49 under home zone:</p> <p>Paragraph 1, 1st sentence 'the development should<u>could</u>.....</p> <p>Paragraph 2, sentence 1 amend 'A home zone should <u>could</u>.....</p> <p>Paragraph 2, sentence 2 amend 'The design of a Home Zone <u>could</u> should be</p> <p>Add to page 42 '<u>A Transport Assessment will be required to accompany any planning application for the site. A Travel Plan will also be required.</u></p>
123	B Woodcock	Object	<p>Generate more traffic.</p> <p>It is too big</p> <p>It will be visible on the landscape.</p> <p>We do not seek to be a town, the centre should be nurtured.</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3</p>	<p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 41.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 4.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 1 and 3</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			Build on Parmiters site instead.	Please see response to representation 8 and 12	Please see response to representation 8 and 12
124	A House	Object	<p>There is no infrastructure to support this development –</p> <p>No sewage capacity</p> <p>Roads cannot cope with increased traffic</p> <p>Electricity – have power cuts</p> <p>The swimming pool – who will build it? Run it etc We need the finances to support the sports centre.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 113.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 34.</p> <p>See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 113.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 19.</p>
125	T Austreng	Object	<p>Swimming pool site – could we have a new fitness suite make the sports centre more viable? Could the developer build this for us rather than the R2 money that we never see.</p> <p>Making the sports hall and school accessible will make Weaveland Road a rat run.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Noted. Please see response to representation 122.</p>	<p>Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Please see response to representation 122.</p>
126	M Taylor	NDM	<p>Not Duly Made – representation was received several days after the deadline date. However I am sure all of the comments are covered under the following representation:</p> <p>Traffic issues: See response to representation 1, 3 and 122.</p> <p>Parking: Representation 32.</p> <p>Building heights: Please see response to representation 41.</p>	NDM	NDM
127	Mr and Mrs R Barrett	Support	Development seems sound and with future of Tisbury will in mind. Better to grow than stagnate. However some of the three storey buildings are out	Noted.	None required.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			of keeping with the area.		
	Western Area committee		<p>The brief should take on board local design features. It should not be an urban development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be given to the quality of the build, e.g. sound insulation, skirting boards, architraves. Building quality should be of a high standard and something that will last 50-60 years. • In terms of the possibility of a new swimming pool for Tisbury, regard should be had to managing peoples' expectations. The Council would not be in a position to take on the running of a new swimming pool in Tisbury. • The layout and spacing of the proposed development is very good. • If there is to be a recreational area as part of the development then discussions should commence early on in order to clarify who will be responsible for the maintenance of this area. 	<p>The design of the development has been inspired by the local vernacular within Tisbury itself. It is therefore felt to be of a high quality.</p> <p>Quality of built is controlled through the building regulations. It is hoped that any buildings would last much longer than 50-60 years.</p> <p>Noted. Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Public open space is proposed to be provided as detailed on page 47 of the development brief. Discussions will be had with the parish council as to their willingness to adopt areas of open space to be provided.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Noted. Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>
	Design Forum		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The future maintenance of proposed structural landscaping (where it lies outside the site) and the issue of tree-planting within private gardens (where it may arise) will need to be dealt with carefully. • Some concern was expressed regarding the viability of a new swimming pool, the proposed cul-de-sac bus route and the quantum of employment-generating uses envisaged. • Regarding public art it was suggested that this should be incorporated in such a way as to enhance the scheme's legibility and distinctiveness. It was also suggested that some funds could be invested in a community initiative event aimed at helping to socially bond the new community with the existing residents of Tisbury. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Noted. Please see response to representation 19.</p> <p>None required.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Change made
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concern was expressed at the ability of the developer to follow through on the brief's aspirations for traditional fenestration given the likely expense imposed by recent more-stringent building regulations. The proposed development is quite Poundbury-esque in character, i.e., overtly vernacular in style, but would make for a pleasant place to live regardless. On the whole the Forum considers that the brief is suitably ambitious in terms of good urban design and its commitment to sustainable construction. 	<p>Noted, this does not appear to be a concern to the developer.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>None required.</p>